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ABSTRACT

In the 3rd century BCE the Hebrew Torah was translated into Greek. This work argues that the translator of Greek Genesis, a narrative text concerning global and Jewish national origins, aimed to make his translation’s plot virtuous according to contemporary literary standards: concision, consistency, sequentiality, unity, believability, and tragedy. Such virtues of plot are heuristically drawn from ancient *progymnasmata*, Aristotle’s *Poetics*, and current research on ancient prose composition, but they are confirmed by other sources as essential components of ancient literary criticism’s common core. The argument proceeds in two steps. First, traditional philological analysis, facilitated by modern digital tools, is undertaken to analyze the translator’s deviations from quantitative and serial equivalence and to examine his tendency to employ lexical and grammatical stereotypes. The results of this analysis are used to sketch the portrait of a complex translator who both adheres to the form of his source and makes deliberate and controlled translation choices affecting various literary dimensions of his translation. Second, case studies show that many such choices specifically contribute to improving the plot of literary units of various sizes, resolving difficulties inherent to the source in light of cultural expectations of anticipated readers: with Noah (Gen 6–9) the translator resolves inconsistency and alleviates redundancy (concision and consistency); with Abraham (Gen 12–25) he explicates the causal links between the different stages of the plot (sequentiality, unity, and believability); and with Joseph (Gen 37–50) he embellishes the plot’s tragic qualities (entertainment).
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

We know regrettably little about the circumstances under which the Pentateuch was first translated into Greek and became what legend later termed the Septuagint, or “Work of the Seventy (Translators).” In fact, numerous preliminary questions on this subject can only be met with answers that are incomplete, approximate, provisional, and probabilistic. The surest data are that the Pentateuch was translated somewhere in Egypt, sometime in the 3rd century BCE, by some group of multilingual individuals who were either Jewish or intimately familiar with Jewish beliefs and practices.\(^1\) The commonly accepted hypothesis that there were five translators who worked independently (one each for Genesis–Deuteronomy) is reasonable and probably correct, but it is still uncertain,\(^2\) and the translators’ level of education can only be approximated.\(^3\) We do not know why the

---


\(^{2}\) The most comprehensive treatment of this subject is Hayeon Kim, “Multiple Authorship of the Pentateuch” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 2006).

\(^{3}\) For a recent overview of scholarly views on this subject and a cautious argument for situating the translators within a documentary context, see James Aitken, “The Language of the Septuagint and Jewish Greek Identity,” in \textit{The Jewish-Greek Tradition in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire}, ed. James Aitken and James Carleton Paget (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014): 120–134. Aitken is right to identify the ambiguity of
translation was undertaken, how long it took, how it was subsidized, or who its intended readers were, and such questions can be multiplied at length.

Uncertainties aside, this translation project marks a watershed moment in the history of interpretation of the Pentateuch, not only because it is the most foundational of Jewish sacred texts or the earliest continuous interpretation of the Hebrew Torah, but also due to its core significance for Greek-speaking Jews and Christians in the centuries that follow. While firm answers to the basic questions about the production and aims of the Septuagint would greatly assist us in contextualizing and accounting for this major milestone of biblical interpretation, there are two main reasons for the cloud of enigmas that surrounds and pervades these issues. First, in the absence of any substantive external evidence, we can only attempt answers to such questions solely on the basis of internal evidence, i.e., the textual data found in the Greek translations, the Hebrew source texts, and any other linguistic, cultural, and historical sources that illuminate the words they contain. To formulate this more succinctly: all Septuagint research begins with linguistic and literary analysis. But the situation is further complicated by the fact that our primary linguistic data comes from a translation and not an original composition. While original authors may leave behind obvious clues concerning the circumstances, causes, or aims of composing a

the linguistic data as one of the major obstacles to pinning down the translators' educational (and professional) background. Specifically, the difficulty lies in “the drawing of a sharp distinction between literary Greek and the popular Greek of the Septuagint” (“Language of the Septuagint,” 129). To broaden this problem and make it more concrete, we can say that it is difficult to know what, if anything, can be inferred from a translator's use of, e.g., a technical term, a Homeric expression, or a documentary formula. While this could imply advanced education or intimate knowledge of a particular line of work, it is not as if different segments of society have exclusive rights to words and phrases most at home in their particular domains.
particular text, translators tend to operate incognito, blending in with the texts and authors they translate like chameleons in camouflage. In fact, translators most often draw attention to themselves when they make a careless mistake, replicate a source expression awkawardly in the target language, or depart from the source text in a major and obvious way. To spy a translator at work behind the translation in more typical circumstances, however, requires keen eyesight, attention to detail, and much patience.

Yet, while the textual evidence of the Greek Pentateuch is ill-suited to answer many of the basic questions of historical-critical scholarship directly, precisely, and assuredly, there is nonetheless much that can be learned about the Septuagint and the work of its translators by carefully comparing their translations with the Hebrew originals, on the one hand, and contemporary Greek sources, on the other. In other words, starting with linguistic and literary analysis, we can build towards answering larger questions about the context and purpose of the translation. But this philological work is tedious and time-consuming, and it bears fruit in a gradual way, one season at a time. In fact, the surest, most important, and most durable results of Septuagint research over the past century and a half are the cumulative product of countless hours of focused attention on textual details, especially those pertaining to textual criticism, translation technique, and the language of the Septuagint vis-à-vis contemporary usage, while the validity and effectiveness of other veins of inquiry typically stands or falls to the extent that it is firmly situated upon this foundational layer of linguistic evidence. To be sure, the classic debates of Septuagint Studies invoked above will likely persist into the distant future, but this does not mean that we must resign ourselves to any definite progress on this front, as the accumulated
fragments of philological evidence can be assembled and fitted together in structurally sound ways to construct arguments that establish more ambitious and provocative claims.

1.2 Thesis

In this work I aim to establish one such grander thesis, namely, that the translator of Greek Genesis (= G) intended to produce in his translation a plot that would be judged virtuous according to contemporary Hellenistic literary standards. This thesis is ambitious, in that it bears a significant burden of proof and thus requires the detailed and extensive analysis of a large corpus of evidence; and it is provocative, in that it calls into question some basic assumptions about the level(s) of discourse at which the translators’ choices operate. That is to say, it is the contention of this thesis that the choices G made in translating Genesis from Hebrew into Greek function not just on the lower levels of word, phrase, or clause, but also on the higher levels of paragraph, episode, and even an entire narrative complex. Apart from the foundational work of John William Wevers on textual criticism, the bulk of recent research on Greek Genesis has appropriately focused on the linguistic details of G’s translation in relation to his Hebrew source and natural Greek usage, and it has taken primarily one of several forms: (i) translation-technical studies, in which the Greek translation equivalents for a given Hebrew grammatical feature are analyzed throughout a large translation corpus, usually the entire Pentateuch; (ii) broader

5 For a sampling of lengthy studies that exemplify the application and adaptation of this approach to a variety of lexical and grammatical phenomena, see: Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta,
studies of the language of the Greek text and the degree to which it is representative of contemporary usage, with secondary consideration given to the Hebrew source text; and (iii) exegetical studies, in which many interpretive aspects of one limited segment of the Greek text are analyzed in sequence, often as a commentary. These studies are of great value, but their very nature privileges focusing on how the translator’s choices affect the meaning of smaller linguistic units, usually taking the word, phrase, or clause as the relevant context for analysis. But might not a translator’s interpretive innovations—as they can be seen through formally, semantically, and statistically divergent renderings—also relate to literary features such as style, plot, character, thought, cohesion, and unity, i.e., the same kinds of concerns that authors have about the poetics of their compositions that pertain more to the work as a whole? If so, it is critical to investigate whether, to what extent, and how this may be so, not only because this constitutes a novel set of important research questions in its own right, but also because what we may learn about the

translators’ interest in higher levels of discourse has the potential to critique and refine our assumptions about how their choices relate to more basic linguistic concerns.

Yet, before even examining G’s translation, there are two complementary reasons why we might expect him to have paid particular attention to the literary quality of his translation’s plot as he represented its Hebrew stories in Greek form. On the one hand, the Hebrew version of Genesis exhibits a certain roughness on account of its complex compositional history, such that the literary virtue of G’s own composition might be threatened by its redundancies, contradictions, gaps, ruptures, and its lack of causal connectedness and overarching unity. I do not claim that G was aware that he was translating a composite text, and my argument does not require any particular solution to the well-known literary-critical problems that have preoccupied Pentateuchal scholars now for centuries. However, it will be clear that I am sympathetic to the neo-documentary approach, as I make occasional reference to the reconstructed sources J, P, and E, especially where viewing the text as composed of source material from these three hypothetical documents illuminates G’s translation choices. Yet, I ask the reader to keep in mind that it is the presence of narrative flaws in Hebrew Genesis (and not their precise cause) that is of direct relevance to my case.

---

On the other hand, we might also expect G to have made narrative improvements in his translation, because Hellenistic literary culture repudiated—in theory if not always in practice—plots that are consistent, concise, sequential, and unified. These particular narrative virtues will be explored and explained in Part II by reference to ancient literary-theoretical texts, specifically the progymnasmata (preliminary exercises in prose composition) and Aristotle’s *Poetics*. As in the case of the source-critical division of Genesis mentioned above, I do not claim that G had first-hand knowledge of these or similar texts, that he was personally affiliated with the literary and literary-critical activity taking place during his time at the famous museum and library of Alexandria, or that he had the kind of top-notch rhetorical education in which he would have had the opportunity to rehearse and apply their principles extensively. Rather, I show that the narrative virtues that receive direct and detailed discussion in these texts are conservative across time, apply to multiple genres, and would have been infused not only into the entire educational system from top to bottom, but also into G’s literary and cultural milieu, as, for example, the theater and the forum were public spaces where his ideas about proper narrative design would have been shaped and influenced by his exposure to Greek drama and rhetoric. Furthermore, while ancient theorists describe the ideal plot systematically and with precise terminology, much of their advice (e.g., the idea that a plot should not contain open contradictions), is rather common sense and cuts across many distinctions of time, place, age, education, and culture. In fact, as I will show that the Joseph narrative exemplifies Hellenistic literary virtues—in contrast to that of Noah and Abraham—and even has a desirable tragic quality, it seems likely that G learned something of narrative excellence from the biblical text itself. Although
my argument situates G’s interpretive activity within the context of broader literary trends, it does not require that he had any particular educational background. We only know that he was neither at the top nor at the bottom of the literary food chain. G’s training and life experience may very well have been more in the documentary than in the literary sphere, especially as literary impulses have been observed among scribes composing more mundane texts familiar to daily life. We must remain agnostic about the precise mechanism by which G would have been influenced by the literary ideals concerning plot and narrative that I will demonstrate he applies in his translation, but ancient literary theory is nevertheless useful for contextualizing the set of translation choices in focus in this study. The proof for this contention of mine rests upon the detailed examination of the evidence in each of the three chapters in Part II.

1.3 Argument

Even though the combination of the narrative flaws haunting Hebrew Genesis and the ideals of plot permeating Hellenistic literary culture renders it prima facie likely that G would have attempted to make improvements to certain aspects of his translation’s plot, proving that he actually aimed to do so is an arduous task. My argument that G intended to produce a virtuous plot is therefore lengthy and cumulative, but it proceeds in two basic steps corresponding to the two major parts of this dissertation. First, I describe, classify, catalogue, and analyze G’s translation choices in the entire corpus of Greek Genesis in order to construct a portrait of him as a translator and show that he carried out his translation work deliberately, carefully, and with thoughtful precision. Then, I examine three narrative
complexes of varying sizes and types (Noah: Gen 6–9; Abraham: Gen 12–25; and Joseph: Gen 37–50) in order to show how the particular translation choices that G makes contribute to particular virtues of plot in each literary unit.

In Part I, I take up the traditional toolkit of philology, using modern digital tools to facilitate my comprehensive translation-technical analysis of Greek Genesis. In particular, after treating preliminary issues about the sources of data used in this study (chapter 2), I analyze G’s treatment of four types of equivalence: quantitative (chapter 3), serial (chapter 4), lexical (chapter 5), and grammatical (chapter 6). In doing so, I demonstrate that G was guided (implicitly) by a complex poetics of translation, in that he aimed to represent both the form and the meaning of the Hebrew text with accuracy and precision in Greek, such that he largely adhered to its formal contours where possible but confidently reworked its thoughts and expressions in Greek where any combination of grammatical, syntactic, stylistic, rhetorical, pragmatic, theological, literary, or other factors rendered formally, semantically, or statistically divergent translation choices expedient. Furthermore, by surveying in detail the numerous kinds of translation choices that G regularly made in his Greek representation of Hebrew Genesis and its stories, I provide in Part I a framework and point of reference for the individual translation phenomena cited in Part II as evidence that G made plot improvements appropriate to specific stories in Genesis. I describe my work in Part I metaphorically as painting a portrait of G as a translator, and I do so for several reasons, but especially because the act of representing the translator that hides behind Greek Genesis is, like painting a portrait, an interpretive task that proceeds in multiple stages (e.g., outline, shading, color, detail, etc.), that involves constant interplay between
the whole and the part, and that requires the subjective judgment of an artist. In citing, describing, analyzing, and summarizing such a bounty of linguistic data, I acknowledge outright the subjective aspects of my role as researcher and interpreter.

With this translator portrait in hand, I then proceed in Part II to three literary case studies in which I demonstrate how G’s specific translation choices contribute to improving the plot of literary units of various sizes and types in view of the cultural expectations shared by G and his readers. In the first two cases, I show that G cultivated virtues of plot lacking in his Hebrew source: in the story of Noah and the flood (Gen 6–9), which contains both contradiction and redundancy on account of being the conflation of two similar accounts, G resolved inconsistency and alleviated redundancy in order to promote the narrative virtues of concision and consistency (chapter 7); in the episodic narrative about Abraham (Gen 11–25), where the events are arranged according to chronology but not necessarily according to causal contingency, G pursued unity and sequentiality by explicating the implicit narrative logic that links the plot’s numerous events in a causal chain, thus unifying the larger narrative complex as a whole (chapter 8). In contrast, the story of Joseph and his brothers (Gen 37–50) stands apart, in that the Hebrew version’s plot already exhibits the virtues of consistency, concision, sequentiality, and unity, and it even bears all the marks of a story narrated in the tragic mode.⁹ So, I argue in this chapter that G strove to capture and embellish the aspects of this plot that a Greek audience would identify

---

⁹ For the common practice of ancient writers applying the tragic mode in various prose genres, see Jeff Jay, *The Tragic in Mark: A Literary-Historical Interpretation*, HUT 66 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).
as tragic, in order to make it even more entertaining and compelling for his readers (chapter 9).

1.4 Method

In this work my argument is confronted at every turn by the thorny question of whether, how, to what extent, and with what degree of certainty we can know the translator’s intention. At its core, this is an issue of moving from describing G’s translation choices to explaining and accounting for them. There may be various explanations for a given translation choice (e.g., grammatical, lexical, stylistic, rhetorical, literary, pragmatic, theological, etc.), and such explanations may (and should) often be combined. Yet, these different types of explanations also exist in a loose hierarchy, such that it is, for example, far simpler to demonstrate that a translator’s intent in any given case relates to the basic aspects of Greek grammar and usage than it is to show that literary or ideological factors are (also) at work. As I will show in Part I, although G’s custom of

adhering closely to the form of the Hebrew undeniably leads him to overuse certain words, phrases, and constructions and to stretch their usage, he generally follows the rules of Greek grammar and uses Greek words according to their usual meanings. Given this fact, it is possible to generalize that G usually operates with lexical and grammatical intentions, although it is, of course, most clear where he deviates from the Hebrew in order to do so.

But how can we discern where G’s intentions are more complex, and especially where they seem to be motivated by literary aspects of his translation, such as plot? There is no one-size-fits-all answer to this question, but in working on Greek Genesis I have identified four main methodological principles that have consistently proven useful, and I repeatedly apply these principles to draw the same kinds of inferences from the textual data. Where G’s translation seems to diverge from the Hebrew in a way that suggests a literary motivation, this divergence is more credibly attributed to the intentionality of the translator where and to the extent that the following conditions are met: (i) **the character of the translator** can generally be shown to exhibit linguistic competence, deliberateness, and care, thus investing his particular choices with individual significance; (ii) **the divergence in meaning** between the particular Hebrew and Greek expressions involved is unambiguous and also confirmed by (ii.a) lexica, grammars, and/or actual texts, (ii.b) G’s regular translation-technical patterns—whether he departs from his main way of handling things or reuses a common translation strategy in multiple passages for a similar effect—and (ii. c) the rejection of G’s translation choices by later revisers of the Greek; (iii) a **convergence of data** of the same or multiple types works in concert to advance the divergence in meaning; and (iv) **the history of interpretation** confirms the divergence in meaning as a viable
interpretation taken by actual readers, especially where readers of the Hebrew consistently go another way.  

It is no doubt easiest to understand these four abstract principles when they are applied to a specific example. The first principle of method, which relates to (i) the translator’s general character, is not demonstrated by a single translation choice but rather the comprehensive analysis of all translation choices, and it is the aim of Part I in its entirety to establish this first condition. Yet, the other three principles can be observed to varying degrees in a single example taken from Genesis 16:2, where Abraham's barren wife Sarah offers her maidservant Hagar to him as a wife by which he may have a son:

16:2

וַתֹּאמֶר שִׂרְיָה אֲלֵא אָבְרָם עֵּֽלֵּֽיָּ֖ה יְהוָ֑ה מַלְּדֶֽֽה נַהֲנֶֽֽנָּ֑ה לֵֽיהוָֽה וְתּוֹךְ נַהֲנֶֽֽנָּ֑ה בָּא נַהֲנֶֽֽנָּ֑ה אִיּוּ אֵֽלֵֽא שַפָּֽטֵֽתְךָ וּרְשֵׁמְרַע אֱֽרֹן לַלָּזָֽל שֵֽׁרַי

And Sarai said to Abram, “Behold! The Lord has prevented me from bearing children. Go in to my maidservant. Perhaps I will be built up from her.” And Abram listened to Sara's voice.

εἰπεν δὲ Σάρα πρὸς Ἀβράμ, ἵδοι συνεχείστην με κύριος, τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν· εἰσελθέν οὖν πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην μου, ἰνα τεκνοποιήσης εἶξ αὐτῆς· ὁπήκουσεν δὲ Ἀβράμ τῆς φωνῆς Σάρας.

Then Sara said to Abram, “Behold! The Lord has closed me so that I cannot bear children. So, go in to my maidservant, in order that you may produce a child by her.” And Abram obeyed Sara's voice.

For a relatively recent and thoughtful statement on the value of reception history for Septuagint Studies, see Martin Meiser, “Die Bedeutung der Rezeptionsgeschichte für die Septuagintaforschung,” in Die Septuaginta — Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.-25. Juli 2010, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 286 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 425–443. In particular, Meiser claims that reception history can (i) provide intellectual background; (ii) reveal points of ambiguity; (iii) corroborate or refute interpretations; and (iv) show the translator's position vis-à-vis fidelity and independence.
Although G has made a number of interesting translation choices in this single verse that deserve a detailed investigation (see §8.3.1), the most striking involve the representation ofami הָבָה (“Perhaps I will be built up”) as ἵνα τεκνοποιήσῃς (“in order that you may produce a child”). The juxtaposition of these pairs of words stands out due to (ii) the unambiguous difference in meaning conveyed by each of the following pairs of English translations: “perhaps” (お互い) => “in order that” (�인); “I” (אני) => “you” (τεκνοποιήσῃς); “be built up” (בנו) => “produce a child” (τεκνοποιέομαι). In the Hebrew version, Sarah thinks that it is a mere possibility that she will experience motherhood vicariously by this proposal, but in the Greek she is certain that not she—but Abraham!—will benefit from her plan. This divergence in meaning is not only established by (ii.a) the grammars and lexica, but its intentionality is rendered more probable by (ii.b) G’s general patterns of translation, since he representsお互い in every other occurrence in a way that conveys contingency (11/12), and he rarely alters the person of a finite verb (39/4,266) (0.9%) (see §6.1.2.1).

Furthermore, the significance of G’s departure from the meaning of the Hebrew is confirmed by the fact that (ii.c) Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all correct his translations of both Hebrew words: they change ἵνα to εἴπως (“if perhaps”) and τεκνοποιήσῃς to either οὐκοδομηθήσομαι (“I will be built up”) (Aquila) or τεκνωθῶ (“I may be furnished with children”) (Symmachus, Theodotion). As a consequence, the likelihood of G’s literary intention in this verse is further bolstered by (iii) the convergence of multiple pieces of evidence (ἵνα, τεκνοποιήσῃς) as well as multiple types of evidence (lexical, grammatical), a

point that could be extended even further by including the other divergent or notable elements of G’s translation underlined in the texts above. Finally, the possibility that G intended to convey Sarah (and Abraham’s) certainty that her plan would succeed is confirmed by (iv) the way that later readers interpret the Greek text, such as Didymus the Blind, who elaborates that Sarah’s surefire plan stemmed from her wisdom and holiness: knowing that Abraham would have children—as God had promised—she recognized her own infertility and so designed to circumvent it. Of course, the interpretations given by later readers are in no way determinative of G’s intended meaning, but their readings serve an important corroborating function. That is to say, while the scholar must be cautious not to read reception history back into the text, her interpretations may be confirmed when, having first divined a literary intention in a set of G’s translation choices, she then finds this interpretation assumed, asserted, or elaborated by those who read G’s text in a context that is historically, geographically, and culturally much closer to his than our own.

1.5 Caveats

Finally, before we immerse ourselves in the fascinating work of the translator of Greek Genesis, I would like to issue a few words of caution. As with all research, each question we ask and the methods we apply to answer it can create certain blind spots or dangers, and by naming several here, I hope to forestall some likely sources of misunderstanding. First, the very act of comparison runs the twin risks of either overstating

---

the differences between the two comparanda or understating them. Since my argument’s primary method works with points of difference between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Genesis, I sometimes strongly emphasize minor differences in form or meaning in order to be clear as to what I understand to be the quality of the difference, especially in relation to alternative translation choices that G could have selected but did not. Since this usually involves producing side-by-side English translations of the Hebrew and Greek in question, I may translate such examples with a greater degree of artificiality than I would if no comparison were being made. In some cases, I might even translate the Hebrew and Greek phrases identically in another context if I were not trying to get at the significance of the particular choice that G has made. Furthermore, constantly comparing the Hebrew and Greek can also be misleading if we do not keep in mind that most of the readers of Greek Genesis did not arrive at its meaning in this way; rather, they read it as an independent Greek text and did not compare and contrast the Greek translation with the Hebrew original. Yet, as the comparison of source and target texts is essential to Septuagint research—and more generally to the study of any translated text being considered as a translation—the best we can do is to remain cognizant of the hazards of comparison.

Second, although I focus—especially in chapters 8 and 9—particularly on those places where I detect narrative flaws in the Hebrew version of Genesis and repeatedly analyze G’s translation choices there in relation to these sources of interpretive problems, beware that I do not claim that G found fault with his Hebrew source himself. In the end, we do not know what assessment G would have given to the stories of Hebrew Genesis, but the literary interpretations I analyze cannot in any single instance prove that he saw these
gaps, contradictions, redundancies, and fractures as such. More likely, his formally, semantically, and statistically divergent renderings reflect his awareness that the more usual representation he could have given would imply such a problem and that the Greek words and forms he has actually chosen are simply the best way to represent what he thinks that the Hebrew actually means. Third, and finally, by focusing in Part II almost exclusively on G’s most obvious, most unusual, and most interesting literary interpretations, one should keep in mind that G makes such translational interventions relatively infrequently. If the reader keeps the more general evidence adduced in Part I in mind, however, this pitfall should be avoidable, since I classify and analyze G’s major patterns and trends as a translator in a general way there. Throughout this lengthy argument and analysis of its complex data, I will strive to keep the part in proper balance with the whole. With these words of warning out of the way, we may dive into this intriguing text, but to repurpose the words of Jesus recorded in the Gospel of Matthew, I will say once more: ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω (“let the reader keep this in mind!”) (24:15).
Part I
2 TEXTUAL ISSUES

2.1 Introduction to Part I

In Part I of this work, I aim to present a systematic and relatively comprehensive analysis of translation technique in Greek Genesis by documenting, classifying, analyzing, and illustrating how G chooses to represent the number (§3) and order (§4) of Hebrew elements in Greek translation as well as their lexical (§5) and grammatical (§6) form and content. Part I lays an essential foundation for the second step in my work’s overarching argument, since it is only by constructing a realistic and detailed portrait of G as a translator on the basis of “a more or less complete picture of the translation technique” of the entirety of Greek Genesis that it is possible to establish that he was a deliberate, careful, and controlled translator, competent and motivated to improve the virtues of his translation’s plot according to contemporary standards of Hellenistic literary criticism. However, the translation-technical analysis in Part I may also be read as a distinct unity, and the translator portrait that I construct here differs from previous work in several important ways, even as it is throughout in conversation with prior research on translation technique. The most significant innovations of the present study may be summed up under

---

1 Staffan Olofsson, “Consistency as a Translation Technique,” *SJOT* 6 (1992): 29. Consider the full quotation: “It would of course be an advantage if one were able to combine different aspects of literality in order to give a more or less complete picture of the translation technique of a given book, but to make a sum out of the different figures, in order to compare the literality of the LXX books, ought in most cases to be avoided.” Although Olofsson cautions against the rash or mindless comparison of translation technical data for different translation units of the Septuagint, he rightly sees the value in trying to get one’s mind around how a particular translator works by means of thick description and comprehensive analysis.
the related headings of (i) scope and level of detail (or pace of exposition), (ii) form, (iii) sources of data, and (iv) purpose.

The most distinctive of these methodological innovations concerns the scope and level of detail (or pace) of analysis. In terms of scope, researchers have rarely undertaken the task of comprehensively analyzing the translation technique of an entire Septuagintal translation unit or book, and never for anything anywhere near the length of Greek Genesis. Even so, many have attempted to characterize larger translation units and their translators on the basis of more circumscribed evidence, typically either (i) examining a single (and often strategically chosen) linguistic feature in a large corpus that may span

\footnote{In fact, the analysis of Part I is actually quite detailed, but it is presented compactly in the main text and relies heavily on illustrative examples, relegating full documentation, more explanation and minor details to the footnotes. For this reason, one can conceive of this distinctive either as a matter of level of detail or as a matter of pace.}

\footnote{Peter Gentry, \textit{The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job}, SCS 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); Kevin Youngblood, “Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations” (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004). The important and very detailed works by Gentry and Youngblood are the nearest comparanda, and yet the asterisked materials in Greek Job and Greek Lamentations are far shorter than Greek Genesis. This fact partially accounts for the relatively rapid pace of analysis and exposition in this study in comparison to their nearly exhaustive approach. Though far less detailed and relying to a large extent on semi-automatic computer analysis of CATSS data, Benjamin Wright has analyzed (i) word order, (ii) segmentation of Hebrew words, (iii) quantity, and (iv) lexical consistency in Sirach in comparison to other Septuagint books in order to evaluate the Greek text’s reliability as a source for Hebrew retroversions (\textit{No Small Difference: Sirach’s Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text}, SCS 26 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989], 19–118). These are four of five dimensions of literalism taken from a typology he developed together with Emanuel Tov, lexical adequacy being excluded because it was deemed impossible to measure statistically (“Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX,” \textit{Text} 12 [1985]: 149–187; cf. \textit{The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research}, 3rd ed. [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2015], 18–31).}
multiple translation units (e.g., the Pentateuch) or even the entire Septuagint,\(^4\) or (ii) investigating many aspects of translation in a narrower subset of a translation unit, very often a single chapter but sometimes even a few verses.\(^5\) Scholars then use these two types of cross-sectional analysis—or rely on prior research and personal familiarity with particular books\(^6\)—to generalize about a given translator and his approach to translation, sometimes


even comparing different translation units with each other. These approaches, valuable as they are, only take into account small slices of the data, making generalizations on the acknowledged assumption that the whole resembles the part, an assumption that could be qualified or even contradicted by the inclusion of additional evidence. In contrast, the present study has been designed to counteract this weakness, because it examines many aspects of the whole. It is partly due to this fact and the prohibitive size of Greek Genesis that the translation-technical analysis of Part I also stands out from prior research in terms of its level of detail (or pace of exposition), as I aim to classify and illustrate the translation phenomena that are most important for understanding how G works as a translator without getting fixated on minor exceptions instead of paying attention to major patterns. At the same time, I have taken great care to provide thorough documentation of counts and references for all but the most common phenomena to be discussed, so that this translator

---

7 For example, such approaches may or may not account for the possibility that a translator learns and adapts throughout his work, as has been argued for Greek Genesis: see Willem van Klinken, “From Literal to Free? A Study of Development in the Genesis Translation of the Septuagint” (ThM thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2006); Theo van der Louw, “The Evolution of the LXX-Genesis Translator,” in Die Septuaginta: Geschichte – Wirkung – Relevanz, 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal, 21-24. Juli 2016, ed. Martin Meiser et al., WUNT 20 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 146–157; “The Unity of LXX Genesis and Exodus” (forthcoming article in VT).

8 Counts often occur in parentheses after a description of a translation phenomenon, sometimes expressed as a ratio of a broader pattern, in which case a percentage may be given to facilitate comparison. All percentages are rounded to the nearest tenth. Concerning biblical citations, all refer to Greek Genesis unless another book
portrait will be maximally useful to anyone who wishes to analyze G, even those who may quip or quibble over the finer points of translation technique as well as those who do not accept all of the findings of Part II or the argument of the whole work. Yet, a sufficiently general level of detail and a sufficiently rapid pace of exposition are required if one is to hold the entire panorama of philological detail in the mind’s eye simultaneously, gazing at the whole portrait of the translator that I will paint and appreciating all of its artistic traits in a single moment. This appreciation of the whole in view of its manifold parts is what is needed to catch G in the subtle act of transforming and improving individual parts of the plot of Hebrew Genesis as he translates it into Greek.

My translation-technical analysis also differs from previous approaches in terms of its form. Of the few studies that do offer comprehensive snapshots of particular translation units,9 the exact rubric of quantitative equivalence (§3), serial equivalence (§4), lexical equivalence (§5), and grammatical equivalence (§6) has been used by none. Gentry and Youngblood, who follows Gentry's model, organize their work around Hebrew parts of speech, a reasonable approach that is reflected in this study in certain ways, especially in the chapters on lexical and grammatical equivalence, where I profitably analyze translation phenomena of a lexical and grammatical order by first grouping words according to their parts of speech. However, in terms of the highest level of organization operative in Part I, is named. To make lists of references more readable, chapter numbers appear in bold type along with the colon that separates the chapter and verse. Where there are versification differences between the standard Hebrew and Greek editions, references are to the Greek unless only the Hebrew text is in question.

9 See note 3 for references to the work of Gentry and Youngblood.
this study closely follows the typologies of literalism developed first by James Barr and then by Ben Wright and Emmanuel Tov, but recombining some of their parts in new ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Barr</th>
<th>Wright-Tov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) segmentation and word order</td>
<td>(i) consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) quantity</td>
<td>(ii) segmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) consistency</td>
<td>(iii) word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) semantic accuracy (and level)</td>
<td>(iv) quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) formal (“etymological”) imitation</td>
<td>(v) linguistic adequacy of lexical choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) level of text/analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative equivalence corresponds to a combination of segmentation and quantity, and serial equivalence to word order, while lexical equivalence and grammatical equivalence chiefly involve consistency and accuracy/adequacy. Despite the similarities, however, I have jettisoned the category of literalism and replaced it with the main analytic categories of equivalence and representation. Equivalence concerns the pairing of Hebrew formal and semantic features with analogous or stereotyped Greek ones on the basis of an analytic pairing or alignment of Hebrew and Greek elements along with their lexical and morphological features (see §2.3), while representation more broadly concerns how G chose to convey the meaning of the Hebrew in Greek regardless of (but not unconscious of) formal similarities or dissimilarities between the Hebrew and Greek equivalents. To put this

---

another way, while equivalence focuses mainly on form, representation also takes content into consideration. Together, the concepts of equivalence and representation are more flexible and allow for more precision in describing the kinds of translation choices made by G. At the same time, they also avoid the unwanted baggage inevitably associated with defining what literal means and what its opposite(s) is or would be. At any rate, it does not appear that G was particularly concerned with how “literal” or “free” his translations were, but rather with translating Hebrew words, phrases, and sentences into Greek in a way that he felt adequately captured the Hebrew meaning, even though he did more often than not choose to represent a given Hebrew word with formally equivalent and statistically dominant Greek translations.

The important differences concerning the sources of data that I use in this study will be discussed directly in this chapter at a later point, and yet several advances may be anticipated now, relating not only to the textual data and its lexical, morphological, and translational annotation, but also to its careful organization for detailed analysis. First, my translation-technical analysis utilizes a reconstructed Hebrew text, because it seems that G’s Vorlage differed in certain minor ways from the MT (§§2.2; 2.3.2), as well as Wevers’s Greek text of Genesis, which is the best approximation of G’s actual translation (§2.3.1). In contrast, while prior studies have not always disregarded the possibility of textual variants, none has systematically reconstructed all likely variants before—and, of course, while—

analyzing translation technique, and researchers utilizing the CATSS database have had to make changes to Rahlfs’s Greek text in order to bring it into line with Wevers’s more current edition. Furthermore, the textual alignment used here surpasses the CATSS data not only in terms of its more fine-grained analysis of the Hebrew text, but also concerning the overall quality and consistency of its lexical and morphological annotation and the textual alignment of its Hebrew and Greek elements (§§2.3.1; 2.3.3). Together, these differences ensure the accuracy and reliability of the translation-technical analysis of Part I.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, my translator portrait differs from prior research in terms of its purpose. Though a few scholars have attempted to produce a comprehensive translation-technical analysis of an extended translation unit, none has done so for the purpose of establishing a translator’s character as the basis of a literary study of his interpretation of the Hebrew source text. In fact, studies of translation technique have often been undertaken primarily for their own sake, but also as evidence in larger arguments, while provocative claims concerning a translator’s intentions have often been based on insufficient evidence or myopic fixation on particular details without adequately considering their relationship to the whole. I have intentionally written Part I like a

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\text{E.g., Evans, Verbal Syntax, 7–8, 270–280.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{13}}\text{This is especially the case with the precise philological work of the Finnish school (see note 4).}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{14}}\text{E.g., Benjamin Wright uses translation-technical analysis to evaluate the reliability of the Greek Sirach as a source for Hebrew retroversions (No Small Difference); T. V. Evans uses it in order to establish the Greek Pentateuch as a source of data that may be used for evaluating Hellenistic Greek usage (Verbal Syntax).}\]
reference work in hopes that it will be of value to all Septuagint researchers, especially as such a labor-intensive study is unlikely to be undertaken again soon. What is more, it stands on its own in terms of its compilation, arrangement, and linguistic analysis, i.e., irrespective of its particular argumentative function in this larger work. In this spirit, I have taken a great deal of care in organizing and presenting Part I in such a way that it can easily be read on its own, in part, and out of order, as the analysis of some or all of this data will hopefully be used by others in the service of their own arguments. At the same time, one should never underestimate the benefits of slogging through the details for oneself. Yet, this too has been facilitated by the copious documentation of the individual data that fuel the analysis. In addition, the reference-like character of Part I has the felicitous effect of allowing for some brevity in Part II, since the manifold translation phenomena analyzed here in relation to the whole can readily be brought to bear on related phenomena analyzed in Part II in relation to the part. Furthermore, by establishing a baseline for how G typically elects to represent myriad Hebrew words and structures in Greek guise, Part I provides a background and framework for the contextualized literary analysis of Part II, where I focus more minutely on G’s specific translation choices that often deviate from the usual patterns observed in Part I but are also integrated into G’s translator portrait as a whole by virtue of their distinctiveness, since it will be argued that the entire range of G’s translation choices implies a complex poetics of translation.

But before it is possible to conduct this analysis of translation technique in Greek
Genesis in order to begin sketching and painting G’s translator portrait, it is necessary to be
more precise concerning the nature and form of the two texts involved and their assumed
translational relationship to one another. So, the present chapter first defines and defends
what are taken to be the source and target texts used in this work and then explains the
digital form of these texts and their textual alignment with one another. This first section of
Part I will thus position the present study in contemporary scholarship by articulating and
defending its foundational layer of assumptions.

2.2 Critical Texts: G and his Vorlage (V)

Any detailed account of a translation’s poetics must first attempt to reconstruct the
precise form of two texts: the translator’s source and the translation itself. But especially in
the case of G and his Hebrew Vorlage (= V), both of which are many centuries removed
from the present, variants are only to be expected among the textual witnesses, and both
texts are always scholarly reconstructions, even if a scholar elects to follow the text of a
single manuscript. For the reconstruction of G, this study relies primarily on the edition by
John William Wevers,16 which aims to reconstruct Greek Genesis as produced by the
translator. For the text of V, however, no such accepted scholarly reconstruction exists, at
least in part due to the fact that reconstructing V faces problems of circularity at every turn,
inasmuch as G itself is the best witness to the form of V.

16 Wevers, Genesis.
Faced with the problem of circularity, then, how should one proceed? One option that has often been taken is to use \( L \) (= Codex Leningradensis) as \( V \), at least in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary.\(^1\) This approach is certainly not irrational, for at
\[ \text{_________________________} \]

\(^1\) This approach is taken, for example, by Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 11–16; “The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis,” *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 62–70. In his article, Rösel particularly excludes the admission of variants that may result from (i) harmonization; (ii) exegesis; or (iii) linguistic factors, at least in the absence of textual evidence in a Hebrew manuscript. This approach is based upon the characterization of \( G \) as a harmonizing translator-theologian developed in his earlier work, but it fails to take into account the harmonizing character of the textual tradition of Hebrew Genesis as a whole. For a critique of Rösel’s position, see William Brown, “Reassessing the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis 1: A Response to Martin Rösel,” *BIOSCS* 32 (1999): 35–39; cf. *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3*, SBLDS 132 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). In particular, Brown thinks that Rösel excludes too many variants in favoring \( L \): “The external evidence that Rösel demands for establishing the textual priority of the LXX is, in fact, too high, for it appears that he requires a Hebrew manuscript that contains all the significant pluses of LXX-Gen before he can be convinced otherwise” (“Reassessing the Text-Critical Value,” 36).

However, neither scholar considers the implications of the broader textual evidence of Genesis, which is the prudent advice of John William Wevers, “The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-partem Reflections,” in *VII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Claude Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 51–60. For other studies that favor the MT in the evaluation of potential variants in \( G \), see Johann Cook, “Ancient’ Readings in the Translations of the Old Testament,” *JNSL* 12 (1984): 41–52; “Translators,” 169–182; Robert J. V. Hiebert, “Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and its Implications for the NETS Version,” *BIOSCS* 33 (2000): 76–93. Hiebert’s more recent work for the forthcoming SBL Commentary on the Septuagint volume on Greek Genesis also leans in this direction, but with full and balanced discussion of the linguistic evidence, as can be seen from his sample commentary on Gen 1 (“In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1-2.3,” in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, ed. Dirk Büchner, SCS 67 [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017], 17–67. For studies that are more open to variants without direct textual evidence in Hebrew manuscripts, see Cook, “Exegesis,” 91–125; Ronald Hendel, *The Text of Genesis I-II: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); “On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis: A Reply to Rösel,” *BIOSCS* 32 (1999): 31–34. Also, consider Melvin K. H. Peters’s statement on Greek Deuteronomy, which is both pointed and persuasive but also illustrates the nature of the debate among Septuagint scholars: “Put simply, certain scholars hold the view that Septuagint ‘translators’ were sometimes not translating at all, at least not from Hebrew, but were ‘authors’ either making things up ‘on the fly’ or, worse, copying Greek from other witnesses, composing from memory, or freely ‘harmonizing with/borrowing from’ other parts of the Hebrew Bible itself” (“Translating a Translation: Some Final Reflections on the Production of the New English Translation of Greek Deuteronomy,” in “Translation is
least three reasons. First, in spite of its relative youth (1009),¹⁸ L is an excellent witness, often containing ancient readings corroborated by ancient witnesses, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls. Second, inasmuch as L is the de facto scholarly standard, being the manuscript reproduced by the diplomatic edition of BHS, this approach purportedly avoids scholarly tampering with the evidence. But third, and most importantly, even a cursory comparison of G and L indicates that V must have been quite similar to L.

Yet, deeper study of the relationship between G and the Hebrew textual tradition of Genesis, primarily L and SP (= Samaritan Pentateuch), indicates that there must have been a number of differences between V and L. Most importantly, V seems to have been a fuller, more expansive form of the text.¹⁹ Expansiveness, a result of the scribal tendency to insert into the text words, phrases, and sometimes entire clauses, is actually the most significant trait of the textual tradition of Hebrew Genesis as a whole, as the tendency to fill the text out (i.e., explicitation), often on the basis of expressions found elsewhere (i.e.,

---


¹⁹ For Emanuel Tov, harmonizing expansion is an essential characteristic of the textual tradition underlying G: “In my view, the harmonizing additions represent the most characteristic textual [i.e., not translational] feature of LXX [i.e., V] in the Torah” (“Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs,” in Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. Reinhard Kratz, BZAW 439 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013], 47); cf. Textual Criticism, 136.
harmonization), is attested not only by G but also by L and SP vis-à-vis the others. To a lesser extent, the harmonizing impulse carries over into qualitative differences: the scribes who touched Hebrew Genesis seem to have been more comfortable inserting words into the text than altering those already present in it.

In Genesis, these pluses and differences, most often involving explicitation and harmonization, are least common in L, more often met in SP, and apparently most widespread in V. That being said, the same textual phenomena are observable in all three witnesses to Hebrew Genesis, the differences between them being mostly of degree and not of kind. To be sure, certainty about the text of V will remain unattainable in the absence of additional Hebrew witnesses, but there are a number of indications that the evidence of G often implies real variants in V.

The wording of one verse is often harmonized with a nearby phrase, but sometimes with a phrase in a remote context, such as another chapter or even another book. Although each potential variant in V has been considered anew, several important textual studies have been invaluable for collecting, classifying, and adjudicating textual variants. The most recent treatment of the harmonizations in G, including discussion of earlier work on the subject, is a pair of articles by Emanuel Tov that presents classified lists of textual harmonization in Genesis (“The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1-11,” in Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, VTSup 167 [Leiden: Brill, 2014], 470–489; “Textual Harmonization,” 19–50). The slightly older work of Ronald Hendel also presents lists of harmonizations for Genesis 1–11 (Text of Genesis I-II, 81–92). The dissertation by Kyung-Rae Kim provides a comprehensive presentation of textual variants among M, SP, and G for the entire Pentateuch (“Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint” [PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1994]). The evidence given by Kim is the most accurate, comprehensive and exhaustive.

Tov characterizes the harmonizations in G as quantitatively more extensive, but certain types (esp. the addition or expansion of participants) are common to all three major witnesses (“Textual Harmonization,” 47).
First, many explicitations and harmonizations in G are also present in SP. In such cases, it is very likely that V contained the reading of SP and not L, although it remains remotely possible that a Hebrew scribe and G made the same intervention independently.

Second, I will demonstrate in chapters 3–6 on the basis of the cumulative evidence of the entire book of Genesis, that G’s poetics of translation are characterized predominately by imitation of the source text, at least in terms of quantity and word order. This means that, all else being equal, it is unlikely that G would have regularly made substantive additions.

Third, expansiveness in the form of explicitation and harmonization may be more common in G than in either L or SP, but these two phenomena are indicative of the textual tradition as a whole. It is significant that the pluses and minuses reconstructed in V fall into the same categories (see §2.2.1), as a common scribal origin may be assumed for this common textual phenomenon. This point is strengthened when combined with the first two: not only does G’s quantitative and serial mimesis of his source text seem inconsistent

---

23 This point is made in no uncertain terms by Tov: “The fact that the LXX agrees with SP in so many harmonizations (53 [group 2 below]) strengthens the assumption of a Hebrew background for other harmonizations as well” (“Textual Harmonization,” 24).

24 Consider the judgment of Robert J. V. Hiebert, who characterizes G as “a strict quantitative representation of its source text” (“Genesis: To the Reader,” 1; cf. Tov, “Textual Harmonization,” 23). Similarly, Marguerite Harl argues that the translators of the Pentateuch aimed to produce a text that was “simultaneously faithful and intelligible (un texte à la fois fidèle et intelligible)” (La Genèse, 8). Martin Rösel, on the basis of his commentary-style study of Genesis 1–11, likewise characterizes the translator’s “modus operandi (Arbeitsweise)” as “following the literal structure of the Hebrew text ([...] folgt der sprachlichen Struktur des hebräischen Textes)” while at the same time being “careful, deliberate, and exegetically reflective (sorgfältig, bedacht und exegetisch reflektiert)” (Übersetzung, 248).
with translational growth, but this precise kind of expansiveness (i.e., explicitation and harmonization) is a scribal practice known to have been at work in the textual tradition of Genesis and specifically at a number of points where G suggests an expanded Vorlage.

Fourth, although G does engage in harmonization as a translator, he also rejects many opportunities to do so for purely stylistic reasons. In fact, he often introduces variety of expression in his translation. In some cases, G even differentiates expressions where harmonizing pluses are involved, which suggests that a Hebrew scribe first harmonized the wording of the text and then G introduced variation in translation.\(^{25}\)

Fifth, while it must be admitted that all arguments for or against G’s hand in such additions are ultimately circular to some extent, it is wise to bracket such evidence as a matter of principle, since this provides a methodological control that limits what counts as evidence that G aimed to improve the quality of his translation’s plot. Perhaps this is best illustrated by concrete example. Based directly on a brief study of Genesis 3, but also on his experience editing all of Greek Genesis, John Wevers makes a number of “tentative statements” about G and his approach to translation, including the following: “There is also observable some tendency towards expansion in the dialogue form in order to make certain the speaker and/or addressee is clearly identified to the reader.”\(^{26}\) Yet, the explicitation of

---

\(^{25}\) Emanuel Tov makes this point (“...in some cases the vocabulary of the two Greek texts – the text from which the harmonizing change was made and the presumed harmonization differs, making it highly unlikely that the translator himself was influenced by the Greek context”) and regularly notes such divergences in parallel Greek phrases involving presumed harmonization in V (“Textual Harmonization,” 23–24). Some divergent Greek parallels are illustrated in the examples of reconstructed harmonizing variants below.

speakers in dialogue is a common scribal phenomenon in all witnesses to Hebrew Genesis (see §2.2.1.1), and so a conservative analysis of G as a translator brackets such ambiguous evidence, only admitting textual phenomena that are more likely to be explained as the result of translation. While the inclusion of this bracketed evidence would slightly alter the overall impression of G as a translator—much in line with Wevers’s judgment above—it would only strengthen the larger argument of this dissertation. Yet, since I categorize this data here and fully catalogue it in Appendix I, it is not laborious to see how its inclusion would affect one’s assessment of G.

As reconstructing V is only a necessary step and not the primary aim of this study, I do not present a full discussion of the reconstructed variants. Instead, all reconstructions (654) are classified and listed in Appendix I, together with additional references where harmonization is involved. Yet, a brief discussion with some examples of each type of reconstruction will be presented below in preparation for an extensive discussion of G’s broad poetics of translation. First it should be noted, however, that not every opportunity has been taken to reconstruct a plus or minus in V. Variants have only been admitted either when they are corroborated by SP or when they seem particularly unlikely to be the result of translation. Especially given that G’s approach to lexical and grammatical equivalence is demonstrably more flexible than his approach to quantitative and serial equivalence, the vast majority of reconstructions involve pluses and minuses (585). Furthermore, qualitative

27 While the work of previous scholars (see note 21) has been essential for collecting and adjudicating textual evidence for the proposed reconstructions in V, no attempt has been made to provide references to these prior works in the lists in Appendix I, noting their differences or correcting their occasional errors, as that would exponentially increase the length of the present study.
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variants have—with only two exceptions—been reconstructed exclusively on the basis of the agreement of G with SP.

In Table 1 below, I have categorized and counted the quantitative variants reconstructed in V—including counts of agreements with SP—in order to give special attention to certain recurring scribal phenomena, which are presented by category.

**Table 1. Quantitative Variants reconstructed in V by category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>+ in V</th>
<th>- in V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) to add a reference to an implied participant</td>
<td>106 [80%]</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) to expand the reference to a stated participant</td>
<td>36 [70%]</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) to add the conjunction ו</td>
<td>45 [45%]</td>
<td>21 [21%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) to add the word כל</td>
<td>35 [2%]</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) to add a speech formula (e.g. לאמר or ויאמר)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) to introduce other pluses, typically involving harmonization</td>
<td>255 [57%]</td>
<td>46 [30%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>484 [119%]</strong></td>
<td><strong>101 [24%]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, before I discuss each type of variant, it should be noted that while these additions are considered to be primarily expansive in nature, this is not to say that a longer form may be a more original Hebrew reading in any witness, as it is only by convention that the terms “plus” and “minus” are used in reference to L. In fact, a “plus” in G may be an original reading that was removed from L by accident or intent, and a “minus” in G may be the original shorter reading expanded by the textual tradition witnessed by L.

2.2.1 Quantitative Variants

2.2.1.1 Implied participant (+106, -17) The most frequent form of expansiveness in the early textual history of Genesis is the tendency to fill out the text with explicit references to
implied participants, especially the addition of verbal subjects and objects. Such references are reconstructed in V in 106 cases as a plus (8 with SP) and in 17 cases as a minus. These additions are especially common in speech formulae, supplying speaker, addressee, or even both. Usually these implicit participants are clearly involved in the shorter form of the text, but such explicitation removes ambiguity, as may be illustrated by the following examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:8</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλεγεν [αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ἔλεγεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:32</td>
<td>καὶ ἔτεκεν ὑὸν [τῷ Ἰακώβ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although explicitation always involves harmonization with the context, sometimes this kind of addition strongly harmonizes the text with another formulation, as in 16:8 // 16:9. As with other harmonizing tendencies, explicitation of an implied participant occurs far more often in G than either MT or SP, but sometimes G has the shorter text.

15:5 (ויאמר (-) καὶ ἔλεγεν)

The presence of this phenomenon across the textual tradition confirms its scribal nature.28

2.2.1.2 Expanded participant (+36, -5) Another common form of explicitation is the tendency to expand the reference to a participant by supplying an appositional noun phrase, usually a proper noun beside a common noun, or vice versa. An expanded participant reference is reconstructed in V in 36 cases as a plus (7 with SP) and in 5 cases as a minus. Since the participant’s identity is not in question in these cases, it seems that the main

---

motivation for participant expansion is to harmonize a short reference with a longer one found elsewhere. For example, Isaac may be named in reference to Abraham with short forms, either with a proper noun (צִּיסֵק) (21:8v), a noun phrase (בֶּן) (24:3v), or a long form combining the two (צִיסֵק בֶּן) (21:5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21:8v</td>
<td>בִּימֵה הַנָּמָל אֶת צִיסֵק (בֶּן)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3</td>
<td>או שֶׁלְעָה אֵשֶׁת לְצִיסֵק (לֶשֶת)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:5</td>
<td>בָּהֹלְדוּל וְלָא צִיסֵק בֶּן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same phenomenon is attested in L, where G has the shorter form, albeit less often:29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21:4</td>
<td>רוֹי הַאָבָרָה אֶת צִיסֵק (בֶּן)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1.3 The Conjunction 1 (+45, -21) It is very common for a scribe to add or omit the conjunction 1, especially given that the character 1 is very common in word-initial and word-final positions and it is often hard to distinguish from the character ־, which also occurs in these positions. Although G usually translates the conjunction ־, he omits it often enough that it is usually impossible to discern whether V contained the conjunction or not (see §3.1.2). For this reason, ־ has been reconstructed in V as a plus (45) or minus (21) only when SP agrees with G. As these variants are often the result of haplography or dittography, it is not unlikely that in some cases G simply misread the text and there was no variant

physically present in V. When such a scribal mechanism is likely in play, the relevant context is given in Appendix I, as in the following examples:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
V & G \\
1:26^\text{v} & κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν [καὶ] καθ' ὑμοίους, \\
6:19^\text{v} & καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων [καὶ] ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκὸς,
\end{array}
\]

Though less sure, the evidence of SP still warrants these reconstructions.

On occasion ὅ is reconstructed as a minus in V on the basis of SP even when it is more likely than elsewhere that G would have left it untranslated if it had been present, as in the following example, with δεῦτε followed by a cohortative subjunctive.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
V & G \\
37:27^\text{v} & ... ἄντι (-) ἀποδώμεθα ...
\end{array}
\]

2.2.1.4 The word כל (+35, -12) Another very common addition is the word כל, which has been reconstructed in V 35 times as a plus (2 with SP), and 12 times as a minus.30 This phenomenon may be illustrated by the following set of examples.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
V & G \\
6:20 & ἀπὸ [πάντων] τῶν ὄρνεων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος \\
8:20 & καὶ ἂν πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν καθαρῶν, \\
41:30 & ἐν [ἀλήθε] γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, \\
41:29 & ἐν [ἀλήθε] γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.
\end{array}
\]

The addition of כל may function as general explicitation or specific harmonization of a common phrase and expanded parallel form elsewhere, as in 6:20 // 8:20 and 41:30 // 41:29.

2.2.1.5 Speech formula (+7) In 7 cases G contains an additional or expanded speech formula that has been reconstructed in V: (5) לאמר (1) ויאמר (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:17 לאמומ בלע (לאמר)</td>
<td>kai elpen en τῇ διανοιᾳ [λέγων]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:9 ויאמר</td>
<td>ὁ [δὲ ἀποσκεπῆς] εἶπεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a handful of cases of the reverse situation (MT > G) may indicate the absence of a speech formula in V (e.g., 3:17), these minuses have not been reconstructed (see §3.1.7.5), since a translator might reasonably omit such common formulae in light of Greek style.

2.2.1.6 Other (+255, -46) Many more pluses (255, 57 with SP) and minuses (46, 3 with SP) have been reconstructed in V, usually on the basis of textual evidence or clear harmonization with expressions elsewhere. Many of the harmonizing pluses fill out the text as in the above cases (§§2.2.1.1–5), usually with the minor addition of a word or phrase, as illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21:13 νῦν [רבנו] אֲשֶׁר־אָשָׁמֵנִי</td>
<td>εἰς ἑνὸς [μέγα] ποιήσω αὐτόν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:6 אל עיקב בנה [תקש]</td>
<td>πρὸς Ἰακὼβ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς [τὸν ἑλάσσω]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 את עיקב בנה [תקס]</td>
<td>Ἰακὼβ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν νεῦτερον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:1 קום עליה [מוקם] בנים אל</td>
<td>Ἀναστάς ἀνάβησθι [εἰς τὸν τόπον] Βαυθῆ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ייכא</td>
<td>καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου Βαυθῆ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On occasion, however, the additions are extensive, constituting entire clauses. Such is the case in 20:2 // 26:7 or the even longer plus in 46:20:

31 This plus is based upon the genealogical information given in Num 26:29–37 // 1 Chr 7:14–27.
A few instances reflect distinctly editorial activity, especially but not exclusively in the genealogies, as in Gen 11 where καὶ ἀπέθανεν occurs at the end of 11:13, 15, 17, 19, 21, and 23 as a way of harmonizing these expressions with those found in Gen 5.

In some cases, the scribal phenomenon of parablepsis may have been at work, so that a phrase dropped from V or a later form of the Hebrew, but in many such cases it remains uncertain whether a phrase was added to harmonize with another passage (15:21 // Exod 23:23) or simply dropped by parablepsis (9:5).

With two exceptions, qualitative differences are only reconstructed in V when SP and G appear to agree against L. Below, the first exception (2:4) involves a minor grammatical change that results from a concomitant plus; the second (11:12) reflects distinctly editorial activity.
The other changes typically involve a single character (10:4), lexical form (18:29; cf. v. 30), or the inflection of a word (38:25; 44:9; 45:20).

### 2.3 Digital Texts: Data Sources Used in This Dissertation

On account of the magnitude of the corpus and the substantial variety of translational phenomena treated in the following chapters, I have considered it necessary to make use of digital resources to facilitate my analysis. Yet, it must not be thought that the computer has taken the place of the scholar. The role of digital humanities in Septuagint Studies has been a persistent point of discussion within the community of Septuagintalists over the past half-century. Much of the debate has concerned the use of computers and computer-generated analysis in studying translation technique, a subfield of Septuagint Studies where computers have obvious utility. Yet, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, the pioneer of the study of translation technique and the grandfather of the Finnish school of Septuagint
Studies,\textsuperscript{32} has expressed arguably the most balanced perspective on the role of computers in studying translation technique, cautioning against the lazy use of computers and statistics divorced from detailed philological analysis, on the one hand, and encouraging scholars to find ways to use computers to assist them in applying more traditional scholarly methods, on the other.\textsuperscript{33}

For the present study, I have developed a suite of digital tools to facilitate my research, ensure consistency, and organize my analysis. In particular, the Hebrew text (V) and its Greek translation (G) have been digitized and annotated for lexical and morphological features, and then the two texts have been aligned with fine granularity, and the alignment has been proofed for mistaken and inconsistent judgments. The database hosting these texts, their alignment, and scholarly annotation is the basis for all of my analysis in chapters 3–6 (i.e., the remainder of Part I). I will now briefly discuss each of these sources of data.

2.3.1 The Digital Text of G

As stated above, the Göttingen edition of Genesis produced by John William Wevers is the best scholarly approximation of the Greek text of G. While the task of textual

\textsuperscript{32} In addition to carrying on and refining his methods, Soisalon-Soininen’s students elevate him to legendary status, though not without reason: “In the beginning there was Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen” (Raija Sollamo, “The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland,” \textit{S/JOT} 10 [1996]: 159).

criticism is never finished, I produced the digital text of G used in this study manually by comparing a print copy of Wevers’s edition with the Logos digital text of Rahlfs’s 2nd edition of Genesis. All differences were recorded, and Wevers’s text was constructed algorithmically based on the differences. Later I compared this digital text with the digitization of Wevers’s text of Genesis published by Logos, and I was able to correct a handful of residual textual errors. I also checked the lemma and morphology codes of every word manually. The tokenization of the Greek text is at the level of the Greek word, and punctuation has been disregarded for the purposes of alignment.

2.3.2 The Digital Text of V

The digital text of V has been reconstructed beginning with the Westminster Leningrad Codex (WLC) and Westminster Hebrew Morphology (WHM), version 4.14. An

---

34 This digital text has been made publicly available by CATSS at http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/catss.html.
35 The indirect comparison of Wevers’s print text with the digital edition of it produced by Logos Bible Software reveals not only the virtually impeccable quality of Wevers’s editorial work, but also the disappointingly low quality of Logos’s digitized text. In only three cases was a mere accent erroneously omitted by Wevers in the print text (διαλευκος in 30:35; ἐπταχ in 33:3; and ἐγενετο in 39:11). This level of precision would seem to indicate a high level of quality in the critical apparatus. In Logos’s digitized text, however, more than 150 mistakes were detected, mostly involving Greek accents and breathing marks or minor spelling errors, but also a number of more serious errors involving the omission of words (ἐτη in 5:19; τὴν in 10:11; ὅλοι in 10:23; γῇ in 26:12; σου in 27:20; Λαβαδ in 29:23; τῇ in 31:6; δὲ in 43:21; γῆς in 50:24) or the transposition of words (καὶ ὁρα Ἀρχαδ in 10:10; μεθ’ ὑπὲν εν ἕγῳ οἰκω αὐτοῖς in 24:3; and ὠστε πονηρόν με εἶναι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν γῆν, ἐν τε πᾶσιν τοῖς Χαναάιοις in 34:30).
36 This checking process included consultation of the list of changes that T. V. Evans made to CATSS morphology codes for verbs (Verbal Syntax, 270–271, 273–274). All his corrections have been accepted except for ἐξέβην in 38:9, which has been kept as imperfect indicative (instead of aorist).
37 Both WLC and WHM are currently maintained by the J. Alan Groves Center for Advanced Biblical Research. See http://www.doxologypress.org/sites/groves/B/.
unvocalized form of this text is tokenized below the word level, so that prefixes—i.e. the conjunction ו, the definite article ה, the question particle ה, and the inseparable prepositions (i.e., ב, כ, ל, and sometimes מ)—and pronominal suffixes are considered separate tokens. Based on reconstructed variants in V, I have deleted, altered, or supplied some parsed tokens to WLC/WHM, but these added tokens have been lemmatized and parsed in accordance with the conventions of WHM by analogy to identical or similar forms elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. By convention, I always mark reconstructed textual variants as [plus], (minus), and <substitution> in citations in this study to indicate transparently that I have reconstructed the Hebrew text. Also, references to reconstructed text appear in square brackets (e.g., [1:6]).

2.3.3 Textual Alignment of G and V

Using these digital texts of G and V, I have aligned them, so that each Hebrew token has been matched ideally with a single Greek token. The textual alignment of V and G conceptualizes the relationships between the two texts as links. If a token has no quantitative match in the other text, then the tokens are unlinked (0 : 1 or 1 : 0 relationships). If a token is represented quantitively in the other text, however, four types of links are possible depending on whether the link involves single tokens or groups of tokens.

38 Only instances of consonantal ה have been preserved. That is to say, the cases in which the article is not present in consonantal form but the Massoretic vocalization indicates its “presence” have all been disregarded, although these are present as tokens in WLC/WHM. For the problem and types of definiteness in Hebrew as it pertains to Septuagint studies, see Albert Pietersma, “Articulation of the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV,” in Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday, ed. Gerard Norton and Stephen Pisano, OBO 109 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 185–186.
in each text (1 : 1, m : 1, 1 : n, or m : n relationships). Each of these six types of relationships is illustrated below in Table 2. The links are visualized as solid lines connecting tokens or groups of tokens in one text with tokens or groups of tokens in the other text, while unlinked tokens appear on a row by themselves with no adjacent line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Types of Alignment Relationships Illustrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ungrouped tokens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlinked tokens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ὕματα     | ἡ        | ἱερὸς   | σῶν      | μῖος   | ἀπὸ   | ἀπὸ   | ἐκ
| ἡ          | ἀβράμ    | ἐδοκεῖ     | πᾶς      | ἤκοι  | ἐκθέτευ | ἐπάνω |
| ἀλαὶ      | οὐκεῖν  | οἶκοι     | σῶμα   | ἐν      | ἤκοι  | ἐπάνω |
| θλίθα      | ἀρέσκῃ  | ἐπάνω     | ἐπάνω  | ἐπάνω  | ἐπάνω  | ἐπάνω  |

Though perhaps no one would disagree with the 1 : 1 alignment from Gen 18:13, where each Hebrew token is neatly matched by a corresponding Greek token, even this very basic set of examples reveals the partly arbitrary nature of word-level text alignment. For example, one might say that δ in Gen 12:1 should not be unlinked, since it functions together with ἔφεσην to translate the Hebrew verb’s gender; the unlinked ἡ in Gen 22:1 could have been grouped with ἡλίαν; or, one might argue that only Οὐ in Gen 3:1 serves to translate ἑλ, and so G’s ἀνὴρ should have been left unlinked (or vice versa). Yet, while I have invested much time and energy in aligning the tokens in the two texts in the best possible way, it is far more important for the analysis generated from this alignment data that the approach to alignment be consistent rather than “right” in some absolute sense, especially
as the word-level perspective on translation is artificial in many ways, even though it does have substantial explanatory power, as I will demonstrate throughout Part I of this dissertation.

For this reason, I have taken several measures to ensure that analogous alignment contexts have been handled in a consistent manner. First, all judgments in alignment have been governed by a set of ordered principles:39

**Principle 1.** Wherever possible, tokens should remain ungrouped.

**Principle 2.** Wherever necessary, tokens should be grouped.

**Principle 3.** In adjudicating competing links, avoid links that entail a change in word order.

Together as a group, these principles select 1:1 relationships and quantitative inequivalence of the form 0:1 or 1:0 (97.0% of all quantitative relationships). Yet, the priority of Principle 1 over Principle 2 accounts for why the Greek and Hebrew articles are left unlinked above in Gen 12:1 (ὁ) and 22:1 (ה), while the caveat of Principle 2 accounts for the decision in Gen 3:1, where it was felt necessary to group ὦ ὑμήν, because either form could translate לא alone. In addition, the initial alignment was produced using Miklal Software Solution’s Text Alignment Tool,40 which was engineered to produce high-quality

---

39 These principles are adapted from those developed together with Drayton Benner (Miklal Software Solutions, Inc.) along with extensive internal documentation (“Consistency Rules”) used to adjudicate how various text-alignment cases should be treated in the production of Hebrew-English and Greek-English text-alignment data for Crossway’s *English Standard Version*, data which is available in the ESV HebrewTools and ESV GreekTools modules on http://www.esv.org.

40 As the reconstructions in V were decided largely based on the alignment, it was subsequently adjusted.
text alignments and outfitted with a number of post-processing checks to ensure consistency. Furthermore, I produced the alignment over the course of a few days, as human judgment is known to shift over time, and I then checked it manually. Once complete, the two digital texts and alignment data were exported into a MySQL database for further annotation and analysis, the results of which form the remainder of Part I of this work.

41 Drayton Benner is to be thanked for making the Text Alignment Tool available for this research as well as for his generous donation of time to assist with loading the digitized texts into the tool for alignment. For a description of the Text Alignment Tool, including screenshots and discussion of such features, see Drayton Benner, “A Tool for a High-Carat Gold-Standard Word Alignment,” in Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, and Humanities (LaTeCH) (Gothenburg, Sweden: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2014), 80–85.
3 Quantitative Equivalence

Quantitative equivalence in translation involves a situation in which a single source token is numerically represented by a single target token (1 : 1). Quantitative inequivalence, on the other hand, results from the other five types of alignment relationships previously defined and illustrated (see §2.3.3), i.e., when source or target tokens have been left unlinked (0 : 1 or 1 : 0) or have been grouped (m : 1/n or 1 : n).\footnote{Because this study assumes a more granular tokenization of the Hebrew text than has previously been used, the concept of quantitative equivalence combines aspects of two features in Barr’s typology. He would call them “the division into elements or segments” (mode 1a) and “the quantitative addition or subtraction of elements” (mode 2) (Typology of Literalism, 294; cf. Benjamin Wright, “The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating ‘Literalism’ in the LXX,” in VI Congress of the IOSCS, SCS 23 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 316; No Small Difference, 68).} Though relatively straightforward, these definitions are based upon several prior assumptions, especially a particular tokenization of the source and target texts and a particular alignment of these two tokenized texts (see §2.3). The texts have been tokenized without consideration of their translational relationship to each other. While this means that the tokenization does not always match G’s analysis of the Hebrew and/or Greek texts,\footnote{This point will be discussed in this chapter, especially in §§3.3.1–2; 3.4.1.} analysis of the texts independent of G’s interpretation of them ensures internal consistency, which means that similar cases may be compared with one another regardless of whether G analyzes them in the same manner or not. Furthermore, it is evident that the tokenization is adequate enough, since (i) the raw counts of source tokens (32,763) and target tokens (32,516) are very close to each other and (ii) over 85% of the tokens in each text (27,941) have been matched with a single token in the other text.
The particular alignment assumed in this study, however, has a profounder effect on the analysis in this and following chapters than the particular tokenization. This fact is best illustrated by example, such as the two-token form לאמר, which G nearly always translates as a participle of λέγω, usually λέγων (see §3.1.1.2). Given the possible alignment relationships available in this study, one can imagine two reasonable ways of matching the Hebrew and Greek forms: clearly אמר should be linked to λέγων in each case, but ל could either (i) be grouped with אמר (m : 1) or (ii) left unlinked (1 : 0), resulting in a 1 : 1 match of אמר and λέγων. While savants may enjoy debating which option is preferable in this and many similar cases, it ultimately does not matter, since it affects not the fact, but only the type of quantitative inequivalence (1 : 0 or m : 1). What is imperative, rather, is not how לאמר and λέγων are linked, but that all cases of לאמר translated by λέγων are linked consistently, so that analogous cases of quantitative inequivalence are grouped and considered together.

Since the principles of alignment used in this study favor analyzing quantitative inequivalence by leaving tokens unlinked more than by grouping them (see §2.3.3), some of the vocabulary that I use to discuss quantitative inequivalence will not always seem equally appropriate. For this reason, a caveat on such terminology is necessary to avoid misunderstanding. When a source token has been left unlinked, it is typically said that G omits that token or leaves it “untranslated.” Similarly, when a target token has been left unlinked, G may be said to “add,” “insert,” or “supply” that token in translation. In most cases, however, unlinked tokens do correspond in some way to something in the other text, but they have no quantitative match from the perspective of the word-level alignment. In
fact, it is one of my primary conclusions in Part I of this dissertation that G generally does not add or omit things in translation, and so the reader is asked to keep in mind that terms such as “omitted,” “left untranslated,” “added,” “inserted,” or “supplied” are really shorthand for something like “with no distinct quantitative representation in the other text.” This shorthand has been adopted for the sake of economy, just as the siglum G is used to mean “Greek Genesis” or “the translator of Greek Genesis.”

Since quantitative equivalence is the rule in Greek Genesis, this chapter analyzes all cases of quantitative in-equivalence. While G’s translation choices are everywhere informed by his commitment to following the rules of Greek grammar in translation, his departures from quantitative equivalence may also be motivated by a variety of other compositional concerns, and often by several at once, including but not limited to (i) idiosyncrasies of Hebrew morphology and syntax, (ii) matters of Greek style and usage, and (iii) more substantive issues pertaining to theological, literary, or rhetorical aspects of his translation. In this chapter, I aim to sketch G’s portrait as a translator from quantity’s point of view, and so it is chiefly concerned with classifying, counting, and illustrating the kinds of quantitative transformations that G decides to make, not accounting for them exhaustively. Yet, full references have been given for all but the most common phenomena in order to facilitate deeper translation-technical analysis. In covering so much ground, I have adopted a rapid pace of exposition in order to keep the part and the whole in healthy balance, and I have selected the copious examples carefully and presented them in such a way that the reader can hopefully grasp the phenomena they represent readily and without the distraction of non-essentials.
3.1 Omitted Hebrew tokens (3,010)

G’s many omissions have been categorized by the omitted tokens’ part of speech:

§3.1.1 Prepositions. 1,539 / 3,010 51.1%
§3.1.2 Conjunctions. 483 / 3,010 16.0%
§3.1.3 Pronominal suffixes. 247 / 3,010 8.2%
§3.1.4 Definite article. 235 / 3,010 7.8%
§3.1.5 Particles. 118 / 3,010 3.9%
§3.1.6 Nouns in date and age formulae. 58 / 3,010 1.9%
§3.1.7 Other commonly omitted elements. 101 / 3,010 3.4%
§3.1.8 Residual cases. 229 / 3,010 7.6%

This first level of analysis reveals that G mostly omits function words (see §§3.1.1–5). In fact, prepositions alone account for over half of all omissions. Unlike content words, which have substantial lexical content, function words primarily function to express grammatical relationships. Nevertheless, while discrepancies between Hebrew and Greek grammar are usually relevant, G omits words for a host of interpretive reasons.

3.1.1 Prepositions (1,541)

Prepositions, which form the commonest type of omitted words, have been grouped according to how G translates the omitted preposition’s object:

§3.1.1.1 Preposition omitted, object translated as a noun. 1,280 / 1,539 83.2%
§3.1.1.2 Preposition omitted, object translated as a verb. 246 / 1,539 16.0%
§3.1.1.3 Preposition omitted, object translated as an adverb. 13 / 1,539 0.8%

Though the first group is numerically dominant, the prepositions י and ננ (DDOM) alone account for roughly four-fifths of the cases across all three groups.
3.1.1.1 **Preposition omitted, object translated as a noun.** Because of the Greek case system, G often uses a noun phrase in an oblique case to translate a Hebrew prepositional phrase, and so the Hebrew preposition is omitted. All omissions of simplex prepositions are tabulated in Table 3 below, classified lexically by the Hebrew preposition omitted and grammatically by the Greek case used for the omitted preposition’s object. The final columns report the number of omissions of each preposition relative to its total frequency in the corpus, first by count then by percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEMMA</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>TOTAL/LEMMMA FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) לַעֲמֹד / לע</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>511 [28] / 1,396 36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DDOM) דומַ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>473 [13] / 1,033 45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלָמָ</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137 [27] / 514 26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּ</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>61 [2] / 842 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רַע</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 [1] / 310 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PREP) דומַ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 / 141 11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בַּ</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 / 75 20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) עוּבָר / עָבְר</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 [1] / 104 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָמ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 / 443 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) כְּפַסָ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 / 151 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יַעֲבָר</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 67 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,260 [72] / 5,077 24.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several general observations may be made from Table 3. First, G omits דומַ (DDOM), דומ, and אָל at a much higher rate than the other prepositions. Second, G prefers a particular case for

---

3 Given the high count of omissions involving prepositions, Muraoka is justified in claiming that the case system constitutes “one of the most significant differences” between Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic (SSG §22a).
some Hebrew prepositions: the dative for ב, ב, יט, and רס (PREP); the accusative for רס (DDOM); and the genitive for נב and ג. Combined, these two facts suggest that G omits נב (DDOM), ב, and ב so often, because he found the Greek accusative to be a good match for נב (DDOM), ב, and ב so often, because he found the Greek accusative to be a good match for נב (DDOM), ב, and ב. Third, G more often omits prepositions bound in a multi-token word, which implies that G’s aim to maintain quantitative equivalence often required only a word-level analysis of the Hebrew.

4 Though infrequent (3/18), G uses the bare genitive for נ with its comparative use most often (3: 26:16; 34:19; 48:19). That the Pentateuchal translators could convert such relatively complicated Hebrew expressions into various Greek idioms reveals their competence in both languages (Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Renderings of Hebrew Comparative Expressions with נ in the Greek Pentateuch,” BIOSCS 12 [1979]: 29–33, 41–42).

5 It is no surprise, then, that נב (DDOM) has been termed the nota accusativi by analogy to Greek and Latin grammar, since it functions primarily to mark a direct object (IBHS §10.3; Joüon §§125e–j), a very common function of the Greek accusative (KG II §§409–412; Smyth §§1551–1577; 1590–1599; 1612–1635; SSG §22xb).

6 Similarly, it is no accident that ב with (IBHS §11.2.2) and ב (IBHS §11.2.10d; cf. Joüon §133d) are said to have “datival” uses, e.g., to mark the recipient and to express (dis)advantage or interest, uses also common for the Greek dative (KG §§422–424; Smyth §§1450–1502; SSG §22w). The match between these Hebrew prepositions and the Greek cases is confirmed by the fact that when G translates these particles with the Greek definite article, as he often does, he usually or most often inflects the article in the same cases, i.e., נב (DDOM) in the accusative (479/525) (91.2%), and ב and ב with (7: 190/286 [66.4%]; ב: 70/79 [88.6%]).

7 This is supported by several points: (i) G more often omits the inseparable preposition ב (41 : 20) than ב with (85 : 104) after the verb יר in (189 with ב; 61 with ב)—note, these counts exclude three anomalous cases (ב = דאש in 8:21; ב = ה in 26:32; and ב = ל in 30:15); (ii) G more often omits ב after יר when it is suffixed (75 : 11) than when it is a separate word (10 : 93); (iii) G only omits נ with its inseparable form (ב); and (iv) G tends to omit נ when it is suffixed (but 17:2; 7; 26:28) and to retain נ when it is not (but 9:13; 13:8; 32:16) (Raija Sollamo, “Repetitions of Prepositions in the Septuagint of Genesis,” in Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust, ed. F. García Martínez and Marc Vervenne [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005], 373; Hiebert, “Hermeneutics of Translation,” 99).


8 Yet, other cases suggest G analyzed the Hebrew more finely than WHM (cf. §3.4.1).
Yet, G’s treatment of particular forms is elucidated by closer analysis. G omits את (DDOM) unless Greek has the article where Hebrew does not, such as when את (DDOM) governs a proper noun (22:1), a suffixed noun (22:2), or a noun in a construct chain (22:6).9

G often omits ל and אל used to introduce an indirect object, especially with certain verbs. For example, when translating נתן as δίδωμι G regularly omits ל and אל, but with other verbs, such as אמר, he varies between retention and omission, often with little difference, as in the following minimal pair:10

Yet, even such a minor difference may be intentional, as in Gen 19:5, where G’s use of the imperfect with the preposition πρός portrays the wicked men of Sodom calling repeatedly to Lot from a distance. (This is the only time G translates a suffixed form of את after אמר.)

9 Such Hebrew nouns are “intrinsically definite,” and so are typically anarthrous (IBHS §§13.4–6; cf. Joüon §§137b; 139–140). In contrast, Greek allows the article in such contexts and often prefers or requires it (KG II §§462; 463.3A; 464.3; Smyth §§1136–1142; 1154–1167; SSG §§5c; 6).
10 For similar minimal pairs, see SSG §22c.
G typically translates the inseparable preposition ב, but not with certain verbs (e.g., משָׁל [6/8] and רָדָה [5/10]) or in certain uses (e.g., temporal [4] and instrumental [4]).

Though less often, but for similar types of reasons, G may omit compound or complex prepositions, such as בִּשְׁנֵה and לֶאֶפְרִי. Finally, G’s use of the nominative case to translate an omitted preposition’s object (28) requires comment. This may involve a Greek predicate nominative (17:4), but it often results from some syntactic transformation (31:36; 43:28).

---

11 G translates ב after רָדָה only with the bare genitive (= omission) or the genitive article, since Greek uses the genitive case for the object of a verb of ruling (KG II §416.2; Smyth §1370; SSG §§22p; 55a). With משָׁל, G uses the bare genitive (6: 316; 4:7; 24: 37:8; 45:8, 26) more often than the genitive article $των (2: 1:18+); with רָדָה, G uses the bare genitive (5: 1:26+, 28[++] as often as the genitive article $των (5: 1:26+, 28+). Yet, like נ (DDOM), the difference simply depends upon the presence or absence of the Hebrew article.

12 7:11; 8:4, 13, 14. For a study of temporal ב-expressions with לֶאֶפְרִי, משָׁל, and לֶאֶפְרִי in the Greek Pentateuch, see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Wiedergabe einiger hebräischen Zeitangaben mit der Präposition ב in der Septuaginta,” ASTI (1978): 138–146. The observation that G tends to use the bare dative for a particular day of the month indicated by a numeral accounts for all the above examples above (“Zeitangaben,” 139).


14 Omission of compound/complex prepositions occurs 10 times, involving 20 tokens: לֶאֶפְרִי (8: 18:8; 24:33; 32:20; 46:28); לֶאֶפְרִי (8: 45:5, 16+; 48:17); וַתָּמִים (2: 33:14); and לֶאֶפְרִי (2: 47:22). G contains a high percentage of the total cases involving the bare dative (3/22) or genitive (1/12) for לֶאֶפְרִי in the entire Septuagint, and the translation of לֶאֶפְרִי with a dative is also fairly uncommon (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 44–46, 134–137). For the translation of compound/complex prepositions, cf. §3.3.1.1.

3.1.1.2 Preposition omitted, object translated as a verb. Less often, G omits a Hebrew preposition due to translating its object verbally as an infinitive (139),
 or even a finite verb (12). These data are tabulated below in Table 4, classified lexically by the Hebrew preposition omitted and grammatically by the Greek verb’s form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEMMA</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>TOTAL/LEMMA FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 / 841 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 / 443 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 514 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 146 0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but four cases involve an infinitive construct (cf. §6.1.1.7), and most involve ל (esp. in לאמר [84]). But excluding לאמר, G typically uses the Greek infinitive (137/162) (84.6%),

---


19 6:21; 24:4; 40:10; 47:26. The Hebrew infinitive construct is very commonly prefixed by prepositions as a type of subordinate clause (IBHS §36.2.2; Joüon §124k), but especially after ל (IBHS §36.2.3; Joüon §124l).

20 G typically translates לאמר as λέγων or another participial form of λέγω (79/84), but he sometimes uses a finite verb (3: 41:16; 42:22; 50:16) or an infinitive (2: [20:2]; 26:7). G omits ב in translating לאמר for at least 56
unarticulated (2:10), but he also uses a variety of constructions, including supplementary participles (11:8), circumstantial participles (43:6), genitives absolute (50:17), and finite verbs (30:15).

The rare use of the genitive absolute (see also 27:5; 30:38) deserves special notice, as this reflects G’s careful selection of an idiomatic Greek structure that differs in form from the underlying Hebrew but similarly functions to mark a temporal clause.22

### 3.1.1.3 Preposition omitted, object translated as an adverb.

At times G omits a preposition due to rendering its object as an adverb (13). This phenomenon is restricted to a few

---

21 Bracketing, Soisalon-Soininen claims that G translates the Hebrew construction [5 + infinitive construct] far more often with a bare infinitive (124) than with the Greek [ὡστε/τοῦ + infinitive] (22), and, based on G’s preference for the bare infinitive to render final cases of [5 + infinitive construct], he classifies G among the most idiomatic Septuagint translators (Infinitive, 49–51, 180, 186). The anarthrous Greek infinitive functions like the Hebrew infinitive construct after a preposition (KG II §473; §§Smyth 1989–2105; SSG §30b).


23 Greek adverbs need no preposition, since they replace a prepositional phrase (KG II §497; Smyth §1095).
expressions: with ב, in במאד מאד (17:2), בברק (17:25), בברק ובעוד (40:19); with כ, inכיום (25:31); and with עד, in עד מאד (27:33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>(also)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:2</td>
<td>καὶ πληθυνῶ σε σφόδρα</td>
<td>17:6, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:25</td>
<td>ἐγένετο δὲ πρῶτον, καὶ ἤδη ἦν Λεία.</td>
<td>24:54; 41:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:19</td>
<td>ἐξετάζει δὲ Ἰσαὰκ ἐκτασιν μεγάλην σφόδρα</td>
<td>25:6; 40:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:31</td>
<td>Ἀπόδου μοι σήμερον τὰ πρωτοτόκια σου ἐμοὶ.</td>
<td>25:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:33</td>
<td>ἦθελε τὸ διά τῆς Ἰσαὰκ ἐκτάσεως μεγάλης σφόδρα</td>
<td>27:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Conjunctions (483)

G frequently omits conjunctions, in part due to the relative prevalence of parataxis in Hebrew compared to the wider use of hypotactic and asyndetic structures in Greek.²⁵ These cases will be treated in the following three groups:

- **§3.1.2.1** G omits a conjunction and produces a hypotactic structure. 290 / 483 60.0%
- **§3.1.2.2** G omits a conjunction and produces asyndeton. 140 / 483 29.0%
- **§3.1.2.3** Residual cases where G omits a conjunction. 53 / 483 11.0%

3.1.2.1 G omits a conjunction and produces a hypotactic structure. G chiefly omits a Hebrew conjunction because he prefers hypotaxis. Usually, G omits הב, but in 20:10;

---

²⁵ Anneli Aejmelaeus discusses the stylistic and interpretive “problem” of Hebrew parataxis: “Parataxis is a real problem for any translator or interpreter of the Hebrew Bible. Over one half of all clauses begin with the conjunction הב. The problem is first of all a stylistic one: for most target languages parataxis used to this extent would be undesirable. But in many cases an interpretational problem arises as well, namely, that the relationship between the ideas or events expressed in two successive coordinate clauses is not always entirely clear” (Parataxis, 2).
29:32), because he uses a circumstantial participle\(^{26}\) for a prior verb (190/208).\(^{27}\) Often, the verbs occur in close proximity (4:1; 25:34) and may form a set phrase or hendiadys (40:18; 43:29).

| 4:1 | דָּתָהּ רַבָּתָהּ | καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἐτέκεν |
| 25:34 | דָּתָהּ שְׁפִי | καὶ ἀσπάσας ὄχετο |
| 40:18 | ἀποκαθιένας ἔλαβεν Ἰσαὰκ | καὶ ἐπικριθεὶς ἔπεν |
| 43:29 | ἀναφέρεται ἔλαβεν Ἰσαὰκ | καὶ ἔπειρα ἔλευθεν |

While G successfully omits a conjunction after using a circumstantial participle in translating sentences that are lengthier (48:13) or syntactically more complex (45:27), he does occasionally lose track of his translation (16:3).

---

\(^{26}\) KG §§485–486; Smyth §§2054–2069; SSG §31d.

\(^{27}\) 32:6; 4:1, 17, 25; 6:2; 8:9+, 10, 12[+]; 9:23; 12:9, 18, 19; 13:10, 14, 18+; 14:7, 13, 14; 16:5; 18:2+, 9, 16, 21, 22, 23, 27; 19:1, 2, 10, 33, 35; 20:10; 21:2, 14, 16++; 22:3++, 4, 5, 9+, 13, 19; 23:7, [10]; 24:10, 16, 26, 28, 42, 46, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 61+, 63, 64, 65; 25:1, 8, 17, 34; 26:8, 13, 21, 22, 31, 32; 27:7, 9, 14, 27, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 45; 28:1; 29:1, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 31, 35; 30:17, 23; 31:4, 14, 17, 23, 31, [33], 36, 43, 45, 55; [32:1], 11, 22; 33:1, 4, 5, 12; 34:2, 17, 30; 35:3, 16, 29; 37:4, 5, 7, 21, 24, 25, 31; 38:3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 25, 28; 39:12, 15, 20; 40:18; 41:8, 14, [21], 42; 42:1, 6, 7, 24, 26, 27, 33; 43:8, 15, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31+; 44:6, 18; 45:13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 27, 28; 46:1, 29+, 31; 47:1, 10; [48:1], 2, 8, 13, 14, 17; 49:15, 33; 50:1, 5, 15, 18. When the conjunction omitted precedes the participle (18), it is usually on a form like רָמַשׁ translated as רָמַשׁ (12:1; 22:7+, 16; 26:22; 28:1; 37:35; 43:20; 46:2, 3; 47:1; 48:2), but not always (6:18:10; 25:29; 28:15; 29:32; 31:55; 37:2).
Yet, G rarely makes this mistake,\textsuperscript{28} and his normal omission of \textdollar, even in such challenging cases, betrays his care as a translator to follow Greek syntactic conventions.

Though less often, G also omits apodotic-\textdollar in complex sentences (59),\textsuperscript{29} usually taking the first clause as a conditional (13:9; 34:17) or temporal (3:5; 22:1) protasis.

\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
13:9 & ἐὰν σὺ εἰς ἀριστερά, ἑγώ εἰς δεξία: \\
\hline
34:17 & ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εἰσακούσατε ἡμῶν τὸν περιτύπωσα, \\
& λαβόντες τὰς θυγατρίας ἡμῶν ἄπελευσόμεθα. \\
\hline
3:5 & ὅτι ἔγενετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἑπείραξεν τὸν Ἁβραὰμ. \\
\hline
22:1 & Καὶ ἔγενετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἑπείραξεν τὸν Ἁβραὰμ. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{28} The Pentateuchal translators tend to omit \textdollar after circumstantial participles. A ejemelaeus counts seven retentions in Genesis, but the rate of retention is higher in other constructions (\textit{Parataxis}, 104). Cf. \textit{SSG} §81.

\textsuperscript{29} 3:5; 8:3; 10:2; 11:2; 12:11, 12, 14; 13:9, 10, 15:12, 17, 17:14; 18:26; 19:15, 29; 22:1, 24; 24:8, 22, 45, 52; 25:11; 27:37; 29:13; 30:25, 41; 31:27, 42; 32:18; 33:10, 13; 34:7, 17, 25; 35:16, 17, 18, 21; 37:23; 38:1, 9, 24, 28; 39:11, 15, 18; 41:11; 43:9, 10; 44:22, 24, 26, 31, 32; 46:34; 47:16, 24; 50:4. The cases in 31:42 and 43:10 involve \textdollar instead of \textdollar. Here, \textdollar could have been matched with \textdollar, but this analysis has been rejected given (i) the rarity of this lexical equivalence and (ii) the necessary change in word order. Still, postpositive \textdollar marks the boundary between the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences and adds structural clarity (cf. §4.1.1).
Unlike with circumstantial participles, G only omits apodotic-\(1\) in complex sentences about half the time.\(^{30}\) Finally, G’s use of other hypotactic structures also results in the omission of a conjunction, especially relative clauses (6)\(^{31}\) (38:26), infinitives (5)\(^{32}\) (22:10; 42:25), and genitives absolute (5)\(^{33}\) (18:1), but other structures (7),\(^{34}\) too.

3.1.2.2 \textit{G omits a conjunction and produces asyndeton.} G also omits conjunctions due to his preference for asyndesis in certain contexts. While asyndeton is rare in Hebrew, mostly restricted to asyndetic relative clauses but also more common in poetry,\(^{37}\) Greek makes

\(^{30}\) Aejmelaeus counts 56/101 (\textit{Parataxis}, 140).

\(^{31}\) 3:19; 18:5; 19:8; 22:16; 33:10; 38:26 (always \(\frac{1}{2}\)).

\(^{32}\) 12:20; 22:10; 42:25; 43:18, 24 (always \(\frac{1}{2}\)).

\(^{33}\) 18:1; 24:30; 44:14, 26, 34 (always \(\frac{1}{2}\)).

\(^{34}\) 26:18; 30:39; 31:10; 37:9, 18; 44:31; 49:23.

\(^{35}\) The use of the infinitive in 22:10 and 42:25 was likely influenced by the following Hebrew infinitives.

\(^{36}\) For a discussion of disjunctive syntax and G’s translation of it, see §4.1.1.1.

\(^{37}\) \textit{IBHS} §19.6; Joüon §177.
greater use of asyndeton for rhetorical effect. G employs clausal asyndeton (32) deliberately, especially in speech, in order to evoke a certain mood or to reduce the causal relationship between two clauses to subtle implicature.

In 4:7 and 29:32, G’s use of asyndeton conveys the intensity of the speaker’s emotion, i.e., anger and desperation, respectively, while his choice merely to juxtapose the two statements in 41:44 imparts a solemn weightiness to Pharaoh’s bestowal of power upon Joseph.

Far more often (108/140) (77.9%), G introduces asyndeton in lower-level structures, such as the omission of ו joining the parts of a compound number (74) (11:17), two noun phrases (26) (35:23), or two prepositional phrases (8) (19:11).

---

38 KG II §546; Smyth §§2165–2167; SGS §82.

39 For cases in narration (6), see 2:10; 7:15; 23:19; 24:16; 36:40; 41:1. For cases in speech (26), see 3:18; 4:7; 16:12; 18:24; 22:7; 24:7; 29:32; 30:32; 31:16, 28, 35, 50; 34:9; 37:13, 20, 35, 44; 42:10, 36; 43:12; 44:8; 45:12; 47:9, 19; 49:2; 50:6. Half of these occurrences are in the Joseph material.

40 For G’s decision not to represent וָאָמ, which also involves ו, see §3.1.8.

41 On apposition in Greek, see KG II §406; Smyth §§976–995.


43 This fits normal Greek usage (see §4.2.1.3 note 121).


45 6:7; 8:17; 13:3; 14:23; 19:4, 11; 31:33; 46:34.
To be sure, it is often impossible to know whether the letter ו was present or visible in V, especially in light of its frequent variance in SP (see §2.2.1.3), but the loss of ו five times in 35:23 was certainly intentional, whether G was responsible for it or not. Yet, the omission of ו in ועד, which accounts for six of the cases involving prepositional phrases (not in 8:18; 31:33), has clearly translational origins and reflects G’s avoidance of the collocation καὶ ἐώς.

3.1.2.3 Residual cases where G omits a conjunction. Of the remaining cases, G most often omits adverbial καὶ in the presence of another conjunction (31)47 (3:22), although he sometimes decides to translate it separately for its strong emphasis (38:11).

Otherwise, G may not translate a conjunction because of a major syntactic transformation (11)49 (37:15), an ambiguous reading of the text (4:20), or for some other reason (11).50

46 For G’s regular omission of nouns like שָׂנָה that are repeated in time phrases, see §3.1.6.
48 On adverbial καὶ, which at times functions much like ו, see KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891; SSG §7bm.
49 8:3, 5; 20:16; 24:40, 63; 26:8+; 32:9, 29; 37:15; 39:20.
In 4:20, G (or V) read אַוֶּלֶת מַכִּנָּה, an example that should serve as a reminder of the tenuous existence of the letters š and š, which can easily be mistaken for one another.

3.1.3 Pronominal suffixes (247)

G's frequent omissions of Hebrew pronominal suffixes will be discussed in groups of similar Greek syntactic environments:

§3.1.3.1 G omits the suffix and translates its noun head without the definite article. 102 / 247 41.3%

§3.1.3.2 G omits the suffix and translates its noun head with the definite article. 47 / 247 19.0%

§3.1.3.3 G translates the suffixed form as a verb. 35 / 247 14.2%

§3.1.3.4 G omits the suffix because it is a resumptive pronoun in a relative clause. 20 / 247 8.1%

§3.1.3.5 Residual cases in which G omits the suffix. 43 / 247 17.4%

3.1.3.1 G omits the suffix and translates its noun head without the definite article. When G translates a suffixed noun in the vocative, he usually omits the suffix (42)52 (27:8).

27:8 ווֹלְנַנְּוֹי, וֹיֵֹי, אַּחְוַּאָבְּרָנְנוּ וּמוֹעַ דֵּנָּה

Both times he retains it (27:1; cf. 49:9, also וֹיֵֹי וּמוֹעַ), it captures the emotional state of a dying father addressing his son with his final words. Also, G often omits the suffix when its


head noun is translated in a prepositional phrase (39)\(^{53}\) (20:5), but this count is inflated by G’s translation of forms like לְמִנָּה (16)\(^{54}\) (6:20). If these are excluded, a similar number occur outside of prepositional phrases (21)\(^{55}\) (19:12).

Though the presence or absence of a possessive pronoun is often a matter of style, G’s choice to omit the suffix may reflect a significant difference of interpretation, as in 22:3, where the translation of אֶת שֵׁנִי נֶעִירִי as δύο παιδας demotes these נֶעִירִים to props, thus distinguishing them from Isaac.\(^ {56}\)

3.1.3.2 G omits the suffix and translates its noun head with the definite article. G often omits pronominal suffixes, because the Greek article—already matched with another Hebrew token—more idiomatically conveys the possessive idea when the possessor can be

---


54 G usually uses κατὰ γένος, only rendering the suffix in three cases as κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν (1:21, 25; 6:20).

55 10:15; 14:24; 19:12+; 22:3, 21; 24:22; 27:38; 37:2; 39:19; 40:5, 10, 16; 42:33; 45:2; 46:7+, 15+; [49:22], 26. The 3ms suffix (τό) may easily have been doubled (dittography), skipped (haplography), or confused with a following conjunction, e.g., perhaps with בּכֶר בּכֶר before בּכֶר (10:15; 22:21), as is suggested by the fact that G regularly translates this form’s suffix. Still, τ-variants have only been reconstructed based on SP (see §2.2.1.3).

56 For a discussion of G’s interpretation of this verse in its narrative context, see §8.3.3.
supplied from context (47). This is very common with nouns denoting (i) family relations (27) (28:7), (ii) personal belongings (9) (46:6), and (iii) body parts (6) (22:4).

3.1.3.3 G translates the suffixed form as a verb. G sometimes omits a suffix on a Hebrew form, usually an infinitive construct (29/35), because he translates it as a verb, most often a finite verb (30) (19:17; 36:6), but at times an infinitive (4) (19:21) or participle (31:40). The Greek verb's inflection may reflect parts of the suffix's morphology (19:17; 36:6; 31:40).

---

57 KG II §461.2; Smyth §1121; SSG §1c; cf. Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im griechischen Pentateuch,” StOr 55 (1984): 279. His count (c. 170) is higher, mainly due to the many cases where G uses the definite article for a pronominal suffix (126) (see §4.1.2.1).


3.1.3.4 G omits the suffix because it is a resumptive pronoun in a relative clause. Out of respect for the rules of Greek syntax, G omits pronominal suffixes on resumptive pronouns in relative clauses (20), but not always.

64 Since Hebrew has a relative particle instead of a relative pronoun that inflects for case, number, and gender, the relative clause’s antecedent is often determined by resumptive elements (IBHS §§19.3–4; Joüon §145).


67 G’s translation of [יֶּ֛שֶׁם] with [𝚗/ לכם] is a recurring technique (John William Wevers, Notes, 633).
3.1.3.5 Residual cases in which G omits the suffix. G omits suffixes for other reasons, especially on certain particles—i.e., ל, ה, ג, שׁ (43:4) —or when a verbal object is contextually superfluous (16) (2:15; 27:34). When G omits the Hebrew definite article, it often would have been ungrammatical to retain it, but several other groups of cases will be treated, as well:

§3.1.4.1 Cases involving the obligatory omission of the definite article. 155 / 235 66.0%

§3.1.4.2 Cases involving ב. 23 / 235 9.8%

§3.1.4.3 Cases involving proper nouns. 10 / 235 4.3%

§3.1.4.4 Residual cases. 47 / 235 20.0%

3.1.4 Definite article (235)

When G omits the Hebrew definite article, it often would have been ungrammatical to retain it, but several other groups of cases will be treated, as well:

§3.1.4.1 Cases involving the obligatory omission of the definite article. 155 / 235 66.0%

§3.1.4.2 Cases involving ב. 23 / 235 9.8%

§3.1.4.3 Cases involving proper nouns. 10 / 235 4.3%

§3.1.4.4 Residual cases. 47 / 235 20.0%

3.1.4.1 Cases involving the obligatory omission of the definite article. G omits the article in certain contexts where it is precluded by Greek grammar (155). Most frequently, this

---


70 18:22; 43:27, 28; 44:14.

71 On ו (3), see 7:8; 20:7; 43:5; on ש (2), see 24:49; 43:4.


73 For other residual cases (7), see 23:15; 24:18, 67; 31:28; 32:23; 44:18; 48:13.
involves the Hebrew definite article used with an attributive demonstrative pronoun (126)\(^\text{74}\) (7:13),\(^\text{75}\) but also when G preposes an attributive adjective (8:5; also 7:11)\(^\text{76}\) or translates an arthrous Hebrew noun with a Greek part of speech that usually or never takes a definite article, such as adverbs (24), which G consistently uses for adverbial uses of the Hebrew nouns (14) (30:32), (7) (39:12), and (3) (2:23).\(^\text{77}\)

| 7:13 | בִּעַצְמָהּ הַיּוֹם בֶּהָזָּה | ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ |
| 8:5 | דְּוָאָהּ תֵּבוּשִׁי | ἐως τοῦ δεκάτου μηνός |
| 39:12 | וְהֵנֵא הַזֵּיתֶה | ἐξεύρεν καὶ ἐξήλθεν ἔξω. | (also 15:5; 19:17; 24:29; 39:13, 15, 18) |
| 2:23 | זֶאת הָבָתָא עַצְמָהּ מְעַמְּהֵרֶי | Τοῦτο νῦν ὡστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὡστεόν μου | (also 18:32; 29:35) |

### 3.1.4.2 Cases involving πᾶς. G often omits the article in a noun phrase with πᾶς (23).

Lexically, this phenomenon is mostly limited to plants and animals, as below in Table 5.\(^\text{78}\)

---


\(^{75}\) Hebrew adjectival demonstratives follow the nouns they modify and are preceded by the article (IBHS §17; Joüon §137e); in contrast, when Greek adjectival demonstratives follow a definite head noun (i.e., predicate position), they are not preceded by the article (KG II §465.4; Smyth §1176; SSG §34b).

\(^{76}\) KG II §463.3A; Smyth §1156; SSG §37bba.

\(^{77}\) Other cases involve Greek finite verbs (2: 32:32; 42:6) and a pronoun (12:15), which never take the article unless they are substantivized (KG II §403; Smyth §1153; SSG §6a).

\(^{78}\) The count is of omitted articles. Note that several may be omitted from one construct chain (e.g., 7:14).
Grammatically, G’s omission of the article may reflect his desire to convey a distributive sense (e.g., πᾶν πετεινόν as “every bird” in 8:19), since the construction [πᾶς + arthrous singular noun] would likely be understood collectively. This fact explains why G does not omit the article with πᾶς for plural nouns (e.g., πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν as “all the birds” in 8:20), as well as the interpretive distinction he makes between πάντα τὸ ποιόν ("every place") in 20:13 and πάντα τὸν τόπον ("the whole place") in 18:26 (cf. 18:24).

---

79 KG II §465.6; Smyth §1174; SSG §38b(i).

80 For other cases involving ἔσω translated in the plural (7), see 1:30; 2:19, 20; 6:20; [8:1], 20; 9:2.
3.1.4.3 Cases involving proper nouns. Infrequently, G omits the definite article on proper nouns with no obvious pattern (10)\(^1\) (2:11). With Ἀδάμ, however, G only (but not always) omits the article in the nominative or when the name itself is meant (6)\(^2\) (2:20).\(^3\)

2:11 ὁ θεὸς ὁ κυρίων πάσαν τὴν γῆν Ἐυλάτ
2:20 Καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδάμ ὄνοματα πάσαν τοῖς κτήσειν

3.1.4.4 Residual cases. The remaining cases (47)\(^4\) are difficult to classify, such as in the following two examples, where G could have used the article but chose to omit it.

30:16 ויבא יעקב מן השדה בערב Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Ἰακὼβ ἐξ ἀγροῦ ἑσπέρας
42:6 ויוושף δὲ ἦν ἄρχων τῆς γῆς

3.1.5 Particles (118)

A number of Hebrew particles are left untranslated by G, but since only נָא and ה are omitted with any regularity, they will be given separate consideration:

---

\(^1\) G omits the article on Xρόν (2; 36:29, 30), Εὐλά(t) (2:11), Θαμάν (36:34), and Xανάαν (50:11).

\(^2\) See 2:19, 20, 23; 3:25, 22; 4:1. But G translates the article on ἀναήμ in 3:1, 8, 12.

\(^3\) Classical Greek allows both use and omission of the article with proper nouns (KG II §462a; Smyth §§1136–1142). Septuagint Greek often has the article with proper nouns, especially in oblique cases and with some lexical patterns (SSG §5c).

\(^4\) Her, τῆν has been matched with πίς, since it is more proximate.


\(^6\) The article is often omitted after prepositions (KG II §462f; Smyth §1128; SSG §3b). Muraoka specifies that this is especially common when the preposition's object is a single lemma.

\(^7\) Here, G does not translate the article on ἀρχων to distinguish it as the predicate (KG II §465; Smyth §1150; SGS §3b). For G's command of Greek verbs of ruling with the bare genitive, see §3.1.1.1 note 11.
3.1.5.1 The particle נָא. G generally leaves the particle נָא untranslated (60/74), regardless of its use, i.e. after a volitive (40/50) (31:12), in the collocation נָא בָּה before a real or implied volitive (7/9) (13:8), or in a variety of non-volitional uses (13/15) (30:27).

The quantitative equivalents G uses for (אל) נָא vary widely (μοι, οὖν, δή, μηδαμῶς, δέομαι, ἄρα), having been carefully selected for a particular rhetorical effect in each context.92

3.1.5.2 The particle ἢ. Omission is also G’s most common way of handling the Hebrew question particle ἢ (25/58), but his decision to omit it reflects his interpretation of its meaning, as G (i) always uses εἰ for indirect questions (14) (8:8)95 and (ii) omits ἢ when

88 IBHS §§34.3, 7; 40.2.5c; Joüon §§105c; 114b.
91 12:11; 16:2; 18:31; 19:2, 8, 19, 20; 24:42; 27:2; 30:27; 33:10: 47:29; 50:4; but ἄρα in 18:3 and νῦν in 18:27. For a discussion of G’s translation of נָא and use of particles in Gen 18–19 to develop a character foil between Abraham and Lot in terms of the quality of their hospitality, see §8.3.2.
92 The particle ἢ is used for polar (i.e., yes/no) questions in Hebrew (IBHS §40.3; Joüon §161).
93 [8:7], 8; 18:21; 24:21, 23; 37:32; 43:6, 7+; 44:19.
94 KG II §589.14; Smyth §2671; SSG §68.
he translates אֶתָּלָה as ou (13:9), thus expecting an affirmative response. Furthermore, he typically uses (iii) μή for questions that anticipate a negative response (10) (4:9) and (iv) no translation for questions that anticipate a positive response (12) (29:5).

The following minimal pair shows that G deliberately uses μή for ג in particular narrative contexts to present a question as expecting a negative response.101


97 Like אלל, questions introduced by ou anticipate a positive response (IBHS §40.3 note 48; Jouion §161c; KG II §589.3; Smyth §2651a; SSG §83ga).


99 KG II §589.4; Smyth §2651b; SSG §83gb.

100 17:17; 18:24, 28; 20:4; 24:5, 58; 29:5, 6; 43:27, 29; 45:3; 50:19. Not all cases anticipate affirmation.

101 Also, compare a similar alternation in 18:23–24, where G first translates Γ as μή to capture Abraham’s surprise (“Surely ... not ... , right?”) and then omits it to soften Abraham’s bartering strategy.
Though both verses contain the same Hebrew question (הawah אליהם אני/אנכי), G captures Jacob’s anger at Rachel with μή (“I’m not in place of God, am I?”) and Joseph’s intent to calm his brothers’ fears by omitting γ (“Do not be afraid, for I belong to God.”).

3.1.5.3 Other particles. G also omits other particles, but not with any regularity: most often הנה (15/129) and אשר (13/421), but also several others (5).

Given the language-specific use of particles like הנה, which G judged to be excessive after its first use in 28:12–13, it is remarkable he manages to translate them as often as he does.

3.1.6 Nouns in date and age formulae (58)

As a rule, G does not leave content words untranslated, but date and age formulae constitute an important exception. G regularly omits שנה (46) and ויש (3) in date

102 Of course, כי in 50:19 inflects the rhetorical question as the reason why Joseph’s brothers should be at ease.
106 Though it obviously results from Hebrew הנה, the particle ἴδογ is especially common in Septuagint with the imperfect and in nominal clauses (SSG §§28c(i); 94db; cf. IBHS §§16.3.5b; 37.6a, d; Joüon §§146h; 154c).
formulae and בן/בת (9) in age formulae, as Greek does not have the same usage.

Repeating ἔτη would be pleonastic (55), and ἵν (8:14) and בן (26:34) need no translation.110

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Instances/Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.1</td>
<td>Resumptive elements.</td>
<td>19 / 101</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.2</td>
<td>Certain uses of לְמָשָׁל.</td>
<td>14 / 101</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.3</td>
<td>Redundant pronominal subjects and prepositional phrases.</td>
<td>42 / 101</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.4</td>
<td>Infinitives absolute with cognate finite form.</td>
<td>6 / 101</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.5</td>
<td>Speech formulae.</td>
<td>14 / 101</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.6</td>
<td>יים in temporal frames.</td>
<td>6 / 101</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.7.1 Resumptive elements. Like pronominal suffixes,111 G omits resumptive prepositional phrases (14)112 (24:14) and adverbs (5)113 (35:27) in relative clauses.

---

110 Most often, G translates age formulae with the pattern [ἔτων + number] (11) or [number + ἔτων] (4), the only exceptions to this rule being in 17:17 (ἐκατονταετής) and 11:10 (ὑὸς ἐκατον ἔτων) (Hiebert, “Hermeneutics of Translation,” 91). Hiebert counts 17 Hebrew age formulae, since he includes the case in 11:10 and the cases where the Greek copula ἦν may be matched with Hebrew בן (7:76; 12:4; 16:16; 17:24; 21:5; 25:26; 41:46).
111 Cf. §3.1.3.4 note 66.
112 24:14, 43; 26:18; 38:25; 42:9, 38; 45:4. Each case involves two tokens, i.e., preposition and object.
3.1.7.2 Certain uses of לְךָ/לְךָ. G sometimes omits לְךָ and לְךָ (14) (12:17), especially with the so-called “ethical dative” used with verbs of motion (8) (12:1).115

21:17 Τί ἐστιν, Ἄγαρ; 116 Αἴχαλε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου

12:1 לְךָ מְאָרָצֶךָ

3.1.7.3 Redundant pronominal subjects and prepositional phrases. Occasionally G omits pronominal subjects (26) (33:6) and prepositional phrases (16) (37:24) that may be gapped or would be either pleonastic or unduly emphatic.

33:6 וַנִּתֵּן הַשְּׁפָרֹת הַמִּדָּה וְלֵיתָן

37:24 ἰθήματα ἔνθανατον καὶ λαβόντες αὐτῶν ἔφεσαν εἰς τὸν λάκκον.120

114 With verbs of motion (8), see 12:1; 22:5, 27:43; for other cases (6), see 18:25; 21:17; 31:32. The Greek dative is used with verbs of motion, but not usually in a reflexive sense (KG II §§423.2–3; Smyth §§1475; 1485).

115 IBHS §11.2.10d; Joüon §133d.

116 The idiom τί ἐστιν (“What’s wrong?”) is common in drama (LSJ, s.v. “εἰμί” A.II.2; DGE, s.v. “εἰμί” A.I.3).


119 It is possible that the suffix -ו was missed by haplography or parablepsis and G moved אתו back a clause.

120 Greek commonly uses one object with two verbs, especially when one is a participle (KG II §597.2b; Smyth §§1634–1635).
3.1.7.4 **Infinitives absolute with cognate finite form.** In a handful of cases, G omits an infinitive absolute used with a cognate finite form (6),\(^{121}\) considering it superfluous.

\[
i ἐὰν ἂν εἰς μὴ ἀποβάνῃ, γνώσθη ὅτι ἀποβάνῃ
\]

3.1.7.5 **Speech formulae.** G sometimes omits לאמר (8) (3:17) or לאמר (יואם) (6)\(^{122}\) (19:9).

\[
ואם אינך משׁיב דע כי
\]

G usually translates such formulae (cf. §3.1.1.2), which may indicate these were absent from V, but pluses and minuses are only admitted with the support of SP (cf. §2.2.1.5).\(^{123}\)

3.1.7.6 **היה in temporal frames.** Although G normally translates היה in temporal frames (12:11), he occasionally avoids such unidiomatic translations (6) (38:29).\(^{124}\)

\[
ויהי כאשׁר הקרב [אברהם] לבה מצרים...
\]


---

\(^{121}\) 20:7; 24:5; 27:30; 31:30; 43:7, 20. On G’s handling of the infinitive absolute, see §6.1.1.8.

\(^{122}\) For לאמר, see 3:17; 23:13; 27:6; 38:21; for יואם, see 19:9; 30:28; 42:2. Note that each of these cases is counted as two tokens on account of the additional omission of either ל or מ. For Genesis, Soisalon-Soininen counts 4 omissions of לאמר ליאמר compared to 75 translated forms (*Infinitive*, 74).

\(^{123}\) “Zum Teil beruht das [i.e. die Auslassungen] wohl auch auf Textvarianten im hebräischen Text. Da in der Septuaginta manchmal auch, abweichend von מ, Zusätze von λέγων, λέγοντες zu finden sind, kann man in dieser Hinsicht ganz sicher Varianten erwarten. Es ist deshalb auch nicht möglich auf Grund dieser Auslassungen etwas über den Charakter der Übersetzungen zu sagen” (Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 74).

Even if G’s regular imitation of this temporal construction produces a foreign-sounding translation, his increased use of δέ in translating temporal frames reflects a contextual understanding of the boundary-marking nature of this formula.\textsuperscript{125}

3.1.8 Residual cases (229)

Some residual cases (229)\textsuperscript{126} do not fit into clear analytical categories that shed light on G’s translational patterns and tendencies and can only be listed here.

3.2 Added Greek tokens (2,989)

G adds words in translation as often as he omits them, and it is again function words that G typically supplies, as shown by their initial categorization by part of speech.

\textsuperscript{125} For the statistically higher use of δέ to translate "ויהי", see Aejmelaeus, \textit{Parataxis}, 40–41. See also the discussion of G’s contextual use of δέ as a boundary-marker in §4.1.1.

\textsuperscript{126} For all residual cases (counted by number of tokens, not groups), see 2:10+; 3:6, 20; 4:22, 25; 6:16+; 7:2, 11, 13; 8:5, 22; 9:6; 14:24+; 17:2, 20; 18:5; 20:10+; 21:16++, 23; 23:1++, 11++, 13; 24:10+, 32+, 42, 53; 26:8+, 13, 29; 27:8, 16+, 46++++; 28:6+, 9+; 29:1, 6+, 14, 17, 30; 31:8, 10, 20, 21+, 24+, 29+, 42, 53++; [32:1][+], 11, 16; 33:1+, 5++, 12+, 19, 20+; 34:10, 12++; 35:7, 8+, 10++++++++, 16, 21++; 36:31; 37:5++, 9++, 10++, 14++; 38:12; 39:11+, 14, 20, 22++; 40:5; 41:5+, 11, 12++++++++++, 19, 23, 33, 44++, 45++++, 56++++++; 42:1; 43:4, 10, 17+, 21+, 25; 44:2, [4][+], 18++; 45:3++, 17, 19, 22+, 23++, 26; 46:6+, 28+, 31++; 47:6++, 17+, 20, 24++++++; 48:1++, 7++, 14++, 17; 49:29++; 50:10, 14+, 18++, 21.
§3.2.1 Definite article. 2,233 / 2,989 74.7%

§3.2.2 Copulas in verbless clauses. 180 / 2,989 6.0%

§3.2.3 Conjunctions. 179 / 2,989 6.0%

§3.2.4 Prepositions. 108 / 2,989 3.6%

§3.2.5 Personal pronouns. 79 / 2,989 2.6%

§3.2.6 The particle ἄν/ἐάν. 38 / 2,989 1.3%

§3.2.7 Double translations. 41 / 2,989 1.4%

§3.2.8 Residual cases. 131 / 2,989 4.4%

The Greek article predominates, but the addition of even this tiniest word, as well as other function words, may address a variety of interpretive concerns. Comparative issues of Hebrew and Greek grammar are often involved and so will be given regular consideration.

3.2.1 Definite article (2,233)

G’s very frequent additions of the Greek definite article will be analyzed in groups based upon the syntactic contexts in which the article is supplied:

§3.2.1.1 G supplies the article for a noun modified by a dependent genitive. 1,484 / 2,233 66.5%

§3.2.1.2 G supplies the article for a noun modified by an attributive construction. 110 / 2,233 4.9%

§3.2.1.3 G supplies the article for a noun with no modifiers. 422 / 2,233 18.9%

§3.2.1.4 G supplies the article to substantivize another part of speech. 125 / 2,233 5.6%

§3.2.1.5 G supplies the article to introduce an attributive construction. 46 / 2,233 2.1%

§3.2.1.6 G supplies the article in its demonstrative use. 46 / 2,233 2.1%

Different patterns of usage of the Hebrew and Greek articles are especially influential here.

3.2.1.1 G supplies the article for a noun modified by a dependent genitive. Hebrew does not use the article on forms that are suffixed or in construct, even though they definite,127 and

so G very often supplies the definite article for a Greek noun that is modified by a dependent genitive, whether (i) a pronoun (980) (2:7), (ii) an articulated noun (292) (30:16), or (iii) a proper noun (212) (50:7).\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{128} KG II §§454.3; 464.3–4; Smyth §§1161; 1184–1185; SSG §§3b; 6.

2:7 μὴ ἐνεστάθησαι εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνῷον ζωῆς
30:16 ἀντὶ τῶν μανδραγόρων τοῦ υἱοῦ μου
50:7 κάθε υἱός παιδεῖς Φαραώ

3.2.1.2 G supplies the article for a noun modified by an attributive construction. Similarly, G supplies the article in translating Hebrew forms that are anarthrous but definite when the Greek noun is modified by attributive modifiers: (i) adjectives (40)\textsuperscript{129} (2:12);\textsuperscript{130} (ii) demonstrative pronouns (36)\textsuperscript{131} (15:18);\textsuperscript{132} (iii) relative clauses (25)\textsuperscript{133} (29:27);\textsuperscript{134} (iv) possessive adjectives (5)\textsuperscript{135} (33:10);\textsuperscript{136} and (v) ordinal numbers (4)\textsuperscript{137} (14:5).\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{129} KG II §463.3A; Smyth §1154; SSG §37bb. Though the anarthrous pattern ἄνηρ ὁ ἄγαθος is permitted, this construction is increasingly uncommon in Hellenistic Greek.

\textsuperscript{130} KG II §465.4; Smyth §§1176–1178; SSG §34a.


\textsuperscript{132} KG II §465.4; Smyth §§1176–1178; SSG §34a.


\textsuperscript{134} Smyth §1120d.

\textsuperscript{135} 24:41; 33:10; 37:7; 47:5; 49:29.

\textsuperscript{136} KG II §454.3; Smyth §1196a; SSG §36a.

\textsuperscript{137} 7:11; 8:13; 14:4, 5.

\textsuperscript{138} KG II §465.14; Smyth §1125; SSG §39b.
When the Hebrew noun is prefixed by an inseparable preposition (i.e., ב, וב, or מ), it cannot bear the article as a consonant (57), though the Massoretic vocalization may indicate its presence (17:21).

17:21 ישכן הארץ ובו ארבע עשר שנה

3.2.1.3 G supplies the article for a noun with no modifiers. Very often G supplies the definite article for unmodified Hebrew nouns (422), both common (370) and proper

---

130 For G’s translation of pronominal suffixes with the Greek definite article, see §4.1.2.1.

140 This includes all 36 cases involving demonstrative pronouns (group [ii]).

141 Pietersma classifies such cases of articulation “indeterminate” (“Articulation,” 185–186). G’s use of the article where it is indicated by the Massoretic vocalization does not mean they necessarily shared a common reading tradition, as G usually supplies the article where the context implies it.

Lexically, G more frequently adds the article for certain Greek nouns, e.g., θεὸς (163) (35:13); γῆ (39) (2:4); πεδίον (9) (4:8); ὥρκος (8) (21:33); Μεσοποταμία (9) (28:2); Συρία (4) (35:9); and Φυλιστεία (5) (21:32).

143 Μεσοποταμία (9: 24:10; 25:20; 27:43; 28:2; 5, 6, 7; 31:18; 33:18); Φυλιστεία (5: 21:32, 34; 26:14, 15, 18); Συρία (4: 35:9, 26; 46:15; 48:7); Αἰγυπτίων (4: 45:2; 47:15, 20+); κύριος [= γάρ] (3: 4:13; 18:17; 28:13); Ἰωσήφ (3: 37:29, 31, 33); Νόε (2: 7:11; 8:13); Σήμ (2: 9:26, 27); Χαλδαιὸς (2: 11:28, 31); Ἀβραὰμ (2: 13:7; 14:13); Λῶτ (2: 13:7, 14); Ἀβίμελεχ (2: 20:18; 21:25); Χανααναῖος (2: 34:30; 36:2); Χεβρών (37:14); Βεθ (36:32); Ὑβεῖς (36:24); Σάρ (23:8); Ιαβόκ (32:22); Ἰσαάκ (26:8); Ἀδὰμ (5:1); Σαδόμιτης (19:4); Φαρά (14:6); Μαασοσού (48:20).

144 Although γῆ is often unarticulated, ἀβυσσός (0/3), πεδίον (1/19: 11:2), and ὥρκος (2/12: 26:33+) are not.


146 G always articulates both Μεσοποταμία (9/13) and Συρία (4/6) except in the combined phrases Μεσοποταμία τῆς Συρίας (4: 35:9, 26; 46:15; 48:7) and ἡ Μεσοποταμία Συρία (2: 28:6; 33:18). G leaves Φυλιστεία unarticulated only twice (2/8: 10:14; 26:1). For lexical patterns of articulation with place names, see SSG §5cb.
Grammatical factors also play a role, as G always supplies the article for the dative of respect to translate Hebrew adjectives in construct with anarthrous nouns (14)\(^{147}\) (41:2),\(^{148}\) and an added article before proper nouns is often in the genitive case (28/52)\(^{149}\) (9:26).\(^{150}\)

\(41:2\) שבע פרות יפות מראה ובריאת בשׂר

\(9:26\) בורוך יהוה אלהי שׁם

As above, the Massoretic vocalization may indicate the presence of the article (90) (4:8).\(^{151}\)

\(3.2.1.4\) G supplies the article to substantivize another part of speech. G also adds the Greek article to substantivize another part of speech (125), most often in the construction

\(^{147}\) 24:16; 26:7; 29:17+; 39:6+; 41:2+, 3+, 18+, 19+.

\(^{148}\) On the addition of the article for the dative of respect in the Septuagint, see SSG §§3e; 22ws; cf. KG II §423; Smyth §§1499–1502. For other creative translations of this construction, see 12:11; 34:21; 35:29; 49:12+.


\(^{150}\) Considering the entire corpus, G inflects the article in the genitive case in only about 1/4 of its occurrences (1,201/4,832, or 24.9%). Of the articles supplied by G, a very similar proportion are inflected in the genitive (596/2,248, or 26.5%). Both of these percentages are roughly half as low as the percentage of genitive articles supplied before a proper noun, which seems significant. This supports Muraoka’s claim that Septuagintal personal names tend to be articular in oblique cases (SSG §5ca).

[preposition + articular infinitive] (80), mainly for the Hebrew constructions [preposition + infinitive construct] (58) (9:14) and [πρίν (ב) + yiqtol/qatal] (9) (37:18).

But G also adds an article in the Greek construction [preposition + articular infinitive] used to translate a variety of other Hebrew formulations (8).

The only other Greek construction for which G adds an article before an infinitive is the Greek genitive articular infinitive used to express purpose (6) (16:2). This type of addition has interpretive significance. In this case, τοῦ transforms the partitive idea of the Hebrew into a purpose clause (“so that I cannot give birth”).

---

152 KG II §§478.4; Smyth §§2032g; 2034b; SSG §§6h; 30aba.
153 IBHS §§36.2.2–3; Joüon §§124k–l.
155 IBHS §§38.7; Joüon §113j. In Genesis, (ב)טרם is followed by yiqtol except in 24:15 (qatal).
159 KG II §§478.4c; Smyth §§1408; 2032e; SSG §30ab.
160 For a discussion of the significance of this addition in its narrative context, see §8.3.1
G also supplies the definite article to substantivize participles (27), usually when the Hebrew equivalent is definite by being suffixed (4:15) or in construct (22) (9:10), but also to substantivize adjectives (12) (25:23), adverbs (5) (15:16), and once a prepositional phrase (39:6).

These participles are analogous to nouns modified by a dependent genitive for which G supplies the definite article (see §3.2.1.1).

3.2.1.5 G supplies the article to introduce an attributive construction. G supplies the definite article to introduce one of several attributive constructions used to modify a definite noun: before attributive adjectives (16) (14:18; 42:39), where Greek grammar requires the

---

161 KG II §§461.4–5; Smyth §§1124; 1153b; 2049–2053; SSG §31bb.
162 3:20; 4:14, 15+, 21; 9:6, 10; 12:3+; 19:14, 25; 23:10, 18; 24:13; 27:29+; 34:24; 36:20; 38:12; 40:8; 41:8, 15, 24; 45:21; 46:26; 49:10, 24. The exceptional cases are 3:20; 4:21; 40:8; 41:15; 49:10. The case in 49:10 involves periphrastic translation, the case in 4:21 is logically definite, and the other three cases involve the Greek article in its generic use (KG II §461.2; Smyth §§1122–1124; SSG §1d).
164 KG II §§403; 461.4; Smyth §§1021–1029; 1153a; SSG §23f.
165 15:16; 18:12; 32:4; 41:5; 46:34.
166 KG II §461.6; Smyth §1153e; SSG §§6a(ii), e; 24a.
167 KG II §§403d; 461.6; Smyth §1153c; SSG §§6a(i); 26l.
169 12:6; 14:3, 18, 19, 20, 22; 23:9; 37:28+; 41:4; 42:3; 43:29; 49:25; 50:8. This includes two marginal cases: an attributive participle (38:21) and an attributive adverb (30:33), both of which function like adjectives.
but also before prepositional phrases (17) (14:5) and proper nouns (13) (26:1), where G’s addition of the article ensures an adnominal interpretation, which is especially significant when the modifier could otherwise be taken adverially (14:5).173

The attributive article in 14:5 disambiguates Ἀσταρωθ καρναί as the residence of the giants and not simply the place of their defeat, while the article in 26:1 assists the reader in punctuating the text, as one might take Ἀβραὰμ as the subject of ἐπορεύθη (i.e. “in the time [that] Abraham went...”) before reaching its actual subject, i.e., Ἰσαὰκ. With such subtle interventions, G shields his reader from misinterpreting the text or stumbling through it.175

170 For notes to the grammars, see §3.2.1.3, which also concerns arthrous nouns and attributive modifiers. The one case of an arthrous attributive adjective following an anarthrous noun (23:9) is exceptional.


173 “The article following an NP and prefixed to a prepositional adjunct or an adverb has an important syntactic function in marking the latter as having an attributive function” (SSG §6cbc).

174 Several cases involve ἄλλοι θεοὶ, ἄλλοι θεοὶ ὁ πυφιστοῦς (4:14:18, 19, 20, 22); cf. cf. שָׁם [18] [ (“ד הָעֹד הוּא הָעֹד אֵשָׁה] 49:25).

175 John Lee claims that G’s translation of הימים מהתת השמים in 1:9 as תָּהָמִבּ תֶּהוֹמִת מֵאָרָבָא may “avert an ambiguity,” but he remains tentative, as the Hebrew may have read הימים יסכנ הימים. But as such interventions are often found in G, they are probably translational (“Accuracy and Idiom: the Renderings of Mittahat in the Septuagint Pentateuch,” in In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus, ed. Kristin de Troyer, et al., CBET 72 [Leuven: Peeters, 2014], 85).
3.2.1.6 G supplies the article in its demonstrative use. Finally, G’s use of the article in its original demonstrative sense is always an addition, since Hebrew has no equivalent structure. G uses ὁ δὲ, ἡ δὲ, or οἱ δὲ almost exclusively to mark a change in speaker (46).

In this way, G helps the reader keep track of who is speaking in a dialogue. While this is often clear from context, it is not always a settled matter of interpretation.

176 KG §§456; 459; Smyth §§1099; 1106–1112; SSG §1a.

177 In theory, G could have used the article in this way to translate cases of Hebrew disjunctive syntax that involve contrastive subjects, such as καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ “Εανόν με εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς σέ – ...” but in fact he never translates a Hebrew personal pronoun as the Greek article (IBHS §39.2.3; Joüon §155). Cf. § 4.1.1.1.

178 49; 168; 189; 22:1, 7, 11; 24:18, 47, 56, 57, 58, 65; 27:18, 20, 24, 32; 29:4, 5, 6, 8; 32:26, 27; 33:5, 8, 15; 34:31; 37:16; 38:16, 17+, 18+, 29; 39:8; 40:8; 42:7, 10, 13, 38; 43:7, 28; 44:7, 10; 46:2; 47:3, 30. Only twice does G use ὁ δὲ with a verb other than a verb of speaking (24:65; 39:8), but in both cases adjacent to dialogue.

179 Identifying the speaker is a basic and recurring interpretive task. For an actual case of confusion, consider that John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 41.7 (PG 53 384) takes Abraham (not the visitor) as the subject of G’s καὶ εἶπεν Οὐχὶ ἀλλὰ ἐγέλασας. For a discussion of this passage and John’s interpretation, see §8.3.2 and note 206.
3.2.2 Copulas in verbless clauses (180)

While both Hebrew and Greek make use of verbless clauses in a variety of contexts,\(^{180}\) G often supplies a copula, usually εἰμί.\(^{181}\) These additions will be treated in groups based upon the type of clause in which they are supplied:

| §3.2.2.1 | G supplies a verb in a main clause. | 90 / 180 | 50.0% |
| §3.2.2.2 | G supplies a verb in a relative clause. | 62 / 180 | 34.4% |
| §3.2.2.3 | G supplies a verb in another type of subordinate clause. | 28 / 180 | 15.6% |

\(^{180}\) Grammarians have not adequately explained the usage of Greek verbless clauses. For example, Voitila—whose treatment of copulas added in the Pentateuch is the most accurate and most exhaustive—claims there are “différences essentielles” between Hebrew and Greek usage of verbless clauses, but he only names two: (i) Greek verbless clauses typically alternate with ἐστι- clauses, whereas Hebrew verbless clauses are not equivalent to clauses with היה, and (ii) Hebrew verbless clauses are more often used in contexts referring to the present moment of speaking than Greek verbless clauses (Présent et imparfait, 6 [cf. 6–23]). Still, he and others are surely correct in holding that verbless clauses have more restricted usage in Greek than in Hebrew (cf. Evans, Verbal Syntax, 86).

\(^{181}\) G uses γίνομαι in 15:4 and ἔχω (4) in 1:29, 30; 41:38; 43:26. Strictly speaking, ἔχω is not a copular verb, but its addition in similar syntactic contexts warrants its inclusion in this group.
3.2.2.1 G supplies a verb in a main clause. G most often supplies a copula in a main clause with a nominal predicate (45)\(^{182}\) (15:7; 23:15), but also in clauses with existential (13)\(^{183}\) (29:2), adverbial (13)\(^{184}\) (4:9), or adjectival (7)\(^{185}\) (15:1) predicates, or in clauses with periphrastic tense constructions (5)\(^{186}\) (44:32).\(^{187}\)

---


\(^{186}\) 18:22; 20:3; 31:10; 43:9; 44:32. G uses periphrastic tense constructions more often, but the copula has often been matched with some Hebrew element (esp. ובו or ניב). For a comprehensive treatment of this topic in relation to the Pentateuch, see Evans, Verbal Syntax, 220–257 (cf. §3.4.4).

\(^{187}\) For remaining unclassified cases (7), see 17:25; 21:17; 24:16; 28:19; 35:12; 38:25; 46:32.
By adding a copula, G explicates the clause’s structure, but since Greek also uses verbless clauses,\(^\text{188}\) he often does this to inflect the verb in a particular mood and/or tense. For example, G gives a particular nuance to the generic question (What (is) this”) in 23:15 by putting it in the optative as τί ἂν εἶνεν τούτο (“What might this be?”), and in 15:1 he takes a future-tense interpretation of σκέφτεται ἡμᾶς (“Your payment (is) very great”) by translating it as ὁ μισθὸς σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα (“Your payment will be very great”).\(^\text{189}\)

3.2.2.2 G supplies a verb in a relative clause. When G supplies a relative clause verb (62), it most often involves adverbial predicates (49)\(^\text{190}\) (35:6a), but also possessive (6)\(^\text{191}\) (24:36), existential (4)\(^\text{192}\) (34:28), adjectival (30:35+), and nominal (35:6b) predicates.\(^\text{193}\)

---

\(^{188}\) IBHS §8; Joüon §154; KG II §354; Smyth §§944–948; SGS §94d. Greek often omits the copula (typically ἐστίν or εἰσίν), but certain contexts are more common: (i) in proverbial expressions; (ii) with modal expressions; (iii) with certain adjectives; (iv) in formulaic expressions; (v) in poetry; and (vi) in main clauses.

\(^{189}\) For the significance of this translation choice in relation to the plot of Abraham’s story, see §8.3.1.


\(^{192}\) 34:28+, 29++.

\(^{193}\) G almost entirely avoids verbless relative clauses, only permitting the formulation [ὁ/γεννεῖσθαι]—always a nominal predicate—and a few cases involving adverbial predicates after o’o (3:1:11, 12, 31:4).
3.2.2.3 G supplies a verb in another type of subordinate clause. G adds a verb in subordinate clauses having the same types of predicates as in main clauses (cf. §3.2.2.1), with the exception of nominal predicates, which are uncommon in this group (6/28). Often, the Greek subordinate clause is introduced by ὅτι (7) or γάρ (7) (39:23a), but G also adds verbs in other subordinate constructions (14) (19:11; 39:23b; 43:3).

In some cases, the Greek verb is grammatically necessary (e.g., 39:23b; 43:3), but by adding a verb, G clarifies the syntax and/or specifies the mood and tense of the clause.

---

194 For adverbial predicates (8), see 19:11; 23:9; 24:54; 39:14, 32+; 44:1; 49:32; for existential predicates (6), see 8:9; 31:35; 41:49; 42:23; 43:3, 5; for nominal predicates (6), see 13:8; 17:15; 35:17; 38:15; 39:9; 46:34; for adjectival predicates (4), see 3:6; 28:8; 30:30; 41:32; for possessive predicates (3), see 17:17; 26:20; 50:19; the case in 13:10 involves a periphrastic tense construction.

195 3:6; 8:9; 13:8, 10; 28:8; 31:35; 41:32. Far more often, G omits the copula in ὅτι-clauses, but especially in expressions like ὅπως X ὅτι καλῶ (10: 1:4, 8, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25; 36+; 49:15). For other cases (7), see 3:20; 12:12; 25:28; 39:3; 40:7; 45:12; 49:15.


3.2.3 Conjunctions (179)

G often supplies conjunctions, as well. These additions will be treated in groups based on the conjunction’s function, i.e., the level of discourse units that it serves to join:

§3.2.3.1 G supplies a conjunction to join clauses. 114 / 179 63.7%
§3.2.3.2 G supplies a conjunction to join phrases. 54 / 179 30.2%
§3.2.3.3 G supplies a conjunction to join adjectives. 8 / 179 4.5%
§3.2.3.4 G supplies adverbial καί. 6 / 179 3.4%

3.2.3.1 G supplies a conjunction to join clauses. Most often G supplies a conjunction (114)—esp. καί (39), ἀλλά (27), δέ (17), καί (9), and γάρ (8)202—to join two clauses in a way that is appropriate to each word.203 While G may introduce the most neutral Greek conjunction καί just to avoid asyndeton (11:30),204 he frequently adds δέ to mark a textual

---

203 For less common conjunctions (14), see τε (3: 27:36; 31:52; 41:13); μέν (3: 27:22; 43:4; 44:8); εἴ (2: 42:20; 45:28); ἄνα (2: 18:21; 30:28); ἀλλά (42:34); ἐκάθεν (33:13); ἐπετέλεσεν (15:17); and ἔστιν (41:2).
204 Asyndeton is the exception in Greek prose (cf. §3.1.2.2 and note 38). Since G also introduces asyndeton, his avoidance of it here means reserving the rhetorical use of asyndeton for the right moments. Also, textual variants with τί must always be considered, especially in the presence of an identifiable trigger, such as in 49:32, where G or V may have doubled τί by reading ἀστὰς ἐπετέλεσεν καί ἐκέλευ (\(= \text{τίν} \text{γυναῖκα} \text{αὐτώ} \text{καί} \text{ἐκέλευ}\)).
boundary, such as a paragraph break (6:9), or in a clearly adversative sense (18:28), and he typically adds δέ to signal the onset of speech (13/17) (42:14).

By supplying the conjunctions οὖν (6:14) and γάρ (42:18), however, G introduces or develops a causal relationship between two clauses simply juxtaposed in the Hebrew text.

With οὖν G presents God’s command for Noah to build the ark as the logical consequence of the preceding warning of the coming flood (6:14), and with γάρ G transforms Joseph’s fear of God into the alleged reason why Joseph provides a way for his family to survive (42:18).

**3.2.3.2 G supplies a conjunction to join phrases.** G also transforms Hebrew phrasal apposition into Greek coordination (54), by joining noun phrases (42) and prepositional

---

205 The idea of postpositives as boundary markers will be treated more fully in §4.1.1.

206 G also adds δέ as a complementizer (3: 33:15; 40:17; 44:4) and in a causal sense (17:14).

phrases (12) with καί (40), δέ (8), or τε (6). G’s addition of καί may improve the style of the translation, but it usually does not significantly alter its meaning.

G's addition of καί may improve the style of the translation, but it usually does not significantly alter its meaning.

In contrast, G adds δέ to clarify complex appositional structures (44:31; 48:13) and τε to bind natural pairs as a unit, such as husband and wife (3:1) or quiver and bow (27:3).

3.2.3.3 G supplies a conjunction to join adjectives. Occasionally, G adds καί to coordinate two attributive adjectives (8), often joined by a conjunction in Greek.

3.2.3.3 G supplies a conjunction to join adjectives. Occasionally, G adds καί to coordinate two attributive adjectives (8), often joined by a conjunction in Greek.

---


209 With noun phrases (6), see 24:15; 28:5; 29:1; 44:24, 30, 31; with prepositional phrases (2), see 48:13+.

210 With noun phrases (5), see 3:1, 8; 27:3; 34:30; 48:13; in 13:17, τε joins prepositional phrases.

211 KG II §§521.2; Smyth §2878; SSG §78f.

212 KG II §§526–532; Smyth §§2834–2839. Smyth §2836 gives the example of copulative δέ used “where a second relationship is added,” as in 44:31 and similar to 48:13.

213 KG II §522; Smyth §§2967–2983; SSG §§26m; 78c, k.

214 7:11; 8:4; 27:9; 30:39; 31:10, 12; 41:7, 24.

215 KG II §405.4; Smyth §1033; SSG §37a.
3.2.3.4 G supplies adverbial ΚΑΙ. Rarely, G adds adverbial ΚΑΙ (6)\textsuperscript{216} for emphasis.\textsuperscript{217}

By adding ΚΑΙ (“also”) in 14:12, G focuses on Lot’s kinship with Abraham as the relevant fact motivating Abraham’s military intervention in a foreign war, and by using ΚΑΙ (“actually”) in 41:13, he conveys the speaker’s astonishment at Joseph’s true prophecy, which, in turn, magnifies Joseph’s status as magisterial interpreter of dreams.

3.2.4 Prepositions (108)

G’s additions of prepositions could be categorized based on their adverbial or adnominal usage, but, given the translation-technical similarities between both types, they will be grouped by semantic function of the supplied preposition:

§3.2.4.1 G supplies a preposition with a spatial sense. 67 / 108 62.0%
§3.2.4.2 G supplies a preposition with a temporal sense. 11 / 108 10.2%
§3.2.4.3 G supplies a preposition that was not repeated in Hebrew. 4 / 108 3.7%
§3.2.4.4 G supplies a preposition to express the agent. 3 / 108 2.8%
§3.2.4.5 Residual cases. 23 / 108 21.3%

3.2.4.1 G supplies a preposition with a spatial sense. G frequently supplies a spatial preposition (67),\textsuperscript{218} since Greek often uses one to express an adverbial or adnominal

\textsuperscript{216} 14:12; 31:33; 34:15, 22; 41:13; 49:16.

\textsuperscript{217} KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891.

relationship with a locative (9:2; 36:37), allative (9:19; 27:3), or ablative (46:26) sense,\(^{219}\) whereas Hebrew may only require a bare noun phrase or a construct chain.\(^{220}\)

| 9:2 | καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς |
| 36:37 | μεριμνάτην ἐνε \(\text{παρὰ \rhoωβάς τῆς ποταμοῦ} \) |
| 9:19 | διεσπάρησαν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τῆν γῆν |
| 27:3 | ἐξελθὲ τὸ πεδίον |
| 46:26 | οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ |

Even where such additions are obligatory, G’s choice of preposition involves interpretation. For example, ἠγισθᾶ constellates with both source (46:26) and goal (27:3), and, while G’s interpretation is likely correct, ἡς ὁρύς in 27:3 could be taken as locative (ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ).

### 3.2.4.2 G supplies a preposition with a temporal sense.

G also adds temporal prepositions (11),\(^{221}\) though not often, no doubt since Greek expresses these relationships with case alone.\(^{222}\) In light of this, it is likely significant that the Hebrew expressions are often idioms.

| 15:17 | γραμμὸι τῆς Θεοῦ ἄγαν ... |
| 27:45 | λίμνας ἐκεῖνοι καὶ ἔθεσαν τὸν θρόνον οὐκ ἔστατον ἡμέρα μιᾷ. |
| 39:10 | ἧνικα δὲ ἐλάλησεν τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, ... |
| 46:30 | Ἀποθανοῦμαι ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου |

\(^{219}\) KG II §§428.1–4; Smyth §§1636–1637; SSG §26a.

\(^{220}\) IBHS §§9.5.2f; 10.2.2b; Joüon §§126h; 129f.

\(^{221}\) KG II §§428.1–4; Smyth §§1636–1637; SSG §26a.

\(^{222}\) For the temporal genitive, see KG II §419.2b; Smyth §§1444–1449; SSG §22h; for the temporal dative, see KG II §426.2; Smyth §§1539–1543; SSG §22we; for the temporal accusative, see KG II §510.5b; Smyth §§1582–1587; SSG §§22xc–xd.
3.2.4.3 G supplies a preposition that was not repeated in Hebrew. In a few cases G repeats a preposition from a preceding phrase (4)\(^{223}\) for the sake of clarity and stylistic evenness.\(^{224}\)

1:14 εἰς σημεία καὶ εἰς καιροὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς ἔναντις

39:20 εἰς τὸ ἄχρωμα, εἰς τὸν τόπον ἐν ὃ ...  

3.2.4.4 G supplies a preposition to express the agent. In a few cases G adds ὑπὸ to express the agent of a verb or verbal idea where the genitive would not suffice (3). In two of these cases (45:21, 27), G has used a verb where Hebrew has other parts of speech.

26:29 καὶ νῦν σὺ εὐλογηθήσετε ὑπὸ κυρίου.

45:21 κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ Φαραώ τοῦ βασιλέως

45:27 καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐγκαθέτα ὑπὸ Ἰωσήφ

3.2.4.5 Residual cases. The other added prepositions (23)\(^{225}\) do not follow any clear patterns and express a variety of grammatical relationships.

19:21 διὰ τοῦ μὴ καταστρέψαι τὴν πόλιν, περὶ ἡς ἐλάλησας.

22:3 ή διὰ τοῦ μὴ εὐχάριστον καὶ εἰς ὑπὸ κυρίου.

3.2.5 Personal pronouns (79)

G supplies personal pronouns in a variety of contexts,\(^{226}\) which have been grouped by the syntactic function of the added pronoun:

\(^{223}\) 1:14; 24:10; 39:20; 40:3.

\(^{224}\) KG II §451; Smyth §§1667–1674; SSG §78g.


\(^{226}\) For the omission of pronouns and verbal objects or adjuncts, see §§3.1.3; 3.1.7.3.
§3.2.5.1 G supplies a pronoun that is the verbal subject. 35 / 79 44.3%

§3.2.5.2 G supplies a pronoun that is a verbal object. 25 / 79 31.6%

§3.2.5.3 G supplies a pronoun that is a possessive modifier. 16 / 79 20.3%

§3.2.5.4 G supplies a pronoun that is the object of a preposition. 3 / 79 3.8%

3.2.5.1 G supplies a pronoun that is the verbal subject. Sometimes G supplies a nominative pronominal subject (24) for emphasis.227

With ἐγὼ in 21:30, G underscores the disputed claim over the well; with σὺ in 24:46, he emphasizes Rebecca’s generous offer to both Abraham’s servant and his camels; and he uses ἐγὼ and μὲν ... δὲ in 38:23 to contrast Tamar and Judah in this rhetorically charged dialogue.

Also, G introduces accusative pronominal subjects of infinitives (11), but as this often involves the translation of a Hebrew finite verb, it is a strategy for retaining the person, number, and gender encoded by the Hebrew verb (7) (24:33; 37:18).


228 KG II §454.1; Smyth §§1190–1191; SSG §7.

229 KG II §§475–476; Smyth §§1972–1981; SSG §69A.

3.2.5.2 G supplies a pronoun that is a verbal object. G also occasionally supplies object pronouns in the accusative/genitive (15) or dative (10). The dative pronouns typically add a non-essential frame of reference (45:28), but the accusative and genitive pronouns are often included because of the Greek verb’s preferred argument structure (11:3; 42:22).

3.2.5.3 G supplies a pronoun that is a possessive modifier. Sometimes G supplies a possessive pronoun for a Hebrew noun lacking a pronominal suffix (16), more often for a definite Hebrew noun (10) (21:16; 47:31), but not always (6) (27:25).

3.2.5.4 G supplies a pronoun that is the object of a preposition. Rarely, G adds a form of σύ after a preposition and before κύριος (3) in order to clarify the Hebrew circumlocution, i.e., translating בְּעֵינֶי אֲדֹנִי (“in the eyes of my lord”) in 33:8, 15 as ἐναντίον σου κύριε (“before you, lord”) and אל אדונִי (“to my lord”) in 47:18 as πρός σὲ τὸν κύριον (“to you, (the) lord”).
3.2.6 The particle ἄν/ἐάν (38)

Since Hebrew has no conditional particle like Greek ἄν/ἐάν,235 G’s use of this word usually entails an addition (38). G primarily uses ἄν/ἐάν in subordinate clauses, whether relative (24),236 temporal (4),237 final (3),238 or comparative (33:10), but also in main clauses (6).239 In subordinate clauses, G uses ἄν/ἐάν mainly with the subjunctive to refer to future events (28) (2:17), but sometimes in a present general sense (21:22; cf. 30:33).240 He uses the past indicative of iterative action (3) (2:19)241 and the optative of comparison (33:10).242

2:17 ήδε ἄν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, δανάτῳ ἀποβανείσθε.
21:22 ὁ θεὸς μετὰ σοῦ ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ἦν ποιήσας
2:19 καὶ πᾶν, ὁ ἐάν ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸ Ἀδὰμ, ψυχὴν ζώσαν
33:10 καὶ πᾶς καραίως σινεις πρὸς σου ἡμείς

235 KG II §§392–399; Smyth §§1761–1849; SSG §§29c, db(ii); 89l.
236 With aorist subjunctive (20), see 2:17; 3:5; 11:6; 12:1; 15:14; 20:13; 21:12; 22:2; 24:14; 43; 26:2; 28:15; 22; 31:32; 34:11, 12; 41:55; 44:9, 10; 48:6; with present subjunctive (3), see 21:22; 30:33; 42:38; with aorist indicative, see 2:19.
237 With aorist subjunctive (2), see 12:12; 30:38; with indicative (2), see 6:4 [imperfect]; 30:42 [aorist].
238 With aorist subjunctive (3), see 12:13; 18:19; 50:20.
239 With aorist indicative (4), see 30:27; 31:27, 42; 43:10; with optative (2), see 44:8 [aorist]; 23:15 [present].
240 KG II §559.1; Smyth §§2555; 2567; SSG §29c(i).
241 KG II §392.4; Smyth §1790; SSG §§29c(iii); 89l.
242 KG II §§582–583; Smyth §2477; SSG §29dc(i); Joosten, “Elaborate Similes,” 227–236; Evans, Verbal Syntax, 190–197.
In main clauses, G supplies ἂν/ἐάν with the indicative in a contrafactual apodosis (4) (43:10)\(^{243}\) or with the potential optative (2) (23:15).\(^{244}\)

\[
\text{כי לולא התמהמהנו כי עתה שׁנבו זה פעמים εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐβραδύναμεν, ἥδη ἂν ὑποστρέψαμεν δίς.}
\]

\[
\text{ WD איהו תי מזו מז ויתו כז יב עז חזימ נז נז נז}
\]

3.2.7 Double translations (41)

Double translations occur when the same Hebrew word or phrase is translated twice and each rendering could stand on its own.\(^{245}\) However, it is easier to define double translations than to explain or even identify them. To begin with, is this phenomenon scribal or translational? If scribal, it could be the result of dittography (in the Hebrew) or the inclusion of a marginal gloss (in the Greek).\(^{246}\) If translational, G may have produced a double translation deliberately—perhaps he could not make up his mind—or by accident. Or, this phenomenon might have a combination of scribal and translational origins, such that a secondary translator's alternate rendering made its way into G's translation.

\[243\text{ KG II §574; Smyth §§2302–2312; SSG §89b.}\]
\[244\text{ KG II §396.2; Smyth §§1824–1834; SSG §29db(ii); Evans, Verbal Syntax, 188–190.}\]
\[245\text{ This definition, adapted from the work of Zipora Talshir, eliminates, e.g., “alternate renderings” and expansive translation (see §3.4) (“Double Translations in the Septuagint,” in VI Congress of the IOSCS, ed. Claude Cox, SCS 31 [Jerusalem: Scholars Press, 1986], 23).}\]
\[246\text{ If so, it may have been meant as a replacement (“Double Translations,” 28).}\]
Greek Genesis contains 19 potential double translations involving 41 Greek words, all of which are presented here with a vertical bar (|) separating the two parts. Where the Greek has a Hebraism (19:17), it is likely a variant in V, but even this is inconclusive.  

19:17 | | Σῴζεις | σῴζεις τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν.  

In contrast, where the two renderings serve as exegetical alternatives (19:37, 38; 30:18), it more likely originated in Greek, but it still remains uncertain who is responsible for it.  

19:37 | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ δνομα αὐτοῦ Μωάμ. | ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.  

19:38 | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ δνομα αὐτοῦ Ἄμμαν. | ὑιὸς τοῦ γένους μου.  

30:18 | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ δνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσσαχάρ. | ὁ ἐστιν Μισθός.  

Most double translations, however, simply involve a single word or phrase having been rendered by the juxtaposition of two similar alternatives.

---

247 Given this indeterminacy of accounting for this phenomenon, no variants have been reconstructed in V on the basis of apparent double translations.

248 This case does not qualify according to the definite given above, since only one of the two renderings can stand alone. For a full discussion of G’s handling of the infinitive absolute, see §6.1.1.8.

249 In these examples, it is also hard to imagine both parts standing on their own, since the translation of the proper noun serves to explicate the preceding transliteration.

250 Talshir’s caution is certainly warranted: “It would be rather presumptuous to think we are able to establish objective criteria for distinguishing doublets that are the result of creative translating and those effective in the process of transmission” (“Double Translations,” 29).
3.2.8 Residual cases (131)

The remaining cases of added Greek words are difficult to characterize as a group (131), although G most often adds demonstrative pronouns (15)\(^{251}\) (6:3; 19:34) and relative pronouns (12)\(^{252}\) (14:19).\(^{253}\) These small words may clarify or alter the meaning.


For example, τούτοις in 6:3 carries a pejorative sense, while G’s addition of ὥς in 14:19 is needed to clarify the sentence structure, since he uses a finite verb for the participle ἐκεῖ.

In a similar vein, G adds other words to clarify the text (25:22) or solve an interpretive problem (2:9; 20:4), though some could be Hebrew variants (39:6).255

25:22 ἐι σοῦτος μοι μέλλεις γίνεσθαι, ...  
2:9 καὶ ἔξαντείλεν ὅ θεὸς ἔτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς  
20:4 Κύριε, έθνος ἄγνοσὺν καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολείπῃς;  
39:6 Καὶ ὃν Ἰσαὰκ καλὸς τῷ εἴδει καὶ ὡραῖος τῇ ὁμα σφόδρα.

In 2:9, ἔτι (“again”) mediates the redundancy of God creating plants in the two creation accounts, and G adds ἄγνοσὺν (“unwitting”) in 20:4 to protect Abimelech’s character.257

Three additions in the Jacob-Esau cycle form an interesting set, because they serve to develop the character of the two brothers with respect to their troubled relationship.

27:36 Δικαίως ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ.  
27:38 κατανυσρέω τῷ Ἰσαὰκ ἀνεβόησεν φωνῇ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ἐκλαυσεν.  
33:4 καὶ ἐκλαυσαν ἀμφότεροι.

254 The article may be omitted with this emotive (“mit Affekt”) or “contemptuous” use of σοῦτος (KG II §465.4d; Smyth §1178e).
255 The addition in 39:6, which is discussed in §9.3.3 (see also §5.2.2.4), is an unlikely addition, since G also differentiates his translation of ἔτι in order to enhance Joseph’s physical attractiveness.
256 Rösel, Übersetzung, 62–63; Harl, La Genèse, 101–102; Wevers, Notes, 26. Still, ἔτι may reflect a Hebrew variant, since there are six such cases: 2:9; 29:35; 30:12; 37:30; 44:23; 45:1.
257 For the significance of this addition in relation to its narrative context, see §8.3.2.
In Gen 27, G enhances first Esau's irritation at Jacob's persistent trickery by adding ἤδη ("now") (27:36) and then his injury by supplying a genitive absolute that describes their father's deep pain at this (27:38). Yet, when Jacob later returns home, G clarifies that the enmity is past by specifying that “both” (ἀμφότεροι) wept tears of joy at their reunion (33:4).

3.3 Synthetic Translation (646 groups)

Generally, G translates each Hebrew token with a distinct Greek token, even for Hebrew words composed of multiple tokens. The phenomenon whereby G renders multiple Hebrew tokens together with one or more Greek tokens, however, may be termed “synthetic translation” and stands in opposition to expansive and analytic translation.

The analysis of these cases is facilitated by the following division:

§3.3.1 Hebrew compounding. 373 / 646 57.7%
§3.3.2 Greek compounding. 110 / 646 17.0%
§3.3.3 Periphrastic translations. 163 / 646 25.2%

Since each case involves multiple Hebrew tokens, they are counted by groups of tokens.

3.3.1 Hebrew compounding (373 groups)

Though relatively uncommon, Hebrew compounding is involved in most cases of synthetic translation. The cases will be grouped by the Hebrew compound’s part of speech:

---

258 Such granular translation is Barr's “narrow segmentation,” Typology of Literalism, 294–303.
259 Expansive translation, treated in §3.4, refers to quantitative matches of the type 1 : n. Analytic translation involves the translation of a token (expansive) or a group of tokens functioning as a unit by dividing the token or unit into parts and translating them individually.
§3.3.1.1 Compound prepositions. 254 / 373 68.1%
§3.3.1.2 Compound conjunctions. 67 / 373 18.0%
§3.3.1.3 Compound adverbials. 41 / 373 11.0%
§3.3.1.4 Compound question words. 11 / 373 2.9%

3.3.1.1 Compound prepositions. G’s synthetic translations most often involve Hebrew prepositions lexicalized over time as compound or complex prepositions (254). For simplicity’s sake, both types will be referred to as compound prepositions, since both classes involve very similar processes of derivational morphology by compounding. Common forms are presented with their Greek equivalents in Table 6 below.

---

260 Compound prepositions are composed of multiple prepositions (IBHS §11.3.3; Joüon §133j). Complex prepositions are prepositions composed of prepositions and nouns (IBHS §§11.3.1–2; Joüon §103o; Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 1–2). Joüon refers to them as “pseudo-prepositions,” and Sollamo uses “semiprepositions.”

261 For example, the “complex” preposition מְלַפָּני likely formed from a prior compound preposition לפני, which had already become lexicalized as a preposition regardless of its historical formation.
The only prepositions G translates analytically with any regularity involve ל פני, מ פני, נכי, על פני, ובין, ובין (between, and between), i.e., according to normal Greek usage (“from off the surface” [cf. 4:14; 6:7; 7:4; 8:8], however, is a “Hebraism”) (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 114). In her final analysis, Sollamo places Genesis among the second freest group (of four), but this relates only to translation technique and not necessarily the quality of Greek (Semiprepositions, 280–289). G’s tension between acceptable Greek usage and quantitative equivalence reflects his complex poetics of translation.

G only translates ל פני analytically in 23:17 (κατὰ πρόσωπον). This is the only case in Genesis of local with an inanimate object, which Septuagint translators typically treat differently (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 72–73).

6:11, 13; 7:1; 10:9+; [12:19]; 13:9; 17:1, 18; 18:32; 20:15; 23:12; 24:12, 40; 27:7, 20; 30:30; 33:14; 34:10, 21; 40:9; 41:46; 43:9, 14, 15, 33; 44:14, [32]; 47:2, 6, 7, 18; 48:15.

24:7; 32:3, 16, 17; 33:3, 14; 41:43; 45:5; 46; 48:20; 50:16.


68: 164, 5; 18:3, 19:14, 19; 21:11, 12; 27:12; 28:8; 29:20; 30:27; 32:5; 33:8, 10, 15; 34:11, 18+; [35:22]; 38:7, 10; [39:4], 21; 41:37+; 42:25, 29, 50:4. ‘Ενάντιον is a favorite equivalent for על פני in the Septuagint, and, while it was primarily local in contemporary usage, it absorbed “novel metaphorical nuances” associated with judgment/evaluation in the Septuagint (like παρά + dative) (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 123–125).


27 G renders נש לע analytically just as often (14): ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (7: 11:8, 9; 17:3, 17; 18:16; 19:28; 50:1); κατὰ πρόσωπον (4: 16:12; 25:18+; 32:21); ἐπὶ προσώπων (2: 7:23; 11:4); ἐπὶ προσώπω (8:9). Genesis contains relatively many “Hebraistic” cases of ἐπὶ + πρόσωπον meaning “on the surface of” (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 113).


6:1; 7:3.
Synthetic translations of less common compound prepositions are given in the notes.)

276 In 3:17 and 8:21 G translates ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου (3:17) and διὰ τάς ἔργα (8:21), but in these cases was or was read as ἐν τῷ.

277 Just as often, G translates ἐν κατά (2:13:14; 24:27; 26:16; 31:31; 48:12), παρά (2:41:32; 44:32), ἐν (44:29)

278 Just as often, G translates μετά (5:13:14; 24:27; 26:16; 31:31; 48:12), παρά (2:41:32; 44:32), ἐν (44:29)

279 Just as often, G translates μετά (5:18:12, [13], 24; 24:3; 25:22; ἐν (2:45:6; 48:16)

280 It is noteworthy that, although they are commonly matched elsewhere in the Septuagint, G never translates μετά as εν μέσῳ, but selects more linguistically appropriate equivalents, ἐνί being an especially rare translation of ἐν κατά (5:23:11, 18; 30:41; 42:24; 47:19)

281 G usually translates υπὸ analytically (25), rendering the noun υπὸ as χείρ, but the preposition υπὸ in various ways: ἐν (11:16:6; 35:4; 38:18, 20; 39:12, 13, 23, 43:12, 15, 21, 26); εἰς (5:27:17; 39:6, 8; 40:11, 13); διὰ (4:30:35; 32:16; 39:4, 22); ὅ (3:19:16++); ὀν (9:2); μετὰ (22:6). The uses of υπὸ in Genesis, however, are almost exclusively local, and so G’s analytic translations are “good Greek equivalents” (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 178–190).

282 G usually translates υπὸ as χείρ analytically (25), rendering the noun υπὸ as χείρ, but the preposition υπὸ in various ways: ἐν (11:16:6; 35:4; 38:18, 20; 39:12, 13, 23, 43:12, 15, 21, 26); εἰς (5:27:17; 39:6, 8; 40:11, 13); διὰ (4:30:35; 32:16; 39:4, 22); ὅ (3:19:16++); ὀν (9:2); μετὰ (22:6). The uses of υπὸ in Genesis, however, are almost exclusively local, and so G’s analytic translations are “good Greek equivalents” (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 178–190).

283 The uses of υπὸ in Genesis, however, are almost exclusively local, and so G’s analytic translations are “good Greek equivalents” (Sollamo, Semiprepositions, 178–190).
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In many cases, G still maintains a type of quantitative equivalence with his synthetic translations, since they are often Greek compounds whose constituents sometimes match the individual Hebrew elements (e.g., ἐν-αντίον, ἐμ-προσθεν, ἐν-ώπιον, ἐπ-άνω, ἀπ-έν-αντι, κατ-έν-αντι, ὑπο-χείριος). But in general, G’s treatment of Hebrew compound prepositions reveals his concerns for usage and meaning, since he avoids analytic translation where it would be bad Greek or convey the wrong sense (cf. notes 262–281). Let us take לפני as an example, since it is the most common Hebrew compound preposition. First, G only renders לפני analytically once (23:17), but only where it constitutes good Koine Greek (see note 263). In addition, G selects one of his three main equivalents (i.e., ἐναντίον, ἐμπροσθεν, and πρό) depending on whether the sense of לפני (i) is spatial (40:9), (ii) denotes “going” or “being ahead of” or preeminence (24:7), or (iii) is temporal (27:7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לפני</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לפני</td>
<td>πρό</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1.2 Compound conjunctions. G’s synthetic translation of Hebrew conjunctions that have become lexicalized by compounding is very similar but less frequent (67). The most common cases are presented below in Table 7.


283 This classification comes from Sollamo, who calls the second category “intermediate,” used for “cases denoting going (being) ahead of” or, infrequently, pre-eminence” (Semiprepositions, 16, 68–80).
TABLE 7. COMMON HEBREW COMPOUND CONJUNCTIONS TRANSLATED SYNTHETICALLY

Many common equivalents for הבש is composed of לקת (ק) and a relative (א[ט]פ, וּז, וּז). As with the compound prepositions, G has found in these translations Greek compounds whose constituents match the constituents of the Hebrew compound nicely.

3.3.1.3 Compound adverbials. G provides synthetic translations for a number of Hebrew adverbial expressions involving ב or (41), as well. These are listed below in Table 8.

284 On הבש, see IBHS §§38.5a, 7a; Joüon §§166n; 174a. In three cases G translates הבש analytically as ו (24:32); חניכה חק (27:40), or $םח (44:1).


288 On י, see IBHS §§39.3.5d; Joüon §§164c; 172c; 173b. About as often G translates הבש כ כ (4) as ו (2: 32:26; 42:15), or ג (47:18), or $םח (28:17).

289 On הבש, see IBHS §§38.7; Joüon §113j.


291 See י, see IBHS (2) [חניכה (2: 32:26; 38:27)]; שפ (1) [ב (24:38)]; שפ (1) [בתש (18:19)]; שפ (1) [לתש (18:19)]; שפ (1) [לתש (23:13)]; שפ (1) [לתש (24:11)]; שפ (1) [לתש (27:10)]; שפ (1) [לתש (27:8)]; שפ (1) [לתש (28:15)]; שפ (1) [לתש (3:11)]; שפ (1) [לתש (39:5)]; שפ (1) [לתש (41:49)].
Table 8. Hebrew compound adverbials with מ and ב

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek Equivalent (Biblical References)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>מָן</td>
<td>ἐν τούτῳ (3:37:17; 42:15; 50:25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>מָזִית</td>
<td>ἐνταῦθα (6:14); ἐνθα (24:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>מָנוּב</td>
<td>ἐνθα (9:22; 24:31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>מִבֵית</td>
<td>ἐσωθεν (6:12:1; 20:13; 24:7:40; 34:26; 44:8) and מִבֵּית (9:31:14, 41; 39:2, 5, 20, 22; 40:5; 42:19; 47:24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1.4 Compound question words.</td>
<td>In a few cases, G translates compound Hebrew question words synthetically (11), presented in Table 9 below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As with the compound adverbials, the suffix -θεν could be matched to the preposition μν if the Greek words were tokenized at a more granular level. So, with all four types of Hebrew compounds treated here, G’s synthetic translations often involve the careful selection of a Greek compound with constituents similar to those of the Hebrew compound.

3.3.2 Greek Compounding (110 groups)

As noted at several points in the previous section (e.g., with καθ- compounds and πόθεν), Greek compounding is also a common factor contributing to G’s use of synthetic translation. These cases will be grouped by the Greek compound’s part of speech:

§3.3.2.1 Greek compound numbers.  
50 / 110 45.5%

§3.3.2.2 Greek compound κἀγώ form formed by crasis.  
5 / 110 4.5%

§3.3.2.3 Other Greek compounds.  
55 / 110 50.0%

---

297 G usually translates למה analytically as ἢνα τί (14: 4:6+; 12:19; 24:31; 25:22, 32; 27:46; 29:25; 31:26, 30; 32:29; 33:15; 42:1; 44:7; 47:15), but once as τίν (18:13). James Mulroney suggests that reading the Hebrew from an Aramaic background helps to explain G’s usual analytic translation, but this seems unnecessary—even if the translators read the Hebrew through an Aramaic filter—given G’s tendency to translate with quantitative equivalence (“The Standardization of Translation Choice for למה within the LXX-Pentateuch: ἢνα τί as a Neolinguistic Phrase,” in XV Congress of the IOSCS, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël van der Meer, and Martin Meiser [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016], 425–435).
3.3.2.1 Greek compound numbers. Unlike Greek, Hebrew expresses all parts of a complex number with separate words, and so G often translates numbers synthetically (50). Parts of the Greek compound numbers have obvious correspondences to each of the Hebrew number words (e.g., in 14:5 τεσσαρες- goes with ארביע and -דekte with שעור).  

3.3.2.2 Greek compound χαγω formed by crasis. When G uses the form χαγω,300 formed by crasis from και and ἐγω,301 the two constituents translate different Hebrew words (5): נב (3: 20:6; also 30:3, 30), or נב (40:16).  

3.3.2.3 Other Greek compounds. G also translates synthetically when using compound nouns formed with ἀρχι- (20) for Hebrew construct phrases with ר as the nomen regens, or in using the negated compound pronouns οὐδὲ/μηδὲ/οὐδείς (9) (19:17).304

---

298 IBHS §15; Joüon §142; KG I §181; Smyth §347.


300 G does not always use contracted forms of και ἐγω: see 17:4; 43:8; 44:9, 16; 46:4+, 34; 47:3. Also, G uses the related form χαμε twice (27:34, 38) in translating ר נב as δὴ χαμε.

301 KG I §51.5b; Smyth §68c.


303 G translates שׁ as μηδὲ (3: 19:17; 22:12; 45:5), שׁ as οὐδὲ (4: 21:26; 39:9; 45:6) or μηδὲ (31:52 [אין שׁ]), and שׁ as οὐδείς (2: 31:44, 50). See also 19:31, where G translates שׁ שׁιν synthetically as οὐδεὶς ἐστιν.

304 KG I §186; Smyth §349b; SSG §83e.
G's synthetic translations also involve other compounds:305 adjectives (19)306 (41:6; 17:12), verbs (3)307 (31:29), nouns (20:11; also 14:13), and adverbs (33:3; also 43:34).308 As with other types of Greek compounds, the parts correspond to distinct Hebrew elements.

3.3.3 Periphrastic Translations (163 groups)

Though this group simply labeled “periphrastic translations” includes a few recurring types that will receive separate treatment, most cases are motivated by a variety of contextual factors that cannot be adequately investigated at this point:

---

305 Smyth §§869–899.
307 18:21; 24:27; 31:29.
308 The other compounds are: εἰκό-γενής (4) [תְבוּ כְּבָדָה (3: 14:14; 17:23, 27)]; παρ-άλλοιος (1) [לָחוּץ] מִיָּם: 49:13]; συν-ωμόλογος (1) [מִיָּם: 14:13]; πολυ-χρόνιος (1) [מִיָּם: 26:8]; εὐ-πρόσωπος (1) [כְּבָדָה: 12:11]; συν-תֵּלֵוַעַתּ (1) [כְּבָדָה: 18:21]; ἑκατόν-αετε (1) [מִיָּם: 17:17]; πεντα-πλασ (1) [מִיָּם: 38:34]; ωμο-μήτριον (1) [מִיָּם: 43:39]; εὐ-ἐξομα (1) [כְּבָדָה: 24:27]; τρί-μηνον (1) [כְּבָדָה: 38:24].
Among synthetic translations, this group illustrates the limits of G’s willingness to depart quantitatively from his source. Many examples involve substantive interpretive matters.

### 3.3.3.1 Certain Hebrew idioms with pronominal suffixes.

G gives synthetic translations for several Hebrew forms with pronominal suffixes, because they are difficult to break apart in Greek: איננו (12) (31:2), לבד (9) (2:18), באכה (5) (10:19), and ב (43:20; also 44:18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Idiom</th>
<th>Greek Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>איננו עמו</td>
<td>οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לבד</td>
<td>οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν μόνον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>באכה עד עזה</td>
<td>ἀπὸ Σιδῶνος ἐως ἑλθείν εἰς Γέραρα καὶ Γάζαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>Δέσποτα, κύριε-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3.2 Divine names.

G translates several compound divine names synthetically as θεός (11) (33:20; 14:22; 2:4) and once renders εἰρην κυρὶος synthetically as Δέσποτα (15:2).  


310 G usually translates suffixed forms of לבד as μόνος (8: 21:18; 21:28, 29; 32:24; 42:38; 43:32; 44:20; 47:26), but in 32:16 as κατὰ μόνας. Only in three cases (30:40; 43:32+) does he translate the suffix independently by rendering לבד as κατά and the suffix as a reflexive pronoun (see §3.3.1.1 note 282).


312 For the significance of this synthetic translation within its narrative context, see §8.3.1.
As G usually uses κύριος ὁ θεός for יהוה אלהים (21), the equivalence between יהוה אלהים and ὁ θεός, as in 2:4, likely reflects a variant in V.314

3.3.3.3 Apparent cases. In a few cases synthetic translation might result from G or V having had or read a form different from that of L (5).

| 11:30 | פארこれโอ | καὶ οὖκ ἐτεκνοποιεῖ. |
| 26:32 | מיםיו | Οὐχ εὑρομεν ὕδωρ. |
| 27:5 | ליחודתדרמליה | θηρεύσαι ἐήραν τῷ πατρί αὐτοῦ |
| 28:19 | צידלנה | καὶ Οὐλαμλοῦζ |
| 30:15 | לאמער | εἶπεν δὲ Λεία |

Such differences may be graphic, such as the confusion of ו and ר (11:30), or acoustic, such as the exchange of ל and ש (26:32) or ר and נ (27:5).315

3.3.3.4 Residual cases. G's choice to use synthetic translation in many other contexts relates to his concern for a variety of interrelated aspects of his translation, e.g., grammar, style,

---

313 2:8, 15, 16, 18, 22; 3:1, 8+, 9, 14, 21, 23; 9:26; 24:3, 7, 12, 27, 42, 48; 27:20; 28:13.

314 This is the position of Ronald Hendel contra Martin Rösel (Hendel, Text of Genesis I-II, 35–39; Rösel, “Übersetzung der Gottesbezeichnungen,” 357–378). For a more moderate position that duly emphasizes this problem's complexity without proposing a solution one way or the other, see Harl, La Genèse, 49–50.

315 Abraham Tal, ed., Genesis (Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015), 145.
idiom, interpretation, etc. (117). G’s motivations must be assessed in relation to each context, but he may translate synthetically to avoid replicating a Hebrew idiom in Greek (19:8; 31:35; 37:19), to encourage a certain reading of the narrative (6:6; 8:7; 18:12), or to make use of a Greek idiom that fits the context well (16:5; 43:23, 27).

In any given case, it is likely that G was motivated by multiple factors. For example, he may have avoided the impropriety of the Hebrew idiom אחרי בלתי (“after I am worn out”) in 18:12, but his choice to translate this as οὔπω μὲν (“certainly not yet”) also reflects his interpretation of how Sarah’s statement functions in the story. Similarly, G avoids the Hebrew idiom חמסי עליך (“May the wrong I have suffered be upon you”) in 16:5 by

---


317 For G’s synthetic translation of the same Hebrew idiom elsewhere, see 16:6; 19:14; 20:15.

318 For other impersonal constructions translated synthetically, see 46; 30:2; 32:7.

319 For a discussion of this Greek idiom, see §6.1.1.5 and note 149.
translating it as ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ (“I stand wronged by you”), a variation on a Greek petitionary formula, but this choice, too, relates to G’s construal of this indictment within the larger plot of Abraham’s story.\textsuperscript{320}

3.4 Expansive Translation (394 groups)

The reverse of synthetic translation, which may be termed “expansive translation,” involves G’s translation of a single Hebrew token by multiple Greek tokens. It is relatively uncommon, especially given that a significant number of instances of expansive translation reflect inadequate granularity of the source text’s tokenization or a likely variant in V, cases which will be treated before moving on to more substantive types of expansive translation:

| §3.4.1 | Inadequate granularity of tokenization. | 142 / 394 | 36.0% |
| §3.4.2 | Likely textual variants. | 26 / 394 | 6.6% |
| §3.4.3 | Multiple function words. | 100 / 394 | 25.4% |
| §3.4.4 | Verbal periphrastic constructions. | 44 / 394 | 11.2% |
| §3.4.5 | Residual cases. | 82 / 394 | 20.8% |

3.4.1 Inadequate granularity of tokenization (142)

From one perspective, the following types of expansive translation do not really involve quantitative equivalence but just stem from variance between G’s granular analysis of the Hebrew and the coarser tokenization of WHM (Westminster Hebrew Morphology):

\textsuperscript{320} The interpretive significance of several of these examples is discussed in Part II of this dissertation. For διενοήθη in 6:6, see §7.4.1; for οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν in 8:7, see §7.4.5; for οὐπω μέν in 18:12, see §8.3.2; and for ἀδικοῦμαι in 16:5, see §8.3.1.
§3.4.1.1 Directional-ה. Though not a token in WHM, G usually translates the Hebrew directional suffix (ה)\(^{321}\) with a Greek preposition,\(^{322}\) which entails an expansive translation (100).\(^{323}\) Since it always changes the word order, this group will be treated in §4.1.3.

12:5 ייצאו ללכת ארץ קנעם ויבאו ארץ קנעם καὶ ἐξῆλθοσαν πορευθῆναι εἰς γῆν Χανάν, καὶ ἦλθον εἰς γῆν Χανάν.

§3.4.1.2 Compound proper nouns. Similarly, some multi-word Hebrew proper nouns have been analyzed by WHM as a single token, and yet G represents each word independently, resulting in another type of apparent expansive translation (30).\(^{324}\)

14:5 οἱ ἄστρα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ Καρνᾶν \[in Ἁσταρῶν Καρνᾶν\]

21:32 δὲ ἐρᾶς ὄρχησμος \[Φράρ ὄρχησμος\]

10:11 καὶ τὴν Ῥωμινοῦ πόλιν \[καὶ τὴν Ῥωμινῆς πόλιν\]

§3.4.1.3 Analytic translation. In a dozen more interesting cases, all listed below, G similarly etymologizes a single Hebrew word or analyzes it into several constituents.

---

\(^{321}\) IBHS §10.5; Joüon §§93c–k.

\(^{322}\) For G’s addition of spatial prepositions, see §3.2.4.1.

\(^{323}\) 10:19, 30; 11:31; 12:5+, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14; 13:1, 14; 14:10; 15:5; 18:2, 6, 22; 19:1+, 6, 10, 17, 19, 23; 20:1; 24:16, 32, 45, 52, 67; 25:6, 18; 26:1, 2; 27:43+; 28:2+, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12+, 14+++; 29:1; 31:18; 32:3; 33:3, 14, 16, 17; 35:6; 37:10, 14, 17, 24, 25, 28, 35; 38:9, 12, 13; 39:1, 11; 41:57; 42:6, 29, 38; 43:16, 17, 26++, 30; 44:11, 13, 14, 29, 31; 45:4, 17; 46:1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 26, 27, 28; 47:5, 14; 48:5, 12; 50:13, 14. See also two additional examples in 46:28, 29 (καὶ Ἡρώων πόλιν = קנה) counted under §3.4.1.2.

\(^{324}\) 10:11; 14:5, 6, 7+; 19:38; 21:14, 31, 32, 33; 22:19+; 23:2; 26:23, 33; 28:10, 19; 31:13, 47; 33:18; 35:9, 16, 18, 26, 27; 46:5, 15; 50:10, 11+. 
### 3.4.2 Likely textual variants (26)

Another set of cases of expansive translation may not really count for another reason, namely that they likely reflect textual variants, although they have not been reconstructed as such in V. One subgroup involves the rendering of יהוה (16) or אלהים (5) as κύριος ὁ θεός, G’s usual translation of their combination as יהוה אלהים (cf. §3.3.3.2). Another subgroup likely reflects editorial differences in numbers similar to those that have been reconstructed in the genealogy of Gen 11 on the basis of SP (5).

### 3.4.3 Multiple function words (100)

The first and largest set of cases of more genuinely expansive translation is the analogue of G’s synthetic translation of Hebrew compounds (see §3.3.1), but here G uses

---

325 Concerning G’s recognition of the denotational significance of proper nouns in aetiologies, see §5.2.2.1.
328 5:9, 12, 15, 21; 46:27. For the variants in Gen 11 attested by SP, see Appendix I §12.
multiple Greek function words to translate a single Hebrew function word, most often ἀνὰ μέσον for the Hebrew preposition בֵּין (59) (26:28), although the particle combination οὐ μὴ (emphatic denial with the subjunctive) (330) is also common (14) (28:15).

G’s deliberate choice of οὐ μὴ with the subjunctive reveals his concern to select a translation that is appropriately emphatic, i.e., one that is stronger than οὐ with the future indicative. Less often, G translates other combinations expansively (3:3; 19:9; 18:1; 38:1). Sometimes, G may have analyzed the Hebrew function word into multiple parts (e.g., לְרָעָל (31:42) and מֵדֶדָע (26:27)).

---

3:3
... ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνειτε.

19:9
ὥστε τοῦ ὑμῶν μᾶλλον εἴκοσις.

18:1
καθημένου αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς βόρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ

38:1
καὶ ἀφίκετο ἐκεῖ πρὸς ἀνθρωπὸν τοῦ Ὀδολλαμίτην

31:42
ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου Ἀβραὰμ ἢν μοι...

26:27
'Tίνα παρατείνει πρὸς με;'
3.4.4 Verbal periphrastic constructions (44)

With content words, G most often translates Hebrew (esp. stative) verbs expansively by using a periphrastic structure. Typically, G uses γίνομαι (9) (26:16), εἰμί (8) (34:30), or (κατά) φαίνω (5) (21:11) together with a predicate adjective.

Similarly, G may translate the Hebrew verb with a verb plus an adverb (9) (32:12; 43:2) or object (3) (44:5; cf. 7:4; 41:1), or another periphrastic rendering (13:9; cf. 41:51; 43:25).

On periphrastic tense, see KG II §353.4; Smyth §§599–601; SSG §31f; Evans, Verbal Syntax, 220–257.

61: 26:13+, 16; 38:11, 14; 41:21; 42:16; 45:2.

13: 2; 21:12; 24:8, 41; 26:11; 34:19, 30; 48:19.


Since this is indirect statement, the subject and predicate are both in the accusative (oblique predication). Cf. the similar factitive construction treated expansively earlier in the verse (ἐν ου = Μισητόν ... πεποίηκατε).

With εὖ (5), see 12:13, 16; 32:9, 12; 40:14; with πάλιν (3), see 42:24; 43:2; 44:25; with μακράν, see 44:4.
3.4.5 Residual cases (82)

The remaining cases of expansive translation are difficult to classify but nevertheless indicate G’s care as a translator for the grammatical, stylistic, theological, rhetorical, and literary dimensions of his translation, and often for multiple aspects at once.

For example, G often uses the Greek idiom ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχεῖν/λαμβάνειν to translate הרה (8), and he regularly distinguishes between a stative sense (“be pregnant”) and an ingressive sense (“get pregnant”) by using ἐχω and λαμβάνω, respectively. This selection of a Greek idiom, then, also involves choosing an appropriate form in each narrative context.

---

343 See also 22:17 (ἠ μὴν) and 42:15 (νὴ τὴν ὑγίειαν).
344 See also 41:50; 46:20, 28, 29. Similarly, G specifies ᾿Αραβίας as Γέζεμ Ἀραβίας in 45:10; 46:34.
345 G also translates ἰμα with οὐ θέλω in 39:8 and 48:19. See also Ἰερ = οὐ + δύναμαι in 41:49.
346 For similar quasi-double translations (8), see 4:15; 19:37, 38; 22:13; 35:20; 45:5; 48:16; 49:24. These cases do not count as double translations, because the two are interdependent (cf. § 3.2.7).
3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have surveyed G’s departures from quantitative equivalence in translation in order to sketch an outline of his translator portrait. This bounty of textual data, which has primarily been organized and illustrated here, has nevertheless furnished ample opportunities to see the kinds of quantitative transformations that G makes as well as the range of factors that motivate such departures from his source text’s form. G adheres to Greek usage, he is attuned to the rhetorical nuances of his translation choices, and he shows concern for literary and theological dimensions of his translation. Yet, it must not be forgotten that such quantitative divergences are exceptional, which is to say that G manages to replicate the vast majority of distinct elements of his Hebrew source with a single Greek word. This combination of facts gives us the first impression of a translator whose deliberate and controlled approach to translation is notoriously difficult to characterize. On the one hand, he follows the quantitative form of the Hebrew with incredible precision, but on the other, his willingness to innovate for the sake of grammar, style, and meaning betrays his concern for another kind of fidelity, i.e., the desire to represent not just the outward form but also the inner meaning of the Hebrew text with accuracy and precision. As these two impulses are sometimes at odds with each other, I describe G’s approach as a whole as being guided by a complex poetics of translation. Moreover, this initial sketch anticipates the findings of the next three chapters on lexical, serial, and grammatical equivalence, which will likewise fill out G’s translator portrait with shading, color, and personality in order to cast him as a cautious translator with complex motivations.
4 Serial Equivalence

Serial equivalence in translation concerns whether a translator follows the order of the words in his source or departs from it. It has long been recognized that word order, i.e. the ordering of constituents within a clause or phrase, constitutes a systemic difference between Hebrew and Greek. On the one hand, the Greek case system renders Greek word order flexible enough to replicate most Hebrew clausal and phrasal structures; on the other hand, the imitation of Hebrew word order does not always produce the most eloquent Greek. Nearly a century ago, John Rife drew up a list of “some of the commonest fixities of Semitic word-order which do not correspond to Greek word-order:"

No word comes between the article and its noun.
An adjective always immediately follows its substantive.
No postpositive conjunctions.
A genitive always immediately follows its construct.
A direct, personal, pronominal object always follows its governing verb.
A demonstrative pronoun always follows its substantive.
In addition to the above, though not so fixed, are the normal sequences of subject, verb, and object.¹

Despite Rife’s accurate systemization of major differences in Hebrew and Greek word order in the abstract, few scholars have attempted to present a concrete, systematic study of word order in any book of the Septuagint. Most discussions of serial equivalence either have remained theoretical, albeit informed by close and extensive study,² or have been devoted to

isolated topics that relate to word order, such as the placement of pronominal clitics and pronouns,\textsuperscript{3} or the use of postpositives to translate paratactic structures.\textsuperscript{4} Systematic and direct treatments of word order, however, are virtually nonexistent.\textsuperscript{5}

The current chapter constitutes something of a novelty in Septuagint studies, then, as it is a direct and comprehensive treatment of all word order changes in Greek Genesis. I will address each of the differences theorized by Rife and more, not from a theoretical vantage point, but based upon an empirical analysis of all the cases in which $G$ deviates from the word order of his source text, given the tokenized Hebrew and Greek texts and alignment of those texts that are used in this study (see §2.3). Since roughly two-thirds of all transpositions in Greek Genesis involve a Hebrew morpheme, the granular tokenization


\textsuperscript{5} The only extended treatment of word order \textit{per se} is that of Galen Marquis on Greek Ezekiel, but he only treats certain words and syntagms (“Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel,” \textit{Text} 13 [1986]: 59–84).
of the Hebrew text produces much more detailed results than would a word-level analysis.\(^6\)

As a rule, G strictly imitates the order of the tokens in his source, as only 1,548 of the 32,516 tokens in his translation involve a transposition of one kind or another (4.8%).\(^7\)

Furthermore, when G does elect to depart from the Hebrew order, he most often moves morphemes, i.e., parts of words (1,054), or small words and phrases within a clause (474), and he usually does not move them far from their corresponding position in Hebrew. Typically, changes in word order involve the transposition of neighboring tokens or neighboring groups of consecutive tokens. Only rarely does G engage in more drastic transpositions (20), usually in combination with other syntactic alterations, provided that these cases are not actually textual variants.\(^8\)

Since G usually follows the Hebrew order in translation, it is especially revealing to consider why he sometimes deviates from serial equivalence. As was shown in the previous chapter in relation to G’s departures from various types of quantitative equivalence, G

\(^6\) Using the CATSS data, Benjamin Wright attempted to count all of the word order changes for each book of the Septuagint, and, though CATSS is a word-level alignment, he was able to find many cases of transpositions involving Hebrew morphemes (he counts 772 involving \(\delta\varepsilon\)), and yet his total (1,108) is much lower than the number of transpositions discovered by the granular alignment used in this study (\textit{No Small Difference}, 35–54).

\(^7\) This count is based upon the number of groups of consecutive Greek tokens that would have to be reordered to match the sequence of the equivalent Hebrew tokens precisely. In the case of Hebrew morphemes, which account for the majority of cases, this involves a single Hebrew token and a single Greek token, but the other cases may but do not necessarily involve multiple consecutive tokens counted as one transposition, which is why the counts given in the headings are labeled “groups.”

\(^8\) Wright helpfully distinguishes between “syntactic” and “displacement” variations. Defining syntactic variations in reference to Rife’s list of “fixities,” he notes that they cannot reflect a different Vorlage, as the order of the Greek words would be ungrammatical in Hebrew, whereas with displacement variations it is difficult to adjudicate between scribal and translational causes (\textit{No Small Difference}, 36–43).
changes the word order of his source text in translation due to a range of overlapping factors, e.g., differences between Hebrew and Greek syntax, matters of Greek style, contextual interpretation, as well as literary, theological, and other concerns. Viewing the Genesis translator from a new angle in this chapter, that is, with attention to how he does and does not imitate the order of the Hebrew words in Greek translation, I now add depth and shading to G’s translator portrait to fill out the rough outline sketched by the previous chapter. Here, too, we spy a deliberate and cautious individual with a complex poetics of translation. His nearly consistent replication of the Hebrew word order reveals his care to stay true to the source text in his Greek translation, while his transpositions, which stem from an integrated network of grammatical, syntactic, stylistic, pragmatic, structural, literary, and interpretive factors, show that he meant to convey not only the form but also the meaning of the Hebrew text in Greek translation.

4.1 Displacement of a Hebrew Morpheme (1,054)

G’s displacement of Hebrew morphemes, which usually involves the transposition of neighboring tokens, accounts for the majority of all word order changes (1,054/1,548) (68.1%) and concerns three types of Hebrew morphemes, each receiving its own treatment:

§4.1.1 The conjunction ו. 758 / 1,054 71.9%
§4.1.2 Pronominal suffixes. 194 / 1,054 18.4%
§4.1.3 Directional ה. 102 / 1,054 9.7%
4.1.1 The conjunction ו (758)

To a great extent, the lone conjunction ו singlehandedly serves to hold Hebrew discourse together, especially narrative text. In Genesis, for example, ו occurs far more often than any other lemma (4,264), even if only instances of clausal-ו are counted (3,264). The next-most-common conjunction is כי, and it occurs a fraction as often (293). Lexically, clausal-ו is essentially without semantic content, since it functions only to join two clauses without specifying their relationship to one another in any particular way. Because of this fact, the precise relationship between two clauses joined by ו is often ambiguous in Hebrew, although certain syntactic patterns are used to signal the way a ו-clause relates to the preceding (or following) clause, the most important distinction being whether clausal-ו is followed by a verb or a non-verb. The latter (often termed “disjunctive syntax”) is a marked structure that is used to indicate a variety of non-sequential interclausal and intersentential relations. A third lexico-syntactic environment, in which a temporal clause is introduced by והיה or יהי, is technically a subset of the first, since clausal-ו is followed by a verb and the verbless clause is encoded as a coordinate clause like any other, and yet it may be treated separately because of its special use to introduce a temporal clause that is syntactically coordinate with but logically subordinate to the clause that follows.

---

9 IBHS §39.1a; Joüon §177. Waltke and O'Connor make the claim: “So pervasive is ו that the discourse is largely organized around this single particle.”


11 Lambdin, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew, 123–124 (§110); IBHS §§32.2.6b, 4b.
Though Greek prose does not employ parataxis to as great an extent as Hebrew, it does have two conjunctions with a similarly vague specificity. The Greek conjunction καί is the most neutral and most versatile, and so the most like Hebrew ו. Yet, the Greek conjunction δέ is also commonly used to join clauses much like καί and appears in similar contexts, even if it is better-suited to mark contrasts, transitions, and discontinuities—much like Hebrew ו used to introduce disjunctive or temporal clauses. Even though they describe καί and δέ with nuance, traditional approaches to Greek grammar encourage a basic contrast between καί and δέ, artificially represented by the distinction between the English conjunctions “and” and “but,” respectively. Yet, since καί and δέ are function words—and very flexible function words at that—it is best not to focus on what they mean, but how they function. If a gloss must be assigned to each, however, one might reasonably prefer “and” for both. Even as traditional grammars and lexica have identified and classified a number of uses of both καί and δέ, the more modern perspective of discourse analysis makes a novel contribution to our understanding of these conjunctions: while καί and δέ both signify “and,” καί presents the coordinated terms as continuous with one another, whereas δέ marks a discontinuity. From this perspective, καί and δέ serve more to give a

---

12 Anneli Aejmelaeus discusses Hebrew parataxis as “a problem for any translator or interpreter of the Hebrew Bible” (Parataxis, 2). For more discussion of this idea in relation to the omission of clausal-ו, see §3.1.2 note 25.

13 KG II §§515–535; Smyth §§2834–2839; 2868–2880; cf. J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996), xlvii–l, 162–203, 289–327. While the entries for καί and δέ in LSJ essentially follow the nuanced descriptions of grammars and reference works, the glosses they give are, in fact, “and” and “but.”

14 The concept of δέ as a boundary-marking connective particle is argued persuasively by Egbert Bakker: “This particle [i.e. δέ] can be shown to function in discourse as a marker of boundaries which run a gamut of various types and ‘strengths’, from semantic to cognitive, and from local switch-reference to global text-organization.
text a particular structure than to signify particular sets of interclausal or intersentential relations, not only as the meaning of conjunctions is influenced to a great extent by the individual contexts in which they occur, but also since two clauses may be joined variously with καί or δέ with no essential difference in meaning, although the events or ideas will be presented differently and with a different structure.\textsuperscript{15}

One distinctive feature of δέ (in relation to both καί and ı) is that δέ is a postpositive particle. This fact has several implications. First, like all postpositives, δέ puts emphasis on the preceding word, whereas καί only emphasizes the following word when it functions adverbally and not as a conjunction.\textsuperscript{16} Second and related, is the fact that δέ may never begin a clause. This is important for the study of G’s deviations from the word order of his source, because G’s use of δέ and other postpositives as an equivalent for clausal-ı always

\begin{tabular}{l}
In traditional grammatical terms, δέ can be characterized as a connective particle: it connects a given discourse unit (clause, sentence, paragraph) to the preceding discourse and in doing so effects a boundary between two discourse units. In this capacity, δέ should be distinguished from the connective particle καί, which connects items within a discourse unit and which can as such be said, as a continuous discourse marker, to operate under the scope of δέ [...] (“Boundaries, Topics, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle δέ,” \textit{Studies in Language} 17 [1993]: 276–277). Similarly, Helma Dik terms the postpositives “punctuation after the fact,” i.e. textual signposts that signal boundaries of different types and strengths (\textit{Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus}, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 5 [Amsterdam: Gieben, 1995], 35).
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{15}In relation to the fact that καί and δέ are often interchangeable, Aejmelaeus aptly describes the difference between them: “The information conveyed may be exactly the same, regardless of which of the two is used, the emphasis, nevertheless, being different in each case. Where καί simply adds one clause to another, δέ contrasts or weighs the events or ideas in question: ‘on the one hand – on the other’. Just as the contrast between the clauses may be left unspecified by the use of καί, a continuative relation may be highlighted by the use of δέ” (\textit{Parataxis}, 34–35).

\textsuperscript{16}KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891.
entails a transposition unless G adds a word in clause-initial position or moves another word before the postpositive.\textsuperscript{17}

Before I analyze G’s use of postpositives for \( \mathfrak{1} \), it will be helpful to consider the main equivalents that G gives for clausal-\( \mathfrak{1} \) in each of the Hebrew syntactic contexts listed above, and so I have tabulated G’s most common equivalents for clausal-\( \mathfrak{1} \) below in Table 10.

**Table 10. Main translation equivalents for clausal-\( \mathfrak{1} \)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{1} ) in disjunctive clauses</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{1} ) in temporal frames</th>
<th>( \mathfrak{1} ) in preverbal position</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa \alpha \iota )</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta \epsilon )</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omit</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma \upsilon \nu )</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta \zeta )</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \iota \nu \alpha )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>694</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these equivalents, it is really only \( \kappa \alpha \iota \), \( \delta \epsilon \), and omission that occur with any real frequency (nearly 97% of all cases), and the other equivalents occur in fairly restricted environments: G chiefly uses \( \sigma \upsilon \nu \) to translate \( \mathfrak{1} \) when it occurs in the form \( \text{ועתה} \) in a disjunctive clause;\textsuperscript{18} he typically uses \( \delta \zeta \) to translate \( \mathfrak{1} \) opening a disjunctive clause that is

\textsuperscript{17} Note that not every occurrence of a postpositive particle is counted as a transposition, as in some cases G may (i) supply a postpositive conjunction when V has no conjunction (e.g. \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \delta \epsilon \) in 15:1); or, G may (ii) move (e.g. \( \delta \lambda \lambda \alpha \iota \) \( \delta \epsilon \) in 41:23) or (iii) supply (e.g. \( \tau \delta \delta \epsilon \) in 2:12) another constituent in(to) clause-initial or phrase-initial position. Cases (i) and (iii) involve no transposition but are counted as quantitative additions, whereas in case (ii), it is the other constituent that is counted as having moved.

\textsuperscript{18} For G’s use of \( \sigma \upsilon \nu \) for \( \mathfrak{1} \) in \( \text{ועתה} \), see \$4.1.1.1.
parenthetical; he uses ἵνα to translate clausal-ι mostly when it precedes a cohortative or yiqtol and follows a volitional form, a sequence that typically signifies purpose in Hebrew. In general, G most often translates clausal-ι as καί (61.9%), followed by δέ (24.8%) and omission (10.2%), and yet he employs δέ more often than καί for ι in temporal frames (67.1%, cf. 28.9% for καί) and almost as often as καί for ι in disjunctive clauses (37.2%, cf. 48.7% for καί). The translation of clausal-ι in the Pentateuch has already received extended treatment by Anneli Aejmelaeus, and the above percentages are very similar to those she gives, though the exact counts differ due to the textual variants reconstructed in V and the inclusion of all cases of clausal-ι. My analysis largely confirms the earlier study by Aejmelaeus, but it also extends it, especially in that I separate off disjunctive clauses and focus on how G deploys postpositives as boundary-markers or signposts that structure his discourse:

§4.1.1.1 Clausal-ι before a non-verb (disjunctive syntax). 249 / 758 32.8%
§4.1.1.2 Clausal-ι in temporal frames. 50 / 758 6.6%
§4.1.1.3 Clausal-ι before a verb. 455 / 758 60.0%
§4.1.1.4 Phrasal-ι. 4 / 758 0.5%

While the transpositions entailed by G’s relatively extensive use of postpositive particles are not a manipulation of word order for its own sake, they do attest to his widespread concern for the logic, flow, and structure of his translation, since these particles constitute an

---

21 IBHS §34.5.2; Joion §116. For G’s treatment of volitionals, see §6.1.1.4; for yiqtol, see §6.1.1.2.
22 Aejmelaeus only counts “introducing an ordinary paratactic clause,” and her total count is 3,083. She tabulates all counts after treating each equivalent in detail (Parataxis, 122–125).
important segment of the connective tissue that binds the narrative together at various levels, e.g. clause, sentence, paragraph, episode, cycle, etc.

4.1.1.1 Clausal-ו before a non-verb (disjunctive syntax). Hebrew disjunctive syntax serves a variety of interrelated functions, but chiefly it marks clauses that are (i) contrastive, (ii) circumstantial, (iii) explanatory or parenthetical, (iv) terminative or initial, (v) causal, or (vi) comparative. As Greek often uses conjunctions other than καί in such contexts, G deploys postpositives—especially δέ and οὖν—to translate disjunctive-ו much more often (288/694) (41.5%) than he uses the same postpositives for clausal-ו in general (850/3,264) (26.0%). What is more, when Hebrew disjunctive clauses are classified by their clause-initial constituents, sharper translation patterns emerge.

G translates disjunctive-ו with postpositives even more commonly than καί when the clause-initial constituent is ו (13/16), ו (20/25), a pronominal subject

---

23 Thomas Lambdin, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew, 162–165 (§132); IBHS §39.2.3; cf. Joüon §155k–t. Clause types (i) – (iv) are discussed by Lambdin; Waltke and O’Connor add (v) and (vi).

24 Aejmelaeus notes that δέ most often corresponds to disjunctive-ו in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, but because of the preponderance of preverbal-ו in the narratives of Genesis, she fails to note that G renders disjunctive-ו with postpositives more often than in general, especially when particular kinds of disjunctive clauses are treated separately (Parataxis, 38).

25 For ד (12) with a change in word order (11), see 13:9; 18:21; 20:7; 24:8, 49; 30:1; 31:8; 42:16; 43:5; 47:5; with no word order change (1), see 4:7. For μηδέ with a change in word order (1), see 31:52.

26 For μηδέ with a change in word order (18), see 21:23; 24:49; 27:3, 8, 43; 30:30; 31:16, 30, 44; 37:20; 41:33; 44:30, 33; 45:5, 8; 47:4; 48:5; 50:5; for δέ with a change in word order (2), see 20:7; 32:10.
(44/65)\(^{27}\) (17:9), a demonstrative pronoun (16/29)\(^{28}\) (10:1), or a nominal subject (135/253)\(^{29}\)

(4:2; 29:2; 47:13; 2:14).

\[30:1\] Δός μοι τέκνα· εἰ δὲ μὴ, τελευτήσω ἐγώ.

\[27:8\] ὑνὸν οὖν, υἱὲ, ἤκουσόν μου ...

\[17:9\] Σὺ δὲ τὴν διαβήκῃν μου διατηρήσαις,
καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σὲ εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν.

\[10:1\] ἀδελφός τοῦ ἰδίου ὦ γάι, ...

\[4:2\] καὶ ἐγένετο Ἀβέλ ποιμὴν προβάτων,
κάι δὲ ἦν ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν.

\[29:2\] λίπος δὲ ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ τῶν στόματι τοῦ φρέατος

\[47:13\] Σῖτος δὲ οὐκ ἦν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ;

\[2:14\] ὅ δὲ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος, οὗτος Εὐφράτης.

---

\(^{27}\) For δὲ with a change in word order (42), see 6:17, 21; 9:7; 14:13, 18; 15:2, 15; 17:9; 18:8, 13, 27; 19:19; 20:3; 22:5; 24:31, 62; 26:27; 27:11; 28:16; 32:12, 21, 31; 33:3, 14; 34:19, 30; 37:30; 38:14, 23; 41:15; 42:8, 16, 19, 23; 44:5, 10, 17; 45:19; 48:7, 14, 22; 49:19; for γὰρ with a change in word order (1), see 14:12; for μὲν γὰρ with a change in word order (1), see 43:14.

\(^{28}\) For δὲ with a change in word order (16), see 10:1; 11:27; 25:7, 12; 36:1, 9, 13, 14, 18, [20], 23, 25, 26, [27], [28]; 46:8.

\(^{29}\) For δὲ with a change in word order (107), see 1:2; 2:6, 10, 14; 3:1; 4:1, 2, 22+; [6:4], 8; 7:6, 19; 8:5; 10:6, 7+, 8, 15, 24, 26; 12:4, 6; 13:2, 7, 12; 14:10; 16:1, 16; 17:24, 25; 18:10, 11, 16, 18, 22; 19:1; 20:4; 21:5; 23:10; 24:16, 21, 35, [43], 62; 25:3+, 4, 26, 27, 28, 34; 27:5, 6, 22; 29:2, 17, 31; 30:36, 42; 31:19, 25+, 34, 47; 34:5, 21, [27]; [35:24], 25, 26; 36:12, 22, 39; 37:3, 24, 36; 39:1; 41:46; 42:6, 13, 32; 43:1; [44:16], 33; 46:9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17+, [19], [20][+][+], 21+[+], 23, 27, 32; 47:13, 24; [50:20], 24; with no change in word order (28), see 2:12; 4:24; 13:13, 14; 14:10; 15:2, 16; 18:12, 17; 19:38; 24:13; 27:29; 28:3; 29:17; 31:5, 7, 29; 34:5, 7; 35:18; 37:11, 27; 41:12; 43:14; 44:20, 30; 48:6, 10.

\(^{30}\) G omission of ἢνι is one of the residual omissions listed in §3.1.8.
G’s use of δέ for 1 in וַאֲמַה is always contrastive (30:1), while he captures the inferential sense of וַעֲתָה by translating 1 as οὖν (27:8). As subject pronouns are emphatic in both Hebrew and Greek, G’s use of δέ in translating 1 before a Hebrew pronominal subject similarly emphasizes the subject or contrasts it with another participant (17:9). As in 10:1, when G uses δέ for 1 before a demonstrative, 1 is part of a formula that serves to introduce a new paragraph (ואלה בני) or subparagraph (ואלה תולדת/שׁמות). The many cases where G translates disjunctive-1 before a nominal subject with δέ are more varied, however, but often contrast the subject with another participant (4:2), introduce a parenthetical statement (29:2), open a new paragraph (47:13), or bring a paragraph to a close (2:14).

31 KG II §§526; 530.4; Smyth §§2835; 2838. Furthermore, when G does not select δέ for 1 in וַאֲמַה, there is no contrast in the Hebrew (3): 17:17; 24:41; 31:50.

32 IBHS §39.3.4f; HALOT, s.v. "ע תָה" 3; KG II §§544.1–2; Smyth §2964; LSJ, s.v. "οὖν" A.II–III; Denniston, The Greek Particles, 425–430. G prefers οὖν for 1 in וַעֲתָה far more than the other translators of the Pentateuch (Aejmelaeus, Parataxis, 57–58). Many cases involve וַעֲתָה being translated as νῦν οὖν, and the correspondence could be analyzed in at least two other ways. First, the tokens could be matched according to their order, so that νῦν = 1 and οὖν = וַעֲתָה. Second, this could be included under cases of synthetic translation. Although each of these alternate analyses has its appeal, the first has been rejected on account of the regular equivalence between וַעֲתָה and νῦν (38/44) and the not uncommon equivalence between 1 and οὖν (24). The second analysis has been rejected on the grounds that two Hebrew tokens are regularly translated by two Greek tokens, which implies a token-level correspondence. Only in 24:49 (וַעֲתָה = εἰ οὖν) does וַעֲתָה correspond to οὖν, and there 1 is also present, and only in 43:10 (וַעֲתָה = ἐκάθε) does וַעֲתָה clearly correspond to a Greek word other than οὖν.

33 Cf. §3.1.7.3 note 117.

34 KG II §531; Smyth §2836.

35 KG II §531.2; LSJ, s.v. “δέ” A.II.2.a; DGE, s.v. “δέ” I.3; cf. Denniston’s discussion of δέ for γάρ (The Greek Particles, 169–170).

36 DGE, s.v. “δέ” V.2; cf. Denniston’s “inceptive” use of δέ (The Greek Particles, 172–173).
In two other contexts, G renders disjunctive-ι with a postpositive less frequently than with καί but still more often than generally, namely, when the clause-initial constituent is a prepositional phrase (23/64) or a nominal object (17/49) (19:6).

Yet, as with the first group, G often selects δέ to oppose the phrase or object with what precedes: G uses δέ in 2:16–17 to contrast the two trees in the garden and, in 19:6, to contrast Lot approaching the danger outside his home with him shutting the door behind him. Furthermore, G uses μέν ... δέ four times in disjunctive contexts in order to present two participants or ideas in strong contrast with one another:39

---

37 For δέ (23) with a change in word order (22), see 2:17, 20; 3:3, 17; 4:5; 8:14; 14:5; 15:14; 17:20; 19:15; 20:16; 24:29; 27:37; 29:16; 30:42; 40:10, 17; 41:13, 50, 54; 45:22; 47:2; with no change in word order (1), see 16:1.

38 For δέ (16) with a change in word order (14), see 12:12; 14:21; 15:10; 17:21; 19:6, 11; 30:40; 37:22; 40:22; 41:13, 52; 42:4, 33; 46:28; with no change in word order (2), see 6:16; 23:15; for τε with a change in word order (1), see 34:26.

39 KG II §527; Smyth §§2904–2912.
In contrast to the first two groups, G translates disjunctive-\(\delta\) with postpositives less commonly than in general when the clause-initial constituent is a negative particle (i.e., \(\aleph\), \(\aleph\), or \(\aleph\)) (9/62)\(^{40}\) (8:21; 40:23; 45:5), \(\aleph\) (4/23)\(^{41}\) (44:9), \(\aleph\) (6/62)\(^{42}\) (29:2), a question word (0/15), \(\aleph\) (0/13), or anything else (1/18).\(^{43}\)

\(^{40}\) For \(\delta\) (3) with a change in word order (2), see 31:32; 40:23; with no change in word order (1), see 42:20; for \(\mu\delta\) with a change in word order (3), see 19:17; 22:12; 45:5; for \(\sigma\delta\) (2) with a change in word order (1), see 39:9; with no change in word order (1), see 3:3; for \(\sigma\) (1) with a change in word order, see 8:21.

\(^{41}\) For \(\delta\) with a change in word order (2), see 15:14; 44:9; for \(\sigma\delta\) with a change in word order (2), see 21:26+.

\(^{42}\) For \(\delta\) (6) with a change in word order (2), see 29:2; 37:7; with no change in word order (4), see 5:3; 28:13; 41:3, 23.

\(^{43}\) For \(\delta\) with no change in word order (1), see 14:4.
G rarely translates disjunctive-ו before a negative particle as ד or או, and only when he separates it from או or מ (8:21; 40:23), in order to avoid confusion with מ, ש, and או, which mean more than the sum of their parts.44 Furthermore, he only uses מ or או when it follows a prior negative, and thus carries the meaning of “neither … nor” (45:5). Finally, when G does use a postpositive for והנה, he never translates והנה as ישוע, in keeping with Greek idiom.45 In sum, G’s care in selecting an appropriate conjunction for

---

44 For או/מ, see KG II §535; Smyth §§2930–2950; SSG §83e; LSJ, s.vv. “או/מ” (A.I.2) and “מ” (A); Dennistion, The Greek Particles, 190–199. For או, see KG II §507.5e; Smyth §§2951–2954; LSJ, s.v. “או,” The Greek Particles, 430–441. Note, the handful of transpositions involving מ and או are, strictly speaking, not transpositions, as this requires tokenizing the Greek text with a granularity below the word level. Yet, since the two parts of the Greek compound have an obvious correspondence to distinct Hebrew tokens occurring in reverse order, these cases have nevertheless been counted as changes in word order.

45 Despite direct and indirect interference from biblical idiom, it is telling that a TLG search for כא וידע returns 3,578 hits, while וידע ד fetches a mere 91 (nearly 40 : 1). From another perspective, however, the interference of biblical usage does not undermine but actually supports the claim that כא וידע is better Greek than וידע ד, as only כא וידע occurs in the NT (75). Had a NT author chosen to use וידע ד, it would have been repeatedly cited in patristic texts. For renderings of והנה in the Pentateuch, see Aejmelaeus, Parataxis, 26–28.
each of these types of disjunctive syntax indicates his deliberate control over his translation and his concern for producing a Greek text that is grammatical, logical, and meaningful.

4.1.1.2 Clausal-ו in temporal frames. Strictly speaking, temporal frames with הו and יהי belong in the following group, since clausal-ו is followed by a verb and the logically subordinate clause is grammatically encoded as coordinate to the following clause. Yet, temporal frames deserve separate attention, not only because of their special status to represent temporal clauses in Hebrew prose, but also on account of G’s heightened tendency to use postpositives for the 1 of the temporal clause (53/76) (69.7%) in comparison to clausal-ו generally (850/3,264) (26.0%). Since Genesis is largely narrative, most cases involve past-tense constructions with והיה (49/68) (38:1; 24:52), but there are a few instances of frames with והיה (4/8) (12:12).

---

46 Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 123–124 (§110); *IBHS* §§32.2.6b, 4b.
47 For δέ (49) with a change in word order (46), see 12:11, 14; 14:1; 17:1; 19:34; 20:13; 21:22; 22:20; 24:22, 52; 25:11; 26:8, 32, 34; 27:1, [34]; 29:10, 13, 25; 30:25; 34:25; 35:16, 17, 18, 22; 37:23; 38:1, 24, 27, 28, 29; 39:5, 10, 11, 15, 19; 40:1, 20; 41:1, 8, 13; 42:35; 43:2, 21; 44:24; 48:1; with no change in word order (3), see 15:12, 17; 39:18.
48 For δέ with a change in word order (2), see 27:40; 30:41; for והי with a change in word order (2), see 12:12; 46:33.
Since temporal frames establish a boundary between the preceding text and what follows, G’s preference for postpositives is contextually and grammatically appropriate.49

4.1.1.3 Clausal-1 before a verb. By count, the majority of transpositions involving clausal-1 result from G’s uses of a postpositive for clausal-1 when it occurs before a verb (455). Yet, this statistic must be balanced against the fact that in Genesis clausal-1 occurs before a verb (2,494) far more often than before a non-verb (694) or in a temporal-frame construction (76). In fact, while it was shown that G uses postpositives to translate clausal-1 in these other contexts more often than in general, the opposite is true for clausal-1 before a verb (509/2,494) (20.4%).

Nevertheless, certain lexical and syntactic factors influence G’s use of δὲ and other postpositives to translate clausal-1 before a verb, and often in combination with one another.

49 Copulative δὲ is common “wenn die Rede von einem Gedanken zu einem neuen, von einem Moment zu einem andern verschiedenen fortschreitet” (“when the discourse advances from a thought to a new one, or one moment to another”) (KG II §531.2), and “when a new phase of a narrative is developed” (Smyth §2836).
and other contextual considerations. Most prominently, G very often uses δὲ to translate ιακάβ  before the verb ἀναμετρό, 50 usually as εἴπεν  δὲ (26:9–10) or ὅ  δὲ εἴπεν (29:4–6).

Though common, the second type (ὅ  δὲ εἴπεν) does not involve a change in word order, since G has supplied a word before the postpositive (cf. §3.2.1.6). In such contexts,
regardless of whether the speech formula initiates, terminates, or continues a dialogue, δέ is always a contextually appropriate choice.51

In addition to אמר, however, G also uses postpositives for clausal-ו before other Hebrew verbs, especially when he translates the verb with a circumstantial participle, but most commonly before בָּה (29/90),52 רָא (23/81),53 עָנָה (14/17),54 שָׁמָע (10/35),55 מָתָה (10/42),56 שָלָה (9/34),57 עָנָה (9/33),58 שָמָע (7/18),59 and שָא (5/10).60 Like אמר, several of these verbs are used in connection with dialogue (i.e., עָנָה, שָמָע, and שָא), and here, too, δέ suits the context, given the back-and-forth of conversation, especially with עָנָה, which always involves a change in speaker (27:36–37).

51 Aejmelaeus judges them “sound Greek expressions and skillful translations,” considering δέ appropriate on account of the frequent change in speaker and audience, which “fulfils the requirement of dissimilarity between items connected by δέ” (Parataxis, 37).


54 23:5, 14; 34:13; with a circumstantial participle (11), see [18:9]; 23:10; 24:50; 27:37, 39; 31:31, 36, 43; 40:18; 41:16; 42:22. The case in 18:9 does not involve a change in word order.

55 4:16; 14:8, 17; 15:5; 19:6, 14; 25:25; 34:1, 6; 41:46.

56 35:8, 19; 36:33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39; 46:12.

57 20:2; 32:3; 38:20; 45:7, 24; with a circumstantial participle (4), see 19:10; 31:4; 41:14; 48:14.

58 21:32; 37:35; 41:30; 46:5; with a circumstantial participle (5), see 21:32; 37:35; 41:30; 46:5.

59 16:2; 21:17; 31:1; 37:27; 45:2; with a circumstantial participle (2), 14:14; 37:21.

When G uses a circumstantial participle together with δέ, it has the combined effect of separating the clause form the preceding one (δέ) and joining it more closely to the clause that follows (circumstantial participle),⁶¹ as is illustrated by Gen 6:1–2:

6:1–2

Kai ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἠρέπαντο οἱ ἀνθρώποι

ὡρι πολλοὶ γένοντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,

καὶ ὄγασάν τοὺς ἄνθρωπος

ἕτεροι ἄνθρωποι τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἁπάντων

ὅτι καλὰ εἶναι,

ὅτι ἔρξαντο, ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων

οἷος ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν, ἐν δὲ ἐξεξάντα.

By translating ἰδόντες δὲ in 6:2 as ἰδόντες δὲ, G separates the inciting event of this brief prelude to the flood from the prior verse, which sets the stage for this preparatory scene.

This last example illustrates how δέ, even in its more continuative or copulative uses, presents an event or idea as discontinuous with the preceding sentence. As has been illustrated above, certain linguistic and narrative contexts encourage G to use δέ or another postpositive to mark a textual boundary between two discourse units, such as to signal transitions (e.g., from one paragraph to another, from dialogue to narration, or from a main event/idea to a parenthetical comment). Yet, G’s choice between καὶ and δέ ultimately

---

⁶¹ The strong correlation between G’s use of circumstantial participles together with δέ, which has this effect of separating a clause from what precedes and joining it more closely to what follows, corroborates Bakker’s description of δέ as a boundary marker (see §4.1.1 note 14).
reflects his judgment not that the neighboring clauses are inherently similar or contrastive, but that they are best represented as continuous or discontinuous in a particular narrative context. This point should be stressed, as it is often the case that G could have used either καί or δέ in a particular context.

Let us compare, for example, the different ways that G decides to present the transitions marked by the first two paragraphs of Genesis 50 (per Wevers’s edition), even though both paragraphs are introduced by wayyiqtol in Hebrew.

The editorial judgment of John William Wevers to begin a new paragraph in both 50:1 and 50:4 is reasonable, as the story moves in 50:1 from Jacob’s dying words to Joseph’s reaction and in 50:4 to a new scene taking place weeks later. Perhaps due to the continuity of time and place between 49:33–50:1 in contrast to 50:3–4, however, G elects—with καί—to present Joseph’s emotional response to his father’s death as seamlessly following upon the
death itself, and—with δέ—to mark the opening of a new scene detailing the translation of Jacob’s remains to the land of Canaan.

The transition from speech to narration is another context in which G must choose between καί and δέ as viable alternatives. In some cases, he prefers to mark the transition with καί, especially when the actions follow directly on the words previously spoken.

In these examples, the speech has strong logical and linguistic connections with the action that follows, such as the transition from command (Γενηθήτω) to fulfillment (ἐγένετο) in 1:3 or from an action’s proposal (ἐρωτήσωμεν) to its undertaking (ἐκάλεσαν Ἐβέκκαν καί ἐπαν αὐτῆ) (24:57). In other cases, however, G decides to use δέ for its boundary-marking power, especially in alternation with καί, in order to give a particular structure to a sequence of events, such as in 37:9–11, which also involves the transition from speech to narration.
While G uses δὲ for the 1 of the wayyiqtol that initiates the exposition of Joseph’s second dream, he decides to present the following four wayyiqtol forms as continuous, translating each 1 as καί until reaching the final form (ἐσκεφήσθη), for which he uses δὲ (“so”). Though καί would have worked here as well, given that the response to Joseph’s dreams follows logically from his father’s words, G prefers to present the events in a way that highlights the response of Joseph’s brothers—in contrast to that of their father—as the culminating event of the otherwise continuous scene. In this way, G anticipates the developing antagonism between Joseph and his brothers that is thematic throughout the entire novella.

In the rare cases where G uses a postpositive other than δὲ for clausal-1 before a verb in translation, it is usually a postpositive with a causal sense, i.e., γάρ (3: 27:36; 30:27; 45:7) or οὖν (2: 41:24; 45:13), but G uses νῦν once for 1 in combining two clauses into one (43:21).

62 This line either involves a textual variant—though none has been reconstructed—or G has moved this speech formula into 37:9 and combined it with the similar formula there.
In each of these cases, G’s choice of particle fits the context, and sometimes it even resolves an exegetical difficulty. For example, in both cases that G uses οὖν for clausal-1 before a verb (41:24; 45:13), it comes as the conclusion of a preceding narrative or statement, and G’s use of γάρ in 30:27 helps to explain the meaning of Laban’s elliptical expression. As shown by these examples, G’s selective use of postpositives for clausal-1 before a verb demonstrates, in particular, his desire to structure his narrative and shape its plot to represent the Hebrew stories in his own Greek way.

4.1.1.4 Phrasal-1. In just four cases, G changes the order of words in translation due to translating phrasal-1 with a postpositive, each of which is presented below.
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All of these examples involve lists of varying complexity. While G uses δὲ to contrast the clean and unclean animals (7:2), he uses the combination τέ ... καί to bind together logical pairs (everything in the city/field (34:28) and in the city/homes (34:29)). The example in 48:13, however, involves G’s use of δὲ to organize a fairly complex Hebrew phrase around the opposition of Ephraim and Manasseh.

4.1.2 Pronominal Suffixes (194)

Hebrew uses pronominal suffixes extensively, attaching them to a variety of forms, but especially substantives, verbs, and prepositions. Greek differs in two key respects. First, Hebrew uses adnominal suffixes more often than Greek uses analogous pronominal modifiers, in part since the Greek definite article is at times an idiomatic equivalent for a

---

63 KG II §522; Smyth §§2974–2979; SSG §26m; 78c, k; Denniston, The Greek Particles, 511–513.
64 For G’s addition of τέ and δὲ (2x) in this phrase, see §3.2.3.3.
65 IBHS §§16.4, 9–11; Joüon §§39d; 61; 94; 103.
Hebrew pronominal suffix. Second, since Hebrew pronominal suffixes occur bound to their heads, there is no flexibility in word order, which contrasts with Greek, where possessive modifiers may precede or follow their nouns. The transpositions involving Hebrew pronominal suffixes are grouped by the part of speech on which they occur, and, in the case of substantives, by whether the suffix is translated by a Greek article or pronoun.

| 4.1.2.1 | Nominal suffix: Greek article. 128 / 194 66.0% |
| 4.1.2.2 | Nominal suffix: Greek pronoun. 43 / 194 22.2% |
| 4.1.2.3 | Verbal suffix 23 / 194 11.9% |

### 4.1.2.1 Nominal suffix: Greek article. Most transpositions of Hebrew pronominal suffixes involve the situation in which G has translated the suffix with the Greek definite article,

---

66 KG II §461.2; Smyth §1121; SSG §1c. The omission of possessive pronouns, which includes translation by the Greek definite article, has been treated by Ilmari Soisaalon-Soininen in a very detailed study that covers the entire Pentateuch (“Auslassung des Possessivpronomens,” 279–294). Because he treats this as omission of the pronominal suffix, he does not consider the potential interactions between such omissions and Greek word order, a factor brought into consideration by the classification of this subset as transpositions. Cf. §3.1.3.2.

67 KG II §646; Smyth §§1154–1185; SSG §41a. The subject of fronted pronominal clitics (in the entire Septuagint) has been treated exhaustively, but not always reliably, by Wifstrand, “Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina,” 44–70. He states that Genesis, Exodus and Isaiah, stand out for tending towards normal Greek usage in this regard, but he admits that they are still hardly “good Koine Greek” (cf. Thackeray’s division). He offers some tentative explanations to account for these relatively uncommon transpositions, which are generally supported by the evidence from Genesis (see §§4.1.2.2–3; 4.2.2): the clitic is pulled into second position by (i) clause-initial (stressed) pronoun; (ii) clause-initial strong negation, or (iii) a subordinating conjunction or relative pronoun; or, (iv) the clitic is fronted because of a strongly emphasized predicate (“Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina,” 69). Raija Sollamo builds on Wifstrand’s study, not only doubling his count but also classifying the occurrences based on the underlying Hebrew grammar (“Place of Enclitic Personal Pronouns,” 153–160). Although Wifstrand’s count for Psalms 1–50 is apparently off, his count for Genesis (c. 65) is very close to mine (68). In a similar study, Larry Perkins rightly addresses the need to consider more than the clitics, as these account for only a portion of Hebrew pronominal suffixes that are fronted in Greek. He also attempts to make contextual sense of why a Septuagint translator fronts pronouns in certain cases (“Order of Pronominal Clitics,” 46–76). The syntactic approach of Wifstrand and Sollamo should be understood as complementary to Perkins’s appeal to pragmatic factors.
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which, unlike the Hebrew suffix, must precede its noun. This phenomenon is very similar to one already discussed in relation to quantitative equivalence, i.e., G’s omission of the Hebrew suffix in translating suffixed Hebrew nouns governed by prepositions, where the Greek article has been aligned with the Hebrew preposition and not the suffix (§3.1.3.2).
The difference is illustrated by the following near-minimal pair:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix omitted</th>
<th>Suffix “transposed”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הלעת—evenalláξ</td>
<td>μὴ ποτὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ני תא</td>
<td>ἐκτείνῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידיו χεῖρας</td>
<td>τὴν χεῖρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>3ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 48:14</td>
<td>Gen 3:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such situations reveal one limit of text alignment as a tool for studying translation, and yet it is still possible to keep track of the fact that these very similar environments have been classified separately according to the typology in use.

Usually, G’s use of the Greek article for a Hebrew pronominal suffix involves no palpable change in meaning, especially given that he typically does this—as with the omitted suffixes handled previously—with certain classes of nouns where the possessor is
relatively unambiguous, i.e., with nouns for (i) interpersonal relations (33)\(^68\) (45:3);
(ii) personal belongings (29)\(^69\) (43:22); and (iii) body parts (26)\(^70\) (38:29).\(^71\)

\(^{68}\) πατήρ (8: 19:34; 35:18; 37:4; 44:20, 32+, 34; 48:17); κύριος (7: 18:27, 31; 39:2, 16; 44:7, 24; 47:18); ἀδελφός (4: 37:8; 44:26, 33; 45:3); μητέρ (3: 21:21; 24:55; 27:13); ὑπενεντός (2: 22:17; 24:60); γυνή (44:27); θυγάτηρ (37:35); κυρία (16:4); παιδίκη (21:12); παῖς (33:14); πληρούν (11:7); πρωτότοκος (27:32); συνγένεια (50:8); τέκνον (27:20).

\(^{69}\) ὀδήρια (6: 24:15, 16, 18, 20, 45, 46); ἄργυριον (3: 42:25; 35; 43:22); ἱματία (3: 39:12, 16, 18); κτήνος (3: 36:6; 46:32; 47:1); βοῦς (2: 46:32; 50:8); ἄρσησις (2: 42:27; 44:1); ὀδόρ (33:10); ἄρσησις (38:19); ἀρμάζον (38:18); ποιμανό (31:4); πρόβατον (50:8); κάμηλος (24:20); βάθος (38:18); τετράπον (34:23); τέξον (27:3); μερέτρα (27:3).

\(^{70}\) διάνοια (4: 17:17; [24:15], 45; 27:41); ἀφθονικός (4: 24:63, 37:25; 43:29; [45:20]); χείρ (3: 3:22; 38:29; 46:4); ψυχή (3: 34:3, 8; 35:18); ὄμος (3: 21:14; 24:15, 45); ἄρσησις (48:13); ἄργυρωντος (2: 17:13, 23); δεξιά (2: 48:10, 13); πούς (2: 29:1; 49:33); πρόσωπον (2: 45:31).

\(^{71}\) KG II §461.2; Smyth §1121; SSG §1c. Cf. §3.1.3.2 note 57.


\(^{73}\) On the Greek article with abstract nouns, see KG II §461.1; Smyth §§1131–1135; SSG §5i.
While it is possible that G read the ה suffix on בְּיתָה in 39:14 as a locative-ִּ, since he translates it as ἐν τῇ οίκῳ (“in the house”), the meaning of the two phrases is different: the Hebrew speaks of “the men attached to the house,” i.e., slaves, whereas G uses τοὺς ὀντας ἐν τῇ οίκῳ (“the (men) who were in the house”), which focuses on their location rather than their status. In general, however, such differences in interpretation are rare, although these transpositions do improve the style of Genesis as a Greek text.\(^\text{74}\)

### 4.1.2.2 Nominal suffix: Greek pronoun. Less often, G changes the order of noun and suffix in translation when he translates the suffix with a Greek pronoun, usually a pronominal clitic (16: μοι, μου, σοι, σου)\(^\text{75}\) or personal pronoun (8),\(^\text{76}\) but also pronominal adjectives (10),\(^\text{77}\) reflexive pronouns (7)\(^\text{78}\) and demonstrative pronouns (2: 44:30; 48:6). When G moves a suffix translated as a pronominal clitic (30:23) or personal pronoun (3:5), he typically places the genitive in predicate position at the front of the noun phrase.\(^\text{79}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
30:23 & \text{ ἀσφαλεῖν ὁ θεός μου τὸ ὀνείδος} \\
3:5 & \text{διανοιχήσονται ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί}
\end{align*}
\]

In the exceptional cases, G either fronts the pronoun even more (29:32; 50:21) or alters the syntax by inflecting the pronoun/clitic in another case (25:24; 44:33; 39:21; 42:28).

---

\(^{74}\) According to Soisalon-Soininen, this particular stylistic impulse is stronger in Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus than in Numbers and Deuteronomy (“Auslassung des Possessivpronomens,” 294).


\(^{79}\) Genitive personal pronouns modifying a noun typically go in predicate position, but may follow the noun (KG II §464.4; Smyth §1185; SSG §41a). Note, the two examples in 31:8 involve anarthrous nouns.
G translates the nominal suffix יִם on יִמְיה in 25:24 in the accusative and positions it after the infinitive, since it now functions as its grammatical subject. In 44:33, he essentially retains the possessive idea, but prefers the possessive dative, whereas in 39:21 and 42:28, he has used the dative case to transform the suffixes into indirect objects.

In contrast, when G uses a pronominal adjective (22:18; 37:7), reflexive pronoun (19:17), or demonstrative pronoun (48:6) to translate the suffix, he always places it in attributive position between the article and the noun, lending emphasis to the modifier.

---

80 In theory, μου could be taken as modifying κύριος, but perhaps G has moved μου even further to capture Leia's sense of vindication that, compared to Rachel, she is hated by her husband.

81 KG II §423.15; Smyth §1476; SSG §22wd.

82 Pronominal adjectives as well as genitive reflexive/demonstrative pronouns modifying a noun typically go in attributive position, but they may follow the noun (KG II §464.4; Smyth §§1163; 1182; 1184; SSG §11; 36).

83 KG II §463.3A; Smyth §1157; SSG §36; 41b–c. This proper usage reflects G's linguistic competence in Greek (Raija Sollamo, “Reflexive Pronouns in the Greek Pentateuch,” in XV Congress of the IOSCS, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël van der Meer, and Martin Meiser [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016], 309–326).
G has God use the fronted pronominal adjective ἐμός in 22:18 (cf. 26:5) to underscore the fact that Abraham has now proved obedient to his voice and not that of his wife (cf. 16:2; 21:12), and he gives Joseph the same form in 37:7 in order to develop the contrast between his sheaves and those of his brothers. Similarly, G has the divine messengers use σεαυτοῦ to urge Lot to save “his own” soul, in contrast to his wife (19:17), and, with ἐξείνων in 48:6, he gives solemnity to Jacob’s adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh as his own children, since he promises that Joseph’s future children will be heirs to “their” inheritance.

As with the cases where G uses the Greek definite article for a suffixed Hebrew form, the

---

84 Concerning the significance of this statement as the culmination of the entire Abraham narrative, see §8.3.3.

85 Helma Dik explains the common fronting of ἐμός and σός (in Oedipus Coloneus) as related to the inherently contrastive nature of such possessives and their likely saliency, given their reference to the human participants on stage (Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007], 103–104).
nouns for body parts (14), personal belongings (7), and interpersonal relations (3) are common here, but, in contrast, these fronted modifiers lend additional emphasis to the nouns.

4.1.2.3 Verbal suffix G also moves verbal suffixes in translation, usually the suffix on a finite verb (19), in which case it is the verb’s object (26:29; 12:1; 28:15), but also on infinitives (4), in which case it is the verb’s subject (48:5; 30:15). G typically uses a pronominal clitic when he fronts a verbal suffix (19), and, with one exception (30:15), he moves it directly before the Greek verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26:29</td>
<td>כָּתֹבֶּתָּ הַמֶּשֶּכֶת סֵי וּכָּנְבֵּלָּ שֵׁנַעֲנָתָּ</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν γῆν ἥν ἄν σοι δεῖξω</td>
<td>86 φωνή (4:23; 27:43; 22:18; 26:5); πρόσωπον (2:19:21; 43:5); ψυχή (2:19:17; 32:30); ἀἷμα (9:5); ὀφθαλμός (3:5); καρδία (50:21); μῆτρα (30:22); σῶμα (47:18); χείρ (33:10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>άν χαίρετί ἄννας ἀραύκην</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:15</td>
<td>οὐ μὴ γε ἐγκαταλίπῃ τὸν ποιήσαι με πάντα, οὐσία ἐλάλησά σοι</td>
<td>87 δράγμα (2:37:7+); μισθός (2:31:8+); ἀργύριον (42:28); ὑπάρχοντα (36:7); κόνδυλον (44:4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:5</td>
<td>πρὸ τοῦ με ἔλθειν πρὸς σὲ εἰς Ἀγυπτόν</td>
<td>88 γυνή (4:23); παῖδισκή (16:3); παῖς (44:33).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:15</td>
<td>Οὐχ ἰκανόν σοι ὅτι ἔλαβες τὸν ἄνδρα μου</td>
<td>89 In relation to the positioning of ἐμὸς and σὸς vis-à-vis body parts, Dik remarks that these words “surprisingly” precede their noun heads but offers the following tentative explanation: “This might be due to the fact that usually, these inalienable possessions do not need an indication of ownership, so that when such an indication is made, it is salient” (Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue, 112). It seems that the same could be said for G’s interpretation of interpersonal relations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86 φωνή (4:23; 27:43; 22:18; 26:5); πρόσωπον (2:19:21; 43:5); ψυχή (2:19:17; 32:30); ἀἷμα (9:5); ὀφθαλμός (3:5); καρδία (50:21); μῆτρα (30:22); σῶμα (47:18); χείρ (33:10).
87 δράγμα (2:37:7+); μισθός (2:31:8+); ἀργύριον (42:28); ὑπάρχοντα (36:7); κόνδυλον (44:4).
88 γυνή (4:23); παῖδισκή (16:3); παῖς (44:33).
89 In relation to the positioning of ἐμὸς and σὸς vis-à-vis body parts, Dik remarks that these words “surprisingly” precede their noun heads but offers the following tentative explanation: “This might be due to the fact that usually, these inalienable possessions do not need an indication of ownership, so that when such an indication is made, it is salient” (Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue, 112). It seems that the same could be said for G’s interpretation of interpersonal relations.
91 19:22; 30:15; 34:30; 48:5.
92 For the cases involving fronted personal pronouns (4), see 20:11; 24:27; 27:37; 44:20.
93 In 30:15 G inserts ὅτι between the pronominal clitic and its verb.
While clitics seem to be pulled forward in the clause by emphatic personal pronouns (26:29) or clause-initial particles, such as ἄν (12:1) or οὗ μὴ (28:15), it is often difficult to determine why G has fronted the suffix or see what difference it makes in terms of grammar, style, emphasis, or interpretation, although closer investigation of the literary context, which must wait until Part II, may elucidate G’s motivations at points. I will present a similar set of cases in §4.2.2 involving the movement of independent forms.

4.1.3 Directional ℓ (102)

Directional-ℓ is a Hebrew suffix that usually imparts an allative, but sometimes an ablative, locative, or temporal idea to its noun. G could have captured the allative notion of this suffix without transposition by using the Greek allative suffix (-δε/-ζε/-σε), but he never does; rather, he prefers to use a preposition, which necessarily precedes the noun. Because directional-ℓ is not considered a separate token by WHM, such cases were counted as cases of expansive translation (§3.4.1.1), since a Hebrew noun is translated by a Greek

---

95 In the introduction to her monograph on word order in Ancient Greek, Dik stresses the importance of analyzing such examples in context, especially when consideration is given to pragmatics as well as euphony, syntax, and semantics (Word Order in Ancient Greek, 3–15). Even if it is difficult to assess G’s motives, Perkins is right to claim that such transpositions are “deliberate alterations in word order [meant] to communicate specific nuances of meaning in the resultant translation” (“Order of Pronominal Clitics,” 76).
96 IBHS §10.5; Joüon §§93c–k.
97 KG I §135.3; Smyth §342. As discussed in §3.3.1, however, G utilizes the ablative suffix -δεν in the forms ἁνωθεν, ἐκείθεν, ἐμπροσθεν, ἐντεθεν, ἐξωθεν, ἐσωθεν, κατόπισθεν, μακρόθεν, ὑπερθεν, ὑπόσθεν, and ποθεν.
prepositional phrase, but, as this results from inadequate granularity of tokenization, it is preferable to treat them more fully here with other transpositions.

In V, directional ה occurs suffixed to 140 separate words in Genesis, and G very often uses a Greek preposition to translate it (102).98

\[
\begin{array}{l}
11:31 \quad \text{ללכת ארבעה כנў} \quad \text{πορευθηκαί εἰκ ἴην Xανάν} \\
41:57 \quad \text{והל ה אוד-עטט} \quad \text{καὶ πάσαι αἰ χῷραι ἠλθον εἰκ Ἀλγυσσοῦν} \\
19:6 \quad \text{য়יאלמה לט תחתה} \quad \text{ἐξῆλθεν δὲ Λῶτ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸ πρόθυρον}
\end{array}
\]

The exceptions are relatively few (38) and mostly exhibit other consistent translation techniques: G always leaves the suffix untranslated on the adverbial forms ה chauda (19), ἐξω (7), and ממלעה (2),101 for which he prefers to use the Greek spatial adverbs ἐκεῖ (14:10), ἐξω (39:12), and ἀνωθεν/ἐπάνω, respectively.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
14:10 \quad \text{ῥυλὶς ἑσυ} \quad \text{kαὶ ἐνεπέσαν ἐκεῖ} \\
39:12 \quad \text{πῦρ εἰπεν ἑχουσαι ἐξω}
\end{array}
\]

Also, he does not use a preposition for the suffix on the non-spatial form ה חלתילה (4)102 (44:7), and he may omit it in a list of suffixed forms (three times in 13:14).103

---

98 The high incidence of ה- suffixed forms translated by Greek prepositional phrases does necessarily mean that G understood that the spatial idea was specifically conveyed by the suffix ה, especially given his tendency to “supply” spatial prepositions where none is required in Hebrew (see §3.2.4.1). Regardless, G aimed to convey the spatial meaning of the Hebrew clearly in Greek.

99 14:10; 19:20+, 22+; 20:13; [23:6], 13; 24:6, 8; 25:10; 29:3; 39:1; 42:2; 43:30; 49:31++; 50:5.

100 15:5; 19:17; 24:29; 39:12, 13, 15, 18.

101 G translates ה אלמלעל as ἀνωθεν in 6:16 and ἐπάνω in 7:20.

102 G translates ה חלתילה twice as μὴ γένοιτο (18:25+) and twice as μὴ γένοιτο (44:7, 17).

103 For the remaining exceptional cases (3), see 10:19; 38:14; 44:14.
4.2 Displacement of a Hebrew Word or Phrase (474 groups)

Roughly half as often as with morphemes, G displaces an entire Hebrew word or phrase, relocating it to another position within its phrase, clause, or sentence. Here too we find both stylistic and other factors at work. The cases of word/phrase displacement will be treated in the following groups based upon syntactic functions:

§4.2.1 Nominal modifiers. 209 / 474 44.1%
§4.2.2 Verbal arguments and modifiers. 126 / 474 26.6%
§4.2.3 The conjunction כי. 84 / 474 17.7%
§4.2.4 Other cases. 55 / 474 11.6%

4.2.1 Nominal modifiers (209)

Certain nominal modifiers, i.e. adjectives and numbers, are often repositioned by G. These are grouped by the part of speech of the modifier, as G treats each group differently.

§4.2.1.1 Adjective. 68 / 209 32.5%
§4.2.1.2 Cardinal number. 95 / 209 45.5%
§4.2.1.3 Compound numbers. 46 / 209 22.0%

4.2.1.1 Adjective. G repositions Greek adjectival modifiers vis-à-vis the positions of their Hebrew equivalents in various ways, most often placing πᾶς in predicate position before the
Greek article (52). Yet, this case is special for a few reasons. First, when Hebrew ל functions as a modifier, it is not an adjective but a noun in construct, and so it precedes the term it qualifies. Second, G regularly places πᾶς in predicate position before the Greek article (i.e., its normal placement in Greek), but this only involves a transposition when the Hebrew article is absent and the Greek article has been matched with a prior Hebrew preposition. The difference can be seen in the following near-minimal pair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No transposition</th>
<th>Transposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>את כל πᾶς אֶּרֶץ</td>
<td>את πᾶς אֶּרֶץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָּרַבִּים</td>
<td>πᾶς ἄρι ρίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γυναίκα</td>
<td>πᾶς Αἰθιοπίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 13:15</td>
<td>Gen 2:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The important difference, then, between transpositions involving πᾶς in comparison to those involving the other modifiers considered here, is that the transposition does not involve the order of ל relative to the article or relative to the noun, but only the order of כל and the preceding preposition. At the same time, since G often renders πᾶς (DDOM) and other prepositions with the Greek article, it is important to note that that he avoids placing

---

105 IBHS §9.5.3f; Jouon §§139e–i.
106 KG II §465.6; Smyth §1174b; SSG §38b(i). In fact, G only places πᾶς in attributive position between the article and its substantive in 45:20 (cf. similar cases where πᾶς is substantivized [3: 1:31; 9:3; 31:21]).
πᾶς in attributive position between the article and the noun, as this position is reserved in Greek for πᾶς when it has a special meaning (“whole”). ¹⁰⁷

In the other cases, G’s repositioning of the modifier in relation to its noun head is best explained by reference to pragmatic concerns: by fronting adjectival modifiers G gives them greater prominence (12)¹⁰⁸ (15:16; 41:3; 26:33; 27:36), and by postponing them he signals the greater relevance of the noun (4)¹⁰⁹ (1:30, further below).¹¹⁰

G fronts τετάρτη (“fourth”) in 15:16 and ἄλλαι in 41:3—both times in combination with adversative δὲ—in order to contrast them with what precedes, i.e., with the prior generations of slavery and the first group of cows, respectively.¹¹¹ The modifier σήμερον, in turn, is so much more important than its noun, that ἡμέρα is often left implied in such

¹⁰⁷ KG II §465.6b; Smyth §1174a; SSG §38b(i).
¹⁰⁹ 1:30; 25:4; 41:12, 38.
¹¹¹ For preposed adnominal modifiers used contrastively, see Bakker, Noun Phrase, 38–41. Like 15:16, Bakker’s example (number 3) also uses ordinals, contrasting τὴν τρίτην ... γυναῖκα to τὴν δευτέρην.
phrases. Finally, G fronts δεύτερον in 27:36 in order to draw attention to the fact that this is not the first but second (δεύτερον) time that Jacob has tricked Esau.

In contrast, G delays χλωρόν (“green”) in 1:30, here translating a Hebrew construct noun, because the noun χόρτον (“edible plants”) is relatively more important in a list of plants given by God for human and animal consumption.

1:30 καὶ πάντα χόρτον χλωρόν εἰς βρώσιν

Of course, the recourse to pragmatics does not mean that syntactic factors are not also relevant, as is demonstrated by G’s postponement of τοιοῦτον in 41:38, so that he can keep it together with the epexegetical relative clause that specifies its meaning.

41:38 Μή εὑρήσομεν ἄνθρωπον τοιοῦτον, ὃς ἔχει πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ;

4.2.1.2 Cardinal number. More often than not, G deviates from the word order of his source when translating noun phrases with cardinal numbers. Other than ὃς, Hebrew cardinal numbers typically precede their nouns as well as any article. When G uses an anarthrous noun phrase, he often repositions the number after the noun (68).

6:18 μᾶς δὲ πάντα τύχοντα πιστεύσωμεν
30:20 κι έτεκαν γὰρ αὐτῷ υἱὸς ἔξ

---

112 KG II §§596.2; 597.2g; Smyth §1027b; SSG §§24b; 46. Nevertheless, when σήμερον occurs in a noun phrase, G does not leave ἡμέρα implied, but always places it after σήμερον (5): 19:37, 38; 26:33; [35:4], 20.
113 IBHS §15.2; Joüon §§142a–n.
114 5:3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31; 6:1; 7:6, 24; 8:10, 12; 11:11, 12, [13] [+], 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 32; 12:4; 17:1, 25; 21:5; 23:1; 25:20, 26; 26:34; 29:20; 30:20; 31:23; 35:28; 41:46, 50; 42:17; 50:22, 26.
This occurs very often in the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11, which can be accounted for pragmatically, since numbers in lists do not have the same relative importance that they have in other contexts. In addition, this helps explain why G frequently follows the Hebrew order in other cases,\textsuperscript{115} since numbers are often more salient than their nouns.\textsuperscript{116} Similarly, when G uses an arthrous noun phrase, he repositions the number in attributive position after the article and before the noun, not only because Greek grammar requires some transposition, but also in order to signal the number’s contextual significance (27).\textsuperscript{117}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
7:10 & ועבשנה והוים \\
33:1 & נעל השפחה קא וספסם פאתי
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Though these reorderings are minor from a certain perspective, they nevertheless relate to a range of stylistic, grammatical, pragmatic, and interpretive aspects of G’s translation.

\textbf{4.2.1.3 Compound numbers.} In contrast, G’s systematic reordering of the parts of Hebrew compound numbers should be viewed as primarily a matter of style. The pattern of descending grades (i.e., from 100s to 10s to 1s) is found in Hebrew Genesis (13),\textsuperscript{118} but

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{115}For example, G sometimes keeps the number first with anarthrous ἐτὸς (39: 6:3; 9:28, 29; 11:10; 14:4; 15:13; 16:3; 17:17, 24; 25:7, 17; 29:18, 27, 30; 31:38, 41++; 37:2; 41:1, 26++, 27+, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54; 45:6, 11; 47:9, 28+) and anarthrous ἡμέρα (15: 7:4, 10, 12, 17; 8:3, 6; 17:12; 30:36; 40:12, 13, 18, 19; 50:3+, 10).
\item \textsuperscript{116} Helma Dik notes that on the basis of some adjectives in Sophocles, quantifying adjectives tend to be placed before their noun heads (\textit{Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue}, 90–96).
\item \textsuperscript{118} 5:5; 6:3; 9:28, 29; 16:16; 17:1, 24; 23:1; 25:7, 17; 35:28; 50:22, 26.
\end{itemize}
numbers are more often expressed in ascending grades (i.e., from 1s to 10s to 100s). With one exception (8:3), G rearranges compound numbers so that they occur in descending grades, and he regularly omits καί between the elements of the compound number (but not in 8:3 or 14:14). This is in keeping with Greek usage: the classical rule, which persists into later forms of Greek, is that compound numerals may occur (i) in ascending grades with καί joining their parts (typically before the noun) or (ii) in descending grades with or without καί (typically after the noun). What is more, the second pattern grew in favor in post-classical Greek. The discrepancy between the frequent use of ascending grades in Hebrew Genesis and the preference for descending grades in Hellenistic Greek explains why G consistently reorders the parts of compound numerals to be in descending grades (46).

Since this phenomenon is nearly an issue of style alone, it is uniquely suited to reveal G’s concern for the sound and feel of his text as well as its grammar, meaning, and literary structure.

---

119 Waltke and O’Connor claim that the ascending order is uncommon for large numbers, but this apparently applies to numbers in the thousands and higher, as it does not fit the examples in Genesis (IBHS §15.2.5d).
120 For G’s omission of καί, see §3.1.2.2. That G preserves καί in 8:3 (μετὰ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἕκαστὸν ἡμέρας) accords with the rule stated in note 121.
121 KG II §185.2; Smyth §350a; SSG §39; Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, 2 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1923–1934): I.316–317 (§70.A.10); Thackeray, Grammar, §13.4 notes the prevalence of the pattern of descending grades in the Septuagint.
122 5:3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31; 7:20, 24; 11:12, 13++, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 32; 12:4; 14:14; 17:25; 31:41; 37:2; 46:18, 22; 47:9, 28+.
4.2.2 Verbal arguments and modifiers (126)

The cases in which G reorders verbal arguments and modifiers (126) form an interesting set but are rather challenging to classify and explain. Many cases involve the repositioning of pronominal clitics (35)\(^{123}\) (3:16; 30:31; 19:9; 31:12) and personal pronouns (16)\(^{124}\) (11:8; 24:15). These function as verbal subjects and objects and so resemble the transpositions of verbal suffixes (see §4.1.2.3) except for the fact that the Hebrew equivalents are morphologically independent of the verb.

In some cases, G’s intentions seem clear. For example, by moving σέ before κακώσομεν in 19:9, G focuses on Lot as the new target to be victimized by the wicked men of Sodom.\(^{125}\) In 24:15, however, G’s choice to translate תָּרָם הָאָדָם with a preposition has motived the repositioning

---


\(^{124}\) 4:22; 7:9; 11:8; 24:15, 47, 49; 26:16; 34:8; 41:8; 42:35; 43:7; 45:5; 48:12, 17; 50:12, 17.

\(^{125}\) This judgment is supported by the pragmatic analysis of Helma Dik, who proposes the template [P1 PØ V X] for ancient Greek, such that P1 is the topic slot, PØ (pre-verbal) the focus slot, V the default slot for the verb, and X is reserved for the remaining (less salient) clausal constituents (Word Order in Ancient Greek, 12). Here, G places σέ in the focus position to highlight its saliency. Dik calls this particular type of focus “replacing” focus: “Replacing Focus instructs the addressee to replace a wrong assumption or, at any rate, it makes sure that this assumption will not be held and ‘replaces’ it with the correct information. ‘It is not X, but Y’” (Word Order in Ancient Greek, 39).
of the accusative subject pronoun near its infinitive. It is not always easy to discern why G shuffles words around, although it may be noted that he often moves a pronominal clitic forward in the clause and positions it after an emphatic subject pronoun (3:16), a question word (30:31), a postpositive particle (19:9), or a relative pronoun (31:12).¹²⁶

Occasionally, G has moved a verbal argument to the beginning of the clause due to using a postpositive for clausal-٤١, which requires another constituent to be placed in clause-initial position (8),¹²⁷ although he has not always selected the nearest option (7:4; 44:20).

By placing ἢτι before postpositive γὰρ in 7:4, G emphasizes the flood’s imminence (“in just seven more days”), whereas moving αὐτός before postpositive δὲ in 44:20 shifts the subject from Joseph back to Benjamin,¹²⁸ while μόνος in pre-verbal position highlights the fact that Benjamin is his mother’s only and his father’s favorite child. Yet, many such reorderings do not follow easily discernible patterns, and their underlying motivations often remain obscure, even when careful consideration is given to the context of G’s translation choice.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ See §4.1.2.3, especially note 94.
¹²⁸ Concerning resumed topics, see Dik, Word Order in Ancient Greek, 21.
Nevertheless, as the above examples illustrate, G reorders the words in a clause on account of a network of linguistic, literary, pragmatic, and other factors.

4.2.3 The conjunction כי (84)

As with the more frequent use of postpositive conjunctions to translate Hebrew clausal-ı, G often uses the Greek postpositive γάρ for the Hebrew conjunction כי (82), which entails a change in word order. In studying the use of causal ὅτι as a translation of Hebrew כי, Anneli Aejmelaeus makes a distinction between “direct” and “indirect” causation: while Hebrew כי is used to introduce (i) complement clauses and (ii) causal clauses conveying both (ii.a) direct and (ii.b) indirect causation, Greek ὅτι is normally used only for (i) complement clauses and (ii.a) direct causation, whereas γάρ (like ὡς and ἐπεί) is used for (ii.b) indirect causation. While traditional grammars do not make use of the terms direct and indirect causation, they confirm this comparison of ὅτι and γάρ

---


132 IBHS §38.8; Joüon §157.

133 IBHS §38.4; Joüon §170d.


135 KG II §569; Smyth §§2240–2248; SSG §45d.

136 KG II §545; Smyth §§2803–2812.
with other words.\textsuperscript{137} In light of this distinction, it is common for G to use ὅτι for ἦν when it expresses a direct causal relationship (3:14) but γὰρ when ἦν expresses a causal or explanatory relationship of an indirect (19:22), implicit (4:25), parenthetical (2:5), or subjective (18:15) nature.\textsuperscript{138}

\begin{verbatim}
3:14 ὅτι ἐπίσημα ὅ θεὸς τῶν ὁμοίων ἦν καὶ εἰπεν κύριος ὅ θεὸς τῶν ὁμοίων ἦν καὶ ἐπὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπικατάρατος ὑπὸ ἀπὸ πᾶντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πᾶντων τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς.

19:22 ὅτι ἐπίσημα ὅ θεὸς τῶν ὁμοίων ἦν καὶ εἰπεν κύριος ὅ θεὸς τῶν ὁμοίων ἦν καὶ ἐπὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπικατάρατος ὑπὸ ἀπὸ πᾶντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πᾶντων τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς.

4:25 ἐγὼ δὲ Λάδας ἤλθαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλαβούσα ἔτεκεν ὑλὸν καὶ ἐπισωθάματο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ΣΗΘ λέγουσα ἐξανέστησεν γὰρ μοι ὅ θεὸς σπέρμα ἔτερον ἄντι Ἄβελ, ὅπερ ἐπέκεινεν Καίν.

2:5 καὶ πᾶν χαλφῶν ἄγροι πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶντα χαλφῶν ἄγροι πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατειλαῖ- ὁ γὰρ ἐβρεξεν ὅ θεὸς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀνθρώπος οὐκ ἦν ἐργάζεσθαι τῇ γῆν, ...

18:15 ἄντι Ἁβελ ὅτε Σάφραν λέγουσα Οὐκ ἐγέλασα· ἐφεξῆς ὅ γὰρ.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{137} Kühner-Gerth note that the causal relationship expressed by γὰρ relates to a preceding idea “zuweilen auch nur gedacht” (“at times left unstated”) (KG II §545.6); Smyth likewise claims that γὰρ “often refers to a thought implied in what has preceded” (§2810); Denniston, perhaps more pejoratively, says that with γὰρ “the connexion of thought is sometimes lacking in logical precision” (The GreekParticles, 61). Cf. Albert Rijksbaron, who distinguishes between ὅτι, on the one hand, and ὅς, ἐπεί, and γὰρ, on the other (The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction, 3rd ed. [Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 2002], 84–86 [§27]).

\textsuperscript{138} According to Aejmelaeus, Genesis and Exodus—in contrast to other Septuagint translation units—usually make a proper distinction between ὅτι and γὰρ when translating causal uses of ἦν. For Genesis, the ratio of γὰρ to ὅτι as equivalents for causal ἦν is 87 : 68; in Exodus, 12 : 79. When acceptable cases of ὅτι-causale are bracketed, however, the ratios are even higher: G correctly uses γὰρ in 78% of the cases (“ΟΤΙ causale,” 19–20).
In 3:14, G makes proper use of ὅτι in a causal sense, because there is a direct link between the snake’s crime and his punishment. In 19:22, however, the γάρ-clause relates more indirectly to the preceding command for Lot to hurry, as it assumes Lot’s intent to cooperate and not just to save his own skin, whereas the causal relationship expressed by γάρ in 4:25 is implicit, because it technically assumes an elision (e.g., “I named him Seth, which name is fitting, because ...”), as the naming event is only expressed by the narrator. G uses γάρ in 2:5, in turn, to explain parenthetically why no plants had grown yet, i.e., because God had not yet made it rain, and, in 18:15, to explain Sarah’s silence as a result of her subjective feeling of fear.

4.2.4 Other cases (55)

There are a number of other words and phrases that G relocates within their clauses. Some of these cases reflect minor patterns of reordering, such as the promotion of elements from a relative clause to an upstairs clause, or the reordering of compound or appositional phrases. Other residual cases, however, resist categorization.

§4.2.4.1 Promotion from relative clause. 12 / 758 1.6%
§4.2.4.2 Reordering of compound or appositional phrases. 12 / 55 21.8%
§4.2.4.3 Residue 31 / 55 56.4%

4.2.4.1 Promotion from relative clause. At times, G promotes an element from a relative clause (7:4), usually a preposition (18:6; 7:15), to help introduce the relative clause (12).139

As with the similar cases, in which G omits a resumptive pronominal suffix (§3.1.3.4) or another resumptive element (§3.1.7.1), G occasionally uses this more invasive strategy to bring the Hebrew idiom into conformity with the rules of Greek syntax.\textsuperscript{140}

### 4.2.4.2 Reordering of compound or appositional phrases

In only a handful of cases, G reorders two phrases that either are joined by καὶ and so form a compound phrase (9)\textsuperscript{141} (8:18; 14:14) or stand in apposition to one another (3)\textsuperscript{142} (45:12).

While such cases seem intentional (e.g., to organize or prioritize the terms), it is difficult to adjudicate whether the reordering is a textual variant or a translator’s manipulation of the sequence, as any argument ultimately seems circular. Such cases illustrate why word order variants have not been reconstructed in V, even if such an analysis is probable (see §2.2).

\textsuperscript{140} For references to studies and grammars, see §§3.1.3.4; 3.1.7.1 and notes.

\textsuperscript{141} 7:8; 8:18; 14:24; 22:24; 30:43; 31:4; 37; 32:7; 33:7.

\textsuperscript{142} 14:12; 45:12, 28.
4.2.4.3 Residue The remaining cases are hard to characterize as a group. Some apparently agree with SP (8) or otherwise seem more likely to reflect a textual variant (3), while other cases effect certain syntactic changes and so more likely stem from G (20).

4.3 Major Displacement (20 groups)

Quite rarely are words or even entire clauses relocated in more drastic ways (20), affecting, for example, the sequence of events in the narrative (18:8; 33:4). Since G typically prefers to retain the word order of his source and only moves elements a minimal distance when he feels that rearrangement is best, these exceptions seem unlikely to be his handiwork. Yet, might not some special circumstance warrant an exception?

In both 18:8 and 33:4, it is not implausible that the short clauses were moved by G, since this presents an arguably more logical order of events than the Hebrew text. The parenthetical statement in 18:8 about Abraham standing under the tree is an odd

---

143 2:4; 8:21; 11:14; 26:29; 31:17; 34:12; 41:56; 42:32.
144 1:11; 24:7; 31:32.
145 9:4; 11:7; 21:16+; 22:16; 23:6; 24:41; 25:7; 29:24; 30:17; 31:21, 25; 34:7; 35:17; 36:34; 41:35; 44:1; 46:5; 47:5, 8. The cases in 44:1 and 47:5 involve fronted possessive adjectives, as in §4.1.2.2, but also the repositioning of words or phrases and not just pronominal suffixes.
interruption of the sequence of preparing, bringing, and eating the food.\textsuperscript{147} In 33:4, too, it is understandable that someone would find Esau kissing Jacob to be more logically placed after embracing him than after collapsing upon his neck. Note, however, that half of these major changes occur in Genesis 31, where some form of heavy revision has taken place, most likely at the scribal level.\textsuperscript{148}

\subsection*{4.4 Conclusion}

The evidence of G’s departures from serial equivalence presented in this chapter complements the preceding chapter on quantitative equivalence. Here, as there, G’s most basic tendency is to adhere to his source text, imitating it in terms of order as well as quantity. While the focus of this chapter has been on the cases in which G shuffles words and phrases around in translation, it must be kept in mind that they constitute the exceptions and not the rule: to a very great extent, G arranges the words of his Greek translation according to their precise order in his Hebrew source, and when he does move words around in translation, he generally does not move them far from their equivalent position in the Hebrew. At the same time, I have adduced numerous examples and described a variety of recurring scenarios in which G makes deliberate and thoughtful departures from the Hebrew order. This reinforces the thesis that he was guided, at least

\textsuperscript{147} Since G develops the hospitality of Abraham in this passage, repositioning καὶ ἐφάγοσαν might be another strategy used to highlight his service (see §8.3.2).

\textsuperscript{148} Nechama Leiter has argued that the transpositions in Gen 31 should be attributed to a “free” translator, who takes liberties in this passage to improve its style and narrative flow (“The Translator’s Hand in Transpositions? Notes on the LXX of Genesis 31,” Text 14 [1988]: 105–130). Yet, she bases this judgment on her impression of G, whereas the evidence cited in this chapter indicates rather that G did not generally deviate from the Hebrew order. Perhaps it is wisest to remain open concerning the transpositions of Gen 31.
empirically, by a complex poetics of translation, and I have shown that the factors motivating his rearrangements were equally complex, relating to manifold matters, such as grammar, syntax, style, logic, structure, interpretation, emphasis, and rhetoric. Now that the overall shape of G’s portrait is clearly discernible, I will furnish this black-and-white sketch with color and personality in the next two chapters on lexical and grammatical equivalence by considering his customs and habits in selecting words and their forms.
Lexical equivalence is concerned with the correspondences between the lemmas, i.e. the dictionary forms, in a source text and its translation. More than the other aspects of translation considered in Part I of this work, it is lexical equivalence that has received the most attention from researchers. For even more than a century, scholars have had access to tools such as the Hatch-Redpath *Concordance to the Septuagint* meant to assist with determining the lexical equivalents between the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, in part as a means of assisting with the retroversion into Hebrew of textual variants based upon Septuagintal evidence. In addition, lexical equivalence has often been invoked as evidence of the unity or multiplicity of translators for two textual units, to measure the literalness of

---


3 Genesis has not been spared from this debate (Otto Baab, “A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis,” *JBL* 52 [1933]: 239–243; Kim, “Multiple Authorship”). Both Baab’s theory and Kim’s refutation rely largely on lexical data.
a translation unit in comparison to others, for dating and provenance, and even to assess the meaning a translator intended for his words, just to name a few major applications.

In my study of lexical equivalence in Greek Genesis, I will approach the subject from three complementary and interrelated perspectives, first laying a foundation for the analysis by determining and illustrating the Greek parts of speech that G uses to represent each of the major Hebrew parts of speech, including both content words and function words. Then, I will consider the lexical equivalence of content words via the twin criteria of consistency and adequacy. It will be shown that G’s approach to lexical consistency is not monolithic; rather, he translates some lemmas and parts of speech rather consistently and others with

---


6 This has been applied rigorously to the theoretical approach that undergirds the NETS translation, according to which NETS translators are to evaluate lexical equivalences in six steps (Albert Pietersma, *Translation Manual: For a New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)* [Ada: Uncial Books, 1996], 14–15). For an explanation of these steps, see §10 note 5.

7 For an important and recent article covering a range of lexical issues in Greek Genesis, see Robert J. V. Hiebert, “Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Genesis,” in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Craig Evans et al., VTSup 152 (Brill: Leiden, 2012), 405–426.

more variation. Moreover, he does so for a combination of linguistic, literary, and interpretive reasons, but always in order to find Greek words that he considers not only adequate representations of the Hebrew words they translate but also appropriate to their new contexts in his translation. In other words, a constant and core desire to find the right Greek word to best match the Hebrew is able to explain both G’s expected and his more unexpected lexical choices. Building on the preceding chapters on quantitative and serial equivalence, I view Greek Genesis from this third vantage point here in order to bring the shaded black-and-white sketch of G’s translator portrait to life with vivid color, and the emerging analysis of his approach to translation further confirms his deliberate, mindful, and cautious disposition toward Hebrew Genesis, as he aimed to produce a Greek translation to represent the Hebrew source accurately on a range of levels and also to meet certain expectations held by his anticipated readers.

5.1 Part-of-speech Equivalence

Before I analyze how G handles the major lexical items in his source, it will be helpful to consider first how he generally represents each Hebrew part of speech in Greek. In a way, this topic serves as a bridge between the previous two chapters, which have concerned G’s divergences from quantitative and serial equivalence, and the remaining two chapters of Part I, which will treat the lexical and grammatical correspondences primarily where G maintains quantitative equivalence. While in this section I gesture to G’s quantitative inequivalence with each Hebrew part of speech, I focus more on the 1 : 1 correspondences. In addition, it is crucial to see that G mostly maintains the expected part-
of-speech equivalences in translation, especially for content words, since this fact has major implications for the evaluation of the lexical and grammatical matches that he gives in Greek translation for lexical and grammatical features of words in his source text. It would make little sense, for example, to investigate how G represents the Hebrew verbal system with Greek verbal morphology if he regularly translated Hebrew verbs with Greek non-verbs. I will survey each major part of speech on its own, but Table 11 presents this information in a statistical summary.

**Table 11. Primary Hebrew Parts of Speech and Main Greek Equivalents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew POS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>One-to-one</th>
<th>Omitted</th>
<th>Main Greek POS</th>
<th>(With groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content words</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common noun</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>6,059</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>= common noun 5,307</td>
<td>79.4% (82.1% + 184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>= verb 4,835</td>
<td>94.2% (95.8% + 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>= proper noun 2,449</td>
<td>88.3% (90.6% + 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>= adjective 318</td>
<td>48.8% (50.0% + 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function words</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>= conjunction 4,130</td>
<td>86.5% (87.4% + 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>= preposition 1,839</td>
<td>44.0% (53.4% + 392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron. suffix</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>= pers. pronoun 2,856</td>
<td>82.4% (82.7% + 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite article</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>= definite article 1,301</td>
<td>81.9% (83.3% + 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ננה (DDOM)</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>= definite article 525</td>
<td>50.8% (50.8% + 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative particle</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>= rel. pronoun 254</td>
<td>60.2% (62.1% + 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers. pronoun</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>= pers. pronoun 202</td>
<td>50.1% (51.4% + 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 Note, the counts given here and throughout §5.1 may differ from those in §§3.3-3.4, since it is tokens and not groups of tokens that are counted here.
5.1.1 Content words

5.1.1.1 Common nouns. Of all Hebrew parts of speech, common nouns occur most often in Genesis (6,685). Though infrequent, G’s translation of common nouns at times involves quantitative inequivalence: omission (130) (1.9%),\(^{10}\) synthetic translation (404) (6.0%),\(^{11}\) or expansive translation (92) (1.4%).\(^{12}\) When G maintains quantitative equivalence (6,059)

\(^{10}\) Usually, omission involves בָּשָּׁהּ and יָמִים in date formulae (49) or בֵּן and בֵּית in age formulae (9) (see §3.1.6), or nouns in complex prepositions translated by Greek case (9) (see §3.1.1.1). For other omitted common nouns (63), see especially §3.1.8: \[4]22; 6:16; 7:13; 9:6; 18:5; 20:10; 21:16; 23:1; 24:53; 27:8, 16, 46; 29:1; 31:20, 42, 53++; [32:1], 11, 16; 33:1, 5, 19; 35:7, 10++; 36:31; 37:9, 14+, 23; 38:12; 39:11, 14; 40:5; 41:11, 12++, 23, 44, 45, 56++; 43:17, 25; 44:2, [4], 18; 45:3, 22, 23++; 46:31++; 47:17, 20, 24; 48:14, 17, 50:18.

\(^{11}\) With synthetic translation, the Hebrew noun of ten forms part of a compound preposition (183), conjunction (10), or adverbial expression (8) (see §3.3.1); is part of a compound divine name (14) (see §3.3.2); or, G has used a Greek compound with constituents matching multiple Hebrew tokens (76) (see §3.3.2.3). For other common nouns translated synthetically (113), see §3.3: 2:18; 3:8++; 4:7, 17, 21++; 6:6; 7:22++; 8:9++; 21; 11:28, 30; 13:3; 15:10++; 16:5, 6, 13; 17:8, 23++; 18:1++, 5, 6+, 7+, 8++, 11++, 14; 19:4, 8, 12, 31, 38; 20:15; 21:6, 20, 28, 29; 24:7, 44++, 47; 25:27++, 28; 26:35++; 30:2; 31:21, 29, 35; 32:13, 16, 24++; [34:10], 12+, 21; 37:19++; 38:23; 39:11, 19, 20++; 22++; 40:3++, 5++; 41:4, 19; 42:16, 19++; 28++, 38; 43:27, 32; 44:10, 20, 21; 45:1++; 46:29, 32; 47:9++, 26; 49:13, 22, 24; 50:17, 20.

\(^{12}\) Usually, expansive translation involves a Hebrew noun with the directional-ן suffix translated by a Greek prepositional phrase (56) (see §§3.4.1.1; 4.1.3). For other common nouns translated expansively (36), see §3.4: 29; 6:12, 22; 8:15; 9:12, 20; 11:10; 16:13; 18:1, 10, 12; 19:8, 11, 37, 38; 22:13; 28:20; 30:8, 14, 41; 31:35; 35:20; 38:1; 40:8, 17; 41:1; 42:15, 16; 43:19; 45:6; 48:16; 49:5, 17, 24, 26; 50:23.
(90.6%), however, he usually uses a noun (5,307) or adjective (566)\(^\text{13}\) (23:4; 17:12), but at times a verb (74)\(^\text{14}\) (31:18; 43:28), adverb (50)\(^\text{15}\) (1:5; 40:7), or other part of speech (62).\(^\text{16}\)

| 23:4 | דּוֹ תּוּשָׂ הָנָּבִּים עַמְּכֶם | Πάρερχος καὶ παρεπίθημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ’ ὑμῶν
|---|---|---
| 17:12 | מִן שְׁמֵנָם מִי יָשָׁתָ לָבָם | πᾶν ἄρσενικός εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν,
| | לְלֵי [בְּחֶשֶׁן] יְתֵמָהָה בֵּן בָּנָם | ὁ ὀικογενεύς τὸς ὀικίας σου καὶ ὁ ἀργυρόνατος ἀπὸ παντὸς ὑιοῦ ἀλλοτριοῦ.
| 31:18 | וַיִּחְנוּ את אָלְמָהָ בָּנָה | καὶ ἀπήγαγεν πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ
| 43:28 | וַיֵּמָר לֵשֶׁם הָעָבָדָר לֵאַבְן וְעָבְרָהָ | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν 'Τιμὴνιεὶς ο παῖς σου ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ἦτε ζη.
| 1:5 | וַיֵּרְבֶה וָה בֵּן וָה יָדָה | καὶ ἔγενεν ἐσπέρα καὶ ἔγενεν πρωί, ἡμέρα μία.
| 40:7 | וַיְדַעְתָּ נֶפֶשׁ וַיְכַוָּנה | Τί ὅτι τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν σκοπήρωσα σήμερον;

\(^\text{13}\) G uses adjectives for common nouns so much due to the Hebrew word בְּכֹ וְ (355), which is morphologically a noun (cf. Youngblood, “Translation Technique,” 44). Otherwise, G frequently translates υἱὸς as ἕκαστος (16), ἔτερος (31:49), or ἐκατέρος (40:5), ἡρ as ἄρσεν (13) or ἄρσενικός (5), ἡρ as πρωτόκος (15), ἰδικά as ἰδικά (10), ἰδικά as μέσος (9), ἐκατέρος as αἰῶνος (8) or ἀνάνος (49:26), ἀνά as δέξιος (7), or ἀναπήσι as ἀρίστερος (6). For other cases (119), see 1:2+; 9[+], 10, 11, [12], 21, 29, 30; 25, 12; 36, 21, 24; 420; 64, 14, 16; 7:22; 12:2; 13:3; 10, 11, 12; 14:14, 20; 15:2, 12, 13; 16:12; 17:5, 12+, 13; 19:2, 3, 17, 19, 20, 25, 28, 29; 20:5, 6; 22:17; 23:4+, 6, 11; 24:10, 22+, 53+; 25:24, 25; 26:29; 27:9, 15, 16, 36; 29:27, 28; 30:13, 37+, 42; 31:39, 49; 34:1, 7, 30; 35:2, 4, 14; 37:2, 3, 4, 23, 26, 28, 32; 38:27, 28, 30; 41:42+; 43; 43:12, 15, 23; 44:2, 4+[+]; 45:18, 20, 22+, 23; 46:32, 34; 47:5, 6, 11; 48:6; 49:1, 3++, 14, 27; 50:8, 15, 17, 20+. Note, that here and throughout §5.1, references will only be given for content words when they cannot easily be found in Appendix II, such as where lexical and morphosyntactic factors are combined.


\(^\text{15}\) Often, G translates ἡρ as πρῶλ (18), ἦς as σήμερον (15), or Ἣπι as ἐξω (7); for other cases (10), see 2:23; 18:32; 19:34; 24:11; 29:35; 34:25; 41:32; 43:10; 46:30; 49:27.

Very often, when G translates a Hebrew common noun with an adjective, the Greek adjective functions as a substantive,17 or the Hebrew noun is a nomen rectum (e.g., נכר in 17:12) modifying its nomen regens like an adjective.18

5.1.1.2 Verbs. Verbs are the second most frequent part of speech in Genesis (5,132). G rarely translates verbs with quantitative inequivalence, involving omission (51) (1.0%),19 synthetic translation (41) (0.8%),20 or expansive translation (58) (1.1%).21 When G maintains quantitative equivalence (4,982) (97.1%), however, he nearly always uses a verb

---

17 KG II §§403–405; Smyth §§1021–1029; SSG §23f.
18 IBHS §9.5.3; Joüon §§129d–h. Of course, the Greek genitive—by analogy to which the Hebrew construct relationship is termed “genitive”—also has this function: KG II §414; Smyth §§1290–1338; SSG §§41–42. For an overview of the adnominal Greek genitive in G, see Takamitsu Muraoka, “The Logico-Semantic Analysis of the Genitive Relationship in the LXX Greek (Gen 1–25),” in Die Septuaginta — Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 313–321.
19 Most often, omission occurs with רָאָה in speech formulae (7) (see §3.1.7.5), רוּחַ in temporal frames (6) (see §3.1.7.6), and infinitives absolute (6) (see §3.1.7.4). For all other cases (32), see §3.1.8: 2:10; 3:20; 8:5; 23:11, 13; 24:10, 32; 26:13; 29:17; 31:10, 21; 33:12; 34:10; 35:8, 10, 21; 37:5+, 10; 39:20, 22+; 41:5, 12, 45, 56; 45:17, 19; 46:28; 47:24; 49:29; 50:18.
20 At times, G translates a verb synthetically due to using a Greek compound (9) (see §3.3.2.3) or rendering נָעַר as ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπλησίν (5) (see §3.3.3.1). For other cases (27), see especially §3.3.3.4: 4:6, 17, 21; 6:6; 8:7+; 16:13; 18:5, 12; 19:14; 21:20; 24:62; 27:5; 30:2; 31:21, 35; 32:7, 13, 24; 35:17; 38:23; 43:23; 44:21, 28+; 46:32; 49:24.
21 Expansive translation typically involves G’s use of a verbal periphrastic construction in Greek (43) (see §3.4.4). For other cases of expansive translation (15), see especially §3.4.5: 4:15; 16:4, 5; 25:21; 26:22; 30:41; 32:10; 34:25; 37:35; 38:18; 39:8; 41:15, 49; 48:19; 49:25.
(4,835), and rarely a noun (80)\(^{22}\) (4:2; 3:4), adjective (38)\(^{23}\) (9:25; 24:1), adverb (22)\(^{24}\) (37:13), or other part of speech (7).\(^{25}\)

| 4:2 | רוח נבשך צאן ... | καὶ ἔγενετο Ἀβέλ πομήν προβάτων ... |
| 3:4 | ιμερον θύτην οὐκ ἀπέστειλεν ... | καὶ ἐλήπν ἄφις τῇ γυναικὶ Ὅῳ διανάτῳ ἀποβανεῖσθε: |
| 9:25 | Ἐπικατάρατος Χανάν ... | οὐδὲ οὖσαν ἡγεῖται οὐκ ἀποστέλλω σε πρὸς αὐτοὺς |
| 24:1 | ... ὅ λαβαίμ ἦν προσβότερος προβεβηκὼς ἥμερῶν ... | Καὶ Λβράαμ ἦν προσβότερος προβεβηκὼς ἥμερῶν, ... |
| 37:13 | ... δεῦρο ἀποστεῖλω σε πρὸς αὐτοὺς | לָבַת אַשְׁמַַח אֶלִים |

Typically, when G uses a noun (4:2) or adjective (9:25; 24:1), the Hebrew verb is a participle, which may be used both substantively and adjectively.\(^{26}\)

**5.1.1.3 Proper nouns.** Hebrew proper nouns do not occur as frequently in Genesis as common nouns and verbs (2,773). Generally, G does not translate proper nouns in ways that involve quantitative inequivalence: omission (10) (0.4%)\(^{27}\), synthetic translation (16)

---

\(^{22}\) Most often, the verb is (i) a participle (46): ἡνίοχος = πομήν (10); νεκρός = νεκρός (8); διάφω = κατάσκοπος (6); other verbs (22: 1; 21, 29; 4:9, 22; 7:8; 21:16; 23:16; 24:2; 31:26, 39+, [33:14]; 35:17; 37:28; 38:28; 39:20; 45:8; 49:15, 17; 50:2+, 11) (see §6.1.1.6); (ii) an infinitive absolute (16: 2116, 17; 3:4; 17:13; 26:11; 31:15, 30; 37:33; 40:15; 43:3; 44:5, 15; 46:4; 50:15, [24], 25) (see §6.1.1.8); or (iii) an infinitive construct (15): ἀρνηθή = εἰς ὄνειρον (10); other verbs (5: [1:14]; 14:17; 15:12; 35:16; 40:20) (see §6.1.1.7). Also see 15:17; 19:9; 40:10.

\(^{23}\) Most often, the verb is a participle (27): ἐπικατάρατος (6); διάφω = εὐλογητός (6); ἡνίοχος = διάφω = ἡνίοχος (4) or σποδοεύθης (30:39); other verbs (10: 2:9; 3:6; 23:16; 24:60; 28:17; 30:42; 32:8; 41:32, 33, 39) (see §6.1.1.6). For other cases (11), see 15:10; 18:12, 20; 19:31; 24:1, 19; 28:22; 32:28; 34:7; 49:15, 27.

\(^{24}\) A number of instances involve the verbs ῶλα and ἐναντιοῦ translated as δεῦρο or δεῦτε (8); for other cases (14), see 4:7+; 8:10, [12]; 21:16; 26:18; 27:20; 30:16, 31; 31:26, 28; 32:12; 35:17; 48:14.

\(^{25}\) A few cases involve G translating ἀρνηθή as the fossilized imperative ἵδού (4: 27:27; [31:44]; 41:41; 48:11), which is etymologically a verb; for the other cases (3), see 18:30, 32; 24:63.

\(^{26}\) *IBHS* §§37.2, 4; Joion §121. Greek participles also have these functions (KG II §480; Smyth §2049–2053; *SSG* §§31b–c).

\(^{27}\) 23:1; 27:46; 35:10, 21; 41:33, 45+, 56; 42:1; 48:14. Cf. §3.1.8.
When G maintains quantitative equivalence in translating a Hebrew proper noun into Greek (2,643) (95.3%), however, he typically uses a proper noun (2,449) or a common noun (171) (2:8; 41:1), only rarely using an adjective (12) (50:13; 14:3) or a personal pronoun (11) (28:3; 7:9).

While G may use a pronoun as a substitute for a proper noun (7:9),他 often chooses to use a common noun (2:8) or adjective (50:13; 14:3) either because he did not interpret the Hebrew form as a proper noun or because he wished to represent the proper noun’s sense more than its reference (see §5.2.2.1).

---

28 Most cases involve divine names that may reflect textual variants (10) (see §3.3.3.2). For other cases (6), see especially §3.3.3.4: 12:8; 13:3; 19:4, 38; 28:19; 44:18.

29 Typically, this involves inadequate tokenization of the Hebrew text, as in the case of proper nouns with the directional- suffix (42) (see §§3.4.1.1; 4.1.3), compound proper nouns tokenized as a unit (30) (see §3.4.1.2), and analytic translation (5) (see §3.4.1.3). In a number of other cases a textual variant is likely involved (16) (see §3.4.2). For all other cases (11), see §3.4.5: 14:5; 16:14; 24:62; 25:11; 41:45; 50; 45:10; 46:20, 28, 29, 34.

30 The bulk of these cases involve the divine name translated as (117) or (24); for other nouns (30), see 2:13; 3:23, 24; 5:1; 11:9, 28, 31; 13:3; 14:1, 5+, 9, 13; 15:7; 20:1; 24:62; 26:20, 21, 22, 33; 31:49; 32:2; 41:1, 2, 3+, 17, 18, [19]; 48:7.

31 G regularly translates vb as and vb as vb (6) and vb as vb (3). See also 12:6; 22:2; 49:25.

32 G regularly translates with (3) or (2), cf. (49:25 in note 31). The other cases involve personal names translated by (6: 7:9; 14:5; 25:6; 47:10; 48:10, 15).

33 Yet, G’s use of the pronoun to represent Ιωσήφ in 48:15 shifts the reference from Joseph to his sons.
5.1.1.4 Adjectives. Compared to other major types of Hebrew content words, adjectives are the least common in Genesis (652). Typically, G does not break with quantitative equivalence in translating Hebrew adjectives by omission (8) (1.2%), synthetic translation (29) (4.4%), or expansive translation (5) (0.8%). When G maintains quantitative equivalence (610) (93.6%), however, he typically uses a Greek adjective (318) or demonstrative pronoun (227) (38:23), less often a verb (34) (1:24; 43:7), noun (19) (10:8; 38:21), or other part of speech (12).40

When G uses a verb for a Hebrew adjective, he often inflects it as a participle when the adjective functions as an attributive adjective (1:24)41 and as a finite form when the adjective

---

40 For these omissions (8), see especially §3.1.8: 2:23; 7:11; 18:13; 27:46; 31:24, 29; 43:10; [44:4].
41 Synthetic translation is most common with the compound adverbials ןֲבָנִי (3), הָיָה (3), and מִרְחָק (2) (see §3.3.1.3) and when G uses the compound הֲרֵיסָּלֵי for שֶׁמוֹשָׁם (5) (see §3.3.2.3). For other cases (16), see especially §3.3.3.4: 12:11; 16:6, 8; 18:14; 19:8; 20:15; 31:29; [34:10], 21; 39:9, 11, 19; 41:4, 38; 45:10; 50:20.
42 For these rare expansive translations (5), see especially §3.4.5: 13:2; 16:11; 38:24, 25; 42:21.
43 WHM considers forms like יָרֵד and יָרֵדָה adjectives, but they have nominal functions (IBHS §17.1; Jošn §36).
44 Most often, the adjective is יָרֵד (20): as a participle of יָרֵד (13: 1:20, 24; 2:7, 19; 3:20; 8:21; 9:10, 12, 15, 16; [21:19]; 25:6; 26:19); as a finite form of יָרֵד (7: 43:7, 27, 28; 45:3, 26, 28; 46:30). Also common are יָרֵד translated by ἐνεχθείω (4) and θύτη λα ὅρεω (3). For other cases (7), see 6:5; 15:16; 25:29, 30; 27:21, 24; 37:35.
45 Most frequent are יָרֵד translated as γίγας (4) and πορνή (3). For other cases (12), see 1:21, 30; 6:19; 8:11; 13:4; 25:8, 30; 34:27; 40:1, 5; 42:6; 49:24.
47 IBHS §14.3.1; Jošn §121.
functions predicatively in a verbless clause (43:7). Similarly, when he uses a noun for a Hebrew adjective, the adjective often functions as a substantive (10:8; 38:21).

5.1.2 Function words

5.1.2.1 Conjunctions. Of Hebrew function words, conjunctions are the most common in Genesis (4,773). Although G omits conjunctions with some regularity (510) (10.7%), he does not usually translate them synthetically (39) (0.8%) or expansively (17) (0.4%). When G maintains quantitative equivalence (4,207) (88.1%), however, he virtually always

---

42 IBHS §14.3.2; Joüon §154. Cf. §6.1.1.6. By translating a predicative adjective as a finite verb, G avoids using a Greek verbless clause while maintaining quantitative equivalence. For G’s selective avoidance of verbless clauses in relation to quantitative equivalence, see §3.2.2.

43 IBHS §14.3.3; Joüon §§86–87.

44 For most omissions (483), see §3.1.2. For others (27), see especially §3.1.8: 2:10; 19:9; 20:5; 24:10; 30:28; 31:21; 33:12; 35:8, 10, 21; 37:5, 10; 41:5, 44, 45, 56; 42:2; 45:23+; 46:28, 31; 47:19, 24; 48:14; 49:29; 50:18+.

45 Typically, synthetic translations involve Hebrew compound conjunctions (17) (see §3.3.1.2) or G’s use of xάγω (5) (see §3.3.2.2) or another Greek compound (8) (see §3.3.2.3). For other cases (9), see especially §3.3.3.4: 6:3; 8:7; 16:13; 18:23; 24:49; 26:9; 27:36; 28:19; 34:12.

46 With two exceptions, expansive translation occurs when G uses multiple Greek function words in combination (15) (see §3.4.3). For both exceptions (22:17; 42:16), see §3.4.5.
uses a conjunction (4,130), rarely an adverb (33)\(^{47}\) (10:21; 21:23), relative pronoun (19)\(^{48}\) (25:1; 26:13), particle (12)\(^{49}\) (27:34), preposition (8)\(^{50}\) (11:4), or other part of speech (5).\(^{51}\)

Often, G uses adverbial ָּאָ for adverbial הָּ(10:21; cf. 27:34)\(^{52}\) and relative pronouns especially for disjunctive-1 introducing a parenthetical statement (25:1) (see §4.1.1).

5.1.2.2 Prepositions. Hebrew prepositions are also very common in Genesis (4,180), and more often than other parts of speech, G frequently renders them with quantitative inequivalence, especially omission (1,104) (26.4%).\(^{53}\) but also synthetic translation (503)


\(^{49}\) 18:13; 20:11; [24:14], 19, 41, 55; 27:34, 38; 34:26, 28, [29]; 49:10.

\(^{50}\) G sometimes uses a preposition for a conjunction when the preposition governs an articular infinitive (3: 11:4; 27:1; 42:16) or a relative pronoun (2: 22:18; 26:5). For other cases (3), see 24:18; 27:45; 46:4.

\(^{51}\) 3:1; 24:15; 33; 45; 43:11.

\(^{52}\) IBHS §16.3.5b; Joüon §146; HALOT, s.v. “אכ,” 2–6. For adverbial ָּא, see KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891.

\(^{53}\) Omission occurs very often when G translates the preposition’s object as a bare noun (798) (see §3.1.1.1)—note that הָּ (DDOM) is treated separately here (see §5.1.2.5)—as a verb (246) (see §3.1.1.2), or as an adverb (13) (see §3.1.1.3), but also when he omits לָּלֵ (7) (see §3.1.7.2), other prepositional phrases that are either resumptive (6) (see §3.1.7.1) or redundant (3) (see §3.1.7.3), and the speech formula מָּרַ (4) (see
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(12.0%)\(^54\) and expansive translation (67) (1.6%).\(^55\) When G maintains quantitative equivalence (2,506) (60.0%), however, he typically uses a preposition (1,839) or the definite article (496) (10:21), less often using a conjunction (129)\(^56\) (9:3; 34:7; 16:16), adverb (14)\(^57\) (4:15), relative pronoun (12)\(^58\) (5:1), or other part of speech (16).\(^59\)

\(^{54}\) Synthetic translation most often involves prepositions in Hebrew compound prepositions (329) (see §3.3.1.1), conjunctions (54) (see §3.3.1.2), or adverbial expressions (43) (see §3.3.1.3), or in the forms τα (8) or ινα (2) (see §3.3.3.1). For most other cases (67), see §§3.3.3.4: 4; 6, 7; 6, 7; 22; 8; 21; 11; 30; 12; 18; 13; 13; 15; 13; 16; 6; 8; 18; 11, 12; 19; 12; 12; 12; 24, 27; 25; 28; 26; 26; 27; 25; 45; 39; 40; 30; 15; 31; 29; 35; 32; 27, 13, 16, 17; 34; 39; 37; 23, 25; 39; 11, 19; 41; 16, 19, 38, 38; 17, 28; 32; 6, 3, 22; 7, 22; 31; 46; 41; 16, 18, 19, 21, 28; 45; 10; 46; 29; 47; 8; 48; 7; 49; 13, 22.

\(^{55}\) Expansive translation almost exclusively involves G’s translation of ἡμᾶς as ἀνά μῦσον (59) (see §3.4.3). For other cases (8), see §§3.4.1.3; 3.4.3: 19; 21; 26; 23; 13; 29; 30; 38; 43; 3, 5; 49.

\(^{56}\) Most often, this involves one of the inseparable prepositions ἐν, ἐπί, or ἐπί that are being translated (i) as ὑπό (45): (44: 35; 22; 9; 3; 10; 9; 13; 10; 16; 18; 23; 25; 19; 31; 22; 17; 26; 26; 12; 33; 10; 34; 7; 15; 16; 38; 31 (ὑπὲρ), 29; 39; 13; [18]; 19; 41; 49; 42; 30; 44; 10; 48; 5; 20; [49]; 9; 50; 20; (ii) as ἐνα, always ἐν (20: 4; 6; 6; 19; 12; 19; 24; 31; 25; 22; 32; 27; 46; 29; 25; 31; 26; 30; 32; 5; 30; 33; 8; 15; 42; 1; [44]; 7; 47; 15; 50; 20); (iii) as ἐπει (11): ἐπεί (10: 24; 12; 4; 25; 20; 26; 33; 18; 34; 25; 35; 9; 36; 24; 41; 46; 42; 21); (iv) as ἐπες, always ἐπες (8: 115; 17; 9; 15; 15; 23; 38; 42; 30; 45; 27;); or (vi) τῷ translated as ἑως (12: 3; 19; 24; 14; 18; 33; 29; 8; 33; 3; 34; 5; 38; 11; 17; 39; 16; 43; 25; 49; 10). For other cases (17), see 16; 6; 13; 7; 2; 23; 8; 17; 10; 19; 23; 18; 29; 19; 31; 29; 37; 22; 38; 26; 41; 39; 44; 30; 46; 30; 47; 18; 49; 12; 50; 15.

\(^{57}\) Most often, this involves temporal expressions like εἰρήν: (6: 2; 17; 5; 1; 2; 21; 8; 47; 9) or the expression ἐν translated as εἰρήν: (3: 18; 5; 19; 8; 38; 26). For other cases (3), see 19; 31; 32; 13; 44; 1.

\(^{58}\) 12; 6; 19; 28; 21; 16; 25; 5; 25; 33; 12; 4; 34; 14; 31; 37; 24; 39; 9; 41; 23; 45; 11; 49; 16, 26+.
When G translates a Hebrew preposition as a Greek conjunction, it is often comparative ὡς,\(^{60}\) for which G uses ὡς (9:3),\(^{61}\) or the preposition is prefixed to an infinitive construct and introduces a subordinate clause (34:7; 16:16).\(^{62}\)

### 5.1.2.3 Pronominal suffix.\(^{63}\) Also very common in Genesis are Hebrew pronominal suffixes (3,468). With some regularity, G breaks with quantitative equivalence by omitting pronominal suffixes (298) (8.6%),\(^{64}\) but he does not often translate them synthetically (80)

---

\(^{60}\) IBHS §11.2.9; Joüon §§133g–h.

\(^{61}\) The Greek conjunction ὡς nearly functions as an accusative preposition in Greek, since comparative clauses are often elliptical (KG II §581.3; Smyth §§2464–2465; SSG §26n).

\(^{62}\) IBHS §§36.2.2–3; Joüon §§124k–l. Cf. §6.1.1.7.

\(^{63}\) For most cases (246), see §3.1.3. For minor cases involving the omission of לְ (7) or other prepositional phrases that are resumptive (7) or redundant (7), see §§3.1.7.1–3. For the remaining cases (31), see §3.1.8: 14:24; 21:16; 23:11; 26:8; 28:6, 9; 29:6; 31:53; [32:1]; 33:1, 5, 20; 34:12; 35:10+; 37:5, 9; 41:12+, 44; 43:21; 44:18; 45:3; 46:7, 31; 47:24; 48:1, 7; 49:29; 50:14, 18.
(2.3%) \textsuperscript{64} or expansively (19:35). \textsuperscript{65} When G maintains quantitative equivalence (3,089) (89.1%), however, he typically uses some type of pronoun (2,928)—either a personal pronoun (2,856), a reflexive pronoun (57) \textsuperscript{66} (36:2), a demonstrative pronoun (14) \textsuperscript{67} (6:21), or a relative pronoun (3:19)—or the definite article (128) \textsuperscript{68} (29:1). Only rarely does he use a pronominal adjective (19) \textsuperscript{69} (35:10), proper noun (8) \textsuperscript{70} (37:36), or other part of speech (6). \textsuperscript{71}

\begin{table}[H]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{36:2} & "Ush le-khat ha-neshi..."
\hline
\textbf{6:21} & "... kai eiste soi kai exainas fagein."
\hline
\textbf{3:19} & "Ewos tov apostrebein se eis tin gin, ex ek elhimphes."
\hline
\textbf{29:1} & "Kai epharos Iakowb tov tov podoas epeireuth eis gin anatolon."
\hline
\textbf{35:10} & "Eipen de Iakowb Ei eurhka harin enantion sou, dezi tae dpura dia twn exwv xeiropen."
\hline
\textbf{37:36} & "Oi de Madhymaioi apedonoto ton Ioseph eis Aigupton tao Petetre tao spadonti Faraxo, arximageiro."
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{64} Roughly one-third (28) of the cases of synthetic translation involve the handbook of idioms described in §3.3.3.1. For other cases (52), see especially §3.3.3.4: 4:6; 6:6; 7:22; 8:21; 11:28; 30; 13:3; 15:2; 10+, 13; 16:5, 6; 17:8; 18:5, 12; 19:8, 12, 17; 20:15; 21:27, 31; 22:8; 24:7, 44, 47; 25:28; 26:32; 30:15; 31:11, 21; 32:7, 13; 34:9; 39:9; 40:5; 41:16, 17, 56; 42:16, 28; 43:23, 29; 44:10, 18, 21; 46:2, 29; 47:9+; 49:13; 50:17.

\textsuperscript{65} This anomalous case is interesting, in that G has translated a pronominal suffix with an entire noun phrase, harmonizing this phrase in Greek with the parallel expression in 19:33. Since the Hebrew text has two different prepositions (nôfar in 19:33 and 'al in 19:35), this harmonization is more likely due to G.


\textsuperscript{67} 6:21; 19:9; 24:14+, [44]; 26:21; 38:10; 41:3; 13, 30; 42:36; 44:30; 48:6+.

\textsuperscript{68} Cf. §4.1.2.1. Note, this count includes the single instance of the vocative particle δ (27:20).

\textsuperscript{69} Most often it is the first-person and second-person pronominal adjectives ἐσμός (10; 22:18; 24:41; 26:5; [31:31], 43; 33:10; 37:7+; 47:5; 49:29) and το (6: 14:23; 20:7; 21:13; 30:27; 31:32; 33:9). For other cases (3), see 1:26; 9:5; 47:18. This usually involves a transposition (see §4.1.2.2).


\textsuperscript{71} [2:24]; 3:9; 6:15; 44:16; 47:1; 50:11.
The Greek definite article is an idiomatic alternative to a genitive pronoun or a pronominal adjective (29:1), and G uses reflexive pronouns (36:2) and pronominal adjectives (35:10), in part, due to matters of Greek grammar and style, since Hebrew does not have pronouns of these specific types.  

5.1.2.4 Article. The Hebrew article represented by the consonant ה occurs 1,589 times in Genesis. G breaks with quantitative equivalence by omitting the article with some regularity (241) (15.2%), but he does not usually translate it synthetically (42) (2.6%) and never expansively. When G maintains quantitative equivalence in translating the Hebrew article (1,306) (82.2%), however, he almost exclusively uses the Greek article (1,301), exceptionally using a relative pronoun (2: 19:15; 32:33), indefinite pronoun (39:11) or preposition (2: 20:1; 38:20).

72 This point has been discussed in §3.1.3.2 and §4.1.2.1.
73 *IBHS* §16.4g; Joüon §146k; KG I §§168; 170; Smyth §§329–330; *SSG* §§8; 11. Often a *niphal* or *hithpael* verb is used to express a reflexive (or middle) idea in Hebrew (*IBHS* §§23; 26; Joüon 51c; 53i). Cf. §6.1.2.3.
74 For most omissions of the Hebrew article (235), see §3.1.4; for the other cases (6), see §3.1.8: 6:16; 20:10; 27:16; 41:56; 43:17; 48:14.
75 Synthetic translation typically involves the Hebrew article on the nomen rectum of a construct chain (34), often where G has a Greek compound (23: 37:36; 39:1, 21, 22, 23; 40:2+, 3, 4, 9, 16, 20+, 21, 22, 23; [41:7], 9, 10+, 12, [24], 27) (see §3.3.2.3), but also in other cases involving construct chains (11: 3:8; 18:1, 8; 32:24; 37:19; 39:20+, 22; 40:3, 5; 41:4). For other cases (8), see mainly §3.3.3.4: 12:8; 13:3; 16:6; 21:6; 26:8; 32:13; 39:19; 50:20.)
Where G uses the Greek relative pronoun (19:15; 32:32), he has analyzed the Hebrew according to the relative use of the participle.76

5.1.2.5 DDOM. The Hebrew definite direct object marker ב (1,033) could be grouped with the prepositions on morphosyntactic grounds, but it is often considered as having its own part of speech.77 G often omits ב (489) (47.3%)78 and renders it synthetically once (31:21), but never expansively. When G maintains quantitative equivalence (543) (52.6%), however, he chiefly uses the Greek article (525), most often in the accusative (425) (19:10), only rarely translating ב with a preposition (13)79 (34:2) or another part of speech (5).80

76 IBHS §37.5; Joüon §§121; 145e. Cf. §6.1.1.6. Note, G read נָשֶׁה in 32:32 as a verb and not a noun.
77 IBHS §10.3; Joüon §§125e–j. This judgment is due to its restricted usage and diachronic analysis.
78 Most omissions of ב have been discussed in §3.1.1.1. For other cases (16), see especially §3.1.8: 21:16; 28:6; 30:20; 33:5; 35:10; 37:5, 14, 18, 23, 24; 39:20; 41:12, 44; 43:21; 45:4; 49:29.
80 1:30; 22:6; 34:28; 37:14; 39:22. The few cases involving καὶ may reflect a Vorlage that read ב, but ב and καὶ have been matched since 1 has only been reconstructed in V with the support of SP (see §2.2.1.3).
When G uses a preposition to translate אֶת, it is usually due to the fact that he has selected a Greek verb that does not take a direct object, such as the passive deponent κοιμάομαι (34:2), although it is also possible that G took אֶת as [PREP] instead of אֶת (DDOM).

5.1.2.6 **Relative particle.** The Hebrew relative particle רֶשׁ occurs 422 times in Genesis (including רֶשׁ in 6:3). G typically does not translate רֶשׁ in a way that involves quantitative inequivalence, whether omission (14) (3.3%), 81 synthetic translation (52) (12.3%), 82 or expansive translation (30:18). 83 When G maintains quantitative equivalence in translating the Hebrew relative particle רֶשׁ (355) (84.1%), however, he typically uses the Greek relative pronouns ὁς (221) and ὁσος (33) or the relative adverbs οὗ (14) and ὁθεν (2), not infrequently using the Greek article (66) 84 (1:7; 36:31), but rarely a conjunction (13) 85 (24:3) or other part of speech (6). 86

---

81 For all but one omission (13), see §3.1.5.3. For the case in 47:5, see §3.1.8.
82 Usually, synthetic translation involves רֶשׁ as part of a compound conjunction (48) (see §3.3.1.2). For all other cases (4), see §3.3.3.4: 6:3; 19:12; 41:56; 44:15.
83 In this anomalous case, G takes רֶשׁ causally, translating it as ἀνθ' οὗ (IBHS §38.4; Joüon §170e).
84 Generally, G translates רֶשׁ with the Greek article in order to avoid using a verbless relative clause in Greek (53: 1:7; 6:4; 7:2; [3], 8, 23; 13:1; 14:5, 17, 23; 19:11; 20:7, 16; 22:17; 23:9, 11; 24:2, 32, 54; 25:5; 31:1+, [18], 21, [31]; 32:7, 23; 33:9, 14, 15; 35:2+, 4+, 5; 37:22, 23; 38:18; 39:5; 40:5; 41:43, 48; 43:16, 19; 44:1, 4; 45:11; 46:1, 32; 47:1, 24; 49:30, 32), but on occasion because he translates the relative clause's verb as a participle (7: 9:2; 14:24; 15:7; 19:5; 24:15; 36:31; 46:27). For other cases (6), see 7:8; 24:52; 29:8; 33:14; 39:9, 23.
Often, when G uses the Greek article for אֱלֹהִים, it is a way of avoiding a verbless relative clause in Greek, as in 1:7, where G has previously supplied θεὸς for the same purpose. Or, he may use the article because he translates the following verb as a participle (36:31).

5.1.2.7 Personal pronouns. In comparison to pronominal suffixes, independent personal pronouns are used much less in Genesis (403). G typically does not translate Hebrew personal pronouns in a way that involves quantitative inequivalence, but omission (25) (6.2%) is more common than synthetic translation (6) (1.5%), and G never translates them expansively. When G maintains quantitative equivalence (372) (92.3%), however, he uses either a pronoun (278)—a personal pronoun (202), demonstrative pronoun (75) (36:43), or relative pronoun (35:6)—or a copular verb (94) (34:1).
When G uses εἰμί or γίνομαι, the Hebrew personal pronoun is typically a copula (34:1).91

5.2 Lexical Equivalence

Consistency and adequacy are the two main aspects of lexical equivalence that I use in this chapter to evaluate G’s representation of the meanings of Hebrew words in Greek. While consistency is an inherently statistical criterion, adequacy is inevitably subjective. Yet, even though this section relies mainly on statistics to assess G’s lexical consistency and on more detailed consideration of examples to gauge the adequacy of his lexical choices, I will show that the quantification of consistency is not a straightforward task,92 and the “objective” numbers it produces not only must be interpreted with caution but also have direct implications for the more “subjective” arena of adequacy.93 Although it is a survey, this section will show that a number of profitable generalizations may be drawn from a broad consideration of lexical consistency and lexical adequacy.

5.2.1 Consistency

Lexical consistency may be defined as the extent to which a translator represents a given source lemma with a single target lemma in translation. According to this definition,

91 IBHS §16.3.3; Joōon §§154i–j.
92 Cf. the negative evaluation of lexical consistency as a tool for determining whether one or more translators worked on a particular literary unit in Martha Lynn Wade, Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek, SCS 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 105–106.
93 Tov maintains that “linguistic adequacy of lexical choices” cannot be measured as a dimension of literalism, “because of its subjective nature” (Text-Critical Use, 25). While Tov has a valid point, this section will demonstrate that it is not entirely true that nothing can profitably be learned about adequacy from a statistical evaluation of lexical equivalences.
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if G always translates a Hebrew lemma with the same Greek lemma, the equivalence is lexically consistent. While this seems straightforward, lexical consistency actually turns out to be a slippery concept, as it can be constructed with additional facets, such as double consistency (§5.2.1.2), near consistency (§5.2.1.3), and root consistency (§5.2.1.4), each of which elucidates different aspects of G’s lexical consistency.

5.2.1.1 Summary statistics Even though I will problematize the standards of consistency used for quantification in the following sections, a statistical analysis of G’s lexical consistency simply defined is a fine point of entry point into understanding his approach to representing lexical items in his source text. My analysis only takes into consideration the four classes of content words discussed in the preceding section on parts of speech, since function words do not have the same degree of stable lexical meaning that content words have. These content words are divided by part of speech, as different word classes exhibit different patterns of lexical consistency. For each part of speech, I have categorized every Hebrew lemma into one of four groups based upon G’s degree of lexical consistency in translating that lemma: (i) hapaxlegomena;94 (ii) consistent Greek equivalent;95 (iii) main

----

94 Hapaxlegomena are separated out, because G’s translation of a lemma that only occurs once in Genesis cannot be said to be consistent or inconsistent. Since the Hebrew lemmas in each group are counted both by types and by tokens (see below), frequency buckets are unnecessary. Cf. Benjamin Wright’s grouping of nouns and verbs by frequency (1–4; 5–9; 10+) (No Small Difference, 106–108). Nevertheless, the concept of consistency is more meaningful from a statistical point of view with a Hebrew lemma’s increasing frequency.

95 Hebrew lemmas have not been excluded from this group due to omission (see §3.1) or synthetic translation (see §3.3), as these topics have been discussed separately, and their exclusion would misrepresent G’s consistency. Yet, this does not affect the classification of very many lemmas. For lemmas in this group that are omitted at least once (11), see proper nouns (2: שׁוֹרָה, רֱבֶּרֶך, אֲלֵי); common nouns (8: כֻּתֹנֶת, קול, רָעָב, תֵׁבָה); adjectives (none); and verbs (רָהַד). For lemmas in this group that are translated synthetically with

194
Greek equivalent (but not consistent); 96 and (iv) no main Greek equivalent. The lemmas in each group may be counted in two different ways: Table 12 counts them as types (i.e., each lemma counts as one), and Table 13 as tokens (i.e., each occurrence of each lemma counts as one). Both means of counting are necessary, since common and rare lemmas skew the counts variously up and down. For each combination of part of speech and consistency group, three figures are given in Tables 12 and 13: first, a count; second, the ratio of that count to the total; third, the ratio of that count to the total with hapaxlegomena excluded.

96 Inevitably, judging whether a Hebrew lemma belongs in this group or the next involves a certain degree of subjectivity, although the decision is often clear, the simplest case being a common Hebrew lemma translated consistently except for one occurrence. The most relevant details factoring into this judgment are: (i) the frequency of the Hebrew lemma; (ii) the ratio of the frequency of the main equivalence to the Hebrew lemma’s frequency; (iii) the number of Greek equivalents for the Hebrew lemma and the ratio of the frequency of those equivalences to the Hebrew lemma’s frequency; and (iv) whether some Greek equivalents share a common root. Factors (i) – (iii) are usefully combined in a statistical calculation, i.e., the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI), a common measure of market concentration, or the degree of competition/monopoly in a market. The index is calculated by summing the squares of the “market share” of each Greek equivalent for a given Hebrew lemma, which yields a positive index less than or equal to 1, where 1 represents perfect consistency. The formula for calculating the HHI for any given Hebrew lemma can be expressed mathematically as:

$$HHI = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{G_i}{H} \right)^2$$

where $H = \text{the total frequency of the Hebrew lemma}$, $G_i = \text{the total frequency of each Greek equivalent (i) as a translation for H}$, and $n = \text{the total number of Greek equivalents}$.


other Hebrew tokens at least once (16), see proper nouns (ץ, יא); common nouns (10: אֹדוֹת, אֵל, יָלִיד, נְּשָׁמָה; עֵֽבֶר, עָרְלָה, קָדִים, רְּעָבון); adjectives (3: קָרְבּ, רָחָב, רָחוק); and verbs (2: נַחֲה, שֶׁנֵּף).
Several generalizations may be drawn from the data presented in Tables 12 and 13. First, there is a gradient of decreasing consistency as one moves across the tables from left to right: G is most consistent in translating proper nouns and least consistent in translating verbs, while his treatment of common nouns and adjectives falls in the middle. This is indicated both by the decrease in percentage of consistently translated lemmas and by the increase in percentage of lemmas with no main equivalent as one moves from proper nouns to verbs.

G’s high degree of lexical consistency with proper nouns relates to the primacy of their referential meaning (see §5.2.2.1), while the greater extent of variation with other types of content words is largely to be explained (i) by the fact that words may have different senses.

---

97 The four demonstrative adjectives, הָלוֹם, הָלוֹם, הָלוֹם, and הָלוֹם, which are tagged as adjectives in WHM, have been excluded because of their high frequency and status as function words. Their inclusion misrepresents the data.
in different contexts and (ii) by the fact that Hebrew and Greek lemmas often do not share all senses in common, even those pairs that largely overlap in meaning. Yet, some words are readily translatable, such as words for concrete physical objects (e.g., “table”), natural entities (e.g., “sky”) and body parts (e.g., “hand”), universal human activities (e.g., “eat”), and relatively transcultural concepts (e.g., “big”) or institutions (e.g., “city/village”). Such words are often substantives, which helps explain G’s greater degree of consistency with nouns and adjectives than verbs, but certain morphological factors also play an important role in this greater variation, such as the system of Hebrew stems (see §5.2.2.3) or Greek verbal prefixes (see §5.2.2.5).

Second, there are very many different proper nouns in Genesis (442 types), and many of these are hapaxlegomena (219), especially when this number is compared to the total number of proper noun types (49.5%), as this ratio is higher for proper nouns than for the other three parts of speech. This is due to the prominence of genealogies in Genesis, where many of the proper noun tokens (636/2,773) and the majority of the proper noun hapaxlegomena (149/219) occur. Third and related, a comparison of the ratios of the count of tokens to the count of types for each part of speech reveals that the average verb

---

98 Guillou notes a similar disparity between HHI scores (see note 96) for novels in an aligned English-French bilingual corpus, considering translations in both directions. She also observes that commonly occurring verbs are rendered slightly more consistently than rarely occurring verbs, since the latter have more restricted usage (“Lexical Consistency,” 13–14, 16–17). Staffan Olofsson makes a similar point by comparing the consistency of Septuagint translators in rendering pronouns in contrast to verbs, which are “more complicated to render with a stereotype equivalent” (“Consistency,” 20).

99 This includes the following genealogies (counts of hapaxlegomena given in square brackets): Gen 5 (53 [0]); 10 (127 [48]); 11:10–32 (76 [1]); 25:1–4 (25 [11]); 25:12–18 (25 [10]); 36 (207 [34]); 46:8–27 (123 [45]).
(11 : 1) and common noun (10 : 1) have a higher frequency than the average proper noun (6 : 1) and adjective (5 : 1). Such discrepancies between different parts of speech suggest caution is required in the comparative interpretation of the raw statistics for each word class (or of these figures with similar ones from other Septuagintal corpora), and, while the numbers reported here offer a general impression, I will note additional trends in the following sections. Ideally, each lemma would be treated separately and then in comparison to related lemmas and other lemmas from the same semantic domain, along with all of the Greek equivalents for each and the other Hebrew lemmas they are used to translate. Such detailed investigation requires much time and effort, and it is difficult to summarize. It is for this reason that I give the lexical equivalences for every Hebrew content word in Appendix II, listed alphabetically by part of speech and consistency grouping, along with a great deal of information, such as frequencies within the corpus of Genesis, notes concerning quantitative equivalence, and other Hebrew lemmas for which G uses each Greek equivalent.

5.2.1.2 Double consistency One important aspect of G’s lexical consistency that is not represented by the summary statistics presented above is whether or not, in translating a Hebrew lemma consistently with the same Greek lemma, G ever uses that Greek lemma otherwise. If not, then the equivalence may be said to exhibit “double consistency,” since it involves consistency in both directions. If double consistency is considered, then G’s treatment of proper nouns is shown to be even more consistent, as a far greater percent of

100 The term “double consistency” is proposed by Staffan Olofsson along with the synonymous term “reciprocal consistency” (“Consistency,” 24–27; cf. Barr, Typology of Literalism, 311).
the proper nouns in groups (i) and (ii) exhibit double consistency, both by types (319/389) (82.0%) and by tokens (1,108/1,514) (73.2%), as seen in Table 14 below.

**Table 14. Counts of Doubly Consistent Lemmas by Part of Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Proper Nouns</th>
<th>Common Nouns</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doubly consistent</td>
<td>319 82.0%</td>
<td>261 53.5%</td>
<td>18 37.5%</td>
<td>139 58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapax. and consistent</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Doubly consistent</th>
<th>Hapax. and consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper Nouns</td>
<td>1,108 73.2%</td>
<td>1,514 56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Nouns</td>
<td>665 46.5%</td>
<td>1,430 56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>36 31.3%</td>
<td>115 41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>236 56.5%</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should further be noted that, compared to common nouns, Hebrew verbs and adjectives with double consistency have low frequencies. For example, only one adjective and two verbs with double consistency occur more than five times in Genesis, in comparison to twenty-three nouns, all listed below.

**Adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>µεν (14)</th>
<th>παράδειγμας</th>
<th>Μη (7)</th>
<th>Φυλακή</th>
<th>Μη (7)</th>
<th>Φυλακή</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גַלְּדָכָה</td>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>Μη</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Øφις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ℼ (11)</th>
<th>δικαιός</th>
<th>ℼ (12)</th>
<th>κατακλυσμός</th>
<th>ℼ (7)</th>
<th>ολοκάρπωσις</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מִשְׁמָר</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>φυλακή</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>άκροβυστία</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common nouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>µεν (10)</th>
<th>στάχυς</th>
<th>µεν (7)</th>
<th>τόξον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>מִדָּר</td>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>יָדַד</td>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>עַדֲלִית</td>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>קָדָם</td>
<td>מְבָדוֹן</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the researcher interested in uncovering G’s interpretation of his source text, it is often impossible to detect G’s intention when he translates a Hebrew lemma with double
consistency, but this does not imply that G’s translations were automatic or mechanistic in such cases. First, consistent renderings are often accurate interpretations of the Hebrew, such that G has selected the most appropriate Greek word to translate each instance of a Hebrew lemma, either because the Hebrew lemma has a single or dominant sense and is readily translatable by a corresponding Greek lemma with a very similar meaning (e.g., מים as ὑδωρ, חֵלֶק as νῦξ, and מֶלֶך as βασιλέως), or because it occurs in a single passage (e.g., שׁבֹלֶת as στάχυς in reference to Pharaoh’s dreams, מָבָל as κατακλυσμός for Noah’s flood, and רָקִיע as στερέωμα in the creation account). With some cases of double consistency, however, the equivalence is not so predictable, and G may search for a particular Greek word, in part, to signal the rarity of a Hebrew lemma:

Here, G has interpreted the hapaxlegomena וּתֹה and וּבֹה as ἀόρατος ("invisible, unseen") and ἀκατασκεύαστος ("unfurnished") for literary and possibly even philosophical reasons.  

101 This point concerning the ambivalence of the stereotyping tendency for common nouns is made quite cogently by Kevin Youngblood, since consistency in translation may result from “the fact that the chosen equivalent is the best option in Greek” and not the fact that “the translator was intentionally pursuing lexical consistency” (“Translation Technique,” 98).

102 While the philosophical resonance of ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος (“unable to be seen and unfurnished”) cannot be ruled out, Martin Rösel's first (exegetical) explanation for this translation is likely primary, i.e. only in 1:9 is the land “seen” (ἀφήτω) and subsequently furnished (κατασκευάζω) with plants (1:11–13) and animals (1:24–27) (Übersetzung, 31–33). Wevers explains ἀόρατος on the basis of the light created in 1:3, but this fails to account for the fact that the land is still obscured by the waters (Notes, 1–2). James Aitken also thinks that stylistic considerations were in play (“The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch,” in On Stone and Scroll, ed. James Aitken, K. J. Dell, and B. A. Mastin, BZAW 420 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 507). It is interesting to consider the fact that this was surely the earliest translation puzzle that G met in his work, as Gen 1:1–2a is rather straightforward; he may have given more attention to his first real problem.
While it may be challenging or impossible to uncover G's intent with more regular pairings, his other translation choices may shed light on this problem, as with his consistent use of δίκαιος for צְדָקָה. Not only does G uses the root δικ- to translate a number of Hebrew terms (see §5.2.2.6), but he also uses other vocabulary from Greek ethics to encourage his interpretation of צְדָקָה/צְדָקָה as δίκαιος/δικαιοσύνη against this background. In the presence of other pieces of evidence, then, even G's regular translation choices can be seen to hold deeper interpretive significance.

5.2.1.3 Near consistency A second aspect of G's lexical consistency missed by the initial statistics is the number of Hebrew lemmas in group (iii) that nearly qualify to be in group (ii), i.e., Hebrew lemmas for which G is nearly consistent in translation. Any definition of near consistency is necessarily arbitrary, but let us consider Hebrew lemmas for which G uses the same Greek equivalent in at least 90 percent of its occurrences. The counts of such lemmas are given by part of speech in Table 15 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Proper Nouns</th>
<th>Common Nouns</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearly consistent</td>
<td>7 15.9%</td>
<td>30 22.4%</td>
<td>0 —</td>
<td>16 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Proper Nouns</th>
<th>Common Nouns</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearly consistent</td>
<td>701 57.2%</td>
<td>2,430 52.1%</td>
<td>0 —</td>
<td>1,053 29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103 This point is argued in reference to Noah (see §7.4.1).
104 Note, this definition necessarily excludes all lemmas with a frequency less than ten.
By this standard, G translates a significant number of Hebrew lemma types with near consistency, including proper nouns (7),\(^\text{105}\) common nouns (30),\(^\text{106}\) and verbs (16),\(^\text{107}\) but no adjectives. The counts by tokens are even more significant. Exceptions often involve a different part of speech (36:2; 32:28; 17:13) or quantitative inequivalence (15:5; 38:24).

\(^{105}\) See שׁ–––ךְ (196/198), שׁ–––ךְ (160/162), שׁ–––ךְ (139/140), שׁ–––ךְ (93/97), שׁ–––ךְ (47/48), שׁ–––ךְ (42/43), and שׁ–––ךְ (12/13). The lemmas שׁ–––ךְ, שׁ–––ךְ, שׁ–––ךְ, and שׁ–––ךְ are only disqualified from group (ii) consistent, because G uses a personal pronoun once for each name (cf. §5.1.1.3 and notes 32–33).

\(^{106}\) See שׁ–––ךְ (350/368), שׁ–––ךְ (284/315), שׁ–––ךְ (216/227), שׁ–––ךְ (209/213), שׁ–––ךְ (178/183), שׁ–––ךְ (150/152), שׁ–––ךְ (110/115), שׁ–––ךְ (102/109), שׁ–––ךְ (85/93), שׁ–––ךְ (78/82), שׁ–––ךְ (58/59), שׁ–––ךְ (47/48), שׁ–––ךְ (44/45), שׁ–––ךְ (42/44), שׁ–––ךְ (42/43), שׁ–––ךְ (41/43), שׁ–––ךְ (32/35), שׁ–––ךְ (32/29), שׁ–––ךְ (21/23), שׁ–––ךְ (18/19), שׁ–––ךְ (16/17), שׁ–––ךְ (15/16), שׁ–––ךְ (14/15), שׁ–––ךְ (13/14), שׁ–––ךְ (12/13), שׁ–––ךְ (11/12), שׁ–––ךְ (10/11), and שׁ–––ךְ (9/10). For more examples, see §5.2.2.

\(^{107}\) See שׁ–––ךְ (604/617), שׁ–––ךְ (138/153), שׁ–––ךְ (54/56), שׁ–––ךְ (52/28), שׁ–––ךְ (25/26), שׁ–––ךְ (21/22), שׁ–––ךְ (18/20), שׁ–––ךְ (18/19), שׁ–––ךְ (16/17), שׁ–––ךְ (16/17), שׁ–––ךְ (14/15), שׁ–––ךְ (14/15), שׁ–––ךְ (10/11), and שׁ–––ךְ (9/10).

\(^{108}\) Only שׁ–––ךְ are excluded from group (ii) solely due to directional-ה (cf. §§3.4.1.1; 4.1.3).
In 9:4, G properly interprets בשר as κρέας (“meat”), since the context involves eating. In the other cases, G likely felt that the Hebrew also conveyed the sense of the Greek word he chose, but his decision nevertheless relates to more substantial points of interpretation. In 6:13, G uses ἄνθρωπος (“person”) for בשר (“flesh”) in order to underscore the fault of humans (and not animals) for the worldwide flood. Then, by interpreting ברכה in a passive sense as εὐλογητός in 12:2, G takes this statement as synonymous with the verb אברך in the preceding parallel line, which is significant in light of G’s focus on the moral development of Abraham throughout his story. Finally, the translation of רצח (“kill”) as ἀπολλυμι (“destroy”) creates an intertextual link back to Abraham’s debate with God over the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen 18:16–33, where G uses ἀπολλυμι repeatedly to translate the Hebrew verb שחת (“destroy”).

5.2.1.4 Root consistency A third aspect of G’s lexical consistency that is missed by the raw statistics is the extent to which G’s various equivalents for a Hebrew lemma derive from a
common root, i.e., root consistency. This phenomenon, which applies to groups (iii) and (iv), is widespread and can only be surveyed here, but it should be noted that the lists in Appendix II group the Greek equivalents for a Hebrew lemma by root. If one takes the perspective of Greek roots instead of Greek lemmas, G translates more Hebrew lemmas consistently, several included in the cases of near consistency, but also quite a few others, including proper nouns (15), common nouns (18), adjectives (2), and verbs (26).

In order to see the statistical import of the Hebrew content words that are translated in a manner that is nearly consistent or that uses a single Greek root, let us consider the size of group (ii) according to the original, simple conception of consistency and then according to a looser standard that includes these cases (but excludes hapaxlegomena).


113 For proper nouns (2), see כְּנ ע ן and אֱדום; for common nouns (6), see זֶר ע , אָלוּף, בֹקֶר, אֹכֶל, בְּרָכָה, and תולֵׁדות; for verbs (4), see יכל, מול, פרה, and זָכָר.

114 See סְּדֹם (22), חֵׁת (13), בְּאֵׁר שֶׁב ע (11), כְּנ ע נִׂי (11), גֹשֶׁן (10), גְּרָר (9), חָרָן (8), אֱמֹרִׂי (6), חֹרִׂי (5), א שּׁוּר (4), לוּז (4), מואָב (3), תִׂמְּנָה (3), ג לְּעֵׁד (2), and סֻּכות (2). Since place names are often proper nouns, many of these cases involve the presence or absence of directional-ה (cf. note 108).

115 See אָסָף (34), ביָר (22), בַּר (18), שׁאָל (10), בְּרָכָה (10), וְיָדָה (9), מַנְגָּר (9), שׁכָנ (9), פֶשׁ ע (9), עֵׁד (2), and בָּק (2).

116 See זָקֵׁן (9) and אָפָא (8).

117 See בְּר (73), יד (14), אָר (9), שׁב (8), רֹע (7), דָשֲׁנָה (7), מָלַש (5), מַח (5), נָשָׁה (5), הָר (5), וְיִרְבָּא (4), מַח (4), הָר (3), מַח (3), נֵבֶּש (3), פָּרָה (3), פָּרָה (3), פַּר (3), פַּר (3), פָּר (2), צָפ (2), וְיִרְבָּא (2), בְּסָפ (2), בְּס (2), וְיִרְבָּא (2), בְּס (2), צָפ (2), and מַח (2).
For all word classes except adjectives, the inclusion of lemmas translated with near or root consistently has a major effect upon the statistics, and the comparison of calculations given throughout §5.2.1 has revealed that where G is perfectly consistent in translating Hebrew lemmas into Greek, his translation choices may reflect consistency of differing strengths (i.e., double consistency), but, even where he is not strictly consistent, he is often found being consistent in other ways, either in most instances (i.e., near consistency) or by using a single Greek root (i.e., root consistency). It is quite interesting that, in this last set of figures, adjectives and verbs have switched placed in the count by tokens, a fact that is due, in part, to G’s frequent use of a suite of cognate verbs—differing only by the verb’s prefix—to translate a single Hebrew verb (see §5.2.2.2).

All together, this statistical overview of G’s lexical consistency suggests in a general way that G aimed to choose the best Greek word for every occurrence of each Hebrew word. This claim is supported by (i) his varying degree of consistency in translating the four types of content words considered here, as seems appropriate; (ii) the types of Hebrew words that
he translates with double consistency, i.e., Hebrew proper nouns and other content words that have a ready match in Greek or are restricted to a single narrative context; and (iii) his willingness to depart from his standard renderings for a variety of reasons. I will discuss these points and others in more detail and illustrated by specific examples in the next section, where I consider the adequacy of G’s lexical translation choices directly.

5.2.2 Adequacy

Lexical adequacy may be defined in terms of the appropriateness of the words a translator selects as representations of the words in his source text. Moreover, this fit can be understood in two ways, considering how well the target lemma is an adequate representation of the source lemma and how well the target lemma fits within its new translational context. As it is a survey, I will argue in my study of lexical adequacy that, in general, G adequately represents Hebrew words by using Greek words that fit in both these ways. Moreover, this helps explain G’s variable lexical consistency. Though theoretically distinct, the concepts of consistency and adequacy are practically inseparable, and I will illustrate in this section the main factors motivating both G’s lexical consistency and his lexical variation, as each relates to his single quest for le mot juste.

5.2.2.1 Reference v. denotation, and form v. meaning. As demonstrated above, G is far more consistent in translating proper nouns than other types of content words, especially when double consistency is factored in. This consistency gap can be explained by drawing two distinctions: first, meaning comes in two main types, i.e., referential meaning and denotational meaning, although these are not mutually exclusive; second, a translator may
choose to represent primarily a word’s form or its meaning, although here, too, every translation choice involves some degree of both. Unlike other types of content words, proper nouns primarily mean by way of reference not denotation, as they generally do not describe but rather point to unique entities in a text. Because of this fact, lexical variation is not the same with proper nouns as with other content words. To vary translations of a proper noun is to reassign the actions of a story to different characters or to relocate them to different places, and to translate two proper nouns in the same manner is not simply a manner of two terms having related or shared meanings but rather a common name if not also a common identity. It is out of concern for adequacy, then, that G translates Hebrew proper nouns so consistently, often maintaining a one-to-one relationship between Hebrew and Greek lemmas. The dominantly referential meaning of proper nouns also leads G to represent their form over their meaning (denotation),\footnote{Formal representation is typically the optimal way of translating proper nouns into any language (Katrin Hauspie, “Transcriptions of Hebrew Words,” in Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016], 176, including note 30).} as he generally transcribes or transliterates proper nouns to capture their shape and sound.\footnote{As an overview, this study does not differentiate between types of formal representation, e.g., transcription (phonetic) and transliteration (graphic) (Hauspie, “Transcriptions,” 172–175). Given the absence of most vowels from the pre-Massorethic orthography, however, some level of transcription (phonetic) must always be involved (Frederick Knobloch, “Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis” [PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995], 37–39).}
That G prefers formal representation of Hebrew proper nouns can be established readily by even a cursory glance at the equivalences listed in Appendix II.\(^{120}\) He may use indeclinable forms (Γέραρα in 10:19) or forms with some Greek morphological features, such as case endings (Γάζαν in 10:19)\(^{121}\) or gentilic formations (15:19).

\(^{10:19}\) באכה גררה ע תונ ו εώς ἐλθεῖν εἰς Γέραρα καὶ Γάζαν

\(^{15:19}\) ό τοὺς Κεναῖους καὶ τοὺς Κενεζαῖους καὶ τοὺς Κεδμωναῖους

Sometimes G does not represent the Hebrew word's form but uses a Greek proper noun that is a culturally-recognizable equivalent.\(^{122}\)

\(^{120}\) For the typical correspondences between Hebrew and Greek vowels and consonants in Genesis, see Knobloch’s overview (“Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script,” 166–169).


\(^{122}\) Ἁγιπτος/Αἰγύπτιος for מִצְּר יִם (86/90) (cf. Μεσράμ); Ἁληθία for שָׁם (1/4) (cf. Χούς); Εὐφράτης for πύρ (2) and Τήρης for πύρ (1); Ηλίου πόλις for θύρ (3); Ήρώαν πόλις for πύρ (2/10) (cf. Γέσμου); Ἰδουμαία for Ἰουδαία (1/13) (cf. Ἔδωρα); and Μεσσοπόταμια (Συρία) for אֶרֶץ שָׁמַי (11), שָׁמ (1), as well as Σύρος/Συρία for אֶרֶץ (8) and אֶרֶץ (2/4) (cf. Ἀράμ). On Ηλίου πόλις as actualization, see Pfeiffer, “Joseph in Ägypten,” 318–319; cf. Gert Jacobus Steyn, “Heliopolis and On in the Septuagint,” in Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 155–168. On Μεσσοπόταμια and Συρία/Ἀράμ in the Septuagint, see Michaël van der Meer, “Syria in the Septuagint: Studies in the Natural and Geographical Context of the Septuagint,” in Die Septuaginta—Text, Wirkung, Rezeption: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2012, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Siegfried Kreuzer, WUNT 325 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 179–180. Cf. Fernández Marcos, “Nombres propios,” 244–246. Of course, formal representations of various types can also be culturally recognizable. For example, the Graecized loan-word Ἀσσύριος resembles רַשׁ, but Knobloch rightly notes that G’s transcription of רַשׁ as Ἀσσύριος when it refers to a person (10:11, 22) represents the Hebrew form better (τά εἰς αὐτόν in Ιωάν) (“Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script,” 75–76).
In such cases, G makes connections between the narrative world of Genesis and the real world of his readers. For example, if he had regularly transliterated the toponym מִצְר יִם as Μεσράιμ (cf. the personal name in 10:6, 13), his readers might have failed to grasp its reference to Egypt, which Greeks call Αἴγυπτος.¹²₄

Due to the referential meaning of proper nouns, G does not often give multiple formal representations of a single Hebrew proper noun,¹²⁵ although there are multiple explanations for cases where he does, e.g., inconsistency, disambiguation of entities, preference for another name for the same entity (35:5; 37:3), textual problems, etc. It is usually impossible to decide between such alternatives, especially as they mostly involve

¹²³ On the rivers Τίγρις and Εὐφράτης in the Septuagint, see van der Meer, “Syria,” 206–207.
¹²⁴ For another list and discussion of such “substitutions” of Greek proper nouns for Hebrew proper nouns, see Hiebert, “Textual and Translation Issues,” 419–423.
¹²⁵ as Πισών (3) and Δησών (1); יְסָא as Εὐσώς (4) and Χορράεις (1); ρύμα as Ἐνά (6) and Ὄνας (2); ρυγα as Σηγώρ (6) and Ζώγωρα (1); ςυξ as Συχέμ (4) and Σίκιμα (2); ττά as Δαϊδάν (2) and Δαδάν (1); ἠρι as Ζάρα (3) and Ζάρεις (2); θθηκ as Εὐλατ (2) and Εὐλά (2); ριψ as Ὄς (2) and Ὄξ (1); ἄνω as Σαβά (2) and Σαβεύ (1).
incidental people and places. Only rarely does G blatantly mix up or combine well-known entities in his translation.

For similar reasons, G does not often render distinct Hebrew proper nouns with the same formal representation in Greek. When he does, however, it usually involves giving the same representation either for identical lemmas with distinct reference, such as two characters named פֶּרֶשׂ (= 'יוֹבָב'), or for lemmas with similar graphic and phonetic shapes, such as the representation of both רָם and רְעֹה as 'אֵדָד.' With the latter group, it is often impossible to adjudicate among competing scribal and translational explanations.

---

126 For example, Frederick Knobloch finds it unlikely that G transcribed τ or γ as ξ and not ς, and he proposes a Greek scribe corrected BAYZ to BAYΣ and ΩΣ to ΩΞ, erroneously changing Z to Ξ on the basis of their graphic similarity and the normal use of ξ (but not ς) as a final consonant in Greek (“‘Transcription Technique’ and the Text of the Greek Genesis,” BIOSCS 35 [2002]: 106–107).

127 With the case of עָנֵּר and Θαιμία in his translation, Knobloch, “Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script.”

128 For example, the case of 'אֵדָד for דִּישָׁן obviously involves the common confusion of ד and נ, but this still permits multiple explanations. For particular cases, consult Knobloch, “Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script.”
The denotation of a proper noun is sometimes more significant than its reference, however, and such cases are especially common in Genesis due to the prominent role of aetiologies in this book.\(^1\) For Hebrew proper nouns with an aetiological function, G often elects to represent the noun’s denotation instead of its form,\(^2\) and especially where the aetiology is made explicit by a naming event (11:9; 26:22).

| 11:9 | διὰ τούτου ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἑλεσθην | Сперим | ὅτι ἐκεί συνέχειν κύριος τὰ χείλη πάσης τῆς γῆς |
| 26:22 | καὶ ἐπωνύμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Εὐρυχωρία λέγων | שֶׁבֶן בַּא | Δίοτι νῦν ἐπλάτυνεν κύριος ἡμᾶς καὶ νόησαν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς |
| 14:13 | Παραγενόμενος δὲ τῶν ἀνασωθέντων τις ἀπῆγγειλεν Ἀβράαμ τῷ περάτη | בַּאֵל מִׂצְר יִׂם | Παράγενομενος δε των ανασωθενων τις απηγγειλεν Αβραμ τω περατη |

Even where the aetiological significance of a proper noun is less transparent, however, G may find denotational significance in its etymology, as in 14:13, where G translates שֶׁבֶן (“Hebrew”) as περάτης (“crosser”), likely to evoke the fact that Abraham crossed over from the east and thus resembles the generation of the conquest that crossed the Jordan River.\(^3\)


\(^2\) Sometimes, G alternates between formal and semantic representation: שֶׁבֶן as σύγχυσις (1/2) (cf. בַּאֵל מִּצְר יִּם); שֶׁבֶן as οἰκος/τόπος θεού (2/13) (cf. Βαβυλόν); שֶׁבֶן as θεος (1/3) (cf. אֲדֹנָי); שֶׁבֶן as περάτη (1/6) (cf. Ἐβραῖος); שֶׁבֶן as τρυφη (2/5) (cf. Ἐδρον); and שֶׁבֶן as εὐρυχωρία (1/2) (cf. Ἐδρον). Cf. Fernández Marcos, “Nombres propios,” 247–259.

\(^3\) For the contextual significance of this translation choice, see §8.3.1.
In other cases, too, G translates proper nouns by sense and not by reference, usually because he did not read them as proper nouns (41:1; 23:9). At times, it seems that G was unfamiliar with the Hebrew word and guessed at its meaning from context (15:7; 14:3).

G renders רָא י as ποταμοῖς, which reflects its denotation, since רָא י is used of rivers other than the Nile and “the river” in an Egyptian context commonly refers to the Nile, and he reasons on the basis of the root כְּפֵלָה as that means διπλούς (“double”), which makes sense contextually, since the burial cave is to hold husband-and-wife pairs. It seems that G did


134 As ἄνθρωπος (1/9) (cf. ἅδεμ); רֶא as χώρα (3); כָּפֶל as κεφαλή (5); פֹּט as περιφοράς (2); צָרָה as ἐξωθόνος (1); חֹתֶם as ποταμός (7); מַרְדֵּךְ as πύργος Γάδερ (1); מָרְדֵּךְ as ψηφλάς (2); מֶלֶךּ as θυγρός (6); מֶלֶךּ as λύσι (2) and ἐρνός (1); מִדְּרֵכָּה as πόλις (1); מַדָּר as πόλις τοῦ πεδίου (1/2) (cf. πόλις Αρβόσα); מַדָּר as γίγαντες (1/2); דָּרָשׁ as μοῦ (3); סָוִי (2), and ἔρως (1); מַדָּר as ἄνθρωπος (1); מַדָּר as ψηφλάς (3).

not know the place names שִׂׂדִים and אוּר, but figured that the first must be a “country” (χώρα), while the second must have something to do with salt (ἁλυκός), given the parenthetical gloss that follows. On occasion, G may draw out a proper noun’s felt denotation for more far-reaching literary reasons.

Here, G’s use of γίγαντες for רְפָאִים and ἐθνὴ ἱσχυρά for זוּזִים is part of his interpretive move to develop themes of the exodus and conquest in the opening scenes of Abraham’s story.¹³⁶

5.2.2.2 Denotation and variation. Unlike proper nouns, G virtually always represents the lexical component of other content words according to their denotation, even if he gives special consideration to their form.¹³⁷ G varies his translation of other types of content words to find the Greek word that he feels expresses the right meaning, but his lexical

---

¹³⁶ For an extended argument in support of this claim, see §8.3.1.

¹³⁷ Where he does not, this is because G takes a common noun as a proper noun, often where there is a similar or identical proper noun: מִשֵׁק as Μάσεκ (15:2); יֵׁמִים as Ιαμίν (36:24, cf. ימים); שָׁוֶה as Σαυή (14:5, cf. שווה in 14:17); שֶׁכֶם as Σικιμα (48:22, cf. שכם); שֶׁלֶם as Σαλήμ (33:18, cf. שלום); כְּבָרָה as χαβραθα (35:16; 48:7). In other cases, G may represent a word’s form because he uses a loan-word (e.g., כְּרַבָּן as έρραβων [38:17, 18, 20]; חַסְּבֶּה as χασβέ [41:2, 18]), because he did not know the term (e.g., פָּרְצִים as φίλοι νεανίδοι [22:13]), or because he found a Greek word resembling the Hebrew in both form and meaning (cf. Emanuel Tov, “Loan-words, Homophony, and Transliterations in the Septuagint,” in The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint, VTSup 72 [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 165–181; “Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions: A Further Characteristic of the Kaige-Th Revision?,” in The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint, VTSup 72 [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 507–510; Knobloch, “Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script,” 39–41; Pfeiffer, “Ägyptische Elemente,” 241–243).
variation also relates to a variety of stylistic, grammatical, pragmatic, literary, rhetorical, theological, and other factors, and often in combination.

In his search for the optimal Greek word for each word in his Hebrew source, G often varies his equivalences for a particular Hebrew lemma in order to represent its different senses adequately in Greek. The Hebrew word שלם ("man, person") provides a good example. In most contexts, G translates שלם neutrally as ἄνθρωπος ("person") (13:13), but he often prefers ἀνήρ ("man, husband") where it is particularly relevant that the referent is male (19:4; 2:23; 19:8) and ἕκαστος ("each") where שלם functions distributively (11:7).

While the gender of the “men of Sodom” (אנשׁי סדם) is not directly relevant in 13:13, where G uses ἄνθρωπος for שלם, it matters in 19:4, since they intend to rape Lot’s guests: thus, G translates it as ἀνήρ. Similarly, when שלם is suffixed, it usually means “husband,” and so G

138 Harl, La Genèse, 63: “Pour exprimer en grec les réalités concrètes du people hébreu selon les récits de la Genèse, le traducteur a fait appel au vocabulaire usuel de la langue grecque de son époque, en donnant parfois des terms attestés seulement dans des domaines techniques particuliers, non «littéraires»: par exemple, la médecine, l’art de la guerre, l’élevage...Il a su trouver avec intelligence de bons équivalents et n’a pratiquement pas eu recours à des neologismes.”

139 Joüon §147b–d; HALOT, s.v. "שלם" 9–12; Wevers, Notes, 708–709.

140 Though it forms a contrast with אישה ("woman") in its most basic sense, שלם is commonly used in construct with cities, nations, and communities in a partitive sense, where gender is not in focus (HALOT, s.v. "שלם" 8).
selects ἄνδρος (2:23). In this case, ἄνθρωπος would be inadequate, as in 19:8, where one can scarcely imagine Lot’s two daughters never having known “a person” (ἄνθρωπον). The Hebrew noun "tent" presents another type of example, as G variously translates it as σκηνή ("tent") and οἶκος/οἰκία ("household"), but not really because the Hebrew word has multiple senses. Rather, he uses σκηνή to focus on the physical structure (12:8) and οἶκος or οἰκία to strengthen connotations of family relationships (9:27) or domestic activity (25:27) as is fitting to each context.

More similar to שָׁנֶפֶק, G rejects his stereotyped rendering of "person, life, soul" as ψυχή ("life, soul") in two cases where it has the sense of “person,” even if he occasionally uses his stereotypical rendering where it does not seem to be the optimal choice (12:5).

G prefers ἄνδρος ("man") in reference to the hostages that the king of Sodom wishes to recover (14:21) and σώμα ("body") for the slaves of Esau’s household (36:6).
In translating Hebrew lemmas with a vague denotation, G occasionally prefers a Greek word with a more specific meaning or a technical sense that is particularly well-suited to a specific context. Such is the case, for example, with the Hebrew noun דָּבָר (“word, matter, thing”). In many contexts, G translates דָּבָר as ῥῆμα, since the Greek term ῥῆμα has a similarly general range of meanings that overlap with דָּבָר. Yet, at times he prefers to be more specific with the Greek word he chooses: he uses λόγος for its technical sense as “terms” of an agreement (34:18) and πράγμα (“deed”) as a more appropriate object of a verb like ποιεώ (“do”) (19:22), and he selects the equivalents ἐπερώτησις (“questioning”) (43:7), πρόσταγμα (“command”) (24:50), and φωνή (“language”) (11:1) to specify the type of “word” meant by דָּבָר.

146 HALOT; s.v. “דָּבָר.” LSJ, s.v. “ῥῆμα.”
147 LSJ, s.v. “λόγος” VII.4.
148 G avoids translating דָּבָר as ῥῆμα in other cases where it is the direct object of עָשׂ (3:19; 20:10; 21:26), only using ῥῆμα in this context where its denotation actually refers to something previously spoken, agreed, or promised (4:22:16; 30:31; 34:14, 19).
149 LSJ, s.v. “φωνή” A.II.2.
The Hebrew adjective גָדִילָה ("great") is also vague, as it may variously denote greatness of size, extent, number, age, power, etc. Though G finds the similarly flexible Greek term μέγας ("great") adequate in most contexts, he uses other adjectives on occasion to specify greatness in quantity (πολύς) (15:14), age (πρεσβύτερος) (27:42), or quality (πονηρός) (39:9).

The Hebrew noun טֵפִיא presents a different type of example, since it has a fairly precise denotation, meaning small children or other members of a nomadic community who move slower than the able-bodied men. Yet, since it is vague in terms of gender and age and Greek has no single word to fit all contexts, G selects one of four different renderings to express its significance in each occurrence: ἀποσκευή ("family") (43:8), συγγένεια ("kindred") (50:8), οἰκία ("household") (50:21), and παιδία ("children") (45:19).

---

150 G omits the second occurrence of דָבָר in this verse, because the sense of "thing" is adequately conveyed by the neuter adjectives in Greek (KG II §403aγ; Smyth §1023; SSG §23fb).

151 HALOT, s.v. "גדילו.

152 HALOT, s.v. "טף.

153 On the Koine extension of ἀποσκευή "baggage" to include people (esp. a soldier’s family traveling with him during a military campaign), including a discussion of this and other occurrences of ἀποσκευή in the Pentateuch, see Lee, Lexical Study, 101–107.
G’s careful handling of such terms shows his attunement to a Hebrew lemma’s range of meanings in various contexts and his desire to select the optimal Greek word in each case.

5.2.2.3 Morphology, syntax, and variation. To be sure, semantics always factors into G’s lexical choices, but morpho-syntactic considerations play a prominent role in some cases.

This is especially true, for example, where G translates a Hebrew verb variously in its various stems. The Hebrew verb ברך (“bless”) is an ideal example, since G always renders it with a form derived from the root εὐλογ- (“bless”) but uses different lemmas and inflections based upon the Hebrew stem.

For ברך in the piel and pual,154 G always uses the simplex εὐλογέω (1:22); for the qal passive participle, he selects either the verbal adjective εὐλογητός (9:26) or the perfect passive participle εὐλογημένος (14:19);155 and for the niphal and hithpael, he uses the compound ἐνευλογέω (12:3), but syntax also plays a role, since ברך in these stems always collocates

---

154 According to WHM, ברך does not occur in the pual in Genesis, but G seems to have read it as such in 48:20, where he translates ברך with the passive εὐλογηθήσεται. Cf. §6.1.2.3.

155 For εὐλογητός (6), see 9:26; 14:20; 24:27, [31]; 26:29; 43:28; for εὐλογημένος (3), see 14:19; 27:29, 33.
with ב in Genesis.\textsuperscript{156} G’s treatment of the Hebrew verbs פע and שכן is similar, as he translates פע in the qal as καταστρέφω (19:25) and in the hithpael as στρέφω (3:24b), and he translates שכן in the qal as κατοικέω (26:2) and in the hiphil as κατοικίζω (3:24a).

The case of the Hebrew verb יל ("bear/produce a child"), however, is slightly more complicated. In Genesis, יל tends to have female subjects in the qal and male subjects in the hiphil, but this pattern is not entirely consistent. Yet, G reinforces this gender-based distinction in translation, not only by generally using γεννάω ("beget") for יל in the hiphil and τίκτω ("give birth to") for יל in the qal, but also by using γεννάω for a number of cases involving יל in the qal with a male subject, that is to say, by translating them as if they were hiphil.\textsuperscript{157}

Stem-based variation is common with verbs of motion, since they are usually intransitive in the qal and transitive in the piel and hiphil.\textsuperscript{158} With בוא, for example, G

\textsuperscript{156} For niphal (3), see 12:3; 18:18; 28:14; for hithpael (2), see 22:18; 26:4. Cf. Harl, La Genèse, 56.

\textsuperscript{157} 4:18++; 6:4; 10:8, 13, 15, 24[+], 26; 22:23; 25:3.

\textsuperscript{158} IBHS §§24.2e; 24.3.1b; 27.2a–b; Joüon §§52d; 54d.
typically uses the intransitive verb ἐρχομαι (16:8) and its cognates to translate qal forms, but
the transitive verbs ἀγω (2:19), φέρω (27:4) and their derivatives for hiphil forms.

16:8 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου Ἁγάρ παιδίσκη Σάρας, πάντες ἐρχαί καὶ πού πορεύης;

2:19 καὶ ἐπλάσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐτί ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐπλάσεν τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἄγροου καὶ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἰδεῖν, τι καλέσαι αὐτά

27:4 καὶ ποίησον μοι ἐδήσματα, ὡς φίλω ἐγώ, καὶ ἐνεγχέομαι μοι, ἵνα φάγω, διόπες εὐλογηθῇ σε ἡ ψυχή μου πρὸς ἀποθανεῖν με.

Often, the meanings of a Hebrew verb in each stem are closely related to each other, but not always, and in some cases a particular stem may have a technical sense, such as הָלַך in the hithpael, which can mean “walk around or back and forth” (13:17; 3:8) but is often used metaphorically with the meaning of “please” or “find favor with” (5:2), such that the idea of walking is only in the background. Although G typically translates הָלַך with πορεύομαι or ἐρχομαι and their cognates, he uses a few distinct renderings for הָלַך in the hithpael.

13:17 καὶ ἀναστὰς διδάσκειν τὴν γῆν εἰς τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ εἰς τὸ πλάτος

3:8 ἐντεῦθεν τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ περιπατέων ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ

5:2 καὶ ἔφρεστεε δὲ Ἐνώχ τῷ θεῷ

In its metaphorical sense, G translates הָלַך as εὐαρέστεώ ("please") (5:2), and he uses διδάσκω ("travel through") (13:17) and περιπατέω ("walk around") (3:8) for its more literal meaning.

---

159 IBHS §21; Joüon §40.
160 HALOT, s.v. "הלך" hithpael.
In addition, certain aspects of Greek morphology and syntax may also influence G’s use of one Greek lemma over another in a given context. For example, G generally uses γῆ (307) to translate the Hebrew noun אֶרֶץ, but when a plural is required he resorts to χώραι (5), seeing that γῆ does not usually decline in the plural. In the same way, G only uses the noun βρώματα (“(types of) food”) in the plural (6:21) and βρῶσις (“eating”) in the singular (2:9), irrespective of the Hebrew lemma and its grammatical number (usually אכֶל, אוכל, or מַאכָל).

5.2.2.4 Literary context and variation. Of course, a word’s meaning is always affected by the context in which it is used, and G’s lexical consistency as well as his lexical variation are partly motivated by his awareness of literary context, which may be construed on a spectrum of levels that range from a single sentence or utterance to an entire paragraph or episode, and even to the narrative as a whole. Within a relatively restricted narrative context, a recurring word typically has a single sense throughout. This fact accounts for the many cases in which G translates a Hebrew lemma consistently in one passage, regardless

161 See [10:20, 31]; [36:40]; [41:57].
162 The plural of γῆ is rare in Greek (LSJ, s.v. “γῆ”); cf. Harl, La Genèse, 277; Thackeray, Grammar, §10.6.
163 The plural of βρῶμα is common in Greek (LSJ, s.v. “βρῶμα”). In addition, G often uses βρῶσις in the phrase εἰς βρῶσιν and typically in the sense of “eating” (LSJ, s.v. “βρῶσις” [A.II], but not in 25:28, where it has a concrete meaning, i.e., “food,” [A.I]).
of whether he uses other equivalents elsewhere or not. For example, the Hebrew noun בְּכֹרָה ("rights of the firstborn") occurs four times in Gen 25:31–34 in reference to Jacob tricking Esau out of his birthright, and G translates it each time as πρωτότοκια (25:31), which has the same meaning. Yet, when בְּכֹרָה signifies "birth order," or the principle according to which Joseph portentously seats his brothers, G selects the more fitting equivalent πρεσβεῖον ("age") (43:33), even under the pressure of the preceding cognate בְּכֹר, which he translates with the Greek πρωτότοκος ("firstborn"), which is cognate with πρωτότοκια.

In a similar way, the verb שׁחת occurs in three main narrative contexts, and G renders it in three main ways, accordingly: (κατὰ)φθεῖρω for Noah’s flood (6), ἀπόλλυμι in Abraham’s discussion about the destruction of Sodom (7), and ἐκτρίβω when Sodom is wiped out (3).

More examples are furnished by the six Hebrew adjectives in Genesis with a frequency greater than four (בָכִיר, בָרִי, דָּק, טָהוּר, כֵּן, and צָדִיק). These recur so often largely on account of being keywords in specific passages, and G’s perfect consistency in translating each of these terms preserves their thematic and narrative significance in translation.

Since a word typically has the same meaning in all its occurrences within a single, continuous context, it is notable when G introduces lexical variation for proximate occurrences of a Hebrew lemma. Such was the case with בָשָׂר in 6:12–13 (§5.2.1.3), but
another good example is the noun אֱמֶת ("trustworthiness, fidelity") in 24:48–49, which G renders as ἀλήθεια ("truthfulness") (24:48) and then δικαιοσύνη ("justice") (24:49).

Proximate variation often serves as a clue that G’s interpretive choice has more far-reaching implications. While it may be that the noun אֱמֶת carries a different sense in its two occurrences, it seems that G’s use of δικαιοσύνη has less to do with representing distinct senses of the Hebrew noun and more to do with his desire to cast the second occurrence in terms of fair and ethical interactions instead of relational commitment. This lexical choice is significant in light of the way in which G draws the reader’s attention to the development of Abraham’s character in terms of Greek ethics throughout the Abraham narrative, as Abraham, who, at this point in the narrative has not only been credited with the virtue of δικαιοσύνη (15:6) also but withstood the final test of his character (22:15–18), now extends this same moral standard to Isaac’s future in-laws vicariously through his servant.

On the other hand, the appearance of a word in multiple contexts does not automatically imply that it has substantially different meanings in each. On the contrary, G often maintains the narrative and thematic intertextual links in his source text by

---

164 ἀλήθεια has ethical as well as epistemological associations (LSJ, s.v. “ἀλήθεια” II; DGE, s.v. “ἀλήθεια” II.1).
165 HALOT; s.v. “אמת” cites the two occurrences under different senses: “trustworthiness” (24:48) and “constancy, duration” (24:49). Yet, both cases have to do with relational fidelity, which is related to but not the same as what is meant by δικαιοσύνη.
166 For the development of Abraham’s character in terms of Greek ethics, and especially δικαιοσύνη, see §8.3.
translating Hebrew lemmas consistently across the literary contexts where they occur. For example, G consistently translates וּזָה as προσκυνέω and פָרָה as αὐξάνω,167 and yet this should not be taken for granted, especially in light of how often G varies his translation of Hebrew verbs. Rather, in addition to the semantic adequacy of these matching pairs, G’s consistency ensures that the themes invoked by these verbs cohere in Greek as they do in Hebrew. The verb פָרָה, in particular, runs from start to finish through the book of Genesis, and G’s consistency helps the reader see the importance of the theme of God’s blessing and Israel’s multiplication, a theme that also sets the stage for the book of Exodus that follows.

On a smaller scale, there are many types of narrative parallelism in Genesis, and G’s consistent translation of certain key terms maintains the intertextual associations between specific textual moments, as in the follow sets of examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27:43 וּזָה אֶל בַּרְאֶם בֵּרֵאשִׁית</td>
<td>ἀναστάς ἁπαξδράσαν εἰς τὴν Μησοποταμίαν πρὸς Λαβάν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:1 עָשֹׁה שָׁם מֶנֶחֶם לַאֹר הָעָרָה אָלֵד</td>
<td>πολύσον ἐκεῖνω ἀναστήριον τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἀφέντι σοι ἐν τῷ ἀποδιδράσαςεν σε ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἡσαῦ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 יְרָד אֶברֹם מֵעַרְיָה לְגוֹר שָׁם</td>
<td>κατέβας Ἀβραὰμ ἐεὶ Ἀγίουστον παροίκησεν ἐκεῖ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:4 עוֹשֵׁה יְבָרֹךְ מְיָרוּד וְיָרוּד</td>
<td>Μετὰ Λαβάν παροίκησα καὶ ἔχρονσα ἔως τοῦ νῦν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:4 לַעֲבֹר בַּיְם בָּאֹר נְחָשָׁן</td>
<td>Παροίκεῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ ἡκαμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:24 καὶ ἔζησαν τὸν Ἀδὰμ</td>
<td>οἰκεῖ τὸν οὐρανοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:10 δροθαμείτω θαυματώτης καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς</td>
<td>ἐξῆλθεν τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:2 Παρακλησῆν με κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν</td>
<td>ἰδού συνέκλεισέν με κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:18 συγκλείσεν συνέκλεισεν κύριος ἐξωθεὶς πάσαν μήτερν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Ἁβιμέλεχ ἐνεκεν Σάρρας</td>
<td>συγκλείσεν συνέκλεισεν κύριος ἐξωθεὶς πάσαν μήτερν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Ἁβιμέλεχ ἐνεκεν Σάρρας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G’s consistent rendering of בָּרֹה as ἀποδιδράσκω is adequate from a literary perspective, since the second occurrence refers directly to the first (27:43: 35:1), while the other sets involve

167 Harl, La Genèse, 57.
narrative cross-references of an indirect nature, relating to important themes of sojourning (12:10; 32:4; 47:4), exile (3:24; 21:10), and divinely-caused infertility (16:2; 20:18).

At the same time, G may make or enhance similar intertextual connections between passages by varying his translation in order to render one Hebrew lemma as if it were another. This type of variation, which involves semantic leveling, will be discussed directly in §5.2.2.6. The following descriptions of Israel’s attractive ancestors form a good example:

In Hebrew, the two statements about Rebecca’s beauty (24:16; 26:7) are directly parallel (טב מראה), as are the statements about Rachel (29:17) and Joseph (39:6) (יפת תואר ויפת מראה), and there are obvious semantic and structural similarities between these two sets. Yet, by translating טוב in 26:7 as ὡραῖος instead of ἱλικός, and by varying his translation of the repeated term יפה in both 29:17 and 39:6, translating it first as ἱλικός and then as ὡραῖος, G increases the intertextual thematic links between these characters, since Rebecca, Rachel, and Joseph are all said to be both ἱλικός and ὡραῖος.

In many cases, G’s introduction of lexical variation obviously relates to contextual considerations, and scholars commonly refer to such cases as “contextual renderings,” although this term is something of a misnomer, since it wrongly insinuates that, with his other lexical choices, G is either ignorant of—or worse—ignores the context. Of course, this is not what scholars mean by contextual, but rather that such renderings are in some regard
appropriate to the context. There are many such examples in Genesis, where G’s lexical variation gives special focus or nuance to a particular word in its particular context. For example, G translates בֵׁן (“son”) as τέκνον (“child”) instead of γιος (“son”) to highlight Abraham’s love for the child he is preparing to sacrifice (22:7–8):

Or, G renders בגד (“garment(s)”) as στολή (“robe”)—more decadent than ἱμάτιον (“clothes”)—for Esau’s special clothes, which Jacob wears to disguise himself as his brother (27:15), as well as those given to Joseph when Pharaoh releases him from prison (41:42):

In another example, G translates אחזת (“possession”) as κατάσχεσις (“lasting possession”)—stronger than κτησις (“possession”)—in reference to the land of Canaan given to Abraham by God and inherited by his progeny (17:8; cf. 47:11):

This type of “contextual” variation is very common, and so a final pair of examples will have to suffice to illustrate how G picks words to suit the demands of their contexts.

169 That τέκνον has an emotional quality is confirmed by the fact that this equivalence only occurs in speech.
170 The other uses of στολή in Greek Genesis (as an equivalent of בִּשְׂמֵלָה [4: 35:2; 41:14; 45:22+] and בְּלִשְׂנִי [49:11]) also seem to have special clothing in view.
While G could have translated ויקץ (“wake up”) and אכל (“eat”) in these verses with his more usual renderings, i.e., (ἐξ)εγείρω (“wake (up)”) and ἐσθίω (“eat”), he felt that ἐκνήφω (“wake/sober up”) better expresses that Noah came out of a drunken slumber and κατεσθίω (“devour”) aptly depicts the violence with which Joseph was purportedly mauled and eaten.

5.2.2.5 Greek verbal prefixes and variation. One final type of lexical variation applies only to verbs, as it involves G’s use of verbs derived from a common root but differing in regard to the presence, number, and type of verbal prefix(es) attached to the verb. This kind of variation is considered separately, because this aspect of Greek derivational morphology has no direct analogue in Hebrew, and because G varies his translation of Hebrew verbs by adding and/or altering a verbal prefix with great frequency, often in close proximity, and for a variety of semantic, formal, and contextual reasons. In a way, the manner and extent in which G leverages this aspect of the Greek language qualifies it as something akin to his translator’s fingerprint, and the fact that it simultaneously exhibits root consistency and lexical variation makes it emblematic of his complex poetics of translation as a whole.171

The difference in nuance or meaning between such cognate simplex and compound verbs varies with each family,172 but there are certain patterns with particular classes of

---

171 Cf. the fourth category of neologisms in Hiebert, “Textual and Translation Issues,” 414.
172 Ancient readers were attuned to commonalities and distinctions between cognate words. See the comment that Philo, Her. 41 makes in defense of differentiating the noun φίλημα and the verb φιλέω: ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀνακύπτειν οὐκ ἐστι τὸ κύπτειν οὐδ’ ἐν τῷ καταφιλεῖν ἄν πάντως τὸ πίνειν οὐδ’ ἐν μαρσίππῳ ἐπίπος, ὡστούς οὐδ’ ἐν τῷ καταφιλεῖν τὸ φίλειν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μυρίων εἰκοστὶς τίνες ταῖς τοῦ βίου χαλεπώς ἀνέγκαις δεξιόνται. Only a sophist could maintain the equivalence between a horse (ἱππος) and a bag (μαρσίππος).
verbs or particular prefixes, so that even terms coined on the spot would be widely understood by analogy to related forms. For example, spatial prefixes are often added to verbs of motion to indicate direction (e.g. προσ-, ἐκ-) or location (e.g. ἐν-), while some prefixes regularly introduce a particular idea, such as repetition (e.g. ἐπι-), completeness (e.g. δια-), or perfectivity (e.g. ἐκ-). When G introduces lexical variation with this class of Greek verbs, it is often because the form he uses is different in meaning than its cognates, and so such cases resemble the kind of semantic variation discussed in §5.2.2.2. For example, in each of the following pairs, G represents the same Hebrew verb with different Greek cognates, where a change in verbal prefix marks an important semantic distinction.

In the military campaign to rescue Lot, Abraham first “chases down” (καταδίωκω) (14:14) Lot’s captors in Dan and then “away” (ἐκδίωκω) to Hobah (14:15).

In Gen 19, Lot tries to “force” (καταβιάζομαι) the divine messengers to stay at his home (19:3), and the men of Sodom try to “force (contrary to nature)” (παραβιάζομαι) Lot aside and themselves into his home (19:9), so they can violate his guests.

---

173 KG II §§428.9; 445; Smyth §§1646–1653; SSG §22e.
Having fled Sodom’s destruction in 19:30, Lot is afraid to “settle” (κατοικέω) in Segor (19:30a) and so decides to “live” (οἰκέω) in a cave (19:30b), not a durable habitation,\(^{174}\) at least from the perspective of a city-dwelling Jew such as G, who regularly distinguishes between these two cognate verbs in relation to the relative permanence of the residence.

Finally, as Jacob divides his traveling party into groups to meet his brother Esau, G uses the doubly compound ἐπιδιαιρέω (“further divide”) in 33:1, because this is the third division he makes, having earlier split them into camps (32:7) and then groups (32:16–21).

In other cases, G varies Greek cognate verbs in close proximity where the two verbs are relatively close in meaning, but where the second serves as an intensifying corrective of the first,\(^{175}\) although this group should not be rigidly separated from the preceding group. In the flood account, God first announces that he will “wipe off” (ἀπαλείψω) (6:7) and then “wipe out” (ἐξαλείψω) (7:4) his creation from the face of the earth.\(^{176}\)

\(^{174}\) The impermanence of Lot’s residence—as well as his negative association with the men of Sodom via the verb פצר from the preceding example—is one of several points that G subtly alters in translation in order to develop Lot as a character foil to Abraham (see §8.3.2).

\(^{175}\) Robert Renehan has analyzed this and other uses of simplex followed by cognate compound verb (“More on Compound and Simplex Verbs,” in Studies in Greek Texts: Critical Observations to Homer, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes and other Authors [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], 22–27).

\(^{176}\) The flood account also furnishes another nice example of such variation with the verb ἐφθάρη. At the opening of the narrative, the narrator first describes it as “corrupt” (ἐφθάρη) before God, and then God himself sees
G captures the rhetoric of what God says to Abraham in 15:5 by varying the simplex ἀριθμέω ("count") with the perfective ἐκ-compound ἐξαριθμέω ("count up"), approximated in English by: “Count (ἀριθμησον) the stars if you can count them all (ἐξαριθμήσαι).”

It is difficult to capture the difference between σῶζω ("save") and διασῶζω ("save completely") in translation, but, in contrast to the simplex in 19:17, Lot’s response in 19:9 means to convey his doubt that he will safely get “all the way” (δια-) to the mountain.

One final example from poetry is notable for how G uses ἐπιδίδωμι ("give in addition") (49:21) as a means of one-upping δίδωμι ("give") (49:20), an apt representation of the Hebrew parallelism: Asher “gives” delight to rulers; Naphthali “gives also” beauty with his produce.
In some cases, however, it is difficult to perceive any substantive difference between such cognate verbs, and the use of a verbal compound as an intensifying corrective to a preceding cognate verb may be mostly a matter of style, as in the heavily stylized scene of Noah sending out a series of birds from the ark:

8:7 ויהי אתה והרב ויאנ茈ה תונ הקראנה

8 ויהי אתה והנה ויאנ茈ה תונ הנייסטרנ

10 ויסף ששלח את היונה ויאנ茈ה תונ הנייסטרנ

12 ויסף [...] ששלח את היונה ויאנ茈ה תונ הנייסטרנ

While ἀποστέλλω and ἐξαποστέλλω effectively have the same meaning,179 G nevertheless changes from one to the other in combination with other translation choices in order to create a certain novella-like progression in this scene.180

5.2.2.6 Semantic leveling The preceding treatment of lexical consistency, variation, and adequacy has mostly taken the Hebrew text as normative for determining what it means to translate consistently, and yet, as was noted in the discussion of double consistency, it is also valid to view consistency from the Greek side, considering whether G has blurred any distinctions between Hebrew lemmas, either wholly or in part, by using the same Greek lemma for multiple Hebrew lemmas. This phenomenon of collapsing distinctions made in the source language is known as “semantic leveling,” and, as with consistency and variation, G may engage in semantic leveling for any combination of stylistic, semantic, literary,

179 John Lee claims that ἐξαποστέλλω “has the same senses as Classical ἀποστέλλω, and is clearly just a more vigorous form of the older word” (Lexical Study, 93). It seems that G has deployed ἐξαποστέλλω in 8:10, 12 for its additional “vigor.”

180 For the way this helps resolve the narrative redundancy of the raven and the dove, see §7.4.5.
theological, or other types of reasons. Semantic leveling, as the name suggests, always involves the meanings of the Hebrew and Greek words in question. For example, when Hebrew Genesis has two near synonyms, G may not distinguish between them if a single Greek lemma is the best translation of both, as is the case with the Hebrew verbs ישׁב and שׁכן. Though G translates ישׁב in a variety of ways, he levels the distinction between it and שׁכן by always translating either as κατοικέω or as the cognate κατοικίζω, verbs he also uses to translate שׁכן. To a greater extent, G collapses the Hebrew synonyms שִׁפְּחָה and אָמָה onto the single Greek noun παιδίσκη, an adequate representation of both. Yet, since the use of two synonyms to refer to the single character of Hagar constitutes a minor stylistic inconsistency, G’s leveling of Hebrew lemmas may have more literary as well as semantic motivations.

In this vein, semantic leveling at times produces a more consistent narrative, as it increases its cohesion. This can be illustrated by a handful of examples from the opening chapters of the Abraham cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ויאמר יהוה אל אברך לך לך מארץ</td>
<td>Kai εἶπεν κύριος τοῦ 'Αβράμ 'Εξέλθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואברך בן חמשׁ שׁנים ושׁבעים נב מחרן</td>
<td>Ἄβραμ δὲ ἦν ἐτῶν ἐβδομηκοντα πέντε ὑπέξηλθεν ἐκ Χαρράν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ומקלל יך אאר</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ויהי הבש ביב ...</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο μάχη ἀνὰ μέσον ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואלה המרב הביא בוינו</td>
<td>Μὴ ἦστω μάχη ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though minor transformations, Abraham’s action (12:4) sounds more consistent with God’s command (12:1), the parallelism of the curse in 12:3 is sharper, and the aetiology of 13:6 and 13:8 is even more unmistakable than in Hebrew. More impressive than these cases
of proximate semantic leveling, however, is when G harmonizes formulations occurring farther apart.

By translating both עשת (13:14) and בם (15:5) as ἀναβλέπω and both מנה (13:16) and ספר (15:5) as ἐξαριθμέω, G more tightly connects God’s similar gestures to the innumerable grains of sand and the countless stars in the sky as signs of Abraham’s prolific progeny.

Finally, by translating multiple Hebrew lemmas in the same way, G may also focus the conceptual world of the text. A fine example involves the Greek root δικ-, which G uses to translate sixteen different Hebrew lemmas derived from thirteen distinct Hebrew roots:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>δικ-</th>
<th>דיק-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>צ דיק</td>
<td>צְּדָקָה (3); צדק (2); חסד (5/12); נקם (2); ניקוק (1); חוק (1); אמת (1/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חז</td>
<td>חָמָס (4); פֶשׁע (3); עשָק (1); עֵשֶׂק (1); עון (1/4); חטא (1/8); דָבָר (1/64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is striking about these two lists of Hebrew lemmas is not the number of lemmas involved, as there are nearly as many used in Greek, but the wide range of Hebrew roots, even including the vague and flexible noun דָבָר. As I will argue throughout Part II of this work, G’s leveling of so many Hebrew roots onto the single Greek root δικ- constitutes an important aspect of his interpretation of Genesis that concerns the role that δικαιοσύνη and other Greek virtues play in the lives of the patriarchs and G’s imagined readers.

---

182 The Greek lemmas are: δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωμα, δίκαιος, ἀδικέω, δικαίω, ἀδικία, ἀδίκημα, ἀδίκω, ἀδίκος.
5.3 Conclusion

Unlike the preceding chapters on quantitative and serial equivalence, in which I classified and analyzed each of G’s departures from these two types of formal equivalence exhaustively, the data concerning lexical equivalence is so vast that it has been necessary to generalize on the basis of statistics and illustrative examples that G sought to represent the meaning of the Hebrew words of his source with accuracy and acceptability in Greek. At the same time, the above generalizations have been founded upon the analysis of far more data than could be discussed here—much of which is made readily accessible in Appendix II—as well as my close readings of extended narrative units that constitute the core of Part II of this study. It is worth noting that G’s lexical selections have an especially high evidentiary value for the broader thesis that he intended to furnish his translation with a plot that would be considered virtuous by his readers according to contemporary Hellenistic literary standards. Just as G uses the lexical resources of the Greek language to breathe life into his translation, so this investigation of lexical equivalence adds color to the outline and shading of G’s translator portrait, and it augments our understanding of his complex poetics of translation, which involves the tensive act of precise (and often consistent) representation of his Hebrew source and accommodation of its vocabulary to his Greek cultural world. Finally, before I examine G’s plot transformations directly in Part II, it remains to put the finishing touches on his translator portrait, endowing it with personality by considering his representation of Hebrew grammatical features in Greek. As with his word choice, the
inflectional forms that G selects very often give us a clear insight into his interpretation of the stories that he translated.
Like lexical equivalence, grammatical equivalence involves the comparison of aligned tokens, but in consideration of how G represents the morphological features of the Hebrew elements instead of their semantic content. But unlike lexical equivalence, morphological categories (e.g., tense, aspect, person, number, gender, etc.) constitute a very restricted set, and there are only a handful of possible values for each category (e.g., for person: 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, or 3\textsuperscript{rd}). Because of this difference, it is possible to present a more exhaustive analysis of G’s representation of Hebrew morphological features than that of Hebrew lexical items, investigating each grammatical distinction that applies first to verbal parts of speech (§6.1) and then to nominal (§6.2) ones. Furthermore, since many grammatical categories can be mapped readily between Hebrew and Greek (e.g., person and number), such that unexpected equivalences would in most cases drastically alter the sense of the Hebrew text, I will show that G typically represents such Hebrew features with analogous Greek ones, such that his treatment of certain morphological features can be analyzed and summarized quite rapidly. This is because, as has already been demonstrated in many other regards, G aims to represent the meaning of the Hebrew text with accuracy and precision in Greek, only deviating from formally equivalent or statistically dominant translation choices where he is especially motivated by one or more of a variety of grammatical, stylistic, or interpretive factors that he finds particularly pressing in a given context.

However, the manner in which the Hebrew and Greek verbal systems encode tense, aspect, and mood have major points of difference, even as certain logical correspondences
can be established both grammatically and statistically between the forms of the two respective systems. This is why, though grammatical equivalence has not been studied by Septuagintalists as a broad category,¹ many important studies have focused especially upon aspects of Hebrew verbal morphology and syntax.² Still, none of these important studies has analyzed G’s treatment of the Hebrew verbal system as a whole.³ So, as with my preceding analysis of translation technique through the lenses of quantitative, serial, and lexical equivalence, my study of grammatical equivalence contains elements of summary and synthesis of prior research, a novel contribution in its own right, but it also advances prior analysis at nearly every turn. By viewing G’s work from this final perspective with the tools of translation technical analysis in our dominant hand, we prepare to put the finishing touches on G’s translator portrait, bringing the clearly delineated, shaded, and colorful sketch to life by endowing it with a distinct personality. G’s personality shines through

¹ For example, grammatical equivalence has no direct analogue in the typologies of Barr and Wright/Tov, although it could be subsumed under lexical equivalence or construed as an extension of it (see §2.1).

² The most important broad studies of grammatical equivalence include the work of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen on the Hebrew infinitive construct, and that of John Sailhamer, T. V. Evans, and Anssi Voitila on certain aspects of the Greek verb: Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*; John Sailhamer, *The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3–41*, Studies in Biblical Greek 2 (New York: Peter Lang, 1991); Evans, *Verbal Syntax*; Voitila, *PréSENT et IMPARFAIT*. Many shorter studies have taken other more focused aspects of grammatical equivalence into consideration in various Septuagintal corpora, but often focus more properly on matters of syntax than on morphology, a subject that is important but nevertheless beyond the scope of this chapter, even as syntactic factors will be discussed here as they have been throughout previous chapters.

³ While Soisalon-Soininen follows the traditional Finnish method of working from Hebrew linguistic features and structures to their Greek matches, both Evans and Voitila begin with the Greek and look back to the Hebrew. Each approach elucidates different aspects of a translated text, both as a text and as a translated text, but understanding G’s approach to grammatical equivalence (as well as the types of equivalence previously studied in chapters 2–4) requires beginning with the Hebrew text and the morphological features of its tokens (like Sailhamer with Psalms 3–41).
more clearly in his grammatically precise and literarily contextual handling of the tense, aspect, and mood of Hebrew verbs, especially as the Greek verbal system often requires him to make certain morphological choices for which the Hebrew forms provide no direct guidance (e.g., tense/aspect for Hebrew imperatives and infinitives, or mood for Hebrew finite verbs). In this way, and building in particular on the previous chapter on lexical equivalence, I will reveal the increasing complexity of G’s poetics of translation, as the translation phenomena discussed in this chapter will include a stunning combination of precise representation of Hebrew forms and imaginative and innovative transformations aimed at improving the quality of his translation on a range of linguistic, literary, and interpretive levels, a point that gives a janus quality to this final chapter of Part I, as it completes G’s translator portrait in all its complexity and will constitute a special type of evidence for the specific literary arguments that follow in Part II, that G altered and improved his translation’s plot according to various Hellenistic ideals.

6.1 Verbal Morphology

In the following analysis of verbal morphology, I begin with the most complicated (and thus the most interesting) aspect of comparison between the Hebrew and Greek verbal systems, investigating how G uses Greek verbal morphology to represent the types of tense, aspect, and mood distinctions drawn in Hebrew by way of distinct verbal conjugations, giving separate treatment to each conjugation and the verbal forms G uses to represent it (§6.1.1). Then, I will address the morphological categories of verbal person, number, and voice more rapidly, since they function more similarly in Hebrew and in Greek, although
the correspondences between the Hebrew stems and Greek voice is certainly the most complex of the three, and so it will receive a bit more attention (§6.1.2).

6.1.1 Tense-Aspect-Mood

Most of the verbal forms of biblical Hebrew, and especially the finite verbs, do not have an even distribution in direct speech and narration. The statistics for all verbal forms in Genesis are presented below in Table 17.

**Table 17. Hebrew Conjugations in Narration and Speech in Genesis (V)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>In narration</th>
<th>In speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wayyiqtol</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yiqtol</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weqatal</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volatives⁴</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qatal</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive construct</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive absolute</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>2,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between direct speech and narration plays a significant role not only in the Hebrew text, influencing the use of particular verb conjugations, but also in Greek translation.⁵ For many conjugations, G uses separate grammatically and contextually

---

⁴ Though “morphologically independent,” the cohortative (1st person), imperative (2nd person [positive]), and jussive (2nd person [negative], 3rd person) form a “functional class” (*IBHS* §34.1b; cf. Joüon §§114–116).

⁵ Anssi Voitila has shown the value of this distinction for studying the Greek present and imperfect indicative (*Présent et imparfait*, xxxiv–xxxviii; cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 138, 158–161). Other studies have also
appropriate equivalents based on this distinction, and so the following analysis of G’s handling of the Hebrew verbal conjugations consistently considers whether a verb appears in narration or in speech. This distinction also governs the order in which the conjugations will be discussed: first, finite verbs that occur primarily in narration (i.e., wayyiqtol); then, those most common in speech (i.e., yiqtol, weqatal, volatives); and then qatal, which is evenly split between the two. Finally, G’s translation of the non-finite verbs will be treated, first the participle and then the two infinitives.

6.1.1.1 **Wayyiqtol (2,151).** The Hebrew wayyiqtol conjugation regularly expresses temporal and/or logical succession with the preceding clause; less commonly, it signifies an epexegetical or apodotic relationship with what precedes. Furthermore, wayyiqtol represents a situation with perfective verbal aspect as a complete unity. Because it

6 *IBHS* §33.2.1; Joüon §§118c–i.
7 *IBHS* §§33.2.3–4; Joüon §§118j–m.
8 *IBHS* §§20.2g–k; 29; 33.3; Joüon §111. It is debated whether the Hebrew verbal system primarily expresses tense or aspect. The aspect-more-than-tense perspective assumed here sides with Waltke-O’Connor more than Joüon. An excellent, concise, and well-documented presentation of this general perspective is given by Dennis Pardee, who aptly describes the nature of the debate by saying that the commitment of his general view of the Hebrew verbal system to print is tantamount to allowing those he has reviewed critically to take him “to the whipping post” (“The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in a Nutshell,” in *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, ed. Rebecca Hasselbach and Pat-el Na’ama, SAOC 67 [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012], 285–316). For a critique of the aspectual view, see Jan Joosten, “Do the Finite Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Express Aspect?,” *JANES* 29 (2002): 49–70.
expresses succession, wayyiqtol serves as the narrative backbone of Genesis. This is indicated statistically, given that (i) wayyiqtol occurs more often than any other verbal form in Genesis (2,151/5,132) (41.9%) and (ii) wayyiqtol is almost entirely restricted to narrative contexts (2,017/2,151) (93.8%). In addition, even where wayyiqtol is used in direct speech, it often occurs within an account narrated by a particular character.9

In the vast majority of contexts, G translates wayyiqtol forms with either the aorist indicative (1,854) (86.2%) or the aorist participle (175)10 (8.1%), which are similar in regard to the temporal and aspectual value of the Greek verb but different in terms of the structuring of the narrative, since G mainly uses the aorist circumstantial participle in order to convert Hebrew parataxis into Greek hypotaxis (see §3.1.2.1). This wayyiqtol-aorist equivalence is grammatically and contextually fitting,11 as, like Hebrew wayyiqtol, the Greek aorist indicative and aorist participle are also used as main verb forms in Greek narrative,

9 The most extended examples are (i) in 24:34–49, where Abraham’s servant recounts his journey (24); (ii) in 31:5–13, where Jacob urges his wives to leave their father Laban (8); (iii) in 41:9–13 and 17–24, where the cupbearer describes his prison experience with Joseph (5) and Pharaoh retells his dream (8); and (iv) in 44:18–34, where Judah recounts prior events to Joseph (12). Together, these passages account for almost half of all wayyiqtol forms in Genesis that occur in speech (57/134).

10 3:6; 4:1, 17, [25]; 6:2, 5; 8:7, 9, 10, 12; 9:23; 12:14, 18; 13:10, 18+; 14:7, 13, 14; 16:3, 5; 18:2+, [9], 16, 22, 23, 27; 19:1, 10, 33, 35; 21:2, 9, 14, 16+; 22:3++, 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 19; 23:7, 10; 24:10, 16, 26, 28, 42, 46, 48, 50, 53, 54, 61+, 63, 64, 65; 25:1, 8, 17, 34; 26:8, [21], 22, 31, 32; 27:14, 15, 27, 33, 37, 39, 42; 28:1; 29:1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 31, 35; 30:1, 17, 23; 31:4, 14, 17, 23, 31, 33, 36, 43, 45; 31:55, [1], 22; 33:1, 4, 5; 34:2; 35:16, 29; 37:4, 5, 21, 24, 25, 31; 38:3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 28; 39:12, 15, 20; 40:18; 41:8, 14, 16, 21, 42; 42:1, 6, 7, 22, 24, 26, 27; 43:15+, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31+; 44:6, 18; 45:14, 15, 27; 46:1, 2, 6, 29+; 47:1, 10; 48:1, 2, 8, 13, 14, 17; 49:15, 33; 50:1, 15, 16, 18.

and their perfective aspect presents a past situation neutrally as a whole.\textsuperscript{12} While the prevalence of this equivalence leads to G’s overuse of the aorist indicative in comparison to composition Greek,\textsuperscript{13} G also translates wayyiqtol with the Greek imperfect indicative (69)\textsuperscript{14} (3.2%), which distinguishes itself from the two aorist forms by its imperfective aspect, which may represent a variety of particular types of situations (e.g., durative, habitual, iterative, conative, descriptive, inchoative, etc.).\textsuperscript{15} G makes appropriate use of the Greek imperfect to present an action or state of affairs in one of these ways.\textsuperscript{16} Although it is not always possible to determine the imperfective nuance with certainty, relatively clear examples can be found for each:

\textsuperscript{12} KG II §§381; 386.1–7; Smyth §§1850–1852; 1923–1929; SSG §28da.
\textsuperscript{14} This count includes instances of the verb εἰμί (20: \textsuperscript{3}3:1; \textsuperscript{4}4:17; \textsuperscript{6}6:1; \textsuperscript{9}9:18; \textsuperscript{11}11:1, 30; \textsuperscript{21}21:20; \textsuperscript{25}25:20, 27; \textsuperscript{26}26:34, [35]; \textsuperscript{29}29:14, 20; \textsuperscript{35}35:3, [21]; \textsuperscript{39}39:2+, 6, 21; \textsuperscript{40}40:4), which has no aorist (but cf. γίνομαι). For wayyiqtol translated by the imperfect indicative of other verbs (49), see \textsuperscript{7}7:18++; \textsuperscript{8}8:3++; \textsuperscript{12}12:4; \textsuperscript{14}14:12; \textsuperscript{15}15:17; \textsuperscript{19}19:3, 5+, 9, 15, 30; \textsuperscript{21}21:14, 16; \textsuperscript{25}25:21, 22, 34; \textsuperscript{26}26:21, 31; \textsuperscript{27}27:41; \textsuperscript{30}30:39; \textsuperscript{31}31:40; \textsuperscript{32}32:7, 21, 24; \textsuperscript{37}37:1, 18, 28, 34, 35; \textsuperscript{38}38:11; \textsuperscript{39}39:4, 8; \textsuperscript{40}40:7, 20; \textsuperscript{41}41:2, 3, 18, 56; \textsuperscript{42}42:7; \textsuperscript{43}43:30, 33; \textsuperscript{44}44:12; \textsuperscript{47}47:12, [14]; [49:23]+.
\textsuperscript{15} KG II §§381; 383.1–4; Smyth §§1850–1852; 1889–1909; SSG §§28c(i)–(iii).
\textsuperscript{16} Voitila, Présent et imparfait, 169–197; Evans, Verbal Syntax, 120–121.
Not only does G leverage the Greek imperfect on a number of occasions to represent the sense of the Hebrew more adequately in Greek, but he also uses the imperfect indicative and the aorist circumstantial participle in alternation with the aorist indicative to furnish a series of events with a particular structure and to control the pace of narration. While G utilizes the circumstantial participle, especially in combination with δέ, to create a narrative break and quicken the pace by reducing the number of clauses, he often mixes in an imperfect indicative in order to slow down the pace, build narrative tension, and create the expectation of resolution. For example, G combines aorist and imperfect forms in 21:14–15 to depict Hagar’s expulsion dramatically:

\[\textit{ἀνέφεξεν δὲ Ἰσραήλ πάντας τοὺς σιτοβολώνας καὶ ἐπάλληλι πάσιν τοῖς Ἀγγείοις.}\]

---

17 G’s repeated translation of wayyiqtol as imperfect indicative here serves to alleviate the redundancy of this scene of the flood narrative in Hebrew and increases its dramatic presentation in Greek (see §7.4.4).

18 See §§3.1.2.1; 4.1.1.3.

19 This conception of the interplay between imperfect and aorist indicatives in Greek narrative is based upon the work of Albert Rijksbaron, who argues that the imperfect creates a narrative framework that is punctuated...
As he most often does, G uses the aorist indicative for all of the initial wayyiqtol (and qatal) forms in this passage, which describe Abraham equipping and expelling Hagar. However, he translates the next form "(and she went)" as \( \text{ἀπελθοῦσα} \) "(but having gone away)", using postpositive \( \text{δὲ} \) and the aorist circumstantial participle to create a break with the scene of the preceding verse and to combine this action more closely with the following verb "(and she wandered)", for which G uses the imperfect \( \text{ἐπλανάτο} \) "(she wandered on and on)", which slows the narrative, creates anticipation about the fate of Hagar and Ishmael wandering in the desert, and also implies a gap of enough time for their water to run out.\(^{20}\)

by aorist forms: “Thus, it [i.e. the imperfect] creates a temporal framework for other states of affairs, serving as their ‘time anchor’. The latter are, thus, simultaneous with the state of affairs expressed by the imperfect. Aorist states of affairs, on the other hand, expressing closed events, typically fall within the framework created by the imperfect. [...] In fact, the aorist often has the function of bringing an open-ended imperfect state of affairs to completion [...]” (“The Discourse Function of the Imperfect,” in *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner: Proceedings of the International Colloquium in Commemoration of the 150th Anniversary of the Publication of Raphael Kühner’s Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II. Theil: Syntaxe, Amsterdam, 1986*, ed. Albert Rijksbaron, et al. [Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1988], 249; cf. *Syntax and Semantics*: 11–21 [§6]).

\(^{20}\) Such effective use of the imperfect indicative to anticipate future events requires not just contextual consideration, but a specific awareness of how an event relates to those to come: “En employant l’imparfait, le traducteur n’aura pas dû seulement connaître le >texte< déjà traduit, mais aussi le >texte< à venir. Cela aurait été impossible si le traducteur n’avait considéré à la fois qu’un court segment du >texte<. L’imparfait, comme le Ph [i.e., historical present] précédemment, est donc une preuve du fait que, parfois, les traducteurs ont connu le >texte< qui n’était pas encore traduit, mais évidemment cela n’a pas toujours été la cas, loin et là” (Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 230).
Excluding the few cases where G omits a verb (24) or translates a verb with a non-verb (6), G translates wayyiqtol with another Greek tense form in only a handful of cases (23) (1.1%). Most often, he uses a present participle (11) (in all but one case λέγων/λέγοντες for (ויאמר) or an aorist infinitive (4), thus representing a Hebrew paratactic structure hypotactically in Greek. Otherwise, he typically uses another tense of the indicative. G employs the historical present for wayyiqtol to portray an event vividly or dramatically, i.e., Abraham politely insisting that God has not provided what he promised (15:2), Jacob spying the well where he is about to meet his future (and favorite) wife (29:2), and Joseph leaving his garments behind in his mad dash away from Potiphar’s wife (39:16).

The two instances where G uses the future indicative for wayyiqtol differ from each other.

---

21 See §5.1.1.2, which lists such cases for all verbal conjugations.

22 These cases are analyzed in §3.1.2.1, as they involve G’s omission of ו and his use of hypotaxis.

23 KG §382.2; Smyth §1883; SSG §28b(ii); Rijksbaron, Syntax and Semantics 22–25 [§7]; Voitila, Présent et imparfait, 91–106. Based upon his investigation of the historical present in the Greek Pentateuch, Voitila considers G’s more expansive use of the historical present a sign of his relative command of Greek: “Quand la Gen, dont l’auteur a déjà témoigné de l’attachement pour des usages de présent que ne connaissent pas les autres traducteurs, attest l’usage assez naturel formé de divers verbes, bien que toujours restreint, l’Ex et dans son sillage les Nb l’utilisent plus fréquemment, mais seulement avec deux verbes, λέγειν et ὀρθόν, qui ont pourtant des parallèles en grec” (Présent et imparfait, 108).

24 For the major significance of Abraham’s statement within the larger plot, see §8.3.1.
In 33:10, G could have used a number of tenses (e.g., aorist, perfect, present) for Jacob's expression that he has found favor with Esau, but he prefers the future indicative, which focuses more on the future ramifications of the changed fraternal relationship.\(^\text{25}\) In 49:17, however, G appropriately uses the Greek future for a wayyiqtol that follows logically upon the preceding clause with future reference. In the one instance where G translates wayyiqtol with the perfect indicative, the Hebrew verb is epexegetical, such that temporal succession is impossible.\(^\text{26}\)

Also, G uses the pluperfect ἠδει for wayyiqtol only because οἶδα has no aorist.\(^\text{27}\)

---

\(^{25}\) The future tense also admits the uncertainty of their healed relationship from the perspective of the narrator and the reader, as Jacob's future pronouncement takes Esau's present word at face value (KG II §387.4; Smyth §1915; SSG §§28ge–gh.)

\(^{26}\) IBHS §33.2.2; Joüon §118j.

\(^{27}\) KG II §385.1; Smyth §1952a; SSG §28f.
Finally, G’s single use of the aorist subjunctive for wayyiqtol results from his prior decision to add ἵνα, which also captures the logical/temporal consequence of ἧμεν in Greek in the form of a purpose clause.

6.1.1.2 Yiqtol (474). Whereas Hebrew wayyiqtol is mostly confined to narrative, expresses perfective aspect, and is used in Genesis primarily to narrate events in the past, the yiqtol is found almost exclusively in direct speech (444/474) (93.7%), expresses imperfective aspect, and may convey a range of meanings involving imperfectivity or contingency. Waltke and O’Connor helpfully divide this range of meanings into (i) those that express imperfective aspect (i.a) in the past (i.e., habitual, inchoative) \(^{28}\) or (i.b) in the present (i.e., progressive, stative, inchoative, habitual);\(^ {29}\) and those that express contingency involving either (ii.a) modality (i.e., capability, permission, possibility, deliberation, obligation, desire) or (ii.b) volition (i.e., injunction, instruction, prohibition).\(^ {30}\) Furthermore, Hebrew yiqtol is also

\(^{28}\) A few terms used by Waltke and O’Connor have been modified (e.g., “customary” to “habitual,” “incipient” to “inchoative”) in order to bring the terminology of the various Hebrew and Greek grammars into line with one another. This is especially important here, as yiqtol in the past resembles the Greek imperfect.

\(^{29}\) IBHS §§31.2–3; Joüon §§113c–g.

\(^{30}\) IBHS §§31.4–5; Joüon §§113l–n.
used (iii) in other contingent contexts (i.e., conditional protasis, final clause), (iv) to express future time, and (v) to express past time after the particles אָז and טֶרֶם (ב).\(^{31}\)

G’s diverse handling of this polysemous verb form reflects his awareness of its significance in Hebrew and his capacity to find an appropriate Greek tense in each case.\(^{32}\) This is aptly illustrated by the wide range of Greek tense forms G uses to translate yiqtol in its rare occurrences outside of speech (29). Where yiqtol serves as a past imperfective, G typically uses the Greek imperfect indicative as a functional equivalent (7)\(^{33}\) (2:6), but once the iterative aorist indicative (2:19),\(^{34}\) and once he uses the resultative aorist indicative for an inchoative yiqtol (48:17).\(^{35}\)

\(^{31}\) IBHS §31.6; Joüon §§113a–b; 113h–k.


\(^{34}\) KG II §§392.4; 399.2; Smyth §§1790–1792; SSG §89l.2a.

\(^{35}\) KG II §386.1; Smyth §1926; SSG §28da. Cf. two aorist circumstantial participles in a narrative embedded in speech (37:7; 41:15).
Where yiqtol is a present imperfective, G uses the present indicative (50:3; also 2:10), the
gnomic future indicative (2:24; also 10:9), or the emphatic aorist subjunctive (32:32).

Where yiqtol arguably has future time reference, G uses the Greek future indicative (4)
(38:9), and after "טֶרֶם" (בְּ) he translates it with the aorist infinitive (5) (41:50).

Also, G uses the aorist subjunctive for yiqtol in certain types of subordinate clauses where
Greek grammar requires a subjunctive verb (4).

Incidentally, 22:14 also contains the remaining cases of narrative yiqtol, and G’s use of the
aorist indicative alters the temporal reference (אַךְ as εἶδεν and ὤφθη), a fact that is to be

36 KG II §382.1; Smyth §1877; SSG §28b(v).
37 KG II §387.3; Smyth §1914; cf. SSG §28gb.
38 KG II §394.5; Smyth §1800; SSG §§29ba(ii–a); 83ca.
39 2:19; 34:7; 38:9; 43:25. The case in 43:25 is a future periphrastic construction [μέλλω + infinitive].
40 2:5; 19:4; 37:18; 41:50; also in speech (4: 24:45; 27:4, 33; 45:28). Cf. §3.2.1.4.
explained by his interpretation of Gen 22, since God has now seen that Abraham has passed
his most important and final test.\footnote{42}

While G uses a wide range of equivalents for yiqtol in narrative based upon its
contextual meaning in Hebrew and the rules of Greek grammar, the situation is quite
different with yiqtol in speech (445), since he typically uses either the future indicative
(270/445)\footnote{43} (60.7\%) or the aorist subjunctive (104/445) (23.4\%). G uses the future
indicative chiefly for the future use of yiqtol (21:6), but also for its modal and volitional
uses (32:4; 19:2; 38:18), senses that may be expressed by the Greek future indicative.\footnote{44}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lccc}
21:6 & εἶπεν δὲ Σάρρα Γέλωτά μοι ἑποίησεν κύριος· & καὶ ἑπετελάτω αὐτοῖς λέγων & καὶ οὔμημεν οὐ δὲ ἀκοître. & injuction \\
32:4 & καὶ ἑπετελάτω αὐτοῖς λέγων & & οὗτος ἐρέιτε τῷ κυρίῳ μου Ἰσαάκ. & \\
19:2 & εἶπαν δὲ Οὐχὶ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πλατείᾳ καταλύσομεν. & & & resolution \\
38:18 & οὐκ ἐπὶ Ἐὰν τὸν ἄρραβώνα σοι ἔσωσον; & & & deliberation \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

G selects the aorist subjunctive, however, to translate yiqtol in a range of linguistic contexts:
in main clauses (22), he uses it with οὐ μὴ in emphatic prohibitions and predictions (13)\footnote{45}
(3:1)\footnote{46} and when it is deliberative (7)\footnote{47} (44:16) or cohortative (35:3; also 2:18). Here, the
subjunctive captures the modal and volitional sense of Hebrew yiqtol.

\footnote{42} For an extended argument in support of this claim, see §8.3.3.
\footnote{43} To this could be added two aorist circumstantial participles subordinated to future indicatives (15:15; 22:5).
\footnote{44} KG II §§387.5–7; Smyth §§1916–1922; SSG §§28gc–gg.
\footnote{45} KG II §§514.8–9; Smyth §§2754–2756, 1800.N; SSG §29ba(ii–a).
\footnote{46} KG II §§514.8–9; Smyth §§2754–2756, 1800.N; SSG §29ba(ii–a).
אף כי אמר אלהים לא תאכלו מכל עץ הגן

Τί δὲ Ιουδας Τί αντερούμεν τῷ κυρίῳ

και αναστάντες αναβόμεν εἰς Βαιθλα,

και ποιήσωμεν εκεῖ θυσιαστήριον τῷ θεῷ ...

G also uses the aorist subjunctive for yiqtol in various types of subordinate clause that generally require the subjunctive in Greek (82): in a conditional protasis (25) or relative clause (15), in a final clause (21), or fear clause (14), or in a temporal clause (7). These uses of the Greek subjunctive correspond to the function of Hebrew yiqtol in subordinate clauses.

---

48 The alternation of the deliberative subjunctive with the deliberative future indicative is classical (KG II §387.5b; Smyth §1916a; SSG §28gf).
49 8:26, 28+, 29, 30+, 31, 32; 24:14; 30:31; 31:8+, 32:8, 17; 34:15, 17; 37:26; 38:16, 17; 42:37; 44:23, 32; 46:33; also with the present subjunctive (2: 24:8; 28:20).
50 KG II §571; Smyth §2297; SSG §§29c(ii); 89a.
51 11:6; 12:1; 15:14; 20:13; 21:12; 22:2; 26:2; 28:15, 22; 31:32; 34:11, 12; 41:55; 44:9, 10; also with the present subjunctive (2: 42:38; 44:1).
52 KG II §559; Smyth §§2560–2561; SSG §29c(i).
53 3:3; 11:7; 12:13; 14:23; 16:2; 19:15; 24:3; 27:4, 10, 19, 25, 31; 42:2; 43:8; 44:34; 45:11; 46:34; 47:19[+]; also with the present subjunctive (21:30).
54 KG II §553; Smyth §§2193–2206; SSG §29c(iii).
56 KG II §553b; Smyth §§2221–2239; SSG §29b(iv).
57 12:12; 24:41+; 27:40; 38:11; 40:14; 49:10; also, the aorist infinitive (3: 11:4; 29:8; 33:14).
58 KG II §§566–567; Smyth §§2383–2461; SSG §29c(v).
Where G understands a yiqtol form to refer to the present or the past, he selects the Greek present indicative (16) or the aorist indicative (3) respectively.

The case in 49:25 is interesting, in that G’s choice of the aorist contextualizes this part of Joseph’s blessing as having been actualized within the preceding narrative, in which Joseph has been vindicated by God. Of course, it should be kept in mind that G could have read these forms as wayyiqtol.

---


60 43:7 [pluperfect of ἐλεύθησα]; 49:25+. In 43:7, the event occurred in the absolute past but is viewed as future by the speaker (“How were we supposed to know that ...”) (IBHS §31.6.2c; Joüon 113b). G’s translation is different, but it has a similar pragmatic force due to his use of μή (“We didn’t know that ..., did we?”).
In the remaining cases where G does not omit a yiqtol form (34:10) or translate it with a non-verb (3),\(^{61}\) he frequently chooses a Greek imperative ([aorist (14) (7:2)]; [present (6) (27:33)]), corresponding to the volitional uses of yiqtol.\(^ {62}\)

\[7:2\] מהבמה הטהורה את דת תונ עתונ יוחב קדש נקבה וזכר
[سينאא הנקנה] פרוס סכ אסט אסט, ארסן קא שין\]

\[27:33\] ואברכהו גם ברוך ייוהי וטאא גורה איוון, קא יולוימיוו וסינו.

But, he also utilizes a range of other Greek verb forms customarily used in specific contexts:

- the perfect indicative with reference to the present moment of speaking (24:31; also 4:24; 35:12);\(^ {64}\)
- the future infinitive in an oath (21:23; also 26:29);\(^ {65}\)
- the aorist potential optative (44:8)\(^ {66}\) and optative of wish (49:8);\(^ {67}\)
- the aorist infinitive after a verb of command (3:17);\(^ {68}\)
- and the aorist indicative in a contrafactual apodosis (31:27).\(^ {69}\)

---

\(^{61}\) 4:7+; 49:27. Cf. §5.1.1.2.

\(^{62}\) Also, G uses a present participle in 9:2, because he has translated a yiqtol-relative clause substantivally.

\(^{63}\) With this choice, G harmonizes the form with the future indicative ἐσάξεσθε in 6:19. Concerning the way this also resolves some of the narrative difficulties presented by God’s two sets of instructions, see §7.4.2.

\(^{64}\) KG II §384; Smyth §§1945–1947; SSG §28e.

\(^{65}\) KG II §389.5b; Smyth §§1868; 2024; SSG §28gh.

\(^{66}\) KG II §395.3–5; Smyth §§1824–1834; SSG §29db(ii).

\(^{67}\) KG II §395.3–5; Smyth §§1814–1823; SSG §29db(i).

\(^{68}\) KG II §473.2; Smyth §§1991–1999;

\(^{69}\) KG II §574; Smyth §§2302–2312; SSG §89b.
The weqatal conjugation is the rarest of the Hebrew finite verbs in Genesis. Similar to how wayyiqtol expresses succession, weqatal expresses consequence; but like yiqtol, weqatal is mainly limited to speech in Genesis (196/211) (92.9%). The consequential idea communicated by weqatal may be classified into two main uses: (i) if the ו of weqatal introduces an apodosis, then weqatal expresses the consequential relationship between the protasis and the apodosis of the complex sentence (conditional, temporal, etc.); (ii) otherwise, and more regularly, weqatal simply expresses a consequential relationship

Stative verbs like ἴστημι often have present meaning in the perfect: KG II §384.3; Smyth §1946; SSG §28ec.

This is only true if the volitives are counted as a group. The Hebrew jussive (111) and cohortative (107) are less common, but, unlike weqatal, these forms are also restricted as to person.
between coordinated clauses.\textsuperscript{72} Yet, the two uses cannot be sharply distinguished; the fact that both types involve consequence indicates that they are closely related.

For apodotic weqatal in speech, G nearly always selects the Greek future indicative (26)\textsuperscript{73} (9:14; 29:15; 43:9), but twice an imperative (33:10; also 47:6). Both translations are appropriate, since they convey the future-oriented and contingent nature of the apodosis, which, in the case of the imperative, also depends upon the will of the addressee.

It is important to note that even where apodotic and consequential weqatal occur in the same sentence, G successfully distinguishes between them by the Greek verb forms he selects.

\textsuperscript{72} IBHS §32.2; Jouon §119.

Following on his translation of יהיה as ἦ in a conditional protasis, G translates the next three weqatal forms with the Greek subjunctive (διαφυλάξῃ, δῷ, ἀποστρέψῃ), but he switches into the future indicative (ἔσται) when he feels that the apodosis has begun.

However, when weqatal has its purely consequential sense in speech, as with the first three weqatal forms in the preceding example, G selects a Greek verbal form with mood and tense values that are sympathetic to the preceding Greek verb on the same level of discourse. This is appropriate, since consequential weqatal usually takes on the modal and aspectual value of the preceding verb in Hebrew. So, G’s handling of weqatal accurately represents the Hebrew and follows a definite pattern despite the diversity of inflections he uses: most often the future indicative (87) a subjunctive (16) or an imperative (11), but also the aorist indicative (3), the perfect indicative (26:22), and the aorist optative (43:14).

---

74 *IBHS* §32.2.1d; Joüon §§119h–p.
75 *Evans, Verbal Syntax*, 121–122, 133.
76 This counts one case in 6:3 where [οὐ μὴ + subjunctive] is functionally future. slow_1
79 Aorist imperative (6: 27:44, 41:34, 35:45, 13:47:23); present imperative (5: 1:14, 15: 8:17+, 45:19). The cases in 45:13 and 45:19 are accompanied by another weqatal translated by an aorist circumstantial participle. 80 The instance in 35:3 is actually the imperfect of ἐλπί, which has not aorist.
When G does not render weqatal with a Greek verbal form that is sympathetic to the preceding verb, he typically uses the future indicative (24),\(^81\) often to signal that the verb does not just follow from the prior verb but actually marks a new stage of advancement, either a temporal advancement, i.e., where G uses the future after a present (11)\(^82\) (41:30), perfect (3)\(^83\) (17:20), or aorist indicative (47:25), or a modal advancement, i.e. where G uses the future after a subjunctive (10)\(^84\) (3:22), imperative (8)\(^85\) (45:10), or optative (28:3).

\(^81\) In a few other cases, G translates weqatal with the aorist subjunctive due to a syntactic transformation (6), i.e., by introducing a subordinate clause that is conditional (3:33:13; 44:22; 29), relative (24:43), or temporal (2:27:45; 29:8). Similarly, G’s renderings of weqatal by an aorist imperative in 45:13 and present participle in 28:15 also involve syntactic changes. Finally, G only omits weqatal in speech once (46:33).

\(^82\) 74; 9:11, 13; 12:12; 16:11; 17:4; 20:11; 28:15; 34:30; 41:30; 48:21. The case in 34:30 is accompanied by another weqatal translated by an aorist circumstantial participle.

\(^83\) 17:20; 24:14; 26:24.

\(^84\) 3:22; 12:13; (18:23); 27:12; 29:8; 31:44; 37:20; 39:9; 41:36; 45:10. The case in 45:10 involves [μή + aorist subjunctive], and, since it expresses a prohibition, resembles the imperatives below.

\(^85\) 19:2; 27:45; 30:32; 32:20; 40:14; 44:4; 47:24, 29. The cases in 19:2 and 24:45 are accompanied by another weqatal translated by an aorist circumstantial participle.
G switches to the future after another indicative tense when the weqatal form has future time reference in contrast to a preceding verb that refers to the present moment in some way (e.g., anticipatory present (41:30),86 performative perfect (17:20),87 or resultative aorist (47:25)).88 The instances where G switches to the indicative after a non-indicative in translating weqatal (3:22; 45:10; 28:3), however, resemble the apodotic use of weqatal, since the modal shift effectively grants the contingent state of affairs expressed by the Greek subjunctive.89 Especially where G could have continued in the subjunctive, this shift has the rhetorical function of adding emotional intensity, such as in 3:22, where the true essence of

86 KG II §§382.5–6; Smyth §§1879–1882; SSG §28b(iv).
87 KG II §§384.3–4; Smyth §§1946–1947; SSG §28eb.
88 KG II §386.1; Smyth §1926; SSG §28da.
89 KG II §397.2; Smyth §1839.
God's fear is aptly expressed by the future indicative ἐσται (“he will live”), the anticipated result of Adam reaching out to take and eat from the tree of life, or such as in 28:3, where the future indicative ἐστῃ (“you will be”) is presented as the sure result of the prior optatives of wish.

Though uncommon in Genesis (15), G translates weqatal in narration in the same general way, i.e., based on its apodotic (38:9b) and consequential (2:6, 24; 29:3) senses.90

6.1.1.4 Volitional forms (520). Although they are morphologically distinct, the Hebrew imperative (302), jussive (111), and cohortative (107) “form a functional class,” especially as each is associated with a particular grammatical person: first (cohortative), second

---

90 Imperfect indicative (9: 2:6; 6:4; 29:3+++; 38:9+; 47:22); aorist indicative (3: 30:41, 42; 34:5); future indicative (2:24+); omission (2:10). For weqatal translated by the imperfect indicative, see Voitila, Présent et imparfait, 207–216.
(imperative), and third (jussive). Moreover, since these volitional verbs are used primarily to express various aspects of a speaker’s will, they are only found in direct speech in Genesis.

The Hebrew imperative has one main use, i.e., to express a direct command, and G’s treatment of it is consequently quite straightforward, since he basically translates Hebrew imperatives with Greek imperatives (291/302) (96.4%) (38:8), at least if two exceptions are allowed, namely, aorist circumstantial participles subordinated to imperatives (21) and the frozen imperativival participles δεῦρο, δεῦτε, and ιδού (11). This is fitting, since the Greek imperative is also used to express direct commands.

Where G does not use a Greek imperative, he typically employs the future indicative (6), most often in sequence with another future indicative (20:7; but not in 42:18), but he twice uses an aorist infinitive for a Hebrew imperative that may be understood as subordinate to a prior imperative (19:22; also 45:19).

91 IBHS §34.1 (source of quotation); Joüon §§114a–b, g, m.
93 11:3, 4, 7; 19:32; 27:27; 31:44[+]; 37:13, 20, 27; 41:41. For G’s translation of Hebrew verbs with these Greek “non-verbs,” see §5.1.1.2 and notes 24–25.
94 KG II §397; Smyth §§1835–1844; SSG §29e; Evans, Verbal Syntax, 126–128, 133.
95 6:21; 12:2; 20:7; 34:12; 42:18; 45:18.
96 The Greek future indicative also expresses commands (KG II §§387.6–7; Smyth §1917; SSG §28gb).
In spite of G’s consistent approach to translating Hebrew imperatives, Greek morphology requires him to choose between the aorist and present stems, a distinction that is foreign to Hebrew verbal morphology. Lexical factors play an important role in this aspectual choice, as there is a relatively small set of Greek verbal lemmas for which G uses both aorist and present imperatives (11). Yet, certain contrastive pairs demonstrate G’s understanding of the difference and his capacity to select the most appropriate form in each case.

In both pairs, the Hebrew text presents the same idiom twice with no significant differences (עָשָׂה הָעֻז בַּעֲנֵי שֵׁם בִּכְלָל), and yet G distinguishes them aspectually. When God tells Abraham to listen to whatever Sarah says in regard to Hagar, it is a standing order (ἀκοε, λέγω), but in Genesis 19:8 he uses ἀκοει as a speech act. For the way this helps resolve the redundancy of God’s commands to Noah, see §7.4.2.

97 λάμψη also follows a prior future indicative, but not as closely as in 20:7, especially given that δὲ creates separation. For the way this helps resolve the redundancy of God’s commands to Noah, see §7.4.2.

98 KG II §389.6C; Smyth §1864; SSG §§28dfc, ha(iii); K. L. McKay, “Aspect in Imperatival Constructions in New Testament Greek,” NT 27 [1985]: 201–226.

99 The verbs are ἀκοε, γίνομαι, κατέχο, οἰκέω, κατοικέω, ὄραω, πληθύνω, ποιέω, πορεύομαι, φέρω, and χράομαι.
present) (21:12), but when Rachel tells her son Jacob to run away from Esau, she requests his obedience at the particular moment (ἀκουσον, aorist) (27:43). Similarly, when Abraham returns Hagar to his slighted wife Sarah, he permits Sarah to use her however she wants at any time (χρᾶω, present) (16:6), but when Lot tries to hold off the wicked men of Sodom, he offers them his daughters, telling them to use them however they want that night (χρῆσασθε, aorist) (19:8).

The Hebrew jussive, in turn, has two main uses based upon its grammatical person: (i) after בָּלֵךְ, 2nd-person jussives express prohibitions and negative commands, thus suppleting the Hebrew imperative paradigm; (ii) 3rd-person jussives, however, are used to express a variety of volitional senses, ranging from command and permission to wish and request, the particular nuance determined by the relative social status of speaker and addressee as well as by other contextual factors.

For 2nd-person jussives in prohibitions (27), G uses one of two Greek prohibition constructions: (i) [μὴ + present imperative] (12) or (ii) [μὴ + aorist subjunctive] (14).  

100 G uses this imperative along with other translation choices to signal Abraham’s disapproval of Sarah’s plan to kick Hagar and Ishmael out, in contrast to his prior abuse of her (16:1–6). This is significant for G’s take on the plot of Abraham’s story, which is partly concerned with Abraham’s ethical development (cf. §8.3.1–2).

101 IBHS §34.4; Joüon §114i. In Genesis, 2nd person jussives always follow בָּלֵךְ, except in 24:8 (סָלַח). Cf. Joüon §114l.

102 IBHS §34.3; Joüon §114g–l.

103 Most often, with סָלַח translated by φοβέω (8: 15:1; 21:17; 26:24; [28:13]; 43:23; 46:3; 50:19, 21), but also with other verbs (4: 24:56; 35:17; 5:5, 24).

The present imperative typically demands the termination of a present state or action, but it may also be used in a gnomic sense, whereas the aorist subjunctive generally commands that a specific, future course of action or state of affairs not be undertaken or come to pass. While both Greek constructions are grammatically appropriate representations of the Hebrew, G’s choice between the present imperative (15:1; 24:57) and the aorist subjunctive (37:22) reflects his desire to select the one that best represents the meaning of each Hebrew prohibition in its context.

By using the present imperative in 15:1 and 24:57, G has God tell Abraham not to be afraid (because he is), and he has Abraham’s servant tell Lot to stop detaining him. By using the aorist subjunctive in 37:22, however, G has Reuben counsel his brothers against shedding Joseph’s blood or lifting their hand against him, proposing instead to throw him into a pit.

For 3rd-person jussives (84), G employs a greater variety of Greek verbal forms in order to represent the pragmatic and volitional force of the jussive in each case: chiefly the

---

The preceding verbs, which relates to the special function of Hebrew volatives to express purpose after volatives: IBHS §34.6; Joüon §116d–e. Cf. the aorist infinitive mentioned below in note 110.

105 KG II §397.3; Smyth §§1840–1841; SSG §29e.

106 For the connection between Abraham’s fear and the preceding episodes, see §8.3.1.
imperative for commands and prohibitions (49), usually where God is the speaker (1:3) or the speaker is socially superior or equal to the subject or addressee (38:24); or, the optative for wishes (15), usually where God is the subject (9:27a; 48:16a) or the speaker is not in control (48:16b), but also the future indicative for more confident assertions of what will be or where G misses or wishes to deemphasize the volitional idea (14) (4:12).  

| 1:3 | ἀπέρχεται ἔρις ἕναρχος ἄρχει ἀρχής |
| 38:24 | ἐξεπερνευόμενον Θαμάρ ἡ νύμφη σου, καὶ ἠπάτησεν ἐν γαστρὶ ἐστιν πορνείας. καὶ ἠγένετο φῶς. |
| 9:27 | φθάσεις ἐντύλια λήθης καὶ κατακαυθόσα, ἐν τῷ Σήμ, καὶ γεννήθησαν παῖς αὐτοῦ. |
| 48:15–16 | ο θεὸς... ο θεὸς... ο ἀγγέλος... εὐλογήσατε τὰ παιδία ταύτα, καὶ πληθυνθέτησαν εἰς πλῆθος πολύ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. |
| 4:11–12 | καὶ νῦν ἐπικατάρατος συ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἤρθεν τῇ γῆ, καὶ οὐ προσήθησεν τὴν ἱσχὺν αὐτῆς δοῦναι σοι. στένων καὶ τρέμων ἐγὼ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. |


109 KG II §395.3–5; Smyth §§1814–1823; SSC §29db(i); Evans, Verbal Syntax, 125–126, 183–187.  

G’s varying use of optatives and imperatives for the jussives in 9:27 and 48:16 are particularly illuminating. In both verses, G begins with an optative, since one can only wish and not command God to do something. Yet, he switches into the imperative in 9:27, since Noah’s sons are more in control of their future, while he remains in the optative in 48:16, since human fertility ultimately rests in the hands of God. In 4:12, however, G translates the jussive form נשת with the future indicative under the influence of the surrounding yiqtol forms, for which he also uses the future indicative.111

The Hebrew cohortative is the most complex of the three volatives, since it is commonly used in both independent and dependent clauses with different shades of meaning: (i) in independent clauses, to express the speaker’s will (e.g., resolution, request, suggestion);112 (ii) in dependent clauses, to express purpose, result, or consecution.113 While it is possible to distinguish these uses semantically with certain prototypical examples (e.g., (i) cohortative/deliberative and (ii) purpose), the two types cannot be separately rigidly, since the definition of “dependent clause” is imprecise: most “dependent” clauses are introduced by ו, and so are formally indistinguishable from independent clauses. Nevertheless, the independent-dependent distinction is useful for understanding Hebrew

111 Of course, the future indicative may also have jussive force (see note 96).
112 IBHS §§34.5.1; Joüon §114b–f.
113 The other volatives may also express purpose, result, or consecution in a dependent clause, but this use is much more common with the cohortative (at least in Genesis) (IBHS §§34.5.2; 34.6; Joüon §116).
usage as well as the verbal forms G selects to represent the Hebrew cohortative in Greek translation.\textsuperscript{114}

In its independent use, G uses mainly the hortatory subjunctive for the cohortative proper (22)\textsuperscript{115} (19:32)\textsuperscript{116} and the future indicative for the cohortative expressing a resolution (14)\textsuperscript{117} (45:2),\textsuperscript{118} but once the optative of wish (34:11).\textsuperscript{119}

19: 32

לכה נשחקה ואת אבינו יין
deúro kai ποτίσωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν οἶνον
και κομηθῶμεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ

45: 2

אלהים יבר נפשו יושב בנו ישה

34: 11

אמצא חן בעיניכם ואשׁר תאמרו אתן

\textsuperscript{114} For the main equivalents (future indicative, aorist subjunctive), cf. Evans, \textit{Verbal Syntax}, 121–122, 125. There are a few outlying cases not given in the following notes: G uses the aorist subjunctive for the cohortative in a conditional protasis (2: 18:30, 32), the aorist indicative (2: 33:15; 47:25), and the aorist imperative (30:32). He also uses non-verbs (3: 13:9+; 30:31) and omits a cohortative once (33:12) (cf. 5.1.1.2).\textsuperscript{115} 1:26; [4:8]; 11:3+, 4+, 7; 19:32++, 34+; 24:57+; 31:44; 34:23; 35:3; 37:13, 17, 20+, 27; also, aorist circumstantial participles (2: 11:7; 35:3).

\textsuperscript{116} KG II §394.4; Smyth §§1797–1799; SSG §29b(i).


\textsuperscript{118} KG II §387.4; Smyth §1915; SSG §§28ge–gh. The use of the construction \([οὗ μὴ + subjunctive]\) in 21:16 is similar to these resolutions with the future indicative.

\textsuperscript{119} See note 108 above.
For the dependent use of the cohortative, G employs the subjunctive to express purpose or result explicitly (18)\(^ {120} \) (48:9; 29:21) and the future indicative to express consequence more weakly (31)\(^ {121} \) (26:3)

That G intends the subjunctive to express purpose or result in these cases is confirmed by his rare translation of ἵνα by ἵνα (48:9) or δῶς (29:21).\(^ {122} \) The weaker consequential sense of the future indicative, which is illustrated by the representative example of 26:3, is very similar to the type of modal shift observed in the above discussion of weqatal forms (§6.1.1.3). Before I conclude this survey of Hebrew volitional forms, it should be restated that G’s varying translations indicate his comprehension of the underlying Hebrew forms according to their various uses as well as his control of Greek tense and mood and his ability and desire to select a specific form to convey a fitting nuance in each context.

\(^{120}\) Aorist subjunctive (15: 18:21; 19:5; 24:14, 49, [54], 56; 27:4, 7, 41; 29:21; 30:25, 26; [47:19]; 48:9; 49:1); present subjunctive (3: 42:2; 43:8; 47:19); also, aorist circumstantial participle (27:7); cf. the aorist infinitive in 38:16.

\(^{121}\) 12:2++, 3; 17:2++; 22:5++; 23:4, 13; 24:3; 26:3++, 28; 27:9, 21, 25; 30:3, 28, 31++; 32:9; 33:14; 34:12; 42:34; 43:4++, 8; 45:18; 47:16, 19; also, aorist circumstantial participle (43:8). Cf. the present indicative in 44:21.

\(^{122}\) Cf. §4.1.1; Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 68–72.
6.1.1.5 Qatal (910). Hebrew qatal expresses perfective aspect,\textsuperscript{123} and, as yiqtol and weqatal are often used in combination with similar meanings, so are qatal and wayyiqtol.\textsuperscript{124} In fact, Hebrew qatal is often used due to matters of syntax and discourse in contexts where wayyiqtol would be ungrammatical, i.e., where a clausal constituent has been placed between the conjunction \textit{ו} and the verb (i.e., disjunctive syntax),\textsuperscript{125} or in various types of subordinate clauses. Among the finite verbs, the qatal conjugation stands out, in that it occurs as frequently in narration (441) (48.5\%) as in speech (469) (51.5\%). Based on G’s nuanced representation of the other finite verbs, it is not surprising that he handles Hebrew qatal differently in these two contexts. In narration, G treats qatal much like wayyiqtol, using primarily the aorist indicative (347)\textsuperscript{126} (78.6\%) (10:8; 21:1; 14:4b)\textsuperscript{127} or the imperfect indicative (50)\textsuperscript{128} (11.3\%) (13:6; 14:4a),\textsuperscript{129} although he uses the imperfect more often for qatal (11.3\%) than wayyiqtol (3.2\%), since both qatal and the Greek imperfect frequently

\textsuperscript{123} IBHS §§30.1–4; Joüon §112.

\textsuperscript{124} IBHS §§32.2b; 32.2.1; 33.1.2e; Joüon §117a.

\textsuperscript{125} On disjunctive syntax, see §4.1.1.1.

\textsuperscript{126} To this could be added circumstantial participles with aorist indicatives: aorist participle (2:8; 44:4 [gen. absolute]); present participle (29:32).

\textsuperscript{127} Evans, \textit{Verbal Syntax}, 122, 133.

\textsuperscript{128} For \textit{םיִגּוּ}, which has no aorist (24), see 1:2; 3:1; 4:2, 20, 21; 6:4; 10:9; 11:3; 13:3, 5, 6; 27:23; 34:5; 36:7, 12, 13, 14; 37:2; 38:5; [41:48], 54, 56; 42:5; 47:26; for other verbs (26), see 7:19; 13:6++; 14:4; 16:1; 18:11; 19:15, 28, 29; 22:1; 24:62; 27:14; 28:6; 29:9; 31:19; 34:19; 35:18; 36:7; 37:3, 4; 38:9; 39:10; 41:49; 43:30; 45:1, 3; also, an aorist circumstantial participle paired with an imperfect indicative in 44:12.

\textsuperscript{129} Voitila, \textit{Présent et imparfait}, 155–169; Evans, \textit{Verbal Syntax}, 120–121.
present background or subsidiary information.\textsuperscript{130} Once, G uses the historical present for Hebrew qatal (33:17).\textsuperscript{131}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
10:8 & \textit{χοῦς δὲ ἐγέννησεν} τὸν Νεβρὼν \\
           & οὗτος ἦτε ἐγέννησεν τὸν Νεβρὼν \\
21:1 & \textit{kai kúrios ἐπηγέννησεν} τὴν Σάφραν καθὰ ἑτη \\
           & ὑπῆρξεν καὶ ἐπηγέννησεν κύριος τῇ Σάφρα καθὰ ἐλάλησεν \\
13:6 & \textit{kai oû ἔγωγεν} αὐτοὺς ἢ ἦν κατοικεῖν ἁμα \\
           & ὑπῆρξεν ὡς δύο ἡμέρας καὶ ἔγωγεν αὐτοὺς ἢ κατοικεῖν ἁμα \\
14:4 & \textit{δωδεκά} ἦτο ἐν Χοδολλογόμορ \\
           & τῷ δὲ τρισκαιδεκατῳ ἦτε ἵππος πολλὰ \\
33:17 & \textit{καὶ Ἰακώβ ἀπαίρετον} εἰς Σκηνάς.
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

As I already stated in relation to G’s translation of wayyiqtol, G may alternate between the imperfect and the aorist in translating qatal in order to create and then relieve narrative tension, as in 13:6 and 14:4. The statement about the great wealth amassed by Abraham and Lot in 13:6 leads to fighting among their people in the next verse (καὶ ἔγενεν μαχη) and then ultimate separation.\textsuperscript{132} In 14:4, in turn, the twelve years of servitude expressed by the imperfect (ἐδούλευον) anticipate a thirteenth year of revolt (ἀπέστησαν).

\textsuperscript{130} Otherwise, G uses the pluperfect indicative (7), but only with the verbs οἶδα (5: 19:33, 35; 31:32; 39:6; 42:23) and cognates of ἵστημι (2: 19:27; 45:1); or, he uses the perfect indicative (7: [8:7], 8, 11; 24:21; 30:1; 38:14; 50:15) or present indicative (3: 16:4; 32:25; 37:4), but only in content clauses bearing resemblance to direct speech (cf. §6.1.1.1). For rare matches, see also: aorist infinitive (6: 24:15, 52; 27:1, 30; 31:20; 39:5); aorist participle (4: 24:15; 36:31; 46:27+); present participle (2: 65:9; 22:13); perfect participle (2: 6:12; 24:1). For non-verbs (4: 15:17; 24:1; 26:8; 48:14) and omission (4: 3:20; 8:5; 29:17; 39:22). Cf. §5.1.1.2.


\textsuperscript{132} For the way this and other imperfects anticipate not only Lot’s separation from Abraham but also their divergent outcomes in the larger plot, see §§8.3.1–2.
In speech, the aorist indicative is still the most common translation equivalent for Hebrew qatal (297) (63.3%), since characters may refer to the past or even narrate past events just like the narrator. Yet, when they do, they often do not develop the same complexity of narration, a point which helps explain the fact that G basically does not use the imperfect indicative for qatal in speech (9) (1.9%). However, G’s distinctive treatment of qatal in speech is shown not by his most frequent Greek match, but by his more common use of tenses of the indicative that he rarely or never uses for qatal in narration: perfect (85) (18.1%), present (32) (6.8%), and future (7) (1.5%). This fact reflects G’s accurate interpretation of qatal in speech, which is often resultative, stative, or

133 Also, circumstantial participles with the aorist indicative (3: 20:10; 27:35; 49:9).

134 In a similar way, Voitila is hesitant to generalize about the translators of Leviticus and Deuteronomy based on the rarity of the imperfect in those books, since they do not have many narratives with “une structure assez complexe” (Présent et imparfait, 229–230).

135 Only with εἰμί (8: 26:28; 30:29, 30; 31:5, 42; 38:21; 40:13; 46:32) and γίνομαι (31:40); also, one present circumstantial participle with an imperfect (31:40). Similarly, G only uses the pluperfect indicative of ἀπαντά twice (18:19; 28:16).


138 14:22; 15:18; 17:16; 21:7; 38:28; 41:38; 49:11; also, one present circumstantial participle with the future indicative (49:18).

139 For minor matches, G uses the infinitive (5: 24:33; 28:15; 38:22; 41:13+); subjunctive (4: [24:14]; 32:26; 43:9; 48:6); imperative (2: 40:14; 45:19); attributive participles in the aorist (3: 14:24; 15:7; 19:5), present (18:21), and perfect (40:10). For non-verbs (9: 18:12, 20; 19:31; 24:19; 27:20; 31:26, 28; 40:10; 49:15) and omissions (3: 23:11, 13; 41:12), cf. § 5.1.1.2.
performative, but may otherwise have non past-time reference. Very often G translates Hebrew qatal in speech with the perfect indicative (18:20; 31:15) or the present indicative (16:8) with a resultative meaning.

In the first two examples, G uses the perfect indicative in its common resultative sense, referring more to the present state of affairs that results from some action in the past: Sodom and Gomorrah have committed great sins, and their ruckus is “full” (πεπλήθυνται), or at least God is full up with it; Rachel and Leah claim that they are now “thought of” (λελογίσμεθα) by their father as foreigners, who has “sold” (πέπραξεν) and disinherited them. In 16:8, however, G uses the present πόθεν ἔρχηται (“where are you coming from”) to capture the resultative idea of the qatal באת in idiomatic Greek.

Similarly, G makes appropriate use of the perfect and present indicative to translate certain Hebrew stative verbs in speech, most commonly יד “(know)” (15) (12:11;}

---

140 IBHS §§30.5.1c–e, 2b, 3c; Joüon §§112a, F-i.
141 KG II §§382.3–4; 384.1–4; Smyth §§1885–1888; 1945–1947; SSG §28b(i), b(vi), ea.
142 KG II §382.4b; Smyth §1886; SSG §28b(vi).
143 Cf. note 141 (above) and SSG §28ec.
With the Greek present and perfect indicative, G aptly conveys the mental and physical states of knowledge, old age, pregnancy, and despair, but with the 1st-person verbs γεγήρακα ("I am so old") and προσώπικα ("I am vexed"), he uses the Greek perfect in particular to convey Sarah’s extreme age (18:13) and the bitter intensity of Rachel’s emotional pain that Jacob has no suitable bride (27:46).

On a number of occasions G uses the perfect (17:5; 47:23) or present indicative (41:41; 43:23) to translate Hebrew qatal in speech when he takes it as performative, i.e. referring to action accomplished in the present moment of speaking.

145 Cf. also 27:2 and the stative adjective προσώπικα (3: 18:21; 19:31; 24:1).

146 The perfect indicative reinforces the skepticism Sarah has already conveyed with Ἀρά γε ἂληθῶς τέξομαι; ἐγὼ δὲ γεγήρακα.

147 Cf. notes 141–143 (above) and Rijksbaron, Syntax and Semantics, 38 (§10.2).

148 The performative use of the Greek perfect indicative has only been recognized recently by grammarians (SSG §28eb; Anssi Voitila, “The Use of Tenses in the L- and B-texts in the Kaige-section of 2 Reigns,” in Die
In 17:5, God “makes” (τεθεικά) Abraham into a father of many nations as he gives him a new name; in 47:23, Joseph formally “acquires” (κέρτημαι) the Egyptians and their land “today” (σήμερον); in 41:41 Pharaoh “appoints” (καθίστημι) Joseph as second in command over all of Egypt; and in 43:23, Joseph formally “acknowledges receipt” (ευδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχω) of the money his brothers believe to have stolen. 149 It is of great interest that G makes selective use of the perfect indicative to make God’s speech acts to the five most important patriarchal figures in the book of Genesis, thus marking the covenantal themes of the whole book with a unifying surface structure at specific moments in the overarching narrative: with Adam (δέδωκα, 1:29); Noah (δέδωκα, 9:2–3 [twice]); Abraham (τεθεικά, 17:5); Isaac (εὐλόγησα, 26:24); and Jacob (δέδωκα, 35:12). 150

149 This performative use ἀπέχω (“I have received”) is a common receipt formula in the papyri (LSJ, s.v. “ἀπέχω” A.IV; DGE, s.v. “ἀπέχω” A.2; Lee, Lexical Study, 61–62).

150 This is one of the main conclusions of my (currently) unpublished translation-technical study of performative utterances in Greek Genesis: “How to Do Things with God’s Words: Translation Technique of Divine Speech Acts in LXX Genesis” (John William Wevers Prize in Septuagint Studies, 2014).
**6.1.1.6 Participle (366).** In contrast to the preceding finite verbs, the Hebrew participle occurs in a range of syntactic environments because of its complex status as a verbal adjective.\(^{151}\) Though the uses of the participle overlap to some extent,\(^{152}\) they range along a noun-to-verb spectrum: the nominal-adjective uses as (i) a substantive, (ii) an adjective, and (iii) as a relative clause;\(^{153}\) and the verbal use as (iv) a predicate.\(^{154}\) As with the distinct uses of other Hebrew verb forms, G modulates his translation of Hebrew participles according to these syntactic functions. In fact, the Hebrew participle is so syntactically flexible that G’s translation patterns are only recognizable when its uses are treated separately, not to mention the fact that the Hebrew participle appears nearly as often in narration as in speech, a distinction that continues to be relevant for participles that function like finite verbs, for which G typically uses a form of the indicative.

---

\(^{151}\) *IBHS* §37.1; Joüon §§121a, k.

\(^{152}\) The following analysis places each Hebrew participle into one of the four categories enumerated above, but this admittedly involves some subjectivity, especially in distinguishing (i), (ii), and (iii). Yet, a modicum of ambiguous cases does not really alter the analysis of translation technique, especially as they typically involve Greek equivalents shared by the uses in question.

\(^{153}\) *IBHS* §§37.2, 4–5; Joüon §§121i–r.

\(^{154}\) *IBHS* §37.6; Joüon §§121c–h.
For Hebrew substantival participles (44), G typically uses Greek nouns (42)\(^{155}\) (42:9), and for Hebrew adjectival participles (40), he typically uses Greek adjectives (30)\(^{156}\) (41:39), but also perfect and present participles (9)\(^{157}\) (18:11), which are strongly adjectival.\(^{158}\)

\[\text{מרגלים את אשר נראים את צורים הארץ באתם} \]
\[\text{Κατασκοποί ἐστε· κατανοήσατε τὰ ήζη τῆς χώρας ἡματε.} \]
\[\text{אין [אש] להב להב כומך} \]
\[\text{Σύν [οὐ] κατανοήσετε καὶ συνετώτερός σου.} \]
\[\text{אברהם דִּי וֹסָר Trườngים [בָּט] בְּמִימָם} \]

For Hebrew participles functioning as a relative (123), however, G normally uses a Greek participle (108),\(^{159}\) which may function similarly as an alternative to a relative clause.\(^{160}\) Most often, he inflects the participle in the present (76)\(^{161}\) (27:29) or perfect (7)\(^{162}\) (19:14), which appropriately corresponds to the Hebrew participle’s tendency to express general


\(^{158}\) KG II §389.6E; Smyth §1872. For the contextual significance of the one exception (29:16), see §8.3.2.


\(^{160}\) KG II §554.1; Smyth §§2050a; 2488; SSG §31cb.


\(^{162}\) 19:14; 25:27; [32:1]; 45:11; 49:21, 22+. 275
circumstances and states, but he also uses the aorist (25) (21:3), since the temporal and aspectual value of the Hebrew relative participle is ultimately determined by each context.

Where G translates a Hebrew relative participle with a Greek finite verb, it is usually because he has fashioned a relative clause in translation (7) (14:22).

Finally, when the Hebrew participle functions as a predicate (159), G usually translates it with a Greek finite verb (143). G’s shift from participle to finite verb is an important accommodation to the rules of Greek grammar, because Greek participles are not normally used predicatively in place of finite verbs, even though this is relatively common in Septuagint Greek. Since the Hebrew predicative participle typically expresses durative

---

163 IBHS §37.1f.
165 Joüon §121i.
167 This includes a handful of cases where the participle is paired with a form of הָיוּ in a periphrastic progressive construction (11: 1:6; 4:2, 12+, 14+, 17; 27:33; 34:25 [as prepositional phrase]; 37:2; 39:22 [omitted]) (IBHS §37.7.1; Joüon §§121e–f; 154m).
168 KG II §480.1; Smyth §2042; SSG §31g.
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or progressive aspect when it has past and present reference,\textsuperscript{169} but often the immanent future when it has future reference,\textsuperscript{170} G generally uses the present (54)\textsuperscript{171} (4:10; 20:3), future (13)\textsuperscript{172} (15:14), or perfect indicative (5)\textsuperscript{173} (42:38) for predicative participles in direct speech and the imperfect (37)\textsuperscript{174} (24:21) or present indicative (8)\textsuperscript{175} (2:10) for predicative participles in narration.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{169} IBHS §§37.6b–e; Joüon §§121c–d, f.

\textsuperscript{170} IBHS §37.6f; Joüon §121e.


\textsuperscript{173} 24:13, 43; 32:18; 34:22; 42:38.


\textsuperscript{176} G also uses several outlying matches for the predicative participle: pluperfect indicative in narration (4: 18:2, 8; 28:13; 40:3) and speech (3:5); aorist indicative in narration (5: 18:10; 21:14; 27:5; 32:21; 41:1); subjunctive in speech (2: 18:17; 21:22) and narration (39:3); 3rd-person imperative periphrasis in speech (2: 1:5; 27:33); and pluperfect periphrasis in narration (2: 18:22; 40:6). Cf. SG §§31fd, fh; Evans, \textit{Verbal Syntax}, 234, 245–246. For non-verbal renderings (prepositional phrase (34:25) and omission (39:22)), see §5.1.1.2.
Much like with Hebrew yiqtol (see §6.1.1.2), G flexibly translates the Hebrew predicative participle with a range of Greek verb forms that express its durative aspect in present/future (speech) and past (narration) contexts, aiming to select the one that best represents the meaning of the Hebrew in each case. In a handful of instances, G translates a Hebrew predicative participle with a Greek participle (11), especially when it occurs in a genitive absolute (29:9) or after a verb of perception (24:63). Rarely does G use a Greek participle predicatively in imitation of the underlying Hebrew structure (25:26), thus emphasizing the Hebrew participle’s adjectival character.  

177 In genitive absolute (3: 18:1; 24:30; 29:9); after verb of perception (3: 24:63; 26:8; 37:15); predicatively in verbless clause (3: 25:26; 28:12; 33:1); as circumstantial participle (38:25); as attributive participle (40:5).

178 KG II §482.1; Smyth §§2110–2115; SSG §31gd.

179 For a handful of minor matches (5), see 7:8; 37:7; 41:1, 17; 42:35.
6.1.1.7 Infinitive Construct (447). As a verbal noun, the Hebrew infinitive construct may fill any syntactic slot appropriate for a noun, although its most common position in Genesis (as elsewhere) is after a preposition to introduce a subordinate clause (420) (94.0%). If one excludes G’s regular translation of לאמר with a form of the participle λέγων (78), G frequently uses Greek infinitives for Hebrew infinitives construct governed by a preposition (235/342) (68.7%). This equivalence is generally appropriate, since the Greek infinitive—sometimes with the article (37:18; 20:6; 11:25)—is used broadly in the same syntactic environments, but also in very specific contexts that include but are not limited to: after volitional verbs (24:8) or verbs of capacity (34:14a); epexegetically after substantives (34:14b); to express purpose or result (32:5; 37:18); after verbs of hindering (20:6); and after prepositions (11:25).

---

180 IBHS §36.2.1; Joüon §§124a–d.
181 IBHS §§36.2.2–3; Joüon §§124k–l. This count includes infinitives construct after the following compound prepositions or functionally similar combinations (12): בשם (6: 2:4, 17; 3:5; 5:1, 2; 21:8); מעת (2: 24:11; 31:10); Lê (2: 13:10; 36:31); בֵּית (38:27); רבֵּי (30:41).
182 This equivalence has already been discussed in §3.1.1.2.
183 KG II §471.3; Smyth §1968; SSG §30a.
184 KG II §471.3; Smyth §§1991–1999; SSG §30bef.
185 KG II §471.3; Smyth §2000; SSG §30bef.
186 KG II §§473.5–6; Smyth §§2001–2007; SSG §30bc.
187 KG II §§473.7; 478.4c; Smyth §§2008–2011; 1408; 2032e; SSG §30ba–bb.
188 KG §§514.1–5; Smyth §§1392–1400; 2032d; 2038; 2739–2744; SSG §30c.
189 KG II §478.4b; Smyth §2034b; SSG §30aba.
However, considering the particular Hebrew prepositions that govern these infinitives construct yields much sharper translation technical patterns. If omissions and atypical renderings are excluded (28), then G tends to use one of these three main renderings for Hebrew infinitives construct after a given preposition: (i) infinitives (235), (ii) finite verbs (62), and (iii) participles (17).
infinitives: י (167/195), ירא (20/22); יוש (12/14); יכ (9/10); יארך (4); ינפ (41:32) ינפ
finite verbs: ב (21/42); ב (13/15); ב (6); ב (2: 31:10; 38:27); ב (24:11)
participles: only after ב (14) and ב (3: 27:5; 30:38; 50:17)


20: 2:4, 17; 35:5:1, 2; 21:8. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, 24–27. While Soisalon-Soininen treats the Hebrew infinitive as a construct after נ, ב, ו, and ר, apart from infinitive construct after ב and ב (and other prepositions), it is also valuable to consider them together because of (i) their common temporal significance and (ii) G’s common use of finite verbs for the Hebrew infinitive.


Further analysis reveals that where G regularly selects a Greek finite verb, the preposition governing the Hebrew infinitive construct is almost exclusively temporal, largely because Greek does not normally use the construction [ἐν τῷ + infinitive] for temporal clauses.

G typically translates a Hebrew infinitive construct with a Greek supplementary participle after verbs of cessation or exhaustion (11) (24:22), the regular construction in Greek, but also where he prefers another type of supplementary participle (18:16; 27:5), a

---

203 *IBHS* §§36.2.2b; 11.2.5c, 9e; cf. Joı̇on §124k. G takes the preposition 2 conditionally in 42:15, and he takes the preposition 2 conditionally in 44:30 and comparatively in 33:10.

204 KG II §§478.4d; 566–568; Smyth §§2033b; 2383–2461; *SSG* §30aba; Takamitsu Muraoka, “The Infinitive in the Septuagint,” in *VIII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, SCS 41 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 265–266. When G uses the construction [ἐν τῷ + infinitive], it often permits non-temporal meanings (e.g., causal, instrumental). Soisalon-Soininen attributes the fact that many Septuagint translators translate Hebrew [2 + infinitive construct] with Greek [ἐν τῷ + infinitive] in about half its occurrences, not to the Hebraizing character of the Greek construction, but to its capacity to be understood causally (*Infinitive*, 81–82).

205 With παύομαι (11:8; 18:33; [24:14], 18, 22; 27:30); with συντελέω (3:17:22; 24:15, 45); with καταπαύω (49:33); with παραλύω (19:11).

206 KG II §482.6; Smyth §2098; *SSG* §31e.
circumstantial participle (43:6; also 34:7), or a genitive absolute (after temporal ב: 50:17; also 30:38).

While G’s use of Greek finite verbs and participles for Hebrew infinitives construct requires him to make morphological determinations not signaled by the Hebrew infinitive construct (e.g., person, number, mood, and voice), even where he uses a Greek infinitive as a formal equivalent, he must determine the appropriate Greek tense form for each case, i.e. aorist (187) or present (62). While I have already demonstrated G’s control of aspect with finite verbs and participles in the preceding sections, I also give several contrastive pairs here to show that G’s sensitivity to the contextually appropriate use of these two forms extends to the Greek infinitive, as well.

—

207 After ב (4: 18:16; 19:11; 34:7; 43:6); after ב (27:5).

208 For the supplementary participle after verbs of motion, see KG §482.10; Smyth §2099; SSG §§31e; 70ae.

209 For the supplementary participle after verbs of perception, see KG II §482.1; Smyth §§2110–2115; SSG §§31e; 70a.

All of Jacob’s sons and daughters come with the intention of consoling him (παρακαλέσαι) (37:35a), but their attempts are unsuccessful (οὐκ ἤθελεν παρακαλεῖσαι) (37:35b), a contrast that is made clear by the difference between the aorist and present infinitives. Similarly, Potiphar’s wife brings two similar yet contrastive complaints against him, first to his household servants (39:14), and then to his face (39:17). The Hebrew construction is identical in the two verses, but G skillfully differentiates the two situations. When speaking to the household servants, the complaint that Potiphar’s wife makes is more general, namely that her husband has brought this Hebrew slave into the household in order “to mock us” (ἐμπαιζείν ἡμῖν), and this particular event is only representative of the sort of shame that may be brought upon them in the future. When speaking to her husband, however, she uses the aorist infinitive and so brings the focus squarely onto this single infraction against “me” (ἐμπαιξαί μοι), one which is particularly embarrassing for her husband.211

211 Wevers, Notes, 658; Brayford, Genesis, 406; SSG §28ha(i). For a discussion of these cases in context, see §§9.3.1; 9.3.3.
Apart from its main use after prepositions, the Hebrew infinitive construct mainly occurs as a complementary infinitive (10)\(^{212}\) (8:12), but also as the subject or predicate of a nominal clause (4)\(^{213}\) (2:18), after לעין (3)\(^{214}\) (50:20), and in the expression בהカラー (5)\(^{215}\) (10:30).\(^{216}\) In these contexts, too, G primarily uses the Greek infinitive for the Hebrew infinitive construct (8:12b; 2:18; 10:30), but also finite forms in the indicative (8:12a) and subjunctive (50:20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כל סוף והם לבזר</td>
<td>Ο ούχιν εὐθα σπόννον μόνον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udentate מוטה עליה</td>
<td>υμεῖς ἐβουλέυσατε κατ’ ἐμοῦ εἰς πονηρά,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לצושפ לקים הקוה</td>
<td>δὲ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς ἀγαθά,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לתחלת עצם ראב</td>
<td>ὅπως ἂν γενηθῇ ὡς σήμερον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וית เมשבים</td>
<td>ἵνα διατραφῇ λαὸς πολὺς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μמשא יאמ מחר המקד</td>
<td>καὶ γένετο η κατόικησις αὐτών</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.1.1.8 Infinitive Absolute (53).

The rarest of the Hebrew verb forms, the infinitive absolute has, broadly speaking, two main types of uses: (i) an adverbial function (i.a) to intensify a

---

\(^{212}\) IBHS §36.2.1d; Joüon §124c; SSG §30bg; Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 22–24. For G’s renderings, see: after יסף (5), infinitive (3: 4:12; 8:12; 37:8); indicative (2: 8:10, [12]); after באה (3), infinitive (3: 24:50; 37:4; 44:1); after כי, subjunctive (4:7); after כס, indicative (31:12).

\(^{213}\) IBHS §36.2.1b; Joüon §124b. For G’s renderings, see: as subject (3), infinitive (2: 2:18; 29:19); indicative (30:15); as predicate, infinitive (11:6).

\(^{214}\) IBHS §36.2.2b; Joüon §124k; Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 75–78. G uses the subjunctive (3: 18:19; 37:22; 50:20).

\(^{215}\) Always translated as ἐὰν ἐλθεῖν (5: 10:19+, 30; 13:10; 25:18). Cf. §3.3.3.1

\(^{216}\) For less common uses of the Hebrew infinitive construct (2), see 29:7 (adnominal) and 39:18 (= main verb); also, for non-verbal renderings (40:20; 48:11) and one omission (37:5), see §5.1.1.2.
cognate verb, or (ii.b) to qualify a non-cognate verb based upon the meaning of the infinitive absolute; and (ii) a verbal function to replace (ii.a) imperatives, (ii.b) finite verbs, (ii.c) participles, and (ii.d) infinitives construct. The Greek language has no analogous verbal form, and so G’s treatment of the Hebrew infinitive absolute sheds distinctive light on his complex poetics of translations: while he often tries to imitate the Hebrew form by using a Greek participle (17), he also discovers creative ways of representing the Hebrew infinitive absolute in Greek that are linguistically and stylistically more acceptable.

---

217 IBHS §35.3.1; Joüon §§123d–l, o–p.
218 IBHS §§35.3.2; 35.4; Joüon §§123m–n, r–s.
219 IBHS §35.5; Joüon §§123t–x.
In its most common adverbial use with a cognate finite verb (40), G typically translates the Hebrew infinitive absolute variously with a cognate participle (13)\(^{221}\) (37:8),\(^{222}\) a cognate noun in the dative (11)\(^{223}\) (20:37),\(^{224}\) or by omission (6) (24:5).\(^{225}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37:8</td>
<td>עם המלך עלינו</td>
<td>Μη βασιλεύσων βασιλεύσεις ἡμᾶς (kuriεύσων кυριεύσεις ἡμῶν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:37</td>
<td>διαμαρτυρία diaμαρτυρήστηκαί ἡμῖν ὁ ἀνθρωπος</td>
<td>άποστρέψω τὸν ιὸν σου εἰς τὴν γῆν ὅθεν ἐξῆλθες ἐκεῖθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:5</td>
<td>άποστρέψω τὸν ιὸν σου εἰς τὴν γῆν ὅθεν ἐξῆλθες ἐκεῖθεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less often, G uses a cognate accusative (3) (28:22; also 19:9; 50:15),\(^{226}\) an adverb (30:16; also 32:12), or some other construction (5) (37:33; 44:28).\(^{227}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28:22</td>
<td>כל אשר תתן לי עשר אעשה לך καὶ πάντων ὃν εἶν μοι δῷ δεκάτῳ ἀποδεκατῶσω αὐτά σοι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:16</td>
<td>μεισθομαί γάρ σε ἀντί τῶν μανδραγόρων τοῦ ιὸν μου σήμερον</td>
<td>ἐμπέσαν τὸν Ἰωσήφ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:33</td>
<td>ὅρπον ἤρπασεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:28</td>
<td>υπήρθως γέγονεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For other adverbial uses of the Hebrew infinitive absolute, i.e., usually where it occurs in a pair of coordinate infinitives absolute (10),\(^{228}\) G exhibits a lot of flexibility, and

---

\(^{221}\) 3:16; 15:13; 16:10; 18:10, 18; 20:18; 22:17+; 26:28; 37:8+; 37:10; 43:7. The participle in 18:10 is not lexically, but semantically cognate with the main verb.

\(^{222}\) This resulting Greek construction is not ungrammatical, but it is pleonastic and unidiomatic (KG II §490.3; SSG §31db).

\(^{223}\) 2:16, 17; 3:4; 17:13; 26:11; 31:15, 30; 40:15; 43:3; 44:5, 15. In 26:11, where ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ἑσται translates the dative noun άνθρωπος is not cognate with the main verb but has a related meaning.

\(^{224}\) KG II 410.2, Anmerkung 4; Smyth §1577; SSG §22wr.

\(^{225}\) 20:7; 24:5; 27:30; 31:30; 43:7; 20.

\(^{226}\) KG II §410.2; Smyth §§1563–1576; SSG §22xk. In such constructions (with both cognate accusative and cognate dative), an attributive is often supplied to specify how the cognate modifies the verb.


\(^{228}\) The infinitive absolute בָּחֳרָה in 21:16, which G appropriately translates with the adverb μακρόθεν, also functions adverbially, but not in this construction.
the paucity of examples makes it unclear whether he understands the meaning of this Hebrew construction, as some renderings involve major transformations (8:3, 7; 12:9).

| 8:3 | וישּׁבוּ המים מעל הארץ והלוּך ויחסרו וּבֶשׁוּ | kai ἐνεδίδοι τὸ ὕδωρ πορεύμενον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐνεδίδοι καὶ ἡλαττονῦτο ... |
| 5 | יִשְׁמַעְתֶּהוּ וּבֶשׁוּ | τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ πορεύμενον ἡλαττονῦτο |
| 7 | יִשְׁמַעְתֶּהוּ וּבֶשׁוּ | καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν ἐως τοῦ ἔξαπτοναι τὸ ὕδωρ |
| 12:9 | יִשְׁמַעְתֶּהוּ וּבֶשׁוּ | καὶ ἀπῆρεν Ἀβράὰμ καὶ πορεύεται ἐστρατοπέδευσεν ἐν τῇ ἑρῆμῳ |
| 26:13 | יִשְׁמַעְתֶּהוּ וּבֶשׁוּ | καὶ υψώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ προβαίνων μείζων ἐγίνετο ἑώς ὃς μέγας ἐγένετο σφόδρα |

Though perhaps awkward in Greek, the use of the present participle alongside imperfect indicatives in 8:3, 5 and 26:13 is probably meant to capture the progressive quality of these verbal constructions. However, G does not replicate the progressive idea of הלך ונסע (“gradually moving”) in 12:9, transforming this syntactically and lexically into πορεύεται ἐστρατοπέδευσεν (“as he traveled he encamped in the desert”). Similarly, G has overhauled the syntax of 8:3, so that the two infinitives absolute occur in different clauses, and he has polarized the sense of 8:7 by introducing a negative.

The three remaining infinitives absolute function within Hebrew syntax like finite verbs, and G renders them appropriately in each context.

---

229 Judging from the orthography, this construction is not coordinated infinitive absolutes but the functionally similar construction [infinitive absolute + adjective] (IBHS §35.3.2c note 39; Joüon §120s). Yet, it is possible to vocalize this form as גָּדֵּל (adjective) or גָּדֹל (infinitive absolute).
Person, Number and Voice

In contrast to the morphological features pertaining to tense, aspect, and mood, the Hebrew and Greek categories of verbal person, number, and voice/stem are far more congruent. In both languages, the finite verbal forms mark grammatical person (i.e., first-, second-, or third-person), and all but the infinitives mark grammatical number (i.e., singular or plural). Applying to all verbal forms, the category of voice is more complicated for a variety of morphological, syntactic, and lexical reasons that I will discuss below, but the system of Hebrew stems is roughly analogous to Greek’s marking for active, middle, or passive voice. Because the two systems are relatively similar, G generally maintains both person, number, and voice in translation, since most alterations to these morphological categories would substantially change the meaning of the text. However, I will catalogue and explore certain exceptions below.

6.1.2.1 Person Although it is not uncommon for G to translate a Hebrew finite verb with a Greek verb that does not inflect for person (290/4,266) (6.8%), as I have documented in the preceding sections, he rarely alters the person of a Hebrew finite verb directly (39) (0.9%).

---

230 The form "ון" could be analyzed as either an imperative or an infinitive absolute.
231 IBHS §20.2b; Joion §§40–85; KG II §§358–371; Smyth §§363–364; 949–972; SSG §77.
232 IBHS §21; Joion §40a; KG II §§372–378; Smyth §§356; 1703–1758; SSG §§27; 54.
Most often, G does so by way of translating a Hebrew impersonal construction personally in Greek (20), in which case the actors and objects are not significantly altered in translation notionally, even though they are shuffled around grammatically.

Still, these minor adjustments can have important stylistic and literary effects, such as in 9:2, where G uses the first-person perfect indicative δέδωκα as a performative (“I hereby give”), thus capturing the transactional nature of God’s present statement. Like this case, a number of person transformations also involve changes in voice (§6.1.2.3).

More substantive transformations of grammatical person are rare (19). Although they do not always make a major interpretive difference (28:14), they usually do (16:2; 17:15). In several such cases, the discrepancy seems to stem from the fact that G has read the Hebrew form in a different way (26:22; also 28:21; 41:38).

---

233 3rd person to 2nd person (12:46; 6:21; 18:25; 19:9; 31:35; 41:33+; 44:18, 19; 45:20; 49:4, 9); 3rd person to 1st person (8:9; 2, 6; 33:13; 42:10; 43:23; 44:33; 46:34; 47:4).

234 On the Greek performative, especially as a translation of Hebrew qatal, see §6.1.1.5.

235 3rd person to 2nd person (3:817+; 42:16) or 1st person (41:38); 2nd person to 3rd person (6:17:15; 18:4; 21:30; 28:14; 30:33; 38:29) or 1st person (2:23:15; 31:28); 1st person to 3rd person (5:26:22; 28:21; 30:32; 32:10; 49:31) or 2nd person (2:16:2; 44:28).
In 28:14, G’s change in person produces a slightly different meaning, having God promise that Isaac’s seed will multiply instead of Isaac himself, but his manipulation of person (and voice) in 16:2 and 17:15 has more dramatic effects, altering Sarah’s rationale for handing Hagar over to Sarah as a surrogate wife and harmonizing Sarah’s renaming with that of Abraham (17:5). In 26:22, however, G has taken the first common plural verbal agreement on נַפְרִי as a first common plural pronominal suffix (ῃμᾶς).

6.1.2.2 Number More often, G alters a verb’s grammatical number, but this is usually a result of either (i) a disparity in number between the Hebrew and Greek subjects and/or the verbal agreement expected by the two verbs or (ii) the tendency for Hebrew (but not Greek) to allow a singular verb for a plural subject if the verb precedes the subject. G uses a Greek singular verb for a Hebrew plural (70/983) (7.1%) more often than he uses a Greek plural verb for a Hebrew singular (75/3,649) (2.1%), and I will give the recurring reasons for both types of changes, but it is important first to recall that the difference between singular

---

236 These two transformations, as well as other proximate translation choices, have significant implications for the plot of Abraham’s story. This will be discussed in §8.3.1 and §8.3.2, respectively.

237 If only the substantive changes in number are considered (see below), then these percentages are much lower and closer together: singular for plural (35) (1.0%); plural for singular (19) (1.9%).
and plural for many verbal forms is the single character ו, which is easy for scribes, translators, and all readers to miss.

When G renders a Hebrew singular verb with a Greek plural verb, it is most often due to the fact that (i) the Hebrew verb has a collective singular subject, but G prefers a plural and so modifies the verb to agree with its plural subject (21)\(^238\) (13:7);\(^{239}\) (ii) the Hebrew verb is in the singular before a plural or compound subject,\(^{240}\) a context in which Greek generally requires plural agreement on the verb (12)\(^241\) (1:14);\(^{242}\) or (iii) the Hebrew verb is passive and singular, but G renders it as active and plural (7)\(^{243}\) (6:21).

The remaining cases involve various interpretive adjustments to the source text of varying significance, illustrated by the following set of examples (35).\(^{244}\)

---


\(^{239}\) KG II §359; Smyth §949; SSG §77a.

\(^{240}\) IBHS §7; Joüon §150.


\(^{242}\) KG II §370.1; Smyth §§963–965; 967; for exceptions, see KG II §§370.2–6; Smyth §§966; 968–972; SSG §§77ba–bk.


In 2:17, G changes God’s prohibition from singular to plural, so that it explicitly applies not just to Adam, but also to Eve. In 41:38, however, G read נמצא as a first-person common plural qal instead of a third-person masculine singular niphal, and G’s interpretation of the first verb in 48:2 as hophal (and not hiphil) prompted his use of a plural subject for the following participle.

Where G renders a Hebrew plural verb with a Greek singular, however, it usually results from the fact that (i) Hebrew has a subject that G translates as collective singular in Greek (29) (11:3), often ὄδωρ for יִשֵּׂא (7:17); (ii) Greek has a neuter plural subject and so uses singular agreement on the verb (14) (41:29); (41:29), or (iii) a passive transformation is involved, which either triggers or allows the change in number (8) (41:35).
As with the previous group, the exceptional cases involve interpretational adjustments of varying significance (19).

11:31  ויקח תרח את אברם בנו
       ואת לוט בן הירן בן בנו
       ואת שרי כלתו אשׁת אברם בנו
       ויהצו את אלהים צדיקים
       ללבחו את בחינה חכמה
       ויבאו דע תרח ישון שם

27:29  אرار א الرحمن
       ומעברך הרוח

17:10  הם ברית אברהם משמה
       הם ואל אל אברם...
       ...-peeritmenhsetai umon pan arsenev,...

In 11:31, V read ויצא as hiphil (with SP), and so G interpreted אתם as אֹתָם (not MT אִׂתָם), the basis for which the following two verbs are in the singular. Yet, this choice may serve a literary function of creating separation between Thara, who took up residence (κατόικησεν) in Ur, and Abraham, who moved on from there. In 27:29, G resolves a minor grammatical difficulty of numerical disagreement between the subject and predicate by translating the participles in the singular, while the shift from plural to singular in 17:10 seems to reflect G’s own understanding that it is specifically Abraham who is to perform the circumcision, an interpretation that is consistent with the passive-to-active transformation in 17:27 that attributes the act of circumcision explicitly to Abraham.

---

249 On the relative permanence of κατοικέω/κατοικίζω in comparison to the simplex, see §5.2.2.5.
250 For the significance of Abraham’s agency in this chapter and the broader story, see §8.3.2.
6.1.2.3 **Voice** Hebrew verbs do not encode voice directly, and yet, while lexical factors play an important role in determining a verb’s voice and transitivity,\(^{252}\) certain major Hebrew stems generally serve as the middle and/or passive of other stems,\(^{253}\) as follows: the *niphal* expresses the middle or passive of the *qal*; the *hithpael* expresses the middle/reflexive of the *piel*, while the *pual* is its passive; and the *hophal* expresses the passive of the *hiphil*.

Furthermore, these three groups have increasing transitivity as one moves from *qal* and *niphal*, on the low end, to *hiphil* and *hophal*, on the high end, with the *piel*, *pual*, and *hithpael* in between.\(^{254}\) So, while the system of Hebrew stems is structurally quite different from Greek morphological marking of voice as active, middle, or passive, similarly moving from high to low transitivity, there are significant points of correspondence between the two systems. The expression of voice in Greek has its own morphological, lexical, and syntactic complexities, since, for example, the middle and passive are only morphologically distinct in the future and aorist,\(^{255}\) and certain verbs are always inflected as middle and/or passive, or always in certain tenses (i.e., deponents).\(^{256}\) Nevertheless, when all of these Hebrew and Greek factors are taken into consideration, it is possible to show that G typically does not alter a Hebrew verb’s voice or transitivity in Greek translation, i.e., G tends to translate *qal*, *piel*, and *hiphil* forms with the Greek active or middle voice; *niphal*,

---

\(^{252}\) See, e.g., *IBHS* §22.2; Joüon §41.

\(^{253}\) The minor stems are collectively so uncommon in Genesis as to draw any sweeping generalizations.

\(^{254}\) *IBHS* §21.2n–o; Joüon §40a.

\(^{255}\) *KG* II §§372–378; Smyth §§800–821; 1713–1758; *SSG* §27.

\(^{256}\) *KG* II §§372.2; Smyth §§356b; 366a; *SSG* §27a(i).
and hophal forms with the Greek middle or passive; and he translates hithpael forms with the Greek middle more frequently than forms from any other Hebrew stem.

With the exception of well-established deponents, where G inflects a Greek verb with a Greek voice that does not fit the above schema, it is most often because he has avoided using the active form due to its inappropriately transitive meaning (72), at least in certain tenses (22:19). This is very often the case with Hebrew statives translated by Greek denominative verbs that are causative or factitive, especially those ending in -οω (19:13), -ιω/-αιω (31:36), or -υνω/-αινω (8:14).

---

257 The Hebrew pual is actually translated with the Greek active more than one would expect, but this is surely due to its relative infrequency, the small number of lemmas involved (cf. (π)σευδη = τριετίζοντα/ουσαν three times in 15:9), and the fact that pual forms may often be taken as piel (cf. παντελέη = ἔπεκάλυψαν in 7:19, 20).

258 ἀποστρέφεω (8: 15:16; 16:9; 22:19; 31:3; 31:55; 38:22; 42:24; 43:18); ὕψω (7: 7:17, 20, 24; 19:13; 24:35; 26:13; 48:19); αὐξάνω (7: 21:8, 20; 25:27; 30:30; 47:27; 49:22+); πληθύνω (6: 7:17, 18; 18:20; 38:12; 47:27; 48:16); ἀπεκκένω (4: 27:45; 31:38; 43:14+); φαίνω (4: 21:11; [35:22]; 38:10; 45:5); ταράσσω (3: 40:6; 42:28; 43:30); ἔφημω (2: 47:19+); ἐργίζω (2: 31:36; 40:2); μεθύσκω (2: 9:21; 43:34); διασπείρω (2: 9:19; 11:4); πληρώ (2: 25:24; 29:21); ἠπαινῶ (2: 27:14); ἀπιμάζω (2: 16:4, 5); ἐγείρω (2: 41:4, 7); ἔξεγείρω (2: 28:16; 41:21); κυρώ (23:20); καταφαιν (48:17); ἔκτρβω (47:18); πύμπλημ (6:13); ἐπιθέμω (7:18); ἐλαττόνω (18:28); στερεό (48:11); παραλώ (19:11); ἁμβλίνω (27:1); ἄνοχλω (48:11); μεγαλώ (43:34); σκηνόω (49:7); περιστρέφω (37:7); πλατύνω (28:14); χαίρω (45:16).

259 Many of the verbs involved are stative or intransitive in the present (cf. note 258).


261 KG II §374.4; Smyth §816; LSJ, s.v. “στρέφω.”
By using a passive verb in each of these verses, G adequately represents the intransitive meaning of the underlying Hebrew. Less often, the Hebrew stem seems mismatched to the Greek voice at first glance for the opposite reason, i.e., because G has used an active intransitive verb to capture the meaning of a Hebrew middle/passive (8).262

It is also common for G to use a Greek passive form for a Hebrew active verb in an impersonal construction (13)263 (2:20; 30:2);264 less often, he uses an active Greek verb in an impersonal construction for a Hebrew passive (3) (10:9; also 20:9; 22:14). Neither type of change really alters the roles of the participants in the situation conveyed by the verb.

As I have already noted in the preceding sections on grammatical person and number, some changes seem to involve variant ways of reading the Hebrew form (10).265
In 27:18, G has reasonably interpreted אַבֵּה as *hiphil* instead of *qal*, interpreting וַיָּבַא as the direct object of אֵיָּשֶׁנָּה, and he has taken מַעַרְמַת as the direct object of אֵיָּשֶׁנָּה, instead of *niphal*, maintaining continuity of subject with the preceding wayyiqtol.

One important set of cases involves G’s translating of *qal*, *piel*, and *hiphil* verbs with the Greek middle voice in opposition to the active (45). To be sure, using the Greek middle voice to translate a Hebrew stem that has a typically active meaning is not a transformation of the same order as using active for passive, or vice versa. Yet, G’s use of the Greek middle in such cases, especially as a direct reflexive (38:19; 19:2; 14:8) and indirect reflexive (31:44; 25:1; 44:5), indicates his capacity to use appropriate Greek forms to represent the meaning of the Hebrew as well as his concerns for the proper interpretation of particular situations in their literary contexts.

---

266 KG II §§374.2–4; Smyth §§1717–1718; SSG §27cb.
267 KG II §§374.5–6; Smyth §§1719–1722; SSG §27cb.
The use of \(\text{προστίθημι}\) before another verb in verbal hendiadys imitates the underlying Hebrew construction (25:1), and it is likely an abnormal Greek formulation, especially where it governs an infinitive instead of being subordinated to a finite verb, as here.\(^{269}\) Yet, it is very interesting to find that everywhere G uses the middle of \(\text{προστίθημι}\) instead of the active, the following Greek verb would have best been inflected as middle in a more typical Greek construction (e.g., if G had used an adverb such as \(\text{ἔτι}\) instead of \(\text{προστίθημι}\)). In 25:1, then, it seems that G uses \(\text{προσέλαβεν}\) \(\text{δὲ Αβραὰμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα, ἥδηνομα Χεττοῦρα.}\) In this way, G’s desire to inflect a verb with the most appropriate voice even when he uses a Hebraizing construction captures his complex poetics of translation in a picturesque way.

Unfortunately, it is not always possible to determine what meaning G intended for a particular middle form, even where it stands in opposition to an active or passive form of the same verb used elsewhere.

\(^{269}\) SSG §30bg; Thackeray, Grammar, 52–53.
While native speakers of contemporary Greek likely could have differentiated the middle and passive in each of these two pairs, the exact difference remains elusive for us.\(^{270}\)

Beyond the cases illustrated above, more substantive transformations of voice are relatively rare (50),\(^{271}\) having a variety of linguistic and literary effects upon the translation. For example, G’s passive-to-active transformation in 25:10 resolves a minor difficulty of a verb only agreeing in number with the first of a set of subjects (cf. §6.1.2.2), but it may also harmonize this with the similar formulation in the previous verse ((eq[3] = καὶ ἔθαψαν).

However, G’s use of the passive ἐλογίσθη in 15:6 for the hiphil ἠθέσθη has a far more profound effect, making Abraham’s act of faith the verb’s subject instead of God: this move not only alters the larger plot by presenting the interaction between God and Abraham at this point in the story as a bilateral agreement, but it also has important theological implications for later readers.\(^{272}\)

\(^{270}\) Muraoka is less optimistic, speaking of the “functional neutralization” of the middle and passive of particular Greek verbs (SSG §27e).


\(^{272}\) E.g., Gal 3:6–5:1; Rom 4; Jas 2:14–26; Heb 11. The literary and theological aspects of this transformation will be addressed at greater length in §8.3.1.
6.2 Nominal Morphology

As with verbs, G follows the form of Hebrew nominals in many ways, especially translating the morphological categories of person and number into Greek with equivalent values. For this reason, I will analyze G’s treatment of nominal morphology much more rapidly than the lengthy discussion of verbal morphology. Even so, G may alter the person or number of a noun or pronoun as an accommodation to Greek usage or for a range of stylistic, literary, rhetorical, and/or interpretive reasons. As for the category of grammatical gender, however, I will argue that it is not as fruitful for comparison between Hebrew and Greek, since grammatical gender is typically lexically determined and semantically insignificant (except in the case of animate entities) and the grammatical gender of many Greek nouns may or may not match that of Hebrew equivalents. What is significant, however, is that G does not blindly follow the gender of Hebrew nominals, as this would make his translation bizarre and at times unintelligible to Greek readers.

6.2.1 Person

Since nouns and adjectives do not inflect for person, the grammatical category of person only applies to Hebrew personal pronouns and pronominal suffixes. It is very rare for G to change the person of a pronominal suffix or independent personal pronoun (8), and every instance is illustrated below. In half of the cases, the change in person is due to a switch in direct/indirect statement.
In two other cases, where both 1st and 3rd person pronominal suffixes could make sense, it is likely that the difference resulted from confusion between י and י.  

The final two cases result from concomitant choices made by G either to change the person of the clause (44:19) or to use an unusual lexical equivalent (26:24):
6.2.2 Number

Grammatical number applies to Hebrew pronominals (i.e., independent pronouns and pronominal suffixes) as well as to common nouns. I will consider these two groups separately, since G’s treatment of number varies between them.

6.2.2.1 Personal pronouns and pronominal suffixes. G alters the number of a Hebrew personal pronoun or pronominal suffix more often than its person, but still quite infrequently (43), more commonly representing a Hebrew singular as a Greek plural (34) than a Hebrew plural as a Greek singular (9). The main cause of number discrepancies in G’s translations of Hebrew pronominals is collective nouns, such that G either renders a Hebrew collective singular with a Greek plural (17)²⁷⁴ (6:3; 41:15) or a Hebrew plural with a Greek collective singular (5)²⁷⁵ (40:11; 41:26).

In most cases, such transformations have little effect on the interpretation of a phrase in context, such as whether Joseph’s famed ability to interpret dreams applies each dream (יהואו ... חלום) or generally to all dreams (אנהו ... אומן) he hears (41:15), or such as whether a bunch of grapes are conceived of individually as grapes (_UTIL ... עטים) or collectively as a bunch (תנ"ן סתעףלקו ... עטים) (40:11). Yet, subtle shifts in number may address literary and theological aspects of the text as well as lexical and linguistic ones, such as in 41:26, where G’s use of the singular ἐστίν conveys that both of the plural entities (i.e., seven cows, seven sheaves) are collective ciphers for seven years.\(^\text{276}\)

G also alters the number of Hebrew pronominals in Greek translation in other contexts. Once this is due to a concomitant transformation in grammatical voice (17:27), but various other motivations and effects may be involved (20)\(^\text{277}\) (7:13; 44:16).

---

\(^{276}\) Alternatively, one could argue that ἐστίν is specifically attracted to the neuter plural predicate nominative ἐτή, but the neuter status of ἐτή is more likely incidental, such that G has altered the verb’s number because he conceives of the subject as a collective unit and so uses verbal agreement *ad sensum* (KG II §359; Smyth §§949; 958 SSG §77b; contra Wevers, *Notes*, 686).

\(^{277}\) Singular to plural (16: 24:33; 36:19; 38:5, 23; 41:10; 43:20; 44:9, 16, 27, 30, 34; 47:18+, 25, 26; 48:20); plural to singular (4: 7:13; 9:26; 25:13; 41:8).
In 17:27, G has translated the *niphal* form נמלו (“they were circumcised”) actively as περιέτεμεν (“he circumcised”) and thus taken the particle ἐν as ἐν (DDOM) instead of ἐν (PREP), which logically requires a plural object according to this interpretation that highlights Abraham’s agency in circumcising his household. Then, while the Hebrew of 7:13 has Noah and his sons entering the ark with their wives, G has Noah entering with his family, adjusting אתם (“with them”) to μετ’ αὐτοῦ (“with him”) on the basis of the leading verb בא, which is inflected in the singular (“he entered”). Finally, G has translated the singular suffix on δόθη in 44:16 in the plural, which harmonizes this pronoun with the many plural references throughout Judah’s statement, even as it emphasizes Judah’s projection of the collective guilt of Joseph’s brothers in relation to Joseph.

6.2.2.2 Nouns. G typically preserves the number of Hebrew common nouns in translation, but he changes it comparatively often (1,062/6,685) (15.9%), either translating a Hebrew

---

278 For the importance of Abraham’s agency in terms of his agreement with God in Gen 17 and throughout the Abraham story, see §8.3.2.
dual or plural with a Greek singular (526) or a Hebrew singular with a Greek plural (536).\textsuperscript{279}

Usually, this results from lexical differences between Hebrew and Greek, as indicated by the fact that such changes happen quite frequently with particular lexical equivalences. For example, G regularly translates a handful of Hebrew dual/plural nouns with Greek singular nouns (see Table 18 below), and they account for a very large percentage of all such cases (415/526) (81.4%).\textsuperscript{280}

\textsuperscript{279} The counts of changes in grammatical number exclude cases of synthetic translation (cf. §5.1.1.1).

\textsuperscript{280} For other Hebrew plural or dual nouns translated by Greek singular nouns (111), see also γένος (4: 8:19; 17:14; 25:17; 35:29); γῆ (4: 10:5; 26:3, 4; 41:54); γῆρας (4: 21:2, 7; 37:3; 44:20); εὐλογία (4: 49:25++, 26); τράχηλος (4: 27:16; 45:14++; 46:29); δρᾶς (3: 13:18; 14:13; 18:1); ἐργον (3: 20:9; 46:33; 47:3); λαός (3: 25:8; [26:11]; 49:33); ποικίλος (3: 37:3, 23, 32); σταφυλή (3: 40:10, 11; 49:11); στολή (3: 27:15; 41:14, 42); αδελφὸς (2: 24:27; 27:29); ἀλίμως (2: 4:10, 11); ἀργύριον (2: 42:25, 35); γενέα (2: 6:9; 50:23); γένεσις (2: 2:4; 51); δεύτερος + ἐτός (2: 11:10; 45:6); κεφαλή (2: 28:11, 18); μεσημβρία (2: 43:16, 25); ὑσφής (2: 35:11; 37:34); παροίκησις (2: 28:4; 36:7); πιότης (2: 27:28, 39); χρόνος (2: 26:1, 15; ἀμαρτία (41:9); ἀρασία (19:11); βασιλεία (14:1); γένημα (49:21); δεσπότης (15:8); δεύτερος (27:36); διανοομέα (6:5); διασάφηθις + αὐτός (40:8); δικαιοσύνη (32:10); ἔγω (9:16); ἐκ + αἰρεῖσθαι (49:5); ἐλάτη (21:15); ἔπερωσθήσεθι (43:7); ἡμέρα (21:4); θεραπεία (45:16); θυσία (46:1); Ἰαμίν (36:24); ἰματισμός (24:53); καλὸς (27:15); κοιλία (25:23); κοίτη (49:4); κριθή (26:12); νεότης (8:21); οἰκήτης (9:25); οἰκία (25:27); οἶκος (42:33); ἐλγοστός (34:30); ὄνομα (25:13); ἐφώνημα (46:3); παιδίον (21:7); παῖς (46:34); παροικεῖον (37:1); πατρίς (31:3); πόλις (13:12); πορνεία (38:24); πτέρνα (49:17); σκέυος (27:3); συλλαμβάνω + ἔγω (30:8); ταφή (50:3); τερεμίνθος (43:11); τόπος (36:40); ὕμνος (49:20); νίός (36:21); φακὸς (25:34); φαύσις (1:15); φυλή (49:16); φωνή (11:1); χάρις (43:14); χείρ (49:24).
### Table 18. Hebrew Singular Dual and Plural Nouns Regularly Translated as Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual/plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אלהים</td>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>5: 35; 31:30, 32; 35:2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פנים</td>
<td>πρόσωπον</td>
<td>1: 40:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אפים</td>
<td>πρόσωπον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טנייה</td>
<td>πρόσωπον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קמוס</td>
<td>οὐρανός</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֵין יים</td>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>1: 19:2; cf. 49:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ח יים</td>
<td>ζωή</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of these Hebrew nouns are actually lexicalized as plural, i.e. they never occur in the singular (אֱלֹהִים, פָנִים, עֵין יִים, and שָמִים), but G’s use of the Greek singular for all of these Hebrew plurals is an appropriate accommodation to Greek usage. The rare use of the Greek plural for these Hebrew lemmas reveals that G’s translation choices are guided by contextual as well as linguistic factors.

31:10 ἵνα τί ἐκλείψῃ τοῦς θεόν σου
19:2 καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ κύριος ἐξεκλίνατε εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ παιδὸς ὑμῶν
40:7 διότι τὰ πρόσωπα οὖμον σκυθρώπω σήμερον

In 31:10, Laban is referring to his household gods, not the one God of Israel; in 19:2, it is two divine messengers (שנִי_CELEBRITY) who have come to rescue Lot from Sodom; in 40:7, it is two men whose faces are sullen due to their dreams.

---

281 See 9:23 for an example where G uses a distributive singular (τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν). The Greek singular and plural may be used distributively, but the plural is more usual (KG II §§347.4; 365b; Smyth §§998; 1004–1005; cf. SSG §21).
The Hebrew singular nouns that G regularly translates with Greek plurals make up a smaller percentage of the total (218/472 or 46.2%), 282 the most Hebrew singular nouns being presented in Table 1 below.
### Table 19. Hebrew Singular Nouns Regularly Translated as Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שנה</td>
<td>ἔτη</td>
<td>8: 7:11; 8:13; 11:10; 14:4, 5; 45:6; 47:18+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קן</td>
<td>πρόβατα</td>
<td>54; κτήνη (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקש</td>
<td>κτήνη</td>
<td>2: 6:7; 7:23; see also שָׁן = κτήνη (8:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מקנה</td>
<td>κτήνη</td>
<td>2: 6:7; 7:23; see also שָׂרֶם = κτήνη (8:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צאן</td>
<td>πρόβατα</td>
<td>(54); κτήνη (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְֹּּהֵּׁמָה</td>
<td>κτήνη</td>
<td>2: 6:7; 7:23; see also שָׂרֶם = κτήνη (8:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִׂקְּנֶה</td>
<td>κτήνη</td>
<td>2: 6:7; 7:23; see also שָׂרֶם = κτήνη (8:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עוף</td>
<td>πετεινά</td>
<td>3: 1:21; 7:14; 8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֹכֶל</td>
<td>βρώματα</td>
<td>—see also βρώματα (6:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ח יָה</td>
<td>θηρίον</td>
<td>2: 37:20, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָקָר</td>
<td>θηρίον</td>
<td>2: 37:20, 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these examples involve Hebrew collective singular nouns that G prefers to translate with a Greek plural. As with the Hebrew dual/plural nouns translated as singular, the exceptions in this list also indicate that G is aware of when these Hebrew nouns have singular reference, as with particular years indicated by an ordinal number or demonstrative pronoun (7:11), when a Greek distributive singular also works well in Greek (7:14),\(^{283}\) or when the reference is unambiguously singular (37:20).

| 7:11 | בְּשַׂנָּה שֵׁנֶה מִשְׁנָה לַחַיָּיו נַחַי | ἐν τῷ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τοῦ Νῶε |
| 14 | נַכְל הָעַרְשֵׁי לֵאמֵר הָעַרְשֵׁי נַכְל | καὶ πᾶν πετεινὰν κατὰ γένος |
| 37:20 | Οἱ ρύγχοι ποιηθέντες κατέφαγαν αὐτὸν | מְתָא יָרְחַבָּה |

While the majority of differences in number on nouns simply reflect differences in usage between Hebrew and Greek, some changes in number may be the result of G’s contextual interpretation of a noun.

| 11:1 | וְיָרְדֵּכְלָה מַהְרַמְלָה שֵׁפָה הָאָדָם | Καὶ ἤν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χείλος ἐν καὶ φωνὴ μία πᾶσιν |
| 49:3 | רָמֹת בֶּלֶן אֲחָתוֹת יָרְשֵׁהוּ לָאָדָם | Ρουθήν πρωτότοκος μου σὺ ισχὺς μου καὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν μου |

\(^{283}\) On G’s distributive use of πᾶς with anarthrous nouns, see §3.1.4.2.
In the account of the tower of Babel, a single language is arguably better conveyed by a singular noun, and while Hebrew און ("fertility, power, wealth") pertains to children, its meaning is more abstract than the plural τέκνων.

6.2.3  Gender

Although it would be possible to make an extensive comparison between the gender of nominal equivalents in the source and target texts, it would not be particularly meaningful, since, with the exception of lemmas referring to animate entities with biological gender, grammatical gender is an accident of the lexicon, at least from a synchronic perspective.\(^{284}\) What is worth noting in regard to gender is that G does not attempt to imitate the gender of Hebrew words in Greek. At the same time, he may make such changes on occasion for particular interpretive reasons, as in 21:16:

\[21:16 \text{ וּתָשְׁבֶּהָ מִנְגֵּדָה} \rightarrow \text{ וּתָשָׁא} \text{ את קָלָה וְתַבְכֶּה} \]

While the Hebrew text has Hagar lifting up her voice and crying, G ascribes this action to Ishmael, resulting in a change in gender. As a rule, however, G selects grammatical gender according to Greek usage and biological gender that conforms with that of his source.

6.3  Conclusion

As with the previous chapter on lexical equivalence, I have demonstrated in my study of grammatical equivalence that G understood the Hebrew text he was translating and aimed to represent it with Greek forms that would mirror its morphology wherever possible.

\(^{284}\) IBHS §6; Joüon §134; KG I §96; Smyth §§196–200; SSG §20.
but ultimately would capture its meaning as determined by the exigencies of each context. Especially since some Hebrew morphological features have ready analogues in Greek while others do not, G’s grammatical translation choices as a whole reflect a complex poetics translation, such that in many cases he adheres to the form of the Hebrew quite closely (i.e., where Hebrew and Greek grammar are especially similar), but in others he does not. Moreover, behind this complexity stands the common cause that G intended to produce a meaningful translation. This is due not only to comparative morphological reasons but also a range of other linguistic, literary, interpretive, and other factors, often in combination. At the endpoint of Part I and the midpoint of the entire work, I conclude the work of portraiture, as the sketch begun in §3 has been transformed into a realistic and detailed portrait complete with the complexity furnished by shading, color, and personality. Pausing to appreciate this work of art that represents G as a translator, we are now ready to investigate whether his less common translation choices reflect not only his linguistic competence but also that he was sensitive to literary features such as plot as he translated Hebrew Genesis into the Greek language and the world of Greek literary culture.

6.4 Conclusion to Part I

In Part I of this study, I have aimed to provide a systematic and comprehensive descriptive analysis of G as a translator. Even though such an undertaking is a worthy endeavor in its own right, I have done this with the express purpose of getting a handle on G’s approach to translation, described metaphorically as sketching and painting his translator portrait. Eyeing this portrait, which has been constructed from the rigorous
classification, organization, and synthesis of many philological details, the finished work of this realistic and detailed depiction allows us to imagine the translator behind the translation and to see that he carried out his translation work deliberately and carefully. Furthermore, I have shown that his approach to translation implies a complex poetics of translation that aims to represent both the form and the meaning of the Hebrew text with accuracy and precision in Greek, such that G largely adhered to the formal contours of his source where possible but confidently reworked its thoughts and expressions in Greek where any variety of factors (e.g., grammatical, syntactic, stylistic, rhetorical, theological, literary) rendered formally, semantically, or statistically divergent translation choices expedient. Furthermore, I have shown at many points that such motivating factors are often intertwined and thus difficult to disentangle.

Yet, even as developing such a comprehensive picture of G as a translator has inherent value, it also serves a crucial function in the larger argument of my work, namely that G aimed to produce a plot in his translation of Hebrew Genesis that would be deemed virtuous according to contemporary literary standards. This important function relates to the tenuous and unstable character of literary interpretations of translated texts, where it is very easy to over- or underemphasize particular translation choices, which is why it forms the first of the methodological principles applied in the argument of my thesis (see §1.4). To the extent that I have shown that G is generally a competent linguist and a deliberate translator, the possibility that he would have made literary interventions in his translation is rendered all the more likely. By constructing a detailed and realistic portrait of G as a translator, we are thus able to weigh the translation choices he makes in particular contexts.
against his poetic tendencies as a whole, and by establishing a baseline for how he typically represents certain Hebrew words and structures in Greek guise, we are far more attuned to the significance of translation choices that deviate from the Hebrew semantically, formally (in terms of quantity and order), or statistically (in terms of the regular or expected matches of the lexical and grammatical features of Hebrew and Greek elements). In order to establish that G intended specific plot improvements at specific points in his translation, however, I will give relatively more attention to the other three principles of method in Part II: (ii) meaningful divergences in G’s translation that are confirmed by (ii.a) lexic and grammars, (ii.b) G’s patterns of translation technique, and (iii.c) the revisions made by later translators (i.e., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion); (iii) the quantity and diversity of concentrated translational evidence that supports the divergence; and (iv) the actual interpretations given by later readers of G’s translation.

Furthermore, even as the transition from Part I to Part II marks a visual shift from the whole of G’s translator portrait to its individual parts, it also involves an optical adjustment in the opposite direction, since I have focused in Part I on G’s translation choices mainly at the level of morphemes, words, and phrases, whereas in Part II I will consider G’s translation choices through a wide angle lens in relation to much larger text complexes associated with the patriarchal figures of Noah, Abraham, and Joseph. However, accuracy and sensitivity in literary interpretation requires a zoom lens, with which one can variably shift from whole to part and part to whole, on the one hand, and from minute philological detail to expansive literary panorama and back again, on the other. In this way, the relationship between the two parts of my work is complementary, because, just as Part I
furnishes much textual data of importance to specific literary arguments made in Part II, so I firmly maintain that all arguments concerning a translator’s representation and adaptation of plot or other literary features ultimately must be based upon the kind of philological details presented in Part I.

So, in Part II I will proceed by examining G’s translation choices in context, in particular working through the stories about Noah, Abraham, and Joseph. In doing so, I will show that G’s translation choices indicate his awareness and concern for the inner workings of individual stories and episodes in their proximate literary contexts as well as how these smaller literary units are situated in the larger plot complexes that have been recognized by modern scholarship from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives that make use of diverse methodological tools, such as source criticism, form criticism and tradition history, and literary or narrative criticism. I will demonstrate that G’s disparate translation choices often work in unity to cultivate and enhance specific virtues of plot: consistency and concision, sequentiality and unity, and tragedy (or entertainment value). In sum, I take it as established at this point in my argument that G was competent and capable


of transforming and enhancing his translation’s plot in the ways listed above, and I hope to have also rendered it probable that he actually would do so, but it remains to be demonstrated that and how he actually does, the argumentative task of Part II.
Part II
7 THE CONSISTENT AND CONCISE PLOT (NOAH: GEN 6–9)

7.1 Introduction to Part II

In Part II of this work, I move from linguistic to literary analysis of G’s Greek translation of Hebrew Genesis, attending to the evidentiary value of the paragraph, episode, and narrative complex in addition to that of the lower discourse units of word, phrase, and clause that predominated in Part I. In my treatment of G’s use of δέ for disjunctive-ו (§4.1.1.1), I have already shown that G often deployed this postpositive conjunction to signal a narrative break at the level of the paragraph or episode. Yet, in the next three chapters, I assume that G was also aware of the significance that his translation choices held on an even higher discourse level. In other words, G did not read the text of Genesis just word by word or phrase by phrase, as the painstaking analysis of Part I might suggest; rather, he read the individual scenes and episodes of Genesis with an eye to their role in the largest literary sub-units of this lengthy book, such as the narrative complexes centered on the characters of Noah (6–9), Abraham (11:27–25:11), and Joseph (37–50). While I will provide extensive evidence to support this claim in the three chapters of Part I, each of which focuses on one of the three figures just named, it is worth recalling the fact that the Hebrew text of Genesis invites the reader to attend to how its main literary units concern the most significant individuals in Israel’s prehistory, since the highest-level subdivisions of this book are directly indicated in the Hebrew text by the recurring use of the תולדות formula taken from the priestly source:
In this way, the skeletal structure of Genesis is a genealogy, and the book is a book of “generations,” just as it derives its common title from G’s use of γένεσις (“generation”) for each occurrence of תולדות. Yet, the sections headed by this formula are not all of the same form. Half of them are genealogies in the strict sense, giving bare lists of names and relative ages of important figures in an ancestral line (i.e., the generations of Adam [c. 5], the sons of Noah [c. 10], Shem [11:10–26], Ishmael [25:12–18], and Esau [c. 36]), whereas the others are tied to substantial narrative units (i.e., the generations of heaven and earth [1–4], Noah [6–9], Terah [11:27–25:11], Isaac [25:19–35], and Jacob [37–50]).

Now, the claim that G read and translated Genesis with an eye to literary context is a broad one, as literary context is a flexible concept that can be construed in a variety of ways. One of the recognized hallmarks of the Genesis translator is his use of contextual translation choices, as I discussed and illustrated in Part I (§5.2.2.5). Yet, in my argument I will primarily consider the literary sensitivity of G as a translator in relation to the plot of

---

the narrative complexes about Noah, Abraham, and Joseph. The focus on plot is justified in at least three ways: first, some of G’s most interesting and most perplexing translation choices are best explained in relation to the way they present, shift, or transform the plot of a larger literary unit, and, as a byproduct, by appealing to plot I am able to sharpen, elaborate, and unify some of the important conclusions drawn by those who have studied Greek Genesis in detail; second, the compositional history of Hebrew Genesis, compiled from diverse and sometimes competing source documents, has resulted in a series of narrative complexes with plots of varying qualities, some having acute and tangible plot problems (e.g., inconsistency, redundancy, disunity); and third (and related), Hellenistic Greek readers—as well as Greek readers in classical and later times—regularly critiqued and criticized narratives with the very types of narrative problems found in Hebrew Genesis, aiming to free their own compositions’ plots of such defects and to fill them with the opposite types of narrative virtues (ἀρεταί). So, building on the detailed translator portrait constructed in Part I of this extended argument, I now turn to the stories of Noah, Abraham, and Joseph in order to show that G, too, sought a virtuous plot in his translation of Genesis. I do not naïvely expect every reader to be convinced by my interpretation of every piece of evidence in the three chapters that follow, especially as interpreting a translation is a precarious endeavor. Yet, as Part II is a cumulative-case argument that G aimed to capture and construct a virtuous plot in his translation in various ways, it is not that the validity of the whole stands or falls on the strength of every single part, but that the persuasiveness of the main argument is gradually supported and maintained by each new piece of evidence.
7.2 Introduction

Let us begin with several important examples of specific narrative virtues: ancient readers and writers critiqued and constructed narrative texts in relation to their consistency and concision. This fact may be observed from several angles, but the surviving *progymnasmata* offer a perspective that is both representative and illuminating. The *progymnasmata* are representative for two main reasons. First, as preliminary exercises, they are foundational for all types of written and spoken communication. Second, the theoretical principles advocated by these manuals are conservative in nature, and their ideas are broadly continuous with those of Aristotle (as mentioned in §1.2) and can be seen at work across many types of texts. These handbooks of preliminary prose composition exercises endorse consistency and concision positively, as they are either named or implied among the chief narrative virtues (ἀρεταὶ διηγήσεως). Theon of Alexandria, for example, lists three: clarity (σαφήνεια), concision (συντομία), and believability (πιθανότης). Each of these pertains both to content (πράγματα) and style (λέξις). As for the categories of consistency and concision that I use in the analysis of this chapter, concision is directly counted among

---

2 Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel 2:70.23–28).
3 Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:79.21): Ἀρεταὶ δὲ διηγήσεως τρεῖς, σαφήνεια, συντομία, πιθανότης. Aphthonius, *Prog.* 2 (Rabe 3.3–4) adds Greek expression (ὅ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἑλληνισμός). Nicolaus, *Prog.* 3 (Felten 14.4–9) mentions other lists of virtues—including just πιθανότης—but he argues that Theon’s list is the most accurate.
4 Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:79.21–80.7) first discusses the tensive relationship between these three virtues and then discusses them individually in terms of content (πράγματα) and style (λέξις): clarity (2:80.8–83.13); concision (2:83.14–84.17); believability (2:84.18–85.27).
5 A concise narrative focuses on the most relevant (καιριώτατα) facts, excluding what is unnecessary (τὸ μὴ ἀναγκαῖον) and including what is necessary (τὸ ἀναγκαῖον) (Theon, *Prog.* 5 [Spengel 2:83.14–18]).
the three virtues of narrative, but consistency is implied by the other two, since inconsistent narratives are both unclear and unbelievable.

This mindset is reinforced in the *progymnasmata* negatively in relation to the refutation (ἀνασκευή) and confirmation (κατασκευή) of narrative genres, especially fable (μύθος) and narrative (διήγημα/διήγησις), since inconsistency (τὸ μαχόμενον) and redundancy (τὸ πλεονάζον) are listed among the topoi (commonplace arguments) that are relevant to both. While this fact indicates that fable and narrative are closely related

---

6 Events that are misordered (τὸ ... συγχεῖν τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὴν τάξιν τῶν πραγμάτων) or duplicate (τὸ διὰ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν) confuse the sense (συγχεῖ τὴν διάνοιαν) of a narrative (Theon, *Prog.* 5 [Spengel 2:80.24–27]). The same could be said of contradictions.

7 In discussing believability, Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:84.20–21) highlights the importance of causality: events should be probable (εἰκότα) and logically follow one from another (ἂλληλος ἀκάλουθα). Contradictions hinder believability, since they disrupt the causal chain of events.

8 Hermogenes distinguishes between διήγησις and διήγησις (comparing them analogically to ποίημα and ποίησις) by length and number of topics, such that διήγησις and ποίησις are longer and thematically more complex than διήγησις and ποίημα (Prog. 2 [Rabe 2.4–10]). Cf. Nicolaus, *Prog.* 3 (Felten 11.16–12.6).

9 The terminology for this topos varies among the sources. Theon—along with Nicolaus, *Prog.* 6 (Felten 30.15)—primarily call it τὸ μαχόμενον, but he uses ἐναντίος to define it (see note 28 for his definition).


10 In relation to the fable, Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:77.10–13) defines τὸ πλεονάζον as the inclusion of “something that is nothing, whether person, event, time, place, manner, cause, or any such thing” (τι μηδὲν ὄν, οἷον ἡ πράσσωσιν ἢ πράγμα ἢ χρόνον ἢ τόπον ἢ τρόπον ἢ αἰτίαν ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων). In relation to the chreia, Theon, *Prog.* 3 (Spengel 2:105.23–25) defines τὸ πλεονάζον as “when something is said, which, if it is removed, the chreia is no worse off” (ἐπειδὰν λέγηται τι, οὐ ἀφαιρεθήντος οὐδὲν ἤττου διαμένει ἢ χρεία). This definition is very similar to an expression used by Aristotle in *Poet.* 1451a.30–35 cited in §8.1 note 12, with translation and analysis in the main text.

11 Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:76.18–22); cf. *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:93.5–8). The topoi common to fable and narrative are: (i) lack of clarity (ἐκ τοῦ ἀσαφοῦς), (ii) excess of material (ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάζοντος) or (iii) major gaps (ἐκ τοῦ ἐλλειποῦντος/ἐλλιποῦς), (iv) implausibility (ἐκ τοῦ ἀπιθάνου/ἀπρεποῦς/ὅτι μὴ εἰκός ἐστιν), (v) unconventionality (ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυνηθός), (vi) harmfulness (ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυμφόρου), (vii) contradictions and
genres, they are not the same. Theon defines a fable (μῦθος) as “a false account that gives an impression (lit. ‘image’) of the truth” (λόγος ψευδῆς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν)\(^{12}\) and a narrative (διήγημα) as “an expository account of events that have taken place or of events as if they had taken place” (λόγος ἐκβετικὸς πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ώς γεγονότων).\(^{13}\) Based on these definitions, the key difference between fable and narrative is that fables are recognized by all as stories that are not true (ψευδῆς), i.e., historically accurate, whereas narratives may (γεγονότων) or may not be true (ὡς γεγονότων). Yet irrespective of this difference, both fables and narratives require believability,\(^{14}\) which is one reason why they mostly share the same topoi for refutation and confirmation, although the topoi of falsity (τὸ ψευδὲς) and inconsistency (ἐκ τοῦ μαχομένου), (viii) disorder (ἐκ τῆς τάξεως), and—if the fable or narrative has a moral application—(ix) lack of true consequence from the preceding narrative (ἐκ τοῦ ἀνομολου/ψευδος).

\(^{12}\) Theon, Prog. 3 (Spengel 2:72.28). Cf. Hermogenes, Prog. 1 (Rabe 1.12–14): ψευδῆ μὲν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι, πάντως δὲ χρήσιμόν πρὸς τὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ. ἕτε δὲ καὶ πιθανὸν εἶναι βούλονται; Aphthonius, Prog. 1 (Rabe 1.6): Ἐστι δὲ μῦθος λόγος ψευδῆς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν; Nicolaus, Prog. 2 (Felten 5.9–15): Μῦθος τοῖν τοσί λόγος ψευδῆς τῷ πιθανῷ συγκεῖσθαι εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, λόγος μὲν ψευδῆς, ἑπειδὴ ἁμολογομένως ἐκ ψευδοὺς σύγκειται εἰκονίζοιν δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἑπειδὴ οὐκ ἐν ἐργάσαι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, μὴ ἔχουν τινὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀληθῆς ὀμοιότητα. γένοιτο δὲ ἢν πρὸς τὸ ἀληθῆς ὁμοιός ἢ τοῦ πιθανοῦ τοῦ περὶ τὴν πλάσιν.


\(^{14}\) Nicolaus, Prog. 3 (Felten 13.4–13) κοινωνεὶ δὲ τὰ μυθικὰ διηγήματα τοῖς μῦθοις [ἐν] τὸ ἀμφότερα δείσαι πίστεως, διαφέρει δὲ, ὅτι οἱ μὲν μῦθοι ἁμολογομένως εἰσὶ ψευδεῖς καὶ πεπλασμοί, τὰ δὲ μυθικά διηγήματα καὶ παρ᾽ ἄλλων ὡς γεγονότα ἑστήκαται καὶ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἐστὶ γενέσθαι καὶ μὴ γενέσθαι. ἔτι κοινωνεὶ τὰ πλασματικὰ διηγήματα τοῖς μῦθοις τὸ ἀμφότερα πεπλάσθαι, διαφέρει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἄλλησιν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν πλασματικά διηγήματα, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐγένετο, ἄλλ’ ἔχει φύσιν γενέσθαι, οἱ δὲ μῦθοι οὔτε ἐγένοντο οὔτε φύσιν ἔχουσι γενέσθαι.
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impossibility (τὸ ἀδυνατόν) apply especially to narrative. In short, the basic implication is that the stakes are not quite the same for the two genres, since historicity is potentially on the line when confirming or refuting a narrative. Another difference between fable and narrative is a matter of length. This is not readily apparent from Theon’s definitions, although the fact that a narrative is a λόγος πραγμάτων (“an account of things or events”) and not just a λόγος (“account”) already suggests more complexity. Nevertheless, that a narrative is typically longer and more complex can be inferred from (i) Theon’s arrangement of the compositional exercises in ascending difficulty, as would have been appropriate for their actual use, as well as (ii) the literary examples he gives for fable and

15 Theon, Prog. 4 (Spengel 2:11–13): οἱ δ’ αὐτοί τόποι χρήσιμοι καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν διηγημάτων ἀνασκευὴν τε καὶ κατασκευὴν; Theon, Prog. 5 (Spengel 2.93.5–8): Περὶ δὲ ἀνασκευῆς καὶ κατασκευῆς εἶπομεν ὅτι οἱ αὐτοὶ τόποι χρήσιμοι, οἶτε καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μῦθους, ἐν δὲ τοῖς διηγήμασι καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ ψευδοῦ καὶ ἀδυνάτου τόποι ἀρμόττουσιν ...

16 In practical life, this fact is nowhere more relevant than in the courts, where the debate is essentially “about what (actually) happened” (περὶ τῶν γεγενημένων), as noted by Aristotle in Rhet. 1358a.36–1358b.8, where he enumerates and defines the three species of rhetoric (i.e., deliberative, judicial, and epideictic): Ὅστιν δὲ τῆς ἕρτορικῆς εἶδη τριά τῶν ἀρίθμων, τοσοῦτοι γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τῶν λόγων ὑπάρχοντι διάτεσσε, σύγχροται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τριῶν ὁ λόγος, ἐκ τε τοῦ λέγοντος καὶ περὶ οὗ λέγει καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ τὸ τέλος πρὸς τοῦτον ἐστίν, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἀκροατήν. ἀνάγκη δὲ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἢ θεωρὸν εἶναι ἢ κριτήν, κριτήν δὲ ἢ τὸν γεγενημένους ἢ τῶν μελλόντων. ἐστίν δ’ ὁ μὲν περὶ τῶν μελλόντων κρίνων ὁ ἐκκλησιαστής, ὁ δὲ περὶ τῶν γεγενημένων [ὁ] ὁ δικαστής, ὁ δὲ περὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ὁ θεωρός, ὡστε ἔξ ἀνάγκης ἀν εἴη τρία γένη τῶν λόγων τῶν ῥητορικῶν, συμβουλευτικῶν, δικαστικῶν, ἐπιδεικτικῶν.

17 The order of Theon’s exercises is reconstructed, because it was edited in antiquity to make it match Aphthonius’s progymnasmata (George Kennedy, ed., Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric, WGRW 10 [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2003], 2–3). Yet, Theon himself explicitly states the order of the three exercises most relevant to this discussion, i.e., chreia, fable, and narrative: Τὴν δὲ τάξιν τῶν γνωμασιμάτων αὐτῶν οὕτω ποιήσαμεν: πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς χρείας· βραχύ τε γὰρ τούτῳ καὶ εὐμνημόνευτῳ, ἐπείτη δὲ τοῦ μόσου καὶ τῆς διηγήσεως, πλὴν τῆς τούτων ἀνασκευῆς τε καὶ κατασκευῆς· ταύτα γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ὑστερα ἐνεκίῳ πως εἶναι (Prog. 1 [Spengel 2:64.29–65.1]).

18 “The order (τάξις) of the preliminary exercises was not invariably the same in the rhetorical handbooks, but it did follow an apparent progression in difficulty. Theon, for example, justified starting from the chreia
narrative. Theon names Aesop as the prototypical writer of fables but also refers to excerpts of Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, Plato, and others. Yet, in discussing narrative, he mentions time and again the historians Herodotus and Thucydides, the orator Demosthenes, and also the overall arrangement of Homer’s *Odyssey*. Still, both fables and narratives are typically woven into larger compositions (συμπλοκή), and length is ultimately not just a matter of genre, but also of expansion (ἐπέκτασις) and contraction (συστολή), while the level of detail and flourish also relates to elaboration (ἐξεργασία), a more advanced compositional exercise. As a shorter narrative text in a larger composition, the story of Noah and the flood in Gen 6–9 shares a significant degree of affinity with both elementary genres of Greek narrative prose, i.e., narrative and fable/myth. In light of this fact, it is interesting to consider how G would have classified this story—and important, as (‘saying’) because it was ‘short and easy to memorize’ (64.29–30)” (Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005], 223).

19 Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:73.1–74.1).

20 Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:78.15–96.17). For what Theon holds to be prime examples of chreias, fables, and narratives, see *Prog.* 2 (Spengel 2:65.29–66.31).

21 Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:75.9–16; cf. 2:74.3–4): συμπλέκουμεν δὲ ὧδε· ἐκθέμενοι τὸν μῦθον ἐπιφέρομεν διήγημα, ὡς ἐσικεῖν, ἢ ἀνάπαλιν τὸ μὲν διήγημα πρότερον, ὥστε τὸ τὸν μῦθον, ὅν πεπλασμένον, ὅτι κάμηλος ἐπιθυμήσασα κρατῶν καὶ τῶν ἔτων ἑστερήθη· τούτῳ προσώποις ἐπισήμεον τὸ διήγημα τούτῳ τοῦ τρόπου· παραπλήσιον μοι δοκεῖ τι παθεῖν τῇ καμηλῳ τὰτη καὶ ἴππος ὁ Λυδός, καὶ ἄλλη ἐφεξῆς τὸ διήγημα τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ. *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:86.5–7; cf. 85.30): see text in note 22.


a text’s genre is crucial to its interpretation—and it could prove profitable to search for any translation clues he may have left behind that could shed light on this issue.

The tasks of confirmation (κατασκευή) and refutation (ἀνασκευή) are themselves usually listed among the progymnasmata, but they are exercises that are specifically directed at the evaluation of another text, which is why Theon collates his instruction on confirmation and refutation with the other exercises, especially as one does not confirm and refute each genre with all of the same types of arguments. Yet, the substantial overlap between the confirmational and refutational topoi that are used for fable and those that are used for narrative stems not only from the fact that these two genres are closely related, but also because confirmation and refutation begin with the level of aesthetics and the evaluation of a text as a text. However, a piece of literature is not usually evaluated just in order to label it as a good composition or a bad one, but for more substantive purposes. For example, one might refute either a fable or a narrative that ineffectively connects the story to an ethical application (ἐκ τοῦ ἀνομοίου) or that even has a questionable moral (ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυμφόρου). Such claims could jeopardize the role of the smaller text within a larger literary, rhetorical, or dialogical context, or they might reject it altogether for having an inherently ignoble purpose. Furthermore, for a text such as the Gen 6–9 account of Noah’s flood, where God is unambiguously the main character, it makes a big theological difference

24 Hermogenes, Prog. 5 (Rabe 5.1–19); Aphthonius, Prog. 5–6 (Rabe 10.9–16.16); Nicolaus, Prog. 6 (Felten 29.8–35.4).

25 It is strange, however, that a statement Theon makes early in the handbook suggests that he will treat confirmation and refutation separately. See Prog. 1 (Spengel 2:64.29–65.1) quoted above in note 17.

26 For the topoi that are listed by Theon and shared between fable and narrative, see note 11 above.
whether a reader acquires a sympathetic or antagonistic mindset as he or she reads through it, since this could have major implications for big questions on issues such as the goodness of God, human responsibility, and the possibility of forgiveness.

Yet, as was mentioned above, the distinctive of narrative is the relevance of the topoi of “impossibility” (τὸ ἀδύνατόν) and “falsity” (τὸ ψευδές), which pertain to what could never happen and what did not actually happen, respectively. This distinguishing feature of narrative is important for this study of how G aims to improve the plot in the narrative of Noah’s flood, because his translation choices and literary improvements could be taken to suggest that he viewed this account as a narrative and not a fable, which is relevant in the case of this particular story, because educated Greek readers likely would have placed it alongside the famous fable (or “myth” [μῦθος]) of Deucalion and the flood.27 The strongest piece of evidence that G meant for his translation of Noah’s flood to be viewed as narrative and not as fable or myth is the fact that the plot improvements he makes in his translation primarily serve to free this story of inconsistency and redundancy, especially those types of inconsistency and redundancy that are most damaging to the believability of a narrative as a plausible account of past events, as I will demonstrate throughout this chapter. However, it is true that fables or myths also require a sufficient degree of believability in their plots, and so this second-order claim ultimately remains tentative and should not distract from the

27 For the account of Deucalion’s flood, see Apollodorus, Bib. 1.7.2. Cf. also the fragments of the historians Berosus the Chaldean, Hieronymus the Egyptian, and Nicolaus of Damascus preserved in Josephus, A.J. §§1.3.6 93–95.
main point of this chapter, that G worked to improve the consistency and concision of Noah’s story in his Greek translation.

Now, inconsistency and redundancy are defined in somewhat different terms depending upon whether they relate more to content or to style. In terms of content, inconsistency is the result of the combination of conflicting or contradictory narrative claims, and redundancy is the repeated narration of the same event. Since many events are unique and unrepeatable, redundancy of content often implies a contradiction. This point is relevant for the current chapter, as most of the contradictions that I will discuss result from redundancy of content. In terms of style, however, inconsistency involves clashing or unduly heterogenous language, while redundancy results from the piling up of synonyms or from excessive homogeneity in language. Of course, not all repetition of style is redundancy of style, since repetition is used in many cases as a powerful stylistic device, as I will illustrate in the Greek text of Noah’s flood itself (see esp. the sending of the birds in §7.4.5). Yet, with respect to the degree of linguistic uniformity (or lack thereof), inconsistency and redundancy of style may be conceptualized as the two poles of a

---


29 In terms of content, concision requires isolating the essentials from complex narratives and beginning from an appropriately recent starting point (Theon, *Prog.* 5 [Spengel 2:83.17–84.5]). For Theon’s view on how misordering or repeating events damages the clarity of a narrative, see note 6 above.

30 Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:84.5–17). In terms of style, concision involves the avoidance of using synonyms, substituting phrases for words, and selecting compound or long words when equivalent simplex or short ones are available.
continuum: stylistic inconsistency results from weak linguistic and thematic unity, while stylistic redundancy lacks variation. Unlike redundancy, which spoils a narrative in a gradual and cumulative fashion, inconsistencies are especially to be avoided. Not only do inconsistencies destroy a narrative’s credibility (πιθανότης), arguably the most important narrative virtue, but inconsistency, including self-contradiction (τὸ μαχόμενον), is also considered to be the “most combative” (ἀγωνιστικότατος) topoi for refutation, which is why it is crucial to keep a narrative as free as possible of inconsistency of content and redundancy of content that may imply a contradiction.

As the first step towards advancing the broader claim that G was concerned for the virtue of his translation’s plot, I will show in the current chapter that, in the narrative of Noah’s flood (Gen 6–9), G did make specific translation choices intended to eliminate contradictions and alleviate redundancies. While some of G’s translation choices in this story indicate his attunement to other virtues of plot or other aspects of his translation, many seem particularly concerned with consistency and concision, a fact which is no doubt to be explained in relation to the high concentration of related narrative problems within

31 Theon, Prog. 5 (Spengel 2:79.28–31): δεὶ γὰρ ἔχουσαι δεὶ τοῦ πιθανοῦ ἐν τῇ δικήθει· τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτῆς μάλιστα ἰδιον ὑπάρχει· καὶ τούτου μὴ προσόντος αὐτῇ, διὸ ἂν μᾶλλον σαφῆς καὶ σύντομος ἦ τοσοῦτο ἀπιστοτέρα τοῖς ἀκούσας καταφαίνεται. Concision and clarity become narrative vices in the absence of believability.

32 Nicolaus, Prog. 6 (Felten 32.11–14): τὸ δὲ ἀγωνιστικότατον καὶ μάλιστα ἡμῖν συμβαλλόμενον κεφάλαιον <έστι> τὸ καλούμενον μαχόμενον, ὅπου τούτων ὡσπερ ἀντιλέγοντα αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐναντίως δείκνυμεν λέγοντα. In a similar way Rhet. Alex. 1430a.15–19 defines a τεκμήριον as a kind of proof that seeks to expose contradictions (ἔναντια) within an opponent’s speech or between the act and the speech. It is especially effective, because for most people it casts doubt not only upon the issue currently in dispute but upon all that has been said and done. Whether dealing with speeches or with narratives, a single contradiction may spoil the whole.
the Hebrew version of this account. Before I investigate G’s translational solutions, however, it is critical first to grasp the problems they solve.

7.3 Refutation

The Hebrew version of Noah’s flood is an easy target for refutation by appealing to contradictions and redundancies. This means not only that it could be rejected as a fine composition, but also as a made-up story of something that never did or never could have happened, or even as a story that teaches false ideas about the God of Israel and how he relates to people. To a large extent, this vulnerability is the result of the story’s compositional history, since it seems to have been compiled by the interweaving of two complete and independent accounts.33 While redundancy is the natural and pervasive result of the combination of two similar documents, contradictions only arise when their respective details are incompatible or when it is impossible to combine their parts sequentially in a logical way.34 Not all such flaws are of equal severity, however, and so, while the critic may actively search for contradictions and redundancy, most readers

33 The literature on the complex problem of the compositional history of the Pentateuch is vast, and the models are many, but recent trends that begin by identifying literary flaws are particularly relevant for this study (e.g., Stackert, Rewriting the Torah; Joel Baden, Redaction of the Pentateuch; Composition of the Pentateuch).
34 Not all of the narrative discrepancies between the reconstructed accounts of J and P result in contradictions in the combined story, as the combination sometimes produces a narrative that differs from both sources at once. For example, (i) the second set of commands concerning the animals (7:1–4 [J]) can be read as elaborating and qualifying the first (6:19–21 [P]), (ii) it is unproblematic for the floodwaters to come from multiple sources (מעינת תהום רבה וארבת השׁמים in 7:11 [P] and הגשׁם in 7:12 [J]), and (iii) the chronological impossibilities will likely go unnoticed except for readers intently focused on calendrical details. Similarly, the combined narrative is not spoiled by the fact that the J text involves a sacrifice (8:20–22) and the P text a covenant with a sign (9:1–17), at list when the story of Noah’s flood is isolated from other parts of the Torah.
naturally operate under the assumptions that the texts they read are internally consistent and that repetition is meaningful. In the language of the progymnasmata, this is to say that sympathetic readers tend to respond to points of aporia by recourse to confirmation instead of refutation. Yet, the narrative problems of the Hebrew flood account are so severe that the attentive reader will no doubt feel confused at a number of points or wonder whether she has accidentally read the same paragraph twice over, and she will thus feel compelled either to confirm or to refute the text at hand in order to overcome this sense of aporia. In particular, there are five main aspects of the Hebrew version of Noah’s flood that I have identified where the plot’s integrity is tangibly compromised by contradictions and/or redundancy, each of which I will analyze in turn.

7.3.1 Crime and punishment

The first such point occurs in 6:12–13, where one gets the sense that the narrative is starting over again, effectively rehearsing the events of 6:5–7.
Genesis 6:5–7, 12–13

5 The Lord saw that human evil was great on the earth and every inclination of the thoughts of one’s mind was only evil all day long, 6 and the Lord regretted having made humans on the earth, and he was deeply troubled in his mind. 7 Then the Lord said, “I will wipe the humanity that I created off of the face of the earth, from humans to beasts to creeping things to birds of the sky, because I regret having made them.”

12 God saw the earth, and it was corrupt, because all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth, 13 and God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh is now before me, because the earth is full of violence on account of them. Behold, I will soon destroy them with the earth.”

This is a case of redundancy in content, since it seems (at first reading) that the same event is repeated: twice God notices a problem and then decides to destroy his creation.

Furthermore, since it is impossible for God to learn of the same thing twice or make the same resolution twice, this duplication is internally inconsistent and even runs the risk of entailing a contradiction, that is, unless the interpreter posits some type of gap (e.g., a lapse of memory or attention, a weakness of will, or the passage of time) or attempts evasive
maneuvers of another type. Still, it is difficult to imagine an interpretive fix without some degree of theological impropriety.

What is more, while the concatenation of these parallel events produces intolerable redundancy, the repetition also calls attention to problems of variance between them. In particular, God does not give the same reason for sending the flood in both cases. According to 6:5–7, God sees human evil (וירא יהוה כי רבה רע לבראשית באירים); in 6:12–13, however, he sees a corrupt earth (וירא אלהים אט הארץ והנה נשחתה). Moreover, while the human evil stems from a mind bent on doing wrong (וכל יצר מחשׁبت לבו רק רע כל היום), the earth’s corruption is due to both humans and animals having corrupted their way (השׁחית כל בשׂר את דרכו על הארץ) by acts of violence (מלאה הארץ חmas מפניהם; cf. 6:11). In light of these variant and potentially contradictory statements concerning the flood’s cause, the reader is left wondering as to the precise nature of both the crime and the perpetrator. Is the problem incessant and widespread evil or violence resulting in a corrupt earth, or are

The skipping-record effect of this double opening likely played a role in readings of the Hebrew text found in 1 Enoch, LAB, and Jubilees. In 1 Enoch, God learns of the problem from his angels and decides to send the flood (9–10 // Gen 6:5–7), and then it is Noah who sees the earth’s corrupt state (65:1 // Gen 6:11–13). Although the avoidance of God as the subject of וירא in both 6:5 and 6:11 may stem from theological concerns of anthropomorphism, a new narrative structure clarifies the redundancy: first God notices the problem (via intermediaries), and then Noah finds out about it. In a subtler manner but to a similar effect, LAB narrates the first event as “And God saw” (Et vidit Deus) (3:3) and abbreviates the second as “To whom [i.e., Noah] God said ...” (Ad quem [i.e., Noah] dixit Deus) (3:4). Both retellings account for the redundancy by emphasizing the novelty of Noah’s presence in the second case. Cf. Jubilees 5, which similarly splits the two moments but also creates an intervening episode.
these two articulations of the crime to be understood as general and specific, respectively. Then as far as the guilty party is concerned, are only humans responsible, or are animals also to blame?

7.3.2 Warnings, instructions, and preparations

As she proceeds through the text, the reader is likely to feel that both God and the narrator are redundant on account of repetitive and pleonastic expressions. First, God repeatedly announces his destructive intentions. 

Reading the Hebrew text, one is likely to synthesize the two crimes. The specific may color the general, as in 1 Enoch, where the giants begin eating humans and animals and even drinking blood, because the humans stop feeding them their produce (7:3–6). Or, the general may soften the specific, as in the Targumim. Onqelos and Neofiti translate חמס in the plural as חטופין (“acts of violence”) and מפניהם (“because of their evil deeds”). Neofiti, however, renders חמס נגילים as חמסין וגזילין (“acts of violence and theft”), theft being one type of violence. Cf. Genesis Rabbah 31.5. Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti further reinforce a generalized interpretation of חמס by their handling of the first clause in 6:11. Pseudo-Jonathan translates לפני האלהים ("before God") quite expansively as בן זוראה דספ וארוח חוטם קדם ("because the inhabitants departed from ways that are right before the Lord"), while Neofiti restructures the entire clause according to a similar interpretation: וחבלו דיירי ארעא עובדיהון קדם יי ("and the inhabitants of earth corrupted their deeds before the Lord"). Cf. Tanchuma, Noach 4.

One logical solution is to accept the more inclusive set, i.e., both humans and animals, as in Genesis Rabbah 28.6, according to which the animals were destroyed together with humans, because they were responsible for leading them into an evil way (תרבות רעה). Or, the preceding description of human evil may color a reader’s interpretation of בשר, as in Targum Onqelos, which translates the phrase כל בשר ("all flesh") in 6:12 as כל בשר אנש ("every flesh, i.e. human"). Cf. Tanchuma, Noach 5, 12.

LAB’s massive abridgement of this part of the account reflects a negative estimation of its prolixity (3:3–5).

In retelling the flood account, Jubilees only retains two of these four pronouncements (5:4 // Gen 6:7, 13; 5:20–21 // Gen 6:17, 7:4). LAB, however, cuts it down to a single statement (3:3 // Gen 6:7).
I will wipe the humanity that I created off of the face of the earth.

Behold, I will soon destroy them with the earth.

I will soon bring the flood, water upon the earth, in order to destroy all flesh.

I will soon cause it to rain upon the earth... and I will wipe everything that I made off of the face of the earth.

Inasmuch as these statements are understood as God voicing resolutions, i.e., narrative events, this redundancy pertains to content as well as style. But the stylistic redundancy of this passage is aggravated by the repetition of the verb שׁחת three times in a short span of text (6:11–12), not only as it is used to denote God’s planned destruction, but also in reference to the corruption of the earth and its inhabitants:

and the earth was corrupt.

and [the earth] was corrupt.

all flesh corrupted its way.

A second source of redundancy compounds the cumulative lack of concision and clarity, namely, that God repeats his plan to save Noah and some of every kind of animal, a matter of both content and style (6:18–20 // 7:1–3).\(^4\) Twice he tells Noah that he will be safe in the ark (6:14–18 // 7:1); twice he gives him a list of animals with instructions, saying that they will survive together with him (6:19–21 // 7:2–3; cf. 7:8–9). The redundancy of God’s plan for Noah and the animals is rendered more noticeable by these lengthy lists, the repetition

\(^4\) Jubilees 5:21 combines the instructions and omits those pertaining to the animals. LAB 3:4 also combines them but uses the second set of instructions concerning the animals, which reflects the interpretation that the latter elaborates upon the former. Rhonda Brunette-Bletsch explains LAB’s “selective conflation” in relation to its elimination of “unnecessary repetition and inconsistencies” (“The Reception of Genesis in Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,” in The Book of Genesis, VTSup 152 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 459–460).
of which can hardly be missed. Moreover, as these two sources of redundancy involve God’s speech, the reader is left with a literary problem that is also theological in nature: is this lack of concision due to God’s poverty of style, or does he have a particular purpose for his long-windedness?

The other two sources of redundancy, in turn, involve Noah. First, his outstanding character is described in four distinct predications (6:8–9), which is stylistically pleonastic and potentially redundant.41

6:8 וַיָּחַן מִצְפֵּא הָעִיִּין יְהוָה But Noah found favor before the Lord.
9b וַיִּהְיֶה אִישׁ רְאוֹשׁ Noah was a righteous man.
9c וַיְהִי בְּדוֹרֵי נְחָוֹ הָיִיתָם He was blameless in his generations.
9d וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים נָחָוָּא Noah walked with God.

To be sure, different language is used in each clause, and so the multiple statements may be understood as the narrator’s elaboration of praise for Noah. In contrast, the final source of redundancy in this passage is potentially more troubling, as redundant content may entail a contradiction. Twice, Noah executes all of God’s preceding instructions (6:14–22 // 7:1–5), but God repeats some of them the second time, which seems to contradict the universal scope of the first execution formula. Of course, as with much of the redundancy of 6:5–7:5, this can be rationalized by the reader—and no author can be expected to do all of the

41 Jubilees shortens and paraphrases (5:5, 19), only saying that Noah “found favor” and was “righteous in all his ways.” On the other hand, LAB 3:4 not only retains all of these predications about Noah but actually elaborates them, having Noah find “favor and mercy” (gratiam et misericordiam), perhaps intending to stress this pleonasm as effusive praise.
interpretive work for his or her audience!—and it is especially helpful if 6:14–22 and 7:1–5 are understood as chiefly about the ark and the animals, respectively. In particular, such an understanding helps explain why God gives more detailed instructions concerning the number and types of animals in 7:1–4 and why Noah obeys twice: first he constructs the ark, and then he gathers the animals. Furthermore, if the construction of the ark is thought to have taken quite some time, so that there is a substantial gap between 6:22 and 7:1, it is surely not so bothersome for God to repeat himself. Nonetheless, in this passage the reader of the Hebrew text will likely feel a certain lack of clarity resulting from its profuseness.

7.3.3 Noah enters the ark

As the flood starts and Noah enters the ark with his family and the animals, however, this same type of doubling is more perplexing, inasmuch as several apparently unrepeatable events appear to take place on two entirely different occasions. First, the beginning of the flood is narrated twice.

42 In fact, it may be rhetorically advantageous to leave a modicum of interpretive work for the audience on purpose, in order to whet their appetite and to engage them in the process of persuading themselves about a text’s claims, or in the case of forensic rhetoric, to turn a juror (ἀκροάτης) into a witness (μάρτυς), as is suggested by Demetrius, [Eloc. 4.222]: Ἔν τούτων τε οὖν τὸ πιθανόν, καὶ ἐν ὧ Θεόφραστος φησιν, ὡς ὦ πάντα ἐπ’ ἀκριβείας δεῖ μαχηκορεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐνια καταλιπεῖν καὶ τῷ ἀκροατῷ συνιέναι καὶ λογίζεσθαι ἐξ αὐτοῦ. συνεις γὰρ τὸ ἔλλειψθέν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὦν ἀκροατῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς σου γίνεται, καὶ ἄμα εὑμενέστερος. συνετὸς γὰρ ἐκεῖ διὰ τὸ ἀφερήμον παρεσχῆκα τοῦ ἀγνοίας καὶ τὴν ὑποκρίσεως τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ μόνον, τὸ δὲ πάντα ὡς ἀνοιχτὰ λέγειν καταγινώσκοντι ἑηκεν τῷ ἀκροατῷ. For a discussion of pseudo-Demetrius’s idea here in relation to Paul’s cryptic allegory of Hagar and Sarah in Gal 4:21–31, see Hans Dieter Betz, Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia, Hermeneia 62 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 238–240.

43 Genesis Rabbah explicitly states that 6:22 concerns the ark (31.14) but 7:5 the animals (32.5).

44 Genesis Rabbah 30.7, for example, has Noah planting and cutting down trees for his ark for 120 years. The perspectives of several readers of the Greek text are given in note 122.
Genesis 7:6, 10–13

Now, Noah was six hundred years old when the flood came upon the earth. So, Noah entered...

And after seven days the waters of the flood came upon the earth, in the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month on the seventeenth day of the month, on that day all the springs of the great deep burst and the windows in the heavens were opened, and there was rain upon the earth for forty days and forty nights. On that very day Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth (Noah’s son’s), and Noah’s wife and his sons’ three wives entered the ark together.

The contradiction entailed by this doublet stems from the phrase "after seven days" in 7:10, which indicates the two beginnings occur a week apart, and it is exacerbated by the two emphatic temporal phrases (7:11, 13): “on that day” and “on that same day”). An interpreter might posit that the flood began small and that Noah spent a week in the ark with the animals before the floodgates burst open, but this is strictly precluded by the fact that Noah and the animals are said to have entered the ark after both beginnings (7:7–9 // 7:13–16). One might solve this crux by positing a gap, assuming that Noah and his family led the animals into the ark in two groups, first bringing

45 Such an interpretation is adopted by Philo, who, in seeking to account for Noah’s entrance into the ark seven days prior to the flood’s onset, mentions God’s provision for repentance (QG 2.13). He remains silent, however, concerning the contradiction entailed by this interpretation. Yet, perhaps he assumes with LAB that the first beginning of the flood is a proleptic summary (see note 46).
“some beasts...” (מעל לבהמה...), and later “all” (כל הحياة...), but it is more likely that a reader’s preconception of the whole narrative and its basic plan will override the specific details actually given in the text, so that the double entrance is simply overlooked or ignored.

7.3.4 Floodwaters rise

Next, after God shuts the door, the narration of the floodwaters rising proceeds in a potentially redundant style.

**Genesis 7:17–20**

17 And the flood came for forty days [and forty nights] on the earth. The waters multiplied and lifted the ark, and it rose off of the earth. 18 The waters increased and multiplied greatly on the earth, and the ark moved on the surface of the waters. 19 The waters increased very, very much on the earth, and all the tallest mountains under the sky were covered. 20 Fifteen cubits higher the waters increased, and all the tallest mountains were covered.

To be sure, there is a certain dramatic quality to this repetitive passage. The pace slows, and the reader tracks how the waters progress. First, “they multiply” (ירב). Then, they

---

46 LAB solves the crux by having Noah enter the ark seven days before the flood starts, so that the statement in Gen 7:6 is understood proleptically (35; cf. Jubilees 5:23). As will be suggested below, this is likely how G understood the chronology of the passage.

47 Meir Sternberg assesses the repetition quite positively, for example, stating that the repeated elements allow for careful documentation of “the multiphase rage of the flood” (The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading, ISBL 453 [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985], 413–414).
“increase and multiply greatly” (ויגברו ... וירבו מאד). Next, “they increase very, very much” (גברו מאד מאד) so that “all the tallest mountains are covered” (וכל המים הגבוהים).

Finally, “they increase” (גברו) so much that the mountains are submerged fifteen cubits under water. Yet, the line between dramatic repetition and redundancy is a fine one. Some readers seem to have found this style excessive in Hebrew, and the artistic effect would be spoiled in Greek by translating the verbs indiscriminately with the aorist indicative, the regular match for both wayyiqtol and qatal in Greek Genesis (and throughout the Septuagint). Similarly, the three-stage description of the ark rising in the flood could be taken as tedious: the waters first “lift the ark” (יישם את התבה), it “rises off of the ground” (ותרם מעל הארץ), and then it “moves upon the surface of the water” (ותלך התباح על פני המים). Finally, although the narration of the floodwaters’ initial decrease is brief, it is more noticeably verbose in terms of style and content:

Finally, alt

• concision would require the combination of these two clauses.

---

48 LAB finds the entire narration unnecessary for his paraphrase, reducing it to a preposed temporal clause: “Et perseverante centum quinquaginta diebus cataclismo in terra, ...” (3:7). Jubilees 5:26–27 both compresses and reorders the narrative, first narrating that the waters increased and rose fifteen cubits above the mountains, and then that the ark was lifted and moved on the waters. The sequence then concludes with a summary statement that the waters prevailed for 150 days.

49 For wayyiqtol => aorist indicative, see §6.1.1.1; for qatal => aorist indicative, see §6.1.1.5. As will be discussed in §7.4.4, G does capture the dramatic quality of this scene by using the imperfect indicative.

50 Jubilees 5:29 reduces this event to one clause, whereas LAB 3:7 abbreviates the entire narration of the floodwaters decreasing and the earth drying to a single clause.
Once all of the people and animals outside of the ark die in the flood (7:21–23)—an event that is also narrated in no Spartan fashion—\(^{51}\)—the Hebrew text gives a summary statement concerning the floodwaters:

\[ \text{ויגברו המים על הארץ } \text{ for 150 days.} \]

At first blush this statement is confusing, because it seems to contradict previous content. Though the beginning of the clause, i.e., "{\text{and the waters increased on the earth}"") may intensify the repetitiveness of the passage, the contradiction only arises with the temporal phrase at the end of the clause: "{\text{for 150 days}""). The attentive reader will surely be forced to pause and reflect, having previously been told by the narrator that the rain only lasted for 40 days and 40 nights (7:17). If that is true, how can it be that the waters increased for 150 days? A common solution to this problem comes by way of assigning a meaning to the word "\(\text{גבר}\)" that differs from its prior usage: \(^{53}\) by force of logic, "\(\text{גבר}\)" must not mean "increase" in its final occurrence but rather "remain high."\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{51}\) G’s different translations of \(\text{כל אשׁר} \) in 7:22 differentiate between animals (πάντα δέα) and humans (πᾶς ὃς) and thus account for this repetition in a meaningful way. Cf. note 103.

\(^{52}\) For a single sense of "\(\text{גבר}\)" in this passage, see HALOT; s.v. "\(\text{גבר}\)" qal 3; BDB, s.v. "\(\text{גבר}\)" (qal) 2.a.

\(^{53}\) Aristotle, Poet. 1461a.31–33 suggests resolving a contradiction by appealing to multiple senses of a word.

\(^{54}\) Jubilees 5:27 seems to reflect this interpretation of "\(\text{גבר}\)"", whereas LAB 3:7 and 4Q252 1 I, 7 allow for the possibility that "\(\text{גבר}\)" retains the meaning of "increase," because they only say that the rain (and not the flood) was on the earth for forty days and nights (LAB 3:5; 4Q252 1 I, 5–6), in which case the waters could continue to increase from the nether source. Curiously, the Slavonic text of 3 Baruch 4:10 possibly shares this interpretation, since it states that the floodwaters rose twenty cubits above the tops of the highest mountains, inferring that the water must be higher in 7:24 than it was in 7:20.
7.3.5 Raven and dove

The last major event that is likely to strike the reader as redundantly narrated is Noah’s sending of the raven and the dove (8:6–12). In general, the presence of two different birds seems altogether extraneous: if Noah sends out the raven “in order to see whether the waters have gone down” (לראות הקלו המים), so that it “comes and goes until the water is dried off of the earth” (וזא יצא ישו ויבש המים מעל הארץ), why must he also send the dove out for the same purpose? Yet, this general redundancy of content is exacerbated by the inconsistent style of narration of the sendings of the two birds. While the raven’s repeat missions are recounted in summary fashion (8:6–7), those of the dove are described individually in detail with certain formulaic patterns (8:8–9 // 8:10–11 // 8:12). Especially in a narrative sequence that is constructed from a highly parallel set of events, the raven mars the narrative’s style much like flies in perfume (Qoh 10:1).

7.4 Confirmation

By way of refutation, I highlighted in the previous section the five main sources of contradiction and redundancy in the Hebrew text of Noah’s flood. With the exception of the

---

55 This Hebrew phrase, taken from 8:8, has been reconstructed as a harmonizing plus in 8:7. Cf. §2.2.1.6 and Appendix II.
56 The redundancy of the two birds likely explains interpretations found in two Qumran texts. 4Q252 1. I, 14ff. only mentions the dove, and it is only sent out three times. 4Q254a 3 does mention the raven but says that it went out and returned (reading ושׁוב, yet with a distinct purpose: ליתודעין לדורות התל יוחסין). For the text and further explanation in relation to Philo’s question concerning why the raven was sent out first (QG II.35), see George Brooke, “4Q254 Fragments 1 and 4, and 4Q254a: Some Preliminary Comments,” in Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and Its World (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 190–192.
massive doublets involving the start of the flood and the entrance into the ark, I will demonstrate in what follows that G makes numerous translation choices aimed to preempt a refutation of this account as a bad composition, a false myth, or a font of wrong teachings about God and the world. Inasmuch as G's translation of Genesis 6–9 produces a narrative with a more virtuous plot, the act of translation resembles an exercise in confirmation in certain ways, since, by the translation choices that he makes, G preempts criticism of the biblical narrative by eliminating or giving meaning to potential sources of redundancy, on the one hand, and harmonizing or rationalizing inconsistencies and contradictions, on the other. Although G's interpretation of the flood has been studied at length by multiple scholars, the way that G's translation choices constitute a defense of this narrative's integrity has gone unnoticed, largely on account of the primary genre of previous scholarship, i.e., verse-by-verse commentary, which by its very nature inhibits sustained thematic engagement with related yet dispersed textual data.57

57 More scholarly work has been done on Noah's flood than the other sections of Greek Genesis treated in the literary case studies of Part II. Mostly, this work comes in the form of commentaries: Harl, La Genèse; Wevers, Notes; Rösel, Übersetzung; Brayford, Genesis; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis.” Of these, the most important are Harl, Wevers and Rösel: Harl is best on reception history, Wevers on textual issues, and Rösel on G's interpretations. In addition to Harl's commentary, Jack Lewis's older but relatively extensive overview of the reception history of this passage is also quite useful (A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature [Leiden: Brill, 1978], pp. 81–92 on the Septuagint). Also, Benjamin Wright has written a short article on Gen 6–9 in the Septuagint, but he only addresses the most obvious divergences of G's translation from the meaning of its Hebrew source (“Noah and the Flood in the Septuagint,” in Noah and His Book(s), ed. Michael Stone, et al. [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010], 137–142). In relation to this body of scholarship, the main contribution of the present chapter is its attention to how G's smaller translation choices work together to address larger literary problems of the entire narrative. For example, while Rösel notes points where G irons out inconsistency or redundancy of style, he does not discuss the more substantive infelicities of content.
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7.4.1 Crime and punishment

The most pervasive transformations in the Greek version relate to the impetus for the flood, i.e. the nature of the crimes and the identity of the perpetrators. G virtually eliminates the contradictions and redundancy found in the Hebrew source by means of a handful of creative translation choices. In isolation, most of these transformations would only alter the art and interpretation of the resulting translation in a subtle way, but their cumulative effect is substantial.

**Genesis 6:5–13**

5 ἀνέβη κύριος ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἐπληρώθησαν ἀι κακίαι τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶς τὰς διανοήσεις ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐπηλεξένες ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρά πάσας τὰς ἁμέρας.

6 καὶ ἐνεπιθυμήσει ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ διενόχθη. 7 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Απαλέλυψα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, δὴ ἐποίησα, ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ ἄνθρωπον ἐως κτήνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἐρπετῶν ἐως πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅτι ἐθυμώθη ὅτι ἐποίησα αὐτούς.

8 Νῦν δὲ εὑρέθη χάριν ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ.

9 Αὕτη δὲ αἱ γενέσεις Νῦν. Νῦν ἄνθρωπος δικαίος, τέλειος δὲ ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ· τῷ θεῷ εὐφρέστησεν Νῦν. 10 ἐγέννησεν δὲ Νῦν τρεῖς υἱοὺς, τὸν Σῆμ, τὸν Χάμ, τὸν Ιάφεθ.

11 ἐφθάρει δὲ ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας. 12 καὶ εἶδεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἦν καταφθάρμενη, ὅτι κατέφθειρεν πᾶσα σάρξ τῆς ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

13 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Νῦν Καιρὸς παντὸς ἄνθρωπος ἦκεν ἐναντίον μου, ὅτι ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦδον ἐγὼ καταθεῖμα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν γῆν.58

Although I will discuss the complex network of interpretive choices highlighted above in detail below, their net effect is as follows. First, in terms of the perpetrator, G finds humans alone to be responsible for the corrupt state of affairs that results in the flood; second, in terms of the crime, G harmonizes the contradictions by recourse to technical vocabulary

---

58 As with the long texts in 6.3.4–5, the translation and interpretation of the Greek will be discussed at length.
from Greek philosophical ethics. It is no longer evil, violence, or a combination of the two, but rather injustice (ἀδικία) that manifests itself in manifold vices (κακίαι). Finally, G clarifies the relationship between 6:5–7 and 6:11–13 by depicting the first as God’s internal decision-making process and the second as God’s disclosure to Noah at the proper time to make preparations for the coming judgment.

First, let us consider the crimes committed. In translating 6:5–13, G makes a number of choices that develop their nature and intensity. The first such change comes in 6:5.

6:5 רָעָה רָעָה lן אָדָם אָדָם
human evil was great the vices of humans had multiplied

To begin with, G increases the crimes by count morphologically, by substituting a Greek plural for a Hebrew singular on each form in the phrase. In addition, G also amplifies the crimes lexically in two ways. First, G selects the plural κακίαι ("vices") to render רעה ("evil"), which is collective singular by the consonantal orthography. In contrast to רעה,

59 ἐπληθύνθησαν | G inflects the verb as plural so that it agrees grammatically with its plural subject. The form רָעָה may be parsed either as an adjective (feminine, singular, absolute) or a qatal form of בָּרָה in the qal (3rd person, feminine, singular), as in Gen 18:20. G typically translates בָּרָה as πολύς (9/13) and reserves πληθύνω for the cognate verbs πλῆρη (25/28) and בָּרָה (1/28). Regardless of whether he read the form as a verb or an adjective, however, G preferred a dynamic equivalent to a stative one. For adjective => verb, see §5.1.1.4.

60 χαξίαι | G frequently translates רעה (10) in the plural as πονηρά (3: 44:4; 50:17, 20) or χαξά (2: 19:19; 50:15), but he uses χαξίαι only here. G uses χαξία in the singular, however, in 31:52. G may find linguistic justification for his interpretation, since the form רעה may be read as singular (רעה) or plural (רעות).

61 ἄνθρωποι | In the flood account G uses both distributive plural (6: 6:1, 2, 3, 4, 5; 8:21) and collective singular (9: 6:6, 7; 7:21, 23; 8:21; 9:5, 6) renderings of ἄνθρωπος. In each case, G decides whether it is more appropriate to present ἄνθρωπος as collective or distributive. For singular => plural, see §6.1.2.2 (verbs) and §6.2.2.2 (nouns). Elsewhere, he only uses the distributive plural once (11:5 6:2 οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπων // 6:2 οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ).
κακίαι does not mean vice in general or multiple instances of a single vice, but, according to its technical use, it denotes “types of vice,” just as ἀρεται denotes “types of virtue.” Second, in contrast to the singular and static adjective ἄρα (“great”) used as a nonverbal predicate, the aorist passive verb ἐπληθύνησαν (“[they] had multiplied”) implies a more explicit backstory. Although later traditions and interpreters would find manifold vices present in the elusive account of 6:1–4, G’s prior translation of Genesis 1–5 seems to have

62 Rösel is correct to associate the terms κακίαι and δίκια with Greek ethical theory, but the connection is even stronger than he suggests, given the significance of κακίαι when used in the plural (“types of vice,” cf. Rösel: “wicked deeds” [“böse Taten”]) and the collective quality of δίκια (“injustice,” i.e., “all vice”), as I argue here. Rösel does capture the universal character of δίκιας in another way, however, since he takes it as accusative plural instead of genitive singular (Übersetzung, 160, 161, 165, 233).

63 For the technical use of the plural, see LSJ, s.v. “ἀρετή” A.I.2; DGE, s.v. “ἀρετή” I.2; Aristotle, Eth. nic. 1105b.29. Or, consider the title of the short work peri ἀρετῶν καὶ κακίων attributed to Aristotle, which enumerates and defines the types of virtue and vice (Virt. vit. 1249a26–1251b37). Later readers also understood κακίαι in this sense. Didymus, In Gen. 170.3–4, for example, has multiple vices in mind, as he claims they must have been distributed across society, since one person may possess all the virtues but not all the vices, as they come in pairs of extremes: Πάντας μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἄνθρωποι τὰς ἀρετὰς εἶναι δύνατον, ἄλληλαις γὰρ ἀνταλλαγοῦσιν, τὰς δὲ κακίας οὐκ ὠλὸν τὸ διὰ τὰ προειρημένα. Similarly, Philo, Deus 4 interprets Gen 6:1–4 allegorically, explaining the offspring of the “daughters of men” as “vices” (κακίαι) in contrast to the godly offspring, i.e. “virtues” (ἀρετή): τὰ μὲν γὰρ οἰκεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ γεννήματα αἱ ἀδόκιμοι ἀρεταῖ, τὰ δὲ συγγενεῖς πρᾶκτον αἱ ἀνάμμεσται κακίαι. Cf. the statement by John Chrysostom given in note 65.

64 The circumstantial participle used to introduce 65 (Ἰδὼν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός...) is likely meant to reinforce the possibility of interpreting 65ff. in light of the preceding verses, an instinct that is followed broadly among both Jewish and Christian interpreters. (For a survey, see Lewis, Interpretation.) The addition of τούτος in 6:3—perhaps in V—likewise forges a connection between 6:1–4 and the flood narrative: Ὑδὲ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐν τοῖς ἄνθρωποι τούτοις.

65 For example, John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 22.4 (PG 53:191.53–59) assumes a gap between Gen 6:1–4 and 6:5, during which time sexual license (πορνεία) birthed many other (mostly related) vices. Εἰ γὰρ τῆς πονηρᾶς ταύτης πράξεως, καθόπερ ἀπὸ πυγῆς τινος, καὶ έπερα πολλά αὐτῶι έτίκτετο ἁμαρτήματα· διὰ τούτο φησιν. Αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ὁσοι γὰρ πορνεία, καὶ ἁμαρτία, καὶ ταυτάτη ἁμαρτία, εἰκῶς καὶ μέθην, καὶ παροίκων, καὶ πολλῆν ἀδίκων, καὶ πλεονεξίαν καὶ τὰ μυρία τίκτεσθαι κακά. Cf. 24.2 (PG 53:208.44–46). Josephus, A.J. 1.3.1 §72 also
informed his conception of this backstory and how he could present the plot as virtuous on a higher level of discourse retroactively at this point, as the wider narrative arc of the opening chapters of Genesis anticipates the deep moral decay in effect by the time of the flood. Adam and Eve were initially without shame (σῶκ ἡσχύνοντο) (3:1), and so virtuous.⁶⁶ Yet, they compromised human virtue with a bad decision, ironically introducing the vice of folly (ἀφροσύνη)⁶⁷ by heeding the bad advice of the cleverest (φρονιμώτατος, 3:1) of

notes the moral decline from virtue (ἀρετή) to vice (χαλία) among Seth’s virtuous line only after seven generations.

⁶⁶ At least two distinct lines of thought connect virtue and shame in classical ethics. First, the roots αἰεχ- and χαλ- may be used casually as synonyms: “Kalos [Kalós] and aiskschros [aiσχρός] are applied very freely indeed by the orators to any action, behavior, or achievement which evokes any kind of favourable reaction and praise or incurs any kind of contempt, hostility, or reproach … Kalos [Kalós] thus most often corresponds to our ‘admirable’, ‘creditable, honourable’, and aiskschros [aiσχρός] to ‘disgraceful’, ‘shameful’, ‘scandalous’; they are the most important tools of manipulative language” (Kenneth Dover, Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974], 70 [see also 69–73]; cf. David Konstan, “Shame,” in The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006], 91–110). Along these lines, in his discussion of virtue and vice in relation to epideictic genres, Aristotle, Rhet. 1366a places τὸ καλὸν and τὸ aiskhros in apposition to ἀρετή and καλία: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λέγωμεν περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ καλίας καὶ καλοῦ καὶ aiskhρω. Cf. Eth. nic. 1104b.30–34. Second, and directly relevant to what is predicated of Adam and Eve, the virtuous person is said to experience no shame (in a pejorative sense), since shame results from the commission of acts of vice (cf. Eth. nic. 1128b.21–26: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπικείμενος ἔστιν ἡ aisχύνη, εἰπερ γίνεται ἐπὶ τοῖς φαύλοις … φαύλου δὲ καὶ τὸ εἶναι τοιοῦτον ὡς πράττειν τι τῶν aisχρῶν). The Greek concept of shame also has a positive side. According to Plato, Leg. 646e.3–647b.2, aisχύνη/αίδως is a healthy fear that restrains people from committing shameless acts. Against this background, Adam and Eve’s lack of shame implies their complete and perfect virtue.

⁶⁷ Aristotle opposes the vice ἀφροσύνη to the virtue φρόνησις, which he defines as the rational virtue of the deliberative part of the mind (Eth. nic. 1141b.2–14; 1143b.14–17), specifically in relation to making proper decisions concerning good and bad, as stated in Nic. eth. 1140a.25–28 (ὅσκεί δὴ φρονίμου εἶναι τὸ δύνασθαι καλὸς βουλεύεσθαι περὶ τὰ αὐτῶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ συμφέροντα, ό κατὰ μέρος, ὡς ποιά πρὸς υγίειαν, πρὸς ἴσχυν, ἀλλὰ ποία πρὸς τὸ εὖ ζην ἄλως) and Nic. eth. 1141b.9–10 (τὸ γὰρ φρονίμου μάλιστα τοῦτο ἐργον εἶναι φαμεν, τὸ εὖ βουλεύεσθαι). Cf. Rhet. 1366b.20–22; Virt. vit. 1250a.3–4, 16–17, 30–39; 1250b.43–1251a.3. Concerned with the practical, φρόνησις is the mental virtue enabling the pursuit of all ethical virtues. Cf. Eth. nic. 1144a.6–9:
animals. To this initial decline in human moral reasoning, Cain supplied first a vice of excess by his bad temper (ὀργιλότης) and then one of deficiency, i.e., cowardice (δειλία) or lack of courage.70 Most recently, human vice was made complete by the addition of intemperance (ἀκολασία).71 Since G aimed to represent the meaning of the Hebrew accurately in Greek, he would not have altered the major details of the antediluvian stories of moral failure, and yet some of G’s translation choices—as well as the content of the narratives themselves—encourage reading each account as concerning the loss of one of the four cardinal virtues: φρόνησις (Adam and Eve), ἀνδρεία (Cain, Lamech), σωφροσύνη (sons of ἔτος τὸ ἔργον ἀποτελεῖται κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν ἡδικὴν ἀρετὴν· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἀρετὴ τὸν σκοπῆν ποιεῖ ὀρθῶν, ἢ δὲ φρόνησις τὰ πρὸς τοῦτον.

68 As Aristotle makes clear, there is a fine line between cleverness (δεινότης) and practical wisdom (φρόνησις), since the former is requisite for the latter. Yet, unlike practical wisdom, cleverness does not require a virtuous intent (Eth. nic. 1144a.23–1144b.1).

69 Cain is easily upset (ἔλυπησεν λίαν ... περίλυπος ... συνέπεσεν 4:5–6) by the fact that God accepts Abel’s sacrifice but not his and seeks revenge upon his brother even when God provides him with a second chance (4:7). Mark Scarlata points to these translational data as interventions meant to intensify Cain’s emotions in the style of Greek tragedy (Outside of Eden, 57–59, 207–212; cf. §9.1). Building on this, it is significant that the emotion λύπη is particularly associated with a lack of ἀνδρεία (Aristotle, Eth. nic. 1104b.7–8: ὁ μὲν ὑπομένων τὰ δεινὰ καὶ χαίρων ἢ μὴ λυποῦμενός γε ἀνδρεῖος, ὃ δὲ λυποῦμενος δειλὸς). Furthermore, Eth. nic. 1126a.4–8 describes the opposite of ὀργιλότης (“bad temper”), i.e., ἀφρυγησία (“lack of anger, apathy”), as the inability to get upset or be pained (λυπεῖσθαι) by anything. A bad temper, however, responds to sources of pain or grief (λύπη) with the pleasure of revenge (Nic. eth. 1126a.21–22; cf. Virt. vit. 1251a.3–9). Cain’s descendant, Lamech (4:23–24), follows in his ancestor’s footsteps by seeking immediate and final revenge (ἐκδεδίκησαι) for a minor offense (πρᾳδίμα, μώλωπα).

70 Cain’s response to God’s punishment is fear that he will be murdered (4:14). The vice of δειλία (“cowardice”) is particularly associated with the fear of death (cf. Aristotle, Eth. nic. 1115a.24–b.6; Virt. vit. 1251a.10–12).

71 Aristotle defines ἀκολασία (“intemperance”) as the excessive pursuit of bodily pleasures, esp. touch, taste, and sex (Nic. eth. 1118a.23–b.1; cf. Virt. Vit. 1251a.16–23).
God, daughters of men); and δικαιοσύνη (flood). Nevertheless, with his translation of a single phrase in 6:5 (ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων), G insinuates the red thread of vice that runs through virtually the entire narrative up to the present moment.

G reinforces this depiction of manifold human vice later in 6:11–13 by translating חמס (“violence”) twice as ἀδικία (“injustice”), the single vice that collectively represents all vices. What is more, G’s choice of ἀδικία creates contrastive lexical resonance with the

---

72 This claim about δικαιοσύνη will be established beginning in the next paragraph. In this sequence, it is logical that δικαιοσύνη would fall last, because this virtue implies totality (see note 75).
73 The concept of חמס (“violence”) is only central in texts deriving from the Hebrew version. 1 Enoch understands the violence in terms of the giants eating meat (7:3–6; cf. 9:1, 9; 12:5–6). Cf. Book of Giants (4Q531 1, 4Q532 2). Jubilees 5:2 quite accurately interprets the violence as humans and animals eating one another (cf. 7:22–25, which speaks of cannibalism). Some Jewish interpreters understand חמס as a kind of theft (see note 36). Wevers claims that G intentionally translated חמס as ἀδικία in order to form a contrast with Noah as δίκαιος (Notes, 82; cf. Harl, La Genèse, 130). The sharp contrast between δίκαιος and ἀδικία is certainly an important factor that figured into G’s selection. In addition, the shift from חמס to ἀδικία transfers the blame from humans and animals to humans alone.
74 ἀδικία | G always translates חמס as ἀδικία/ἀδικέω (4/4), but he uses the root δικ- for a whole range of Hebrew roots (see §5.2.2.6), which indicates its general importance for him.
75 Not only does justice figure prominently among the traditional cardinal virtues (e.g., φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, and σωφροσύνη), but justice in particular implies perfection of virtue. In book five of Nic. Eth. (1129a–1138b, but esp. 1129a.31–1130a.13), Aristotle argues at length that there are two senses of δικαιοσύνη and ἀδικία, relating (i) generally to what is lawful (τὸ νόμιμον) or unlawful (τὸ παράνομον) or (ii) specifically to what is fair (τὸ ἴσον) or unfair (τὸ ἄνισον). In its general sense, δικαιοσύνη entails all of the virtues, at least those concerning one’s actions towards other people—the most difficult to master—on account of the fact that law explicitly or implicitly endorses actions commensurate with all virtues. On this basis, Aristotle calls δικαιοσύνη “complete virtue” (ἀρετὴ τελεία), considered by many “the greatest of virtues” (κρατίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν).
Furthermore, justice in its general sense is not a part of virtue but “virtue as a whole” (ὅλη ἀρετὴ), and the opposite goes for injustice, as stated in 1130a.8–10: ἀστή μὲν ὄνθεν ἡ δικαιοσύνη οὗ μέρος ἀρετῆς ἀλλ' ἐλλ' ἀρετὴ ἐστιν, ὡς ἡ ἐναντία ἀδικία μέρος κακίας ἀλλ' ἐλλ' κακία. From a different—but in this case complementary—philosophical perspective, Plato’s Republic is an extended investigation of justice, beginning with questions of definition and later arguing that justice in a person or state involves the proper and harmonious disposition of
character of Noah, who is described in opposite terms not just as a person who is δίκαιος76 ("just")77 but also τέλειος78 ("complete"),79 being master of all the virtues by virtue of having the cardinal one: δικαιοσύνη ("justice").80 G develops the contrast between the manifold vices

all the parts in relation to one another (427d–449a). It makes sense, then, that the Jewish philosopher Philo understands δικαιοσύνη as “chief among the virtues” (τῆς ἐν ἀρεταῖς ἡγεμονίδος) (Abr. 27). See also note 80.

76 δίκαιος | ᾿δίκιος => δίκαιος is a consistent rendering (11/11).
77 Rösel characterizes the opposition between Noah (δίκαιος) and humanity (ἀδικία) as “standing in stark contrast [stehen sich ... schroff gegenüber]” (Übersetzung, 165). Wevers reasons that the Greek root δίκ- has “taken on the coloration of the Hebrew root,” because G consistently translates the Hebrew root פתן with the Greek root δικ- (Notes, 81). Yet, this is a non-sequitur. It would be equally valid to conclude that G finds all of the meaning of the root δικ- to be present in the Hebrew root פתן. Furthermore, this explanation fails to account for (i) the prevalence of other Greek ethical vocabulary in this passage and (ii) the semantic leveling of multiple Hebrew roots with the single Greek root δίκ- (see §5.2.2.6). For a critique of some of the methodological assumptions made by Wevers—and the NETS school associated with his name—see Takamitsu Muraoka, “Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model,” in Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006, ed. Martin Kar rer and Wolfgang Kraus WUNT 219, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 221–235.

78 τέλειος | G translates δύναμις in its other occurrence as ἄμεμπτος (17:1), also an important lexical choice that I will analyze in §8.3.2, but he uses τέλειος nowhere else.
79 For its moral connotation, see BDAG, s.v. “τέλειος” 4.a. As with δίκαιος, the adjective “complete” (τέλειος) implies “complete virtue” (ἀρετή τελεια) (Aristotle, Eth. nic. 1100a.4; 1101a.14; 1102a.6; 1129b.26.30.31), but it also invokes the τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, i.e., the ideal human being complete in virtue. For Plato, the inculcation of virtue through education is the first step toward a lifelong pursuit of wisdom (φρόνησις) and “true beliefs” (ἀληθείς δόξαι), the traits of a “complete person” (τέλειος ἄνθρωπος) (Leg. 653a; cf. Phdr. 249c). See also note 75.
80 Philo, Deus 122 paraphrases Noah’s virtue as τὴν ἐν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς τοῦ Ναοῦ τελείωσιν (“Noah’s completeness in the virtues”). John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 23.5 (PG 53:203.10–17) praises Noah’s perfect virtue on the basis of both the term δίκαιος, which invokes every virtue, and the term τέλειος, which he interprets specifically as “complete with every virtue” (ἐν πάσῃ ἀρετῇ τέλειος): διὰ ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τὴν καθόλου ἀρετὴν ταύτην ἑμφαίνει. Τὸ γάρ δίκαιος ἄνομοι ἔσον ἕμι ἐπὶ τῶν πάσων ἀρετῆς μετίοντων λέγειν. ... Πάντα πληρώσας, φησιν, ἀπερ ἐχρῆν ἄνθρωπον ἐπιδείκταις ἀρετὴν ἐλέμονον (τούτῳ γάρ ἐστι, Τέλειος), οὐδὲν ἐλλελοιπός, ἐν οὐδενὶ χωλεύων. Οὐ τὸ μὲν κατορθώσας, ἐν τῷ δὲ διαμαρτών, ἀλλ’ ἐν πάσῃ ἀρετῇ τέλειος ἦν· τούτῳ γὰρ ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν ἐπιδείκταις.
of the masses and the complete virtue of the one man Noah in two small ways. First, by using contrastive δέ for Noah’s introduction (“But Noah found favor...”), Noah’s character is explicitly constructed in opposition to the rest of humanity; second, G translates (“in his generations”) with a singular object in the phrase ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ (in his generation), so that Noah’s virtue is understood specifically in contrast to his contemporaries and not necessarily all humans before him. Finally, the ethical resonance of ἀδικία and κακίαι is amplified by the lexical equivalent G selects for שׁחת in this passage, since (κατα)φθείρω is not only sui place for describing the destruction of natural disasters but has decidedly ethical connotations.

81 G also forms a lexical contrast between Noah and those who died in the flood in 7:23 by translating מಸה and רוא with verbs derived from a common root: when everything is “wiped out” (ἐξηλεφθησαν), Noah alone (μόνος) is “left behind” (κατελεφθη) (cf. Harl, La Genèse, 136; Wevers, Notes, 100). This contrast is reinforced by the interpretation of ἡ as μόνος. Also, at a loss for the meaning of עצי גפר in 6:14, G may have selected the equivalent ξύλων τετραγώνων for its ethical connotations, so that a virtuous boat is built by a virtuous man. Plato, Prot. 339b (cf. Aristotle, Eth. nic. 1100a.19–22) attributes to Simonides the following lines, which metaphorically describe the virtuous man as “foursquare” (τετράγωνος):

82 δέ This contrastive δέ accurately represents the Hebrew disjunctive syntax. For G’s use of δέ, see §4.1.1.

83 γενε All translations μόνος and ἡ γενεᾷ | G only translates μόνος as singular here (1/6), thus harmonizing with the singular ἡ γενεῖς in 7:1, For singular => plural, see §6.2.2.2.

84 WEVERS Sees no difference between the Hebrew plural and the Greek singular (Notes, 81). In isolation, this judgment is not unreasonable, but in combination with other factors that highlight or increase the contrast between Noah and his generation, it is likely not just a matter of style or linguistic preference.

85 For φθείρφθει, used of natural disasters and floods, see Plato, Tim. 22b–23c; Leg. 677; Apollodorus, Bib. 1.7.2. For the ethical connotation of this root, see LSJ, s.vv. “φθείρφθει” A.I.3, “καταφθείρφθει” A.I.2. In Aristotle’s technical vocabulary, existing virtues may be “corrupted” (φθείρφεται) (Eth. nic. 1103b.7–8; 1104a.11–13; et passim). Inasmuch as φθείρφεται is used in this philosophical sense in opposition to intransitive verbs like γίνεται (“come into being”) and αὔξεται (“increase”), it could be translated as “diminish,” but it never loses its
Having resolved the tension in his Vorlage concerning the nature of the crime by pressing the text’s two layers into the mold of Greek ethical vocabulary, G also intensifies antediluvian human vices in terms of their universality, intentionality, and frequency.

First, G universalizes91 human vices by personalizing the distributive92 sense of ἐὰν ("every"), in transferring it from the impersonal ἢς ("inclination") to the personal τις ("person").93

Second, G has supplied a volitional94 dimension to μετάνοια ("thoughts") by rendering it as

\[\text{every inclination of the thoughts of one’s mind/heart} \quad \text{was only evil all day long}\]

harsh connotations of destruction and moral collapse, as is captured by the Euripidean fragment quoted by Paul in 1 Cor 15:33; ἀδέλφωσαν ἡ ζωὴ χρηστᾶ ὡμολαγεῖν κακαί ("bad relations corrupt good ethics"); cf. 2 Tim 3:8.

97 τις | The noun ἤς only occurs again in 8:21 (ἐγκειταί). G rarely uses the indefinite pronoun τις (12: 6:5; 13:16; 14:13; 18:30, 32; 19:12; 20:9; 26:10; 27:44; 33:10; 38:1; 39:11), never together with πᾶς, and usually in periphrastic renderings (but cf. ὁς in 13:16 and ὁς in 26:10; 27:44).

98 διανοεῖται | The noun διάνοια only occurs here in Genesis. G only uses the noun διάνοια in translating ἐὰν (7/7) and the verb διανοεῖσαι when ἐὰν is nearby (3: 6:5, 6; 8:21), as here.

99 ἔπιμελεῖ | G only translates ἔπιμελεῖ as ἔπιμελεῖσαι here and [8:21] (2/11). G more often selects equivalents with a restrictive sense, e.g., πλῆθ (2: 14:24; 41:40), μόνος (2: 19:8; 24:8), χωρίς (2: 47:22, 26).

100 πᾶς τὸς ἡμέρας | Only here does G translate singular ἐὰν (85) as plural, except when it is accompanied by a numeral (8: 7:4, 12, 17, 24; 8:3, 6; 50:3+). For singular => plural, see §6.2.2.2.

101 Brayford claims that G “universalizes” the problem (Genesis, 262).

102 Rösel argues for a distributive sense (Übersetzung, 160–161).

103 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 22.5 (PG 53:192.4–8) dilates on the phrase πᾶς τις, saying that it has strong emphasis (Μεγάλη τοῦ ρήματος ἡ ἔμφασις), including people from all groups: young and old, men and women, slave and free, rich and poor.

104 For the volitional sense of “plan,” see DGE, s.v. “διανοοῦμαι” 1.1. Harl describes διάνοια —at least in contrast to καρδία—in cognitive terms ("le nom dianoia qui a plutôt le sens de pensée, intelligence") (La Genèse, 61). Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 47 explains, in relation to ἔπιμελεῖσαι and διανοεῖται, that Noah’s generation was wholeheartedly engaged in their wicked deeds, practicing them “with great diligence and fervor” (μετ’ ἔπιμελεῖσαι καὶ σπουδῆς) and showing their reason to be a slave to their passions (δοῦλον τῶν παθῶν τῶν λογισμῶν ἀποφαίνοντες)
διανοεῖται (“plans”), the object of which is not abstract “evil” (ר) but concrete “evil deeds” (tà πονηρά). That this transformation is not itself unintentional is indicated by the subsequent choice to translate ר ("only") quite inventively as ἐπιμελῶς ("with great care"). Finally, by rendering the singular phrase כל היום (either "all day long" or "all their days") with the plural πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας (“all their days”), G assumes a generational or even intergenerational perspective on human vice.

In the service of “inventing new vices” (προσεπνοεῖν ἔτέρας κακίας). Based on these terms, Didymus, In Gen. 159 seems to think that ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ also means “whole-heartedly”: Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἐ[κείνην ἐπ]ρήττετο παρὰ αὐτῶν ἡ ἁ[κία] ἆλλ’ ἐπιμελῶς καὶ βέβαιαμενῶς· τότε γὰρ δῆλον τὸ »ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ«. Cf. John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 22.5 (PG 53:192.8–18).

95 Rösel argues that G was at a loss for how to translate ייצר מחשׁבת, because these two terms are near synonyms (Übersetzung, 160). Given G’s control of both Hebrew and Greek, it seems more likely that he simply felt that a verbal rendering would be the best representation of the Hebrew nonverbal clause (cf. Wevers, Notes, 78–79).

96 The concrete outworking of human vice is emphasized again later in 8:21 where G renders בעבור האדם as if it were בעבוד, i.e., διὰ τὰ ἐργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων (“on account of human actions”).

97 The volitional dimension of ἐπιμέλεια is perhaps best illustrated by means of its antonym, ἀμέλεια, which denotes negligence and indifference. According to Aristotle, culpability requires volition (τὸ ἐκούσιον, Eth. nic. 1109b.30–1111b.3) and choice (προαιρέσις, 1111b.4–1113a.14), both of which are entailed by careful deliberation. That G shares this ethical perspective is indicated by his translation in 20:4 ofυν ὁ τὸ τάξις ἔγενον καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολέσθαι as "eagerly [eifrig]" and connects it to “culpability [Selbstverantwortlichkeit]” (Übersetzung, 161). Harl also underscores the “responsibility [responsabilité]” entailed by ἐπιμελῶς, which she translates as “with great care [soigneusement]” but interprets as indicative of intense focus on a single goal (La Genèse, 127). Wevers interprets ἐπιμελῶς as “intensively” (Notes, 78–79).

98 Joüon §139g argues that the first possibility (“all day long”) is rare, but it is nonetheless the case that G has excluded this interpretation from consideration. It should also be noted that this is precisely how some later readers understood the phrase: Genesis Rabbah 27.3 (~from sunrise to sunset); cf. Ps 1:2:2 (~day and night).
Given the extensive development of the crime as the pervasive and deliberate practice of manifold human vices, the possibility of assigning blame to the animals is already all but excluded, but G seals this interpretation with a handful of other translation choices. Most importantly, G translates the key term בשר ("flesh") as ἄνθρωπος ("human").

6:13 קָץ כָּל בָּשָׂר בָּא בָּעֵדֶנֵי מֵא יָמָּנָיו the end of all flesh has come before me the time of every human has come before me

Not only does G restrict the meaning of בשר in this watershed verse, but even before this he limits its meaning to humans in a very subtle fashion, by using a masculine pronoun to translate the pronominal suffix דרכו.

6:11 "all flesh had corrupted its way every ‘flesh’ had corrupted his way"

By using *concordia ad sensum* instead of grammatical agreement between αὐτοῦ ("his") and its referent σάρξ ("flesh")—grammatically feminine—G interprets σάρξ as human. As a

99 For example, Rösel thinks that G’s translation of בשר as ἄνθρωπος in 6:13 is related to his interpretation of חמס as ἀδικία. While animals could be held responsible for acts of violence (cf. 9:5), it is inconsistent with Greek ethical thinking to hold animals culpable for ἀδικία, or vice writ large (Übersetzung, 166). This is especially so for Aristotle, who places animals and minors in an intermediate category, since they have volition (τὸ ἑκούσιον) but not choice (προαιρέσεις); τὸ µὲν γὰρ ἐκούσιον καὶ παῖδες καὶ τέλλα ζῶα κοινωνεῖ, προαιρέσεως δ’ οὔ (Eth. nic. 1111b.8–9).

100 ἄνθρωπος | Only here does G translate בשר as ἄνθρωπος (1/35), and this is the only case in which G uses ἄνθρωπος to translate anything other than רוצי or שין.

101 In a similar way, G’s use of masculine agreement in 9:6 “he who sheds human blood” (ἐκχέων αἵμα ἄνθρωπον) excludes animals from this new legislation, although G previously said they would also be punished for manslaughter (9:5). The Hebrew phrase שפך דם האדם may include both humans and animals.

102 Philo, in Deus 140–144 and QG 1.99, makes a point of the lack of grammatical concord between σάρξ and αὐτοῦ and concludes that the referent is God. Wevers takes this interpretation, but he considers only two possibilities, i.e., that the Hebrew suffix must refer either to God or to humans and animals as a group (Notes, 82–83; cf. Harl, La Genèse, 130). Yet, G’s translation of בשר as ἄνθρωπος, which Wevers interprets as a
result, the translations in 6:13 of the pronominal suffixes on מפניהם (“because of them”) and משחיהם (“destroy them”) no longer refer to both humans and animals, i.e., “all flesh” (כל בשר), but humans alone. G also reinforces his distinction between humans and animals later in 7:22, which narrates the death of all outside the ark, when he interprets the recurring phrase כל אשת (“all that”) first with reference to the animals (πάντα ὄσια [“everything that”]) and then concerning human beings (πᾶς ὁς [“everyone who”]). G’s interpretive interventions concerning this point have proved quite effective, as readers of the Hebrew and Greek versions tended towards differing interpretations as to whether animals were responsible or not, with (as it seems) no Greek reader taking this view.

_________________________

development that singles out humans as “the real culprit” (as I also argue), in combination with other choices that exclude animal culpability, demands serious consideration of the possibility of concordia ad sensum between σὰρξ and ἄνθρωπος, as understood by Didymus, In Gen. 167.28–168.8. Although he entertains Philo’s reading, Didymus takes σὰρξ as co-referential with ἄνθρωπος and the antecedent of ἄνθρωπος as σὰρξ qua ἄνθρωπος.

103 Cf. Rösel, Übersetzung, 181. Wevers also sees a distinction being made by G in the previous verse (7:21), but it is not as clear there (Notes, 98–99).

104 Only readers of the Hebrew text consider the possibility that animals were also to blame. In 1 Enoch 7:5, the animals are passively involved as the victims of evil, whereas in Sanhedrin 108a people lead the animals astray by cross-breeding them. According to two traditions preserved in Genesis Rabbah 28.6, however, it is the animals who lead the people into evil. 3 Enoch 4:4 implies the guilt of the animals by a rhetorical question intended to be refuted. Jubilees 5:2 explicitly indicts the animals. Likely in light of Gen 6:1–4, some Jewish traditions ascribe sexual sins to the animals, such as bestiality (Genesis Rabbah 26.5–6) or illicit relations with other species (Genesis Rabbah 28.8; cf. Sanhedrin 108a; Let. Aris. 128–171; Barn. 10). One saying even extends such sexual impropriety to plant life (Genesis Rabbah 28.8). Readers of the Greek text, on the other hand, feel compelled to rationalize God’s destruction of the animals, usually claiming that their destruction alongside humans was logical since they had been created for humans’ sake, e.g., John Chrysostom Hom. Gen. 22.5 (PG 53:193.9–35); 23.1 (PG 53:198.8–15); cf. 26.3 (PG 53:233.45–52); Didymus, In Gen. 157.28–158.6, 172.6–10; Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 50; Philo, QG 1.94; 2.9.
As for the repetitive opening to the flood story (6:5–7 // 6:11–13), G makes a few lexical adjustments that resolve this redundancy of content by developing the relationship between 6:5–7 and 6:11–13. He reconstrues the first passage in terms of God’s contemplation of having created humanity and his decision to destroy them, and he makes the second passage take place when the time has come for Noah to begin constructing the ark in preparation for the flood.  

G presents the events of 6:5–7 as God’s internal rational and deliberative process by creatively interpreting the meaning of the two occurrences of the verb נחם (“regret”) as well as that of the phrase יתעצב אל לבו (“he was deeply troubled in his mind”). 

Avoiding the idea that God would regret the creation of humans, G sees

105 Consistent with this relationship between the two passages, Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 56 also leans on the character of Noah to explain the doublet: God sees human vices and wants to wipe out everyone, but he notices Noah and decides to spare him, and so he tells him of what is coming.

106 The hithpael of עצב is rare, only occurring in one other verse, also in Genesis (34:7). It means “be deeply worried” or “feel hurt” (HALOT, s.v. עצב hithpael), which is consistent with the root עצב’s associations with pain, grief, and anxiety in the other stems (qal, nifal, piel, and hiphil).

107 Aquila recognizes the semantic incongruity between נחם and ἐνθυμέομαι, correcting G’s ἐνεθυμήθη to μετεμελήθη and his ἐνθυμήθη to μετεμελήθην. Cf. Syrohexaplar ἀπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ (“he turned back in his heart”), i.e. “he changed his mind.” G’s translation of נחם surely had theological motivations, i.e., to avoid attributing the human experiences of regret and anxiety to God or implying that he had erred in making humankind. The Pentateuchal translators—and the καιγε revisers—regularly avoided translating נחם (niphal) with μεταμελέομαι or μετανοέω, although post-Pentateuchal translators did not (Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the Kaige Revisers,” in The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after “Les Devanciers d’Aquila”, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen, De Septuaginta Investigationes 9 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017], 41–53). Even so, ἐνεθυμήθη and διενοήθη still imply that God changed his mind, even if they do not say so directly (James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language, [London: Oxford University Press, 1961], 252–253). Both John Chrysostom, 22.5 (PG 53:192.36–41); 27.3 (53:244.31–33) and Didymus, In Gen. 159.32–160.24 explain this language in literary terms as anthropomorphism (ἀνθρωποπαθῶς/ἀνθρωπίνως λέγειν). For a list of anthropomorphisms in Genesis, see Harl, La Genèse, 54.
that one theological implication of constructing a virtuous plot in his translation is to present its main character, God, as virtuous, and so he has God not regret but “contemplate”\(^{108}\) (ἐνθυμηθη) the fact that he created human beings on the earth.

Furthermore, this particular choice is informed by G’s use of the cognitive verb διανοέομαι (“think, intend, decide”) later in the same verse:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{6:6} & \quad \text{And the Lord regretted having made humans on the earth,} \\
& \quad \text{and he was deeply troubled in his mind.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ ἐπαθηθη} & \quad \text{καὶ ἐπαθηθη} \\
\wedgei & \quad \text{ο βιες} \\
\text{διαενοηθη} & \quad \text{διαενοηθη} \\
\wedgei & \quad \text{ἡκι} \\
\text{ἐν θυμησει τον ἀνθρωπον ἐπι τής γῆς,} & \quad \text{καὶ διενοηθη.}\number{110}
\end{align*}
\]

Indeed, God contemplated the fact that he made humanity on the earth, and he came to a decision.

\(^{108}\) For the cognitive sense, see LSJ, s.v. “ἐνθυμέομαι” A.I.1; DGE, s.v. “ἐνθυμέομαι” I.1. Although Rösel notes that ἐνθυμέομαι may indicate mental activity (“Nachdenken”), he assumes that ἐνθυμέομαι has more to do with anger (cf. LSJ, s.v. “ἐνθυμέομαι” A.I.2), probably on account of G’s second translation of נחם as θυμώ (Übersetzung, 161; cf. Harl, La Genèse, 127). Yet, several points complicate this interpretation. First, ἐνθυμέομαι is not well attested in this sense and not with δια. In fact, anger is not mentioned at all in the recent and well-documented entry of DGE. Second, the sense that would support Rösel’s interpretation, i.e., LSJ A.I.2 (“take to heart, be concerned or angry at”), involves a rational as well as an emotive component, in which case it may be possible that G had both anger/concern and contemplation in mind. Third, later Greek readers interpreted ἐνθυμέομαι as mental activity, e.g., Philo, Deus 34 (see note 111). Fourth, this interpretation does not account for why, if he had wanted to convey God’s anger here, G did not use ἑθυμώθη as in 6:7. Wevers is thus likely correct to interpret G’s translation as substituting mental for emotional activity, although “rectify” overplays the salvific quality of God’s plan at this point in the story: “Gen … has God, rather than reacting emotionally to man’s evil condition, concentrating on what he will do to rectify the situation” (Notes, 79). At this point, God is pondering the lamented creation and not the deliverance of humans.

\(^{109}\) ἐνθυμηθη | G chooses to translate נחם with ἐνθυμέομαι only here (1/9), and he never uses ἐνθυμέομαι otherwise (but cf. θυμώ in 6:7).

\(^{110}\) διενοηθη | The verb ονοθη only occurs two other times in Genesis, but G expresses its emotive dimension in those cases, selecting κατανόησομαι (34:7) and λυπάω (45:5). G’s selection of διανοέομαι here is likely related to the presence of λέει λέει in this phrase (see note 95).
In Greek translation, this contemplation leads not to God’s mental and emotional pain but rather his “making a decision” (διενοήθη), i.e. the end result of the deliberative process.\textsuperscript{111} However, even if one takes διενοήθη as an ingressive aorist (“began to consider”)\textsuperscript{112} or a complexive aorist (“he thought about”),\textsuperscript{113} the deliberative process quickly comes to an end, as God voices the decision he has made in what immediately follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
6:7 & \quad \text{kai eîpev ò basîs Apaleípsos tòn ànthropôn, ón èpoíhsa,} \\
& \quad \text{apò prosòpou tís gês, apò ánthropou èwos xhýnous} \\
& \quad \text{de rêsis tòs thn xuménu, kai apò érpetôn èwos penteinôn tòu oúranou,} \\
& \quad \text{òti èthymóthn} \textsuperscript{114} \text{òti èpoíhsa au'tou's.}
\end{align*}
\]

Unfortunately, the meaning of èthymóthn, G’s second rendering of נחם (cf. 6:6), cannot be determined with precision. Out of context, it would be natural to understand it as an

\textsuperscript{111} For the resultative aorist, see KG II §386.1; Smyth §1926; SSG §28da. For the deliberative sense, see DGE, s.v. “διανοέομαι” II.2; LSJ, s.v. “διανοέομαι” A.II.2. Philo, Deus 34 differentiates between ἐνθυμέομαι and διανοέομαι in this passage as internal and external rational processes, effectively contemplation and deliberation: ἐννοοῦν καί διανοῆσιν, τὴν μὲν ἐνποιείμενην οὖσαν νόησιν, τὴν δὲ νόησεως διέξοδον. Cf. QG 1.93. Aquila and Symmachus do not accept διενοήθη as a valid translation of נחם. Aquila quite cleverly corrects G to διεπονήθη (“he was preoccupied”). Symmachus prefers ἐπέπεσεν. With Wevers, it is hard to make sense of this reading, but it is probably right to understand it in light of συνέπεσεν in 4:5–6 (Notes, 79 note 11).

\textsuperscript{112} KG II §386.5; Smyth §§1924–1925. This possibility seems the least likely, since the prior verb ἐνθυμήθη—regardless of whether one takes it as “grew angry” or “contemplated”—implies that God has already started the thinking process.

\textsuperscript{113} KG II §386.4; Smyth §1927; SSG §28da; Max Zerwick, Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples, Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 114 (Rome: Iura Editionis et Versionis Reservantur, 1963), §253. Rösel understands διενοήθη as ongoing mental activity (“er dachte nach”). Of course, this is certainly related to his translation of the previous verb (see note 108) (Übersetzung, 158, 162).

\textsuperscript{114} έθυμωθῆν | G chooses to translate נחם as θυμωθῆν only here (1/9). Elsewhere, G only uses θυμόω to render רחם (3: 30:2; 39:19; 44:18), but in none of these cases is the verb preceded by the compound ἐνθυμέομαι.
expression of intense emotion ("I am very angry"). Yet, in Greek prose it is common usage to employ a simplex verb after a cognate compound verb such that the simplex has the same meaning as the compound, in which case ἐθυμώθην may share the meaning of ἐνεθυμήηη above: "I contemplated." So, God rationalizes his destructive course of action either by reference to his emotional state, presumably a by-product of his contemplation, or by reference to the contemplative and deliberative process itself. Deciding between the two possibilities is indeterminate, but either way G has given God's opening speech a novel significance within the flood narrative as a whole, as it now serves as a representation of God's internal process of considering the problem of rampant and manifold human vice and coming up with a plan to resolve it, a plan he then divulges to Noah beginning in 6:13.

---

115 For the “dramatic” or “tragic” aorist used by a speaker in the first person to express intense emotion with reference to the present, see KG II §386.9b; Smyth §1937; Rijksbaron, Syntax and Semantics, 29–30 (§8.3.2).
116 Philo, Deus 70 interprets ἐθυμώθην in terms of anger, contrasting God's anger (θυμός) with the wicked and his grace (χάρις) with Noah. Elsewhere Philo considers the expression hyperbolic, since God does not actually experience anger (QG 1.95).
117 See Renehan, “Compound and Simplex.”
118 Symmachus attests the compound form in this verse: ἐνθυμέομαι [...]. Without any justification, Wevers claims that the sense of ἐνθυμέομαι “would indeed be inappropriate” for the second occurrence of לבה (Notes, 80). Yet, the compound would make good sense. The narrator first explains God's mental activity as contemplation that results in a decision (A, then B), and then God voices that decision as the logical conclusion of his contemplation (B, because A).
119 One exegetical reason that G could have had for reading God’s first speech as an internal monologue—as have other readers of the Hebrew text (see note 35 above)—is the verbal linkage of לבה לבה, which also occurs in 8:21 in the phrase ויאמר ... לבה לבה ("and he spoke to himself"). G captures the internal idea there by translating the prepositional phrase with the circumstantial participle διανοηθείς (“after having decided”). G likely knew this phrase from its later occurrence in the flood story and reasoned backwards that the first passage must also be God speaking לבה לבה, i.e., “(silently) to himself,” even though it does not occur with a verb of speaking in the first case.
Finally, a fourth adjustment to 6:13, translating גַּם (“end”) as καιρός\(^{120}\) (“proper time”) insinuates a gap between 6:5–7 and 6:11–13. To be sure, the chronology of the events prior to the flood is underdetermined, but a span of roughly 100 years is implied in two ways: first, in 6:1 Noah is said to be 500 years old, whereas he is 600 when the flood comes in 7:6; second a limit of 120 years is placed by God upon the antediluvian\(^{121}\) generation in 6:3. Regardless, G seems to suppose that a certain amount of time has passed between God’s decision to flood the earth and the “proper time” (καιρός) for such judgment.\(^{122}\)

7.4.2 Warnings, instructions, and preparations

Not only does G resolve the contradictions present in the opening scenes of the flood narrative, but he also addresses the redundancy involved, albeit at a more stylistic level. As stated in the previous section, the four main causes of redundancy in 6:5–7:5 involve the repetition of (i) notices of the destruction and corruption of the earth; (ii) God’s intention to save Noah and the animals along with instructions; (iii) praise of Noah’s righteous

\(^{120}\) καιρός | G translates גַּם as καιρός only here (1/5), but elsewhere גַּם occurs on the form גַּם (i.e., as the object of the preposition אַל), which G translates synthetically as μετά (4:3; 8:6; 16:3; 41:1). Otherwise, G select καιρός (13) to translate עָשֵׂה (4), עַֽיִן (3), עָצִי (2), and עַנֶּה (2). Aquila and Symmachus reject καιρός as an adequate representation of גַּם, preferring תֹּלְדֵה and פָּרָס, respectively.

\(^{121}\) The addition of τούτοις in the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις (“in these humans”) in 6:3, regardless of whether it reflects a variant in V or not, could imply the interpretation that the limit of 120 years applied specifically to the antediluvian generation.

character; and (iv) Noah’s precise execution of God’s instructions. The redundancy from each of these sources is alleviated by G’s differentiation of lexical and morphological aspects of certain words in the passage.

Concerning the first two causes of redundancy, G imparts new significance to the notices of corruption and destruction by lightly restructuring the text with the alternation of verbal forms derived from a common root. God first says that he will “wipe” humanity “off” of the face of the earth (ἀπαλείψω) (6:7), but later intensifies this to “wipe out” (ἐξαλείψω) (7:4). In a similar way, the initial statement by the narrator in 6:11 that the earth is “corrupt” (ἐφθάρη) before God is immediately corrected to a more intense form of expression in 6:12: God sees that it is “utterly corrupt” (κατεφθαρμένη) because “all flesh has

---

123 ἀπ/ἐξαλείψω | G consistently translates נדל, which only occurs in the flood narrative, with one of these cognate verbs (4/4). Once, G uses ἐξαλείφω to render another verb (/feed in 9:15), thus having God promise first not to “destroy” (καταφθέιρω) the earth (9:11) and then not to “wipe it out.” For G’s strategic alternation of cognate verbal forms, see §5.2.2.5.

124 Rösel finds ἐξαλείφω to be especially intense (“obliterate,” cf. BDAG, s.v. “ἐξαλείφω” 2; LSJ, s.v. “ἐξαλείφω” A.II; DGE, s.v. “ἐξαλείφω” I.3), and so fitting as God’s final warning of the coming destruction (“er paßt gut zum Charakter des Verses als letzter Strafandrohung vor der Flut”) (Übersetzung, 176, 199).

125 Robert Renehan describes this use of the sequence of simplex followed by compound as an intensifying corrective: “By far the most interesting category [of simplex followed by compound] consists of passages in which the compound is used in conscious “correction” of the simplex; the compound, being the stronger word, suggests that the preceding simplex has understated or inadequately emphasized the realities of the situation” (“Compound and Simplex,” 24). For the use of a compound verb as an intensifying corrective or preceding a cognate simplex, see §5.2.2.5.
utterly corrupted (καταφθείρεν) his way.” This alternation serves to rationalize the repetition, such that the gravity of the matter is gradually intensified. 

G also varies expression in regard to the animals, translating ἔχιον (“to live”) variously as ἵνα τρέφῃς ( “in order to nourish,” 6:19), τρέφεσθαι (“to nourish,” 6:20), and διαθρέψαι (“to nourish continually,” 7:3). Not only does G vary between simplex and compound forms, i.e., τρέφω (“nourish”) and διατρέφω (“nourish continually”), but he also varies construction and aspect. Furthermore, by translating the imperative קח (“take”) in 6:21 with the future indicative as λήμψῃ (“you will take”), the only comma that God gives Noah in 6:13–21 pertains to the construction of the ark. On the other hand, by rendering the yiqtol form וה (“you will take”) in 7:2 with the aorist imperative εἰσάγαγε

126 (κατα)φθείρω | See note 86. For the simplex/compound alternation, see §5.2.2.5.
127 Rösel agrees that the difference between the simplex and compound forms is not one of substance but of degree or completeness, i.e., the earth is “definitively and completely corrupt [definitiv und vollständig verdorben],” and the theological interpretation he gives of the aspectual intensification (“In 6,12f. wird damit [i.e., by καταφθείρω] unterstrichen, daß die Schlechtigkeit der Menschen keinen anderen Ausweg mehr zuläßt”) can also be viewed as a literary improvement, since it alleviates the redundancy (Übersetzung, 166). In fact, the literary side of this stylistic variation has further theological implications, since an intelligent God would not babble on and on by repeating the very same words and thoughts.
128 (δια)τρέφω | G’s use of (δια)τρέφω (“feed/sustain (continually)”) for ἔχιον is rare (4/63: 6:19, 20; 7:3; 50:20), and G only uses these verbs within the context of the provision of food, i.e., the flood and the famine under Joseph (48:15; 50:20, 21).
129 ἵνα τρέφῃς | For infinitive construct => subjunctive, see §6.1.1.7 (cf. §3.1.1.2).
130 διαθρέψαι | For G’s control of aspect on infinitives, see §6.1.1.7. Here, the choice of perfective aspect, which portrays the nourishment/sustenance of offspring as a bounded action, is well-suited to the added prefix διά (“continually,” i.e., “from start to finish”). Cf. Smyth §§1648; 1685.
131 λήμψῃ | For imperative => finite verb (7/302), see §6.1.1.4.
132 εἰσάγαγε | For yiqtol => imperative (14/474), see §6.1.1.2. Lexically, G has rendered וה as if it were וה, since the equivalence וה = εἰσάγω only occurs twice (2/142, cf. 12:15), whereas εἰσάγω (11/13) corresponds to וה everywhere else.
(“bring in”), G frames God’s speech in 7:1–4 specifically in relation to the animals.\textsuperscript{133} This, in turn, resolves the redundancy created by the two execution formulae, which specifically state that Noah did all that God “commanded” (ἐνέτειλατο) him to do: first he built the ark (6:22) and then he rounded up the animals (7:5).\textsuperscript{134}

7.4.3 Noah enters the ark

Unlike the other major sources or inconsistency and redundancy in this story, G does not completely fix the matter of the flood’s repeated onset or Noah and the animals entering the ark twice. However, two curious translation choices that G makes suggest that he was not blind to the contradiction implied by this redundancy of content, and that he attempted to frame the events of 7:6–9 as proleptic narration of future events. First, in translating the clause יהוה מים על הארץ (“when the flood came, water upon the earth”) in 7:6, G does something peculiar, transforming the appositional relationship of המבול (“the flood”) and מים (“water”) into a single noun phrase ὁ κατακλυσμὸς … ὕδατος (“the flood … of

\textsuperscript{133} G’s interpretation of לכ in 7:2 as πρὸς σε (cf. σεαυτῷ in 6:21) further reinforces the idea that the animals are only now supposed to come “to” Noah. Rösel notes the lexical harmonization of τὰ ἐν θηρίῳ (εἰσάγεται) in 7:2 and ἀνάμεσάς (εἰσέλαβε) in 6:19 (Übersetzung, 175). The fact that G also differentiates modally between 6:19–21 (future) and 7:1–3 (imperative) suggests that this lexical harmonization is not just a matter of homogenous diction but of elucidating the redundancy of God’s two sets of commands pertaining to the animals. In fact, simple homogenization of the language would have exacerbated the redundancy (cf. Theon in note 31). On this point, it may be noted that this harmonization also involves differentiation, since ἡμέρα (λήμψη) is used in 6:21 in reference to the food.

\textsuperscript{134} John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 24.5 (PG 53:213.16–21) states that God’s initial directions regarding the animals made no distinction (ἀδιόριστος) between clean and unclean, which warrants a second set of more specific instructions.
water”), as if to suggest that this phrase is a title of the coming cataclysmic event and not a narration of its beginning. Second, G writes that Noah and his family enter the ark “because of” (διά) the water of the flood, not “from” (מפני) it, which also seems to presuppose that the water has not yet started to flood the earth.

Yet, if G worked so hard to rid this story’s plot of inconsistency and redundancy in other ways, why did he not do more here? Several considerations help to explain this fact. First, it is not clear by what means G could have solved this problem while remaining faithful to his source text: he was, after all, a translator. Perhaps the least disruptive solution would be to eliminate 7:6–9 from the text entirely, but that is not the kind of translation work that G engaged in, as I demonstrated in §3 on quantitative equivalence. Such a drastic solution would be entirely out of keeping with his modus operandi, as he prefers to make minimally-invasive adjustments with the precision and care of a well-trained surgeon. Removing four consecutive verses would be a rather blunt tool for such a translator. Second, it seems unlikely—regardless of what the text actually says—that any reader or interpreter would easily come to believe that the text claims that the flood started twice and that Noah entered the ark twice, both seven days apart. This idea is too improbable, at least

________

135 Wevers notes but offers no explanation for this syntactic change. In relation to 7:17, he claims that δ κατακλυσμός does not refer to “the flood as an event but rather an increase in the waters of the flood.” Though vague, he may intend to contrast this with the expression of 7:6 (“the event”) (Notes, 91–92, 97).

136 διά | G translates ימי (14) causally as διά on only one other occasion (27:46). For G’s treatment of compound prepositions, see §3.3.1.1.

137 This is the motivation ascribed to G by Rösel: “Die Übersetzung ‘wegen’ wird wohl als passender erschienen sein, weil der Beginn der Flut erst in V. 10 geschildert wird” (Übersetzung, 177).
without an explanation for why things would happen this way. As such, this impossibility is especially likely to remain undetected, since readers and speakers everywhere typically work with certain pragmatic expectations, such as the assumption that information is accurate, relevant, and coherent.\textsuperscript{138} Even in ancient treatments of such narrative problems in works on ancient literary criticism, it is held that the most important problems are those that are the most obvious. In fact, this is why Aristotle says that “the irrational is more acceptable in epic (than in tragedy)” (μᾶλλον δ' ἐνδέχεται ἐν τῇ ἐποτοίᾳ τὸ ἀλογον), “because (the audience) is not looking at the person doing the action” (διὰ τὸ μὴ ὅραν εἰς τὸν πράττοντα).\textsuperscript{139} As an example, Aristotle claims that the entire scene of Achilles chasing Hector around the walls of Troy—with all the other Greeks just standing there at Achilles’s command—“would seem laughable on the stage” (ἐπὶ σκηνής ξυτα γελοία ἄν φαινή), but “no one picks up on this in epic” (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἕπεστιν λανθάνει),\textsuperscript{140} that is, because they do not see it before their own two eyes. This comparison is relevant for the current passage, because epic and narrative share the same modes of representation (i.e., 3rd-person narration, speech) over against drama (i.e., enactment).\textsuperscript{141} Perhaps G’s two subtle attempts to correct this impossibility worked, as his readers do not give any direct indication that they noticed it.\textsuperscript{142} Then again, they may


\textsuperscript{139} Aristotle, \textit{Poet.} 1460a.12–14.

\textsuperscript{140} Aristotle, \textit{Poet.} 1460a.14–17.

\textsuperscript{141} Aristotle, \textit{Poet.} 1448a.18–25.

\textsuperscript{142} It is interesting that, for example, Philo, \textit{QG} 2.13 thinks Noah entered the ark seven days before it started, but he is unconcerned about his or the animals' second entrance.
not have mentioned this problem to keep from drawing attention to it, in hopes that it would also escape the notice of their listeners and readers who already knew that Noah only entered the ark once. If there was no need to convince them, why confuse and/or trouble them? In this vein, if G had cut Gen 7:6–9 from his translation, this would have been noticed by at least some or his readers, and he would have only made the problem worse.

7.4.4 Floodwaters rise and fall

As discussed previously, the dramatic narration of the rising of the floodwaters runs the risk of being perceived as redundant. G’s translation of this passage, however, evinces his attunement to the drama\(^{143}\) of the repetition and the risk of redundancy in several ways.

**Genesis 7:17–20, 24**

17 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ κατακλυσμὸς τεσσάρακοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσάρακοντα νῦκτας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπηρεῖν τὴν χισσωτὸν, καὶ ὑψώθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. 18 καὶ ἐπεκράτησε τὸ υδωρ καὶ ἐπηρεῖν τὸ σφόδρα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπέφερεν ἡ χισσωτὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος. 19 τὸ δὲ υδωρ ἐπεκράτησε σφόδρα σφόδρως ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν πάντα τὰ ὄρη τὰ υψηλά, ἣν ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 20 δέκα πέντε πῆχεις ἐπάνω υψώθη τὸ υδωρ, καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν πάντα τὰ ὄρη τὰ υψηλά.

24 καὶ ὑψώθη τὸ υδωρ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἡμέρας ἕκατον πεντήκοντα.

\(^{143}\) John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 25.5–6 (PG 53:226.10–11, 18–20) says that Moses’s narration “amplifies fear” (αὔξει τὸν φόβον) and “causes what took place to swell” (ἐξογκῖται τὸ γεγενημένον), later claiming that the precise daily increase of the waters is carefully narrated: Ὅρα πῶς ἀκριβῶς ἡμῖν διηγεῖται τὴν πολλὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φοράν, καὶ ὅτι ἐφ’ ἐκάστης αὔξησιν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ πλημμύρα τῶν ὑδάτων.
First, G makes use of the imperfect\textsuperscript{144} to translate the wayyiqtol and qatal forms in 7:18–19 to create a sense of mounting anticipation that is not fulfilled\textsuperscript{145} until the aorist form ἐπεκάλυψεν ("it covered") in 7:19. Second, in translating the repetitive expression וַאֲמִי וַאֲמִי ("very, very much"), G elects to vary the expression by means of polyptoton: σφόδρα σφοδρῶς\textsuperscript{146} ("very greatly"). Third, G strengthens the thematic unity of the passage by increasing the agency of the waters in relation to the other participants, i.e. the ark and the mountains. G decreases the agency of the ark by passivizing\textsuperscript{147} the two verbs of which it is the subject (ораה ["it rose"] \(\Rightarrow\) υψώθη ["it was raised"];\textsuperscript{148} γῆ ["it moved"] \(\Rightarrow\) ἐπεφέρετο\textsuperscript{149} ["it was carried"]). G also increases the agency of the waters by translating both occurrences

\textsuperscript{144}ἐπεκράτει, ἐπληθύνετο, ἐπεφέρετο, ἐπεκράτει | For wayyiqtol \(\Rightarrow\) imperfect (69/2,151), see §6.1.1.1; for qatal \(\Rightarrow\) imperfect (67/911), see §6.1.1.5.

\textsuperscript{145}In discussing the interaction of imperfect and aorist forms in narrative from a discourse perspective, Albert Rijksbaron concludes that "the aorist often has the function of bringing an open-ended imperfect state of affairs to completion" ("Discourse Function," 249; cf. Syntax and Semantics, 11–14 [§6.1]).

\textsuperscript{146}σφοδρῶς | Only here does G choose to render τὰς as σφοδρῶς (1/37), a form he does not use otherwise.

\textsuperscript{147}ὑψώθη, ἐπεφέρετο | For active \(\Rightarrow\) passive, see §6.1.2.3.

\textsuperscript{148}Wevers judges υψώθη to be “much more graphic,” taking the form as quasi-middle: “the ark was raising itself above the waters,’ as though the ark propelled itself in a floating position” (Notes, 97).

\textsuperscript{149}ἐπεφέρετο | The passive of ἐπιφέρω is used to describe a boat’s movement (LSJ, s.v. “ἐπιφέρω” A.III.2). Cf. Herodotus, Hist. 8.90.2: ἦ τε δὴ Ἀττικὴ κατεύθυνε καὶ ἐπιφερομένη Λιγυναῖη νήσος κατέδυσε τῶν Σαμοθρηκίων τὴν νέαν; 2.96.4; Thucydides, P.W. 7.37.3; Appian, Bell. Mith. 74; Bell. civ. 5.10.88; Diodorus Siculus, Bib. hist. 13.16.4; 13.45.9; 14.60.1. The equivalence of γῆ = ἐπιφέρω is unique in G (1/125), and G only uses ἐπιφέρω on two other occasions (1:2; 37:22). Rösel is prudent to focus on the lexical fit between ἐπιφέρω and boats instead of the intertextual connection forged with the πνεῦμα θεοῦ in 1:2 (Übersetzung, 180; cf. Harl, La Genèse, 135).
of the phrase "all the mountains were covered" as \( \text{ἐπεκάλυψεν} \) \( \text{πάντα} \) \( \text{τὰ} \) \( \text{ὄρη} \), thus keeping \( \text{τὸ} \) \( \text{ὕδωρ} \) ("the water") as the subject from the prior clause in each case.

What is more, G resolves the implied contradiction of 7:24 by differentiating his translations of the Hebrew verb \( \text{נבָר} \) ("increase"). As long as the water is rising, he translates \( \text{נבָר} \) (7:19, 20) as \( \text{ἐπεκράτει} \) but once it reaches its highest point in 7:20, he begins to translate \( \text{נבָר} \) as \( \text{ὑψώθη} \), which can be interpreted either dynamically as "was made high" or statively as "was high," the second interpretation being required in 7:24 due to the combination of the aorist with an accusative time phrase. In contrast to the Hebrew text, where \( \text{ тебָר} \) in 7:20 and \( \text{וְיגבָר} \) again in 7:24 imply that the waters continued to...

---

150 The form \( \text{ויכסו} \) in 7:19–20 was likely read by G as active (piel) instead of passive (pual).

151 Wevers describes G’s thematic maintenance of the water as subject in terms of “style” (Notes, 97–98). Yet, stylistic choices may also affect content. In this case, by keeping the water as subject, G provides clarity that enhances his dramatic narration, which, in turn, alleviates the redundancy.

152 \( \text{ἐπεκράτει} \) | G only uses \( \text{ἐπικράτεω} \) of the flood and the famine under Joseph (41:57; 47:20 [ὑψόθ]). Outside of this passage, \( \text{נבָר} \) only occurs again in 49:26 (ὑπερισχύω).

153 For the metaphorical use of \( \text{ἐπικράτεω} \), see LSJ, s.v. “ἐπικρατέω” A.II.5b, but particularly in relation to natural disasters and weather see Dio Cassius, Hist. rom. 6.20.1: \( \text{ἐπικρατήσαντος, ὡστε τινὰς καὶ ἐς τὸν λιμὸν, ἀπαντασαν. Cf. Eudoxus, Selenodromium secundum cyclolem duodecim annum} \) 183.21–25, 186.32 (Franz Boll: Codices Germanici, Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 7 [Brussels: Lamertin, 1908]: 183–187).

154 \( \text{ὑψώθη} \) | G normally selects \( \text{ψώθω} \) to translate other verbs (7/9), i.e. \( \text{חָלַל} \) (4) and \( \text{שָׁרַמ} \) (3). Unlike \( \text{נבָר} \), however, both \( \text{ὑψώθη} \) and \( \text{ψώθω} \) explicitly denote height. Aquila and Symmachus reject G’s \( \text{ψώθη} \) in 7:20 and 7:24, preferring \( \text{ἐνεδυνάμωθη} \) and \( \text{ἐπεκράτησεν} \), respectively, and thus retaining the contradiction.

155 On the “complexive” or “global” aorist, which often occurs with accusative time phrases, see KG II §386.4; Smyth §1927; SSG §28da; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, 83 [§253]. Rösel interprets \( \text{ψώθη} \) as dynamic in 7:20 ("Ansteigen des Wassers") and stative in 7:24 ("sein Bleiben auf dem in 7,20 benannten Höchstand"), but he does not explain why \( \text{נבָר} \) has a different sense in 7:20, 24 than in 7:18–19, and he does not note how G’s alternation between the imperfect and the aorist functions to create this transition between the rise of the waters and their subsequent risen state (Übersetzung, 180, 182).
“increase,” G makes it quite clear that the floodwaters only continue to “prevail” (ἐπεκράτει) for forty days, until 7:20 when they “cover” (ἐπεκάλυψεν) the mountains, reaching their “highest” (ὑψώθη) point at fifteen cubits above the highest mountains. Afterwards, they do not rise any further but stay at this “height” (ὑψώθη) for 150 days (7:24).

Finally, when the floodwaters begin to subside, G employs a similar style of dramatic narration, which alleviates the redundancy of 8:3–5. By alternating between imperfect and aorist forms, G restructures this initial abatement of the floodwaters into two distinct groups of anticipatory imperfects followed by a tension-releasing aorist: first, the water abates (8:3) until the ark gets lodged on Mt. Ararat (8:4); then, it continues to decrease until the tops of the mountains are seen (8:5).

156 Wevers notes “the fine use of the imperfect” in 7:18–19, but he assumes that ἐπεκάλυψεν is “semantically determined” as aorist, implying that G’s aspectual choice was inevitable (Notes, 97). Wevers is probably right that ἐπικαλύπτω would more often be used by a native Greek speaker in the aorist than in the imperfect, but Diodorus Siculus, Bib. hist. 14.28.1, for instance, uses the imperfect ἐπεκάλυπτεν to describe snow falling and covering the ground, and G could have continued his descriptive use of the imperfect with this verb in the dramatic depiction of the waters rise (“was covering” or “was beginning to cover”), but he intentionally shifts into the aorist at this point to indicate the transition from process to the achievement of a state.

157 The interpretation that the water rose for forty days, reached its apex, and remained high for 150 days after the rain stopped on account of the fact that the upper and lower sources of floodwater had not yet been sealed (Gen 8:2), i.e., the flood subsided in intensity (but did not cease) after 40 days, which is how the water stayed level. Cf. John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 25.6 (PG 53:227.38–39): Ἐπὶ τοσάντας, φησὶν, ἡμέρας ἔμεινεν κορυφώμενον τὸ ὕδωρ; 26.3 (PG 53:232–233): μετά τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τὰς τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας, ὥσ τὸν ὕδατων φορὰ κατεφέρετο, ὥραν ἐπὶ ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρου τὰ ὕδατα μένοντα.
Achieving this structure in 8:3 has required G to overhaul the syntax of his source by (i) splitting the verse’s two clauses between the two halves of the infinitive absolute idiom (הלוך ושׁוב);\(^{158}\) (ii) moving the first infinitive absolute before the preceding prepositional phrase (πορευόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς instead of μέτα τοῦ ἡλίου);\(^{159}\) (iii) joining the two clauses asyndetically by providing no discrete equivalent for ו;\(^{160}\) and (iv) translating the second infinitive absolute as a finite verb (ἔνεδιδον).

Together, this set of transformations has a poetic effect: the second clause repeats and also supplements the first by way of staircase parallelism between two bicola. The following translation aims to capture the effect of this restructuring:

And the water abated, going from the earth;
abate and decrease the water did, after 150 days.

\(^{158}\) For G’s handling of the infinitive absolute, see §6.1.1.8.

\(^{159}\) For G’s displacement of adverbial modifiers, i.e. ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, see §4.2.2.

\(^{160}\) For G’s use of asyndesis, see §3.1.2.2 (cf. §3.1.2.3 for other cases involving major syntactic changes).
In this way, G retains the repetition of the root שׁוב, but he recasts it syntactically in order to make sense of the redundancy created by the two virtually synonymous Hebrew clauses.\(^{161}\)

This stage of abatement comes to a close when the ark “gets lodged” (ἐκάθισεν)\(^{162}\) on Mt. Ararat. In representing the second stage, G imitates the first, translating the infinitive absolute idiom הרוח ושה (“gradually receded”) with a circumstantial participle and an imperfect indicative: τὸ δὲ ὑδάρω πορευόμενον ἠλαττονοῦτο (“and the water decreased as it went”).\(^{163}\) As with their rising, G narrates the floodwaters’ initial abatement theatrically.

---

\(^{161}\) G’s interpretation of שׁוב in 8:3 may have been facilitated by linguistic and/or textual factors. He may not have understood this special use of the infinitive absolute (see §6.1.1.8), especially as the infinitive absolute was already in decline in Late Biblical Hebrew (Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, HSS 29 [Atlanta: Scholars Press], 47–48 [§310.14]; Takamitsu Muraoka, “Aspects of the (Morpho)syntax of the Infinitive in Qumran Hebrew,” in *Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of a Sixth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*, ed. Eibert Tigchelaar et al. [Leiden: Brill, 2015], 80–81). Also, the 1 of בָּשַׁ in could have been read a , such that he or a previous scribe took the verb בָּשַׁ as yiqtol, and G does use the imperfect more often for yiqtol in narrative (see §6.1.1.2).

\(^{162}\) ἐκάθισεν | A rare equivalent for נוח (1/4), G only uses καθίζω (7/8) otherwise for בָּשַׁ. Rösel’s intuition to reject Harl’s sacral interpretation of καθίζω here is well founded (Übersetzung, 184; cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 137). Her interpretation is based on the fact that this verb is typically used with animate subjects in the LXX, with the exception of the ark of the covenant, also termed κιβωτός (1 Chr 13:14). Wevers only goes so far as to term this “personification” (Notes, 102). That fact that καθίζω is used technically as a nautical term would strengthen Rösel’s argument. See LSJ, s.v. “καθίζω” A.II.6. For examples, see Polybius, *Hist.* 1.39.3 καὶ καθίσαντων τῶν πλοίων εἰς πᾶσαν ἤλιον ἄποριαν; Strabo, *Geogr.* 2.3.4 καθίσαι γὰρ τὸ πλοῖον, ἡπικχῇ δὲ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄθροῦν διαλυθῆναι.

\(^{163}\) Rösel implies that G misunderstood this construction, by calling it “unusual” (“ungewöhnliche”) and saying that it has been “simplified” (“vereinfacht”) (Übersetzung, 184). It is not apparent that the Greek construction is, in fact, simpler than the Hebrew idiom, but if G did not completely understand the infinitive absolute constructions in 8:3 and 8:5, his use of the imperfect at least indicates his ability to infer their meaning from the context (cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 102–103).
7.4.5 Raven and dove

The final major source of redundancy is the two birds. The raven is already unnecessary, but this fact is amplified by its lack of fit within the narration's fixed parallelism. As with the rise and fall of the floodwaters, however, G both captures and improves the dramatic quality of this memorable scene.

**Genesis 8:6–12**

6 καὶ ἔγενετο μετὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἤρεμωσεν Ναὸς τὴν θυρίδα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, ὡς ἔποιήσεν,
7 καὶ ἁπέστειλεν τὸν καφεκα τοῦ ἱδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ· καὶ ἔβαλεν

וית הלבע | ויזא
6 כי יקרפ את הימים אר לב נאז ב הخرج את הדלת ל מים, ב יפה ער.
7 כי אסף את הראב כדי看一看 אם הים נעים לפני המים.

8 καὶ ἁπέστειλεν τὴν περιστεράν ὑπὸν αὐτοῦ ἵδειν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς.
9 καὶ οὐχ ἤφειαν ἢ περιστερὰ ἀνάπαυσιν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῆς ὑπέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν, διὸ ὅτι ὅταν ἐπὶ παντὶ προσώπῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐξεῖνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ

וית הלבע | ויזא
8 כי אסף את הראב כדי الأو המים לפני המים, ב כי לא נסף את הראב או הים לפני המים.
9 כי לא נסף את הראב או לא נסף את הים לפני המים.

10 καὶ ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτά ἑτέρας πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστεράν ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ.
11 καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτόν ἡ περιστερὰ τὸ πρὸς ἐστέραν, καὶ εἶχεν φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔγινε Ναὸς διὸ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

וית הלבע | ויזא
10 כי נשא את הימים תשע אר אר נאז ב הזרן את הראב לפני המים.
11 כי הזרן את הראב לפני המים, ב נסף או שהים לפני המים.

12 καὶ ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτά ἑτέρας πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστεράν, καὶ οὐ προσέβετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔτι.

וית הלבע | ויזא
12 כי נשא את הימים תשע אר אר נאז ב הזרן את הראב לפני המים.

First, G explains why Noah needs to send out the dove alongside the raven by making the raven disappear. In the Hebrew of 8:7, Noah sends out the raven, and it “comes and goes repeatedly” (וית הלבע) until the land is completely dry. In a surprisingly bold move,
even though it is only a matter of one little word,164 G completely alters165 this fact in his translation: καὶ ἔξελθὼν οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν (“and once it went out, it never returned”).166 Perhaps as an unintentional side-effect, but possibly as a source of exegetical support for his interpretation, this translation creates new parallelism between the first two sendings: the raven does not return, whereas the dove does not find a place to land. At any rate, G explicitly transforms the raven’s disappearance into the cause for the dove’s commission by

164 The boldness of this translation choice suggests that if G could have used a similarly non-invasive and precise means of resolving the impossibility of the flood starting twice and Noah entering the ark twice seven days apart, then perhaps he would have done so, even if it totally changed the meaning of the text.

165 As in 8:5, Rösel claims that the Hebrew construction has been “radically simplified” (“stark vereinfacht”) (Übersetzung, 185). Yet, as Rösel acknowledges, the (dubious) simplification is far less interesting than the negation. He seems to suggest that the addition of οὐχ was subsequent to the translation of ἴστι as ὑπέστρεψεν, since the resulting clause (“he returned until…”) would make little sense. This reconstruction of G’s exegetical process is certainly possible, but it seems that G easily could have used the imperfect (e.g., ἐξῆρχετο καὶ ὑπέστρεφεν), as in 8:3, 5. Cf. Harl’s French translation of the Hebrew: “il sortait et revenait” (La Genèse, 137). Wevers also claims that G has “considerably simplified” the construction, but his account for the translator’s exegesis is hard to follow: “Gen realized that if the raven kept flying to and fro he did not return to Noe” (Notes, 104). Wevers apparently is saying that οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν means that the raven did not return for good, and yet the text can bear this interpretation only with difficulty, and the proposed situation is inconsistent with Noah sending the dove out “after” the raven did not return.

166 G’s clever solution to the problem presented by the raven is not without its difficulties, however. The statement that the raven did not return until the water dried up implies that it did return at that point, and yet that possibility is problematic for two reasons: first, there is no place for the raven to land for up to two weeks; second, the narrative is silent as to the raven’s return. For this reason, John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 26.4 (PG 53:234.46–48) felt compelled to state explicitly that this verse does not mean that the raven returned much later, explaining the syntax as a biblical idiom (in modern terms, a Septuagintalism): Οὐχ ἐπειδὴ μετὰ ταῦτα ἄνέστρεψε, τὸ, Ἐως, προσέθηκεν ἡ θεία Γραφή· ἀλλ’ ἰδίωμα τούτο ἐστὶ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς. He proceeds to hypothesize that it was feasting on a dead corpse, while Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 72.55–56 assumes that it drowned.
interpreting the suffix on the prepositional phrase מאתו as referring to the raven instead of Noah, thus “after it”\textsuperscript{167} (ἀπίσω αὐτοῦ)\textsuperscript{168} instead of “from himself.”

In addition to solving this problem, G also enhances the stylized narration in several ways. First, he alternates between the simplex and compound forms ἀποστέλλω and ἐξαποστέλλω,\textsuperscript{169} using the simplex in reference to the first two times that Noah “sends (out)” a bird and the compound for the last two. Although these two verbs are near synonyms, the added “vigor”\textsuperscript{170} of the compound form creates a sense of progression much like the similar alternations in 6:5–7:5 discussed above. Second, G alternates between circumstantial participles\textsuperscript{171} and finite verbs in order to enhance the internal parallelism of each sending.

\textsuperscript{167} The translation “after” is intentionally vague, as ἀπίσω may be understood either in an allative or in a temporal sense. Citing only the context (“inhaltlich sinnvoll”), Rösel prefers a temporal sense (Übersetzung, 185; cf. Harl, \textit{La Genèse}, 137). An allative reading is recommended by LSJ, s.v. “ἐπίσω,” which only gives ἐπίσω followed by the genitive in an allative sense (see I.4), although BDAG, s.v. “ἐπίσω” suggests diachronic shift with ἀπίσω, since it gives both spatial (see 2.a) and temporal meanings (see 2.b). Like Rösel, Wevers interprets ἐπίσω temporally, as he thinks that the rendering ἐπίσω αὐτοῦ conflicts with the subsequent implication of a seven-day period between the sending of the raven and the dove (8:10): “The use of both ἐτί and ἐτέρας seems to belie what was said about ἐπίσω αὐτοῦ in v.8. Yet another seven days’ presupposes that a seven-day period also obtained between the sending of the raven and the dove, but ἐπίσω is indefinite as far as time is concerned. Once again Gen does not take the larger context into account” (Notes, 105). Yet, the fact that G uses ἐτί ἡμέρας ἐπτὰ ἐτές in reference to the prior phrase ἐπίσω αὐτοῦ does not necessarily entail that he disregards the wider context, since there is no logical contradiction between general and specific expressions, as the specific time phrase may be taken to define what was meant by the general one.

\textsuperscript{168} ὀπίσω | Only here does G render ἦν (14) with ὀπίσω. For G’s translation of compound prepositions, see §3.3.1.1.

\textsuperscript{169} For G’s alternation between simplex and compound verbs, see note 125 and §5.2.2.5.

\textsuperscript{170} See §5.2.2.5, which discusses the judgment of John Lee (Lexical Study, 93).

\textsuperscript{171} ἔξελθω, εὐφροῦσα, ἐκτίνας, ἐπισχῶν, ἐπισχῶν | For wayyiqtol => aorist participle (175/2,151), see §6.1.1.1; for qatal => aorist participle (19/911), see §6.1.1.5; cf. §3.1.2.1.
Once Noah sends the raven out, when a character performs a series of actions in sequence, the first one is, with one exception,\(^{172}\) presented with an aorist circumstantial participle.

8:7 \(καὶ ἔξελθον σύχ ὑπέστρεψεν\)

9a \(καὶ σύχ εἰροῦσα ... ὑπέστρεψεν\)

9b \(καὶ ἐκτείνας\) τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἔλαβεν ... καὶ εἰσήγαγεν

10 \(καὶ ἐπισχὺν ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν\)

12 \(καὶ ἐπισχὺν ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν\)

Third, G increases the lexical parallelism in the passage. Usually, the Hebrew uses the verb בָּשׁ ("return") to describe a bird’s return (8:7, 9, 12), but 8:11 has נָבָה ("and it came [in]"). G simultaneously assimilates the two terms to one another and preserves a distinction between them, by selecting ἀναστρέφω\(^{174}\) ("return again") to translate נָבָה. Since G also nuances his translation of the dove’s failure to “turn back” (ἐπιστρέψαι) in 8:12, G creates a neat progression among the four verbs: the raven does not “return,” but the dove does (ὑποστρέφω); then, the dove “returns again” (ἀναστρέφω), but the third time no longer “turns back” (ἐπιστρέφω). All in all, G’s translation has captured and enhanced the poetic virtues of this scene in the Hebrew version, especially its effective use of repetition, narrative parallelism, and stepwise progression, and he also integrated the discordant raven meaningfully into its formalized narration.

\(^{172}\) The dove’s actions in 8:11 form a distinct pattern of aorist followed by imperfect (ἀνέστρεψεν ... καὶ εἶχεν).

\(^{173}\) Anneli Aejmelaeus notes that the expression שִׁלָּח יָד is often translated with a Greek circumstantial participle in the Pentateuch, but she acknowledges that the Genesis translator uses other renderings as well (Parataxis, 93–94). There are four parallels in Genesis, and G uses the circumstantial participle twice (8:9; 19:10), once a finite verb with infinitive (22:10), and once coordinate finite verbs (3:22).

\(^{174}\) ἀναστρέφω | Only here does G choose to translate נבָה as if it were בָּשׁ (1/220). Cf. Wevers, Notes, 106.
By analyzing one set of G’s translation choices in the flood narrative, I have demonstrated his concern for a virtuous plot in terms of consistency and concision. While largely adhering to the form and content of his source text, G has made a handful of surgical alterations to it in order to eliminate contradictions and alleviate redundancy. Furthermore, G’s targeted improvements have transformed the text not just in terms of style, although he has introduced linguistic harmonization and variation where he felt necessary. Rather, G has also improved the flood story’s plot at the level of its content, sometimes altering the relationship between events or their internal structure, and sometimes making explicit a latent interpretive possibility. In many cases, G’s resolution of narrative inconsistencies has been preemptory, altering an earlier statement in anticipation of a subsequent one, a fact that suggests intentionality and foresight. This is particularly relevant in light of the progymnasmata surveyed at the outset of this chapter, as Theon recommends that refutation by the topos of inconsistency should take its starting point from the second of two conflicting details. G’s foresight to promote consistency before a contradiction is actually entailed reveals both his familiarity with the details of the story he was translating as well as his deliberate precision in translation. Thus, by examining the translation choices that G has made in the flood story in reference to their narrative context

175 Additional cases of G’s elimination of stylistic inconsistency could be mentioned, such as G’s translation of י兒子 by ἀπέθανεν in 7:21 and יזרעאל by ἀποθανεῖται in 9:11 as if rendering מות or his use of ἄνθρωπος for both גא and שׁ, but such choices have a minor effect and have been thoroughly documented by Rösel, Übersetzung, 145–200.
176 Theon, Prog. 4 (Spengel 2:77.18–23). For the text, see note 28.
has resulted in a picture of G as a translator that is consistent with the portrait I painted in Part I on the basis of more decontextualized analysis.

   Altogether, G’s transformations of plot in the flood narrative add up to a preemptive confirmation of the biblical account on several possible levels. At the very least, G has confirmed the status of the flood narrative as a virtuous composition that is concise and internally consistent. Beyond this, G’s literary interventions also seem to have a theological dimension, as he has, for example, avoided characterizing God as one who regrets, repeats himself, or punishes without due cause. In the end, it remains uncertain, however, what genre G would have assigned to this account, whether narrative or fable/myth. On the one hand, his pursuit of consistency and concision can be seen as a broader cultivation of believability, an essential feature of narratives, which concern events that are supposed to have actually taken place. If this is the case, then G’s plot improvements may also have been aimed at establishing the historical reliability of this account. But on the other hand, the fable or myth also requires a significant degree of believability, and it is often used to communicate deep theological truths and cultural values, a clear function of the story of Noah’s flood. Ultimately, it is prudent to remain cautiously silent on this point and to reiterate that G’s act of confirmation is most transparent on the literary level of furnishing this story’s plot with a greater degree of consistency and concision than it possesses in its Hebrew version. Furthermore, by considering the aftermath of G’s translation of Gen 6–9, I have additionally demonstrated the effectiveness of his narrative handiwork, as his improvements to this story from the perspective of Hellenistic literary standards have resulted in a noticeable disparity between the readers of the Hebrew and the Greek versions.
of this account, as they were attuned, in part, to different kinds of literary, historical, theological, and other interpretive concerns.

Now, even as I have shown that G was concerned to cultivate the virtues of consistency and concision in his translation of Noah’s flood, redundancy and contradiction are some of the most basic types of narrative flaws, and short narrative genres are well suited to beginners. However, all of the skills and techniques required to compose (or translate) a short and contained narrative such as the flood account of Gen 6–9, are also useful for more complex compositional undertakings, such as writing longer, episodic narratives or various types of historical writing more akin to the lengthier narrative sequences of Genesis that are centered around the lives of Israel’s patriarchs. In fact, Theon claims that “history is nothing but a narrative complex” (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλο τί ἐστιν ἱστορία ή σύστημα διηγήσεως). 177 So, just as the progymnasmata are themselves arranged by length and complexity of composition and level of difficulty, on the one hand, and form the basic building blocks of much lengthier compositions, on the other, so too we will now turn our focus from G’s plot improvements at the level of an individual narrative such as Noah and the flood to those he makes in the lengthier sequences of narratives that make up the stories of Abraham and Joseph. In doing so, I will analyze G’s concern for a virtuous plot at a higher level that demands attentiveness to these and also to more difficult virtues of plot.

177 Theon, Prog. 2 (Spengel 2:60.2-6): ὅτε γὰρ καλῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως διήγησιν καὶ μύβον ἀπαγείλας καλῶς καὶ ἱστορίαν συνθήσει, καὶ τὸ ἰδίως ἐν ταῖς ὑποθέσεις καλούμενον [ἰδίον] διήγημα (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλο τί ἐστιν ἱστορία ή σύστημα διηγήσεως).
8 THE SEQUENTIAL AND UNIFIED PLOT (ABRAHAM: GEN 11:27–25:11)

8.1 Introduction

Based on my analysis of G’s translation of the relatively short narrative text of Noah and the flood in the previous chapter, it may be noted that the entire book of Genesis is for the most part composed of similarly short narrative units, at least when considered from the perspective of the broadest genres of Greek literature. Yet, it is also true that Noah’s story is to a certain extent unique in Genesis, because it narrates a relatively self-contained event, especially in comparison to the stories of the patriarchs, which follow the major events of their lives over a much longer span of time, often from birth to death. Of course, the story of Noah’s flood does play an important role in the larger context of the book of Genesis, as it is a kind of hinge that looks backward to God’s creative act and the moral failure initiated by Adam and Eve and forward to the possibility of restarting the relationship between God and humanity via Israel’s forefathers and the Sinai cult. Yet, the fact that the stories of the patriarchs coalesce into narrative cycles composed of shorter pieces presents new compositional challenges for an author or translator working within the context of the Hellenistic literary world. Most importantly, a reader might question how the individual narratives about each patriarch are logically sequenced to form a larger narrative unity.

Some of the oldest musings by a Greek on the subject of narrative sequence and unity—and certainly the most influential in both antiquity and modernity!—come from Aristotle’s Poetics, where he discusses the virtues of tragic plots, which, like the patriarchal narratives of Genesis, also involve the artistic (or inartistic) arrangement of smaller
narrative building blocks. In a well-known passage, Aristotle explains in his typically analytic manner how plots should be structured:

Now, unity (ἕλον) requires a beginning, a middle, and an end. Beginning means that which does not by necessity (ἐκ ἀνάγχης) follow from another event, but after which another event naturally (πέφυκεν) follows or takes place. In contrast, end means that which itself naturally (πέφυκεν) follows from another event, either by necessity (ἐκ ἀνάγχης) or by statistical probability (ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ), but after which no other event takes place. Middle, in turn, means that which itself follows from another event and also has another event following it. So, well-composed plots (τοὺς συνεστῶτας εὖ μύθους) should neither start nor end at just any point (μὴ ὡσοδότεν ἔτυχεν ἀρχεσθαι μὴ ὡσοῦ ἔτυχε τελευτάν) but should make use of the forms I have stated.3

Both sequence and unity are combined in Aristotle’s abstraction of the ideal plot structure for tragedy, and yet these two concepts are also representative of widely-applicable compositional principles of Greek literary criticism. For example, the same ideas can be found in the pro gymnasmata discussed in the previous chapter, as συντομία (“concision”), one of the three main virtues of narrative, would caution against beginning a story too far in

1 Lit. “from something else,” but in this context Aristotle is discussing ἡ σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων (“the composition/arrangement of events”) (Poet. 1450b.22).

2 The phrase ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ (“as in the majority [of cases]”) has been translated in terms of statistics (τὸ πολὺ) in order to signal that the Greek phrase is not τὸ εἰκός, Aristotle’s regular term for “probability,” although the two expressions are closely related. For examples, see note 14.

3 Aristotle, Poet. 1450b.26–34: ἐλον δὲ ἔστιν τὸ ἔχον ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευτήν. ἀρχὴ δὲ ἔστιν δ ἀυτὸ μὲν μὴ ἐκ ἀνάγχης μετ’ ἄλλο ἐστίν, μετ’ ἑκεῖνο 3’ ἔτερον πέφυκεν εἰναι ἡ γίνεσθαι· τελευτὴ δὲ τούναντίον δ ἀυτὸ μὲν μετ’ ἄλλο πέφυκεν εἶναι ἡ ἐξ ἀνάγχης ἡ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, μετὰ δὲ τότῳ ἄλλο ὦθεν· μέσον δὲ δ καὶ αὐτὸ μετ’ ἄλλο καὶ μετ’ ἑκεῖνο ἔτερον. δεὶ ἄρα τοὺς συνεστῶτας εὖ μύθους μὴ ὡσοδότεν ἔτυχεν ἀρχεσθαι μὴ ὡσοῦ ἔτυχε τελευτάν, ἀλλὰ κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς εἰρήμεναι ἴδιαις.

4 It seems that Aristotle himself may have found this general statement about plot to apply more broadly to genres beyond tragedy, since he announces from the beginning of the Poetics his intention to discuss, inter alia, “how plots should be composed if the poetry (ποίησις) is to be excellent” (καὶ πᾶς δεὶ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ κέλευξαν καλῶς ἔξειν ἡ ποίησις). Tragedy (ἡ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποίησις) is only one species of the broad genus of poetry (ποίησις) (1447a.9–10, 13–14).
the past or letting it run on and on beyond its logical end, and one of the topoi used for the confirmation and refutation of fables and narratives is ἐκ τῆς τάξεως (“from disorder”).

Furthermore, the word μῦθος, which Aristotle commonly uses in Poetics to mean “plot” is the same word used for “fable” in the progymasmata, which suggests that what Aristotle has to say about plots in tragedy is relevant for compositional techniques used in the closely related genres of fable and narrative. Finally, the relevance of Aristotle’s ideas about tragic plot structure can also be seen to have relevance for extended narrative genres in another way, since tragedy and narrative may be connected to one another via the intermediary genre of epic, which for Aristotle goes practically hand-in-hand with tragedy. Like tragedy, epic is composed in metered verse, but epic shares its modes of representation with narrative, i.e., third-person narration combined with dialogue. Moreover, the critics themselves construct epic as a bridge between tragedy and narrative. Throughout the Poetics, Aristotle takes his most important claims about tragedy as relevant also for epic.

5 On Theon’s view of concision, see §7.1 and esp. notes 3 and 5.
6 For the confirmational/refutational topoi common to fable and narrative, see §7.1 and esp. note 11.
7 Aristotle, Poet. 1448a.18–25; cf. Nicolaus, Prog. 3 (Felten 12.7–17): Τών δὲ διηγημάτων εἰσὶ διαφορὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλα τρεῖς· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀφηγηματικά, τὰ δὲ δραματικά, τὰ δὲ μικτά. ἀφηγηματικά μὲν οὖν ἐστιν, ὥσα ἀπὸ μόνου λέγεται τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντος αὐτά, οἷά ἐστι τὰ παρὰ Πινδάρῳ δραματικά δὲ, ὥσα οὖν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συντιθέντος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσώπων λέγεται, οἷα τὰ ἐν τοῖς κωμικοῖς καὶ τραγικοῖς δράμασι· μικτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐκ ἀμφότερων συγκείμενα, οἷα τὰ Ὀμήρου καὶ Ηραδότου καὶ εἰ τίνα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, πὴ μὲν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντος ἐκφερόμενα, πὴ δὲ ἐκ ἕτερων προσώπων.
8 Even from the beginning of the Poetics, epic and tragedy go hand in hand, being found as close neighbors in a list of poetic genres: ἐποποιία δὲ καὶ Ἡ τῆς τραγῳδίας πόλις ἐτὶ δὲ κωμιδία καὶ ἡ διψυχομβολική καὶ τῆς αὐλικής καὶ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικός πάση (1447a.13–15). Furthermore, in addition to Aristotle’s numerous gestures to epic in discussing tragedy, he ends the extant text of the Poetics with a substantive comparison of these two particular genres (1461b.26–1462b.19).
and Theon mentions the *Odyssey* as a prime example of extended narrative in terms of its overall arrangement.9

Aristotle elaborates this bare skeletal blueprint for well-composed plots in a number of ways. To begin with unity, he asserts that plots are not really unified just by being “about a unitary individual” (ἐὰν περὶ ἕνα ἤ),10 but only if they represent a “unitary action” (μία πρᾶξις).11 Furthermore, this unity requires a good plot to contain all of the necessary parts but no extraneous ones, such that:

“if any part is displaced (μετατιθεμένου τινὸς μέρους) or removed (ἢ ἁφαίρουμένου), the unity of the whole is altered and disturbed (διαφέρει καὶ κινεῖται τὸ ὅλον), since that which makes no clear difference whether present or absent (ὃ γὰρ προσὸν ἢ μὴ προσὸν μηδὲν ποιεῖ ἐπίθειλον) is not (really) a part of the whole unity” (οὐδὲν μόριον τοῦ ὅλου ἐστίν).12

Again, this understanding of unity is also advocated by the *progymnasmata*, not only because it relates to the narrative virtue of concision, but also to that of “clarity” (σαφήνεια), inasmuch as missing parts would muddle the story’s narrative logic.13 In fact, ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάζοντος (“from extraneous content”) and ἐκ τοῦ ἐλλείποντος/ἐλλιποῦς (“from missing content”) are also among the topoi of confirmation and refutation for fable and narrative.

9 Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:86.7–17).
13 On Theon’s view of clarity, see §7.1 and esp. note 6.
But for Aristotle—and others—it is not enough to have all of the necessary pieces (and only those pieces) in the right order: the logic behind their order must also be sufficiently clear to the audience or reader. As was stated in Aristotle’s summary definitions on plot structure, this requires that the plot’s events be causally related to one another, either by nature (πέφυκεν), necessity (ἐξ ἀνάγκης), or statistics (ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ), such that each event links to the next from beginning to end through the middle.14 This, in turn, relates to the cardinal narrative virtue, i.e., “believability” (πιθανότης),15 as well as the topos variously termed ἐκ τοῦ ἀπιθάνου (“from unbelievability”), ἐκ τοῦ ἀπρεποῦς (“from impropriety”), and ὅτι μὴ εἰκός ἐστιν (“because it is improbable”), which is used to confirm and refute both fables and narratives. To take up a modern metaphor, Aristotle’s ideal plot is like a sequence of dominoes that have been carefully placed so that when the first is tipped, every domino falls in turn and tips the next until the final piece is knocked over. As with dominoes, the events of the plot must not only be positioned and oriented in such a way that each leads to the next, but they must also be sufficiently close to one another and unobstructed, which means that no essential part of the plot may be omitted and nothing extraneous included. Yet, Aristotle himself uses metaphor to describe his ideal plot when he asserts that a well-composed tragic plot proceeds from δέσις (“complication”) through

14 In addition to Poet. 1450b.26–34, Aristotle makes several other important points about necessity, nature, and probability: “episodic” plots are criticized for lack of necessity/probability (1451b.33–35); complex plots contain reversals and recognitions that should occur naturally (1452a.17–21); like plots, characters ought to be probable, esp. in their speech (1454a.33–36); even actual impossibilities may be included if they are “persuasive” (πιθανόν), i.e. if they seem probable (1461b.11–12).
15 On Theon’s view of believability and its relationship to causality, see §7.1 and esp. note 7.
μετάβασις ("transformation") to λύσις ("resolution"), defining each of these points in relation to the overarching schema of beginning, middle, and end: while the plot's rough midpoint is marked by the transformation, the complication fits between the beginning and the transformation, and the resolution between the transformation and the end. Whether conceived as the symmetrical tying (δέσις) and untying (λύσις) of a knot or as a causal chain where each link connects to the next, the plot’s events must not just be arranged one after another (μετ’ ἄλληλα) in an episodic fashion, but they must actually occur because of one another (δι’ ἄλληλα). In other words, temporal succession must coincide with causal succession in a well-composed plot. In sum, the sequential and unified plot—as Aristotle would have it—must be governed by causal contingency from start to finish and represent a unitary action, constructing and resolving a single point of tension by way of a transformation, with nothing extra or lacking. In this chapter, I will argue that, even as G did not necessarily have direct knowledge of Aristotle’s theoretical statements on tragic plots, he did aim to connect the dots of Abraham’s story in Greek translation from beginning to middle to end, specifically by elucidating its plot structure in terms of complication, transformation, and resolution, i.e., in a distinctly Aristotelean fashion.


17 Aristotle, Poetics 1451b.33–1452a.4: τῶν δὲ ἀπλῶν μύθων καὶ πράξεων ἂν ἐπεισοδιώδεις εἰσὶν ἔχεισαι· λέγω δὲ ἐπεισοδιώδη μύθον ἐν ὧν τὰ ἐπεισόδια μετ’ ἄλληλα οὖτ’ εἰκός οὔτ’ ἄνεγχα εἶναι. τοιαύτα δὲ ποιοῦνται ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν φαύλων ποιητῶν δ’ αὐτούς, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἁγιωτῶν διὰ τοὺς ὑποκριτές· ἁγωνισματα γὰρ ποιοῦντες καὶ παρὰ τὴν δύναμιν παρατείνοντες τὸν μύθον πολλάκις διαστρέφειν ἀναγκάζονται τὸ ἐφεξῆς. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ μόνον τελείας ἐστὶ πράξεως ἢ μίμησις ἀλλὰ καὶ φοβερῶν καὶ ἔλεεινῶν, ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται καὶ μάλιστα [καὶ μᾶλλον] ὅταν γένηται παρὰ τὴν δέξαν ὑπ’ ἄλληλα.
8.2 Critique: an episodic and character-driven plot

Just as G’s pursuit of consistency and concision in the flood narrative was prompted to a large extent by the special concentration of contradictions and redundancy in the Hebrew version of that account, so too the interpretational moves that G makes in translation to reconfigure the plot of Abraham’s story in terms of complication, transformation, and resolution are mainly motivated by the disunity and disjointed sequence of the narratives about Abraham in the Hebrew text. Of course, G more likely viewed such moments of aporia as opportunities to clarify in Greek the nature and structure of the Hebrew narrative as he understood it. Yet, despite its disjointed and episodic character, the plot of Abraham’s story does have unity of several types in its Hebrew version. First, it has unity of character, as virtually each part of the narrative involves Abraham in one way or another. This is not to say that Abraham plays an equally central role in each episode, but even in the rare case that he is entirely absent from a scene, such as in the account of Hagar and Ishmael wandering waterless in the desert (21:14b–21) or of Lot’s incestuous relations with his two daughters (19:30–38), Abraham either plays a direct role in the story from offstage or he is waiting in the wings, ready to step back into the limelight. Second, the story has a very high degree of thematic unity, as it is concerned throughout with God’s promise to Abraham of progeny and land and the partial

---

18 Joel Baden has persuasively argued that God’s promise is singular but takes the themes of progeny and land as its two main foci, which are implied by the initial promise of nationhood in Gen 12:1–3. Furthermore, that the promise of nationhood essentially boils down to progeny and land is confirmed by the nearly universal repetition of these two elements in all of the major promise texts (Promise, 8).
realization of that promise in Abraham’s life. In this vein, the plot both begins and ends in an appropriate place: though his wife is originally childless (11:30) and Abraham is called to leave his home (12:1–3),19 he ultimately dies in Canaan with his own son Isaac as his heir (25:7–11), having received a foretaste of the land with the acquisition of a burial plot from Ephron the Hittite (Gen 23) and having secured the progeny promised to him by marrying his son Isaac to a legitimate wife (Gen 24). Third, the plot of Abraham’s story exhibits unity in a way that Noah’s story did not, since the individual episodes are largely free of the kinds of inconsistency and redundancy detected there. This fact is due to the use of distinct yet related redactional techniques in the Hebrew composition in the two cases: whereas the uniqueness of a cataclysmic event such as the flood all but required the interweaving of two accounts of the same story scene by scene, many parallel episodes in the Abraham material have been judged by the redactor of Hebrew Genesis to be different events regardless of their similarities (e.g., 12:10–20 [J] // 20:1–17 [E]; 15 [E] // 17 [P]; 16 [J and P, but mostly J] // 21:8–21 [E]). So for the most part, each episode constitutes a coherent account from a single source.20 However, where two sources have been combined within a single account

---

19 Abraham’s initial lack of progeny and land anticipates the promise’s fulfillment (Baden, Promise, 12–13). Jonathan Grossman sees this tension as key to the plot, naming God’s promises as “the narrative element that unites the cycle” and Sarah’s infertility as “a constant hindrance to the fulfillment of those promises,” so that the reader questions the manner of resolution throughout the story (Abram to Abraham, 35).

20 This would be true regardless of whether one uses a documentary or a fragmentary model for the sources used in the composition of the Pentateuch. Although I find the neo-documentarian perspective to have the greatest explanatory power, especially as it is able to disentangle the distinct narrative threads that are interwoven in the canonical text from Genesis to Numbers (and Deuteronomy) (see Baden, Composition), the literary arguments in this and other chapters do not rely upon a particular explanation for how the Pentateuch
(e.g., J and P in 11:28–12:9 and 16; J, P, and E in 21:1–7), the sparse narrational style of the priestly source has often facilitated their integration such that the combined narrative only exhibits a modicum of redundancy, the brief statements of P being absorbed by narration from another source (e.g., 19:29, a brief P notice in the J account of Gen 18–19).

Yet, as I showed in my analysis of sequence and unity in Greek literary criticism above, unity of action requires more than unity of character, unity of theme, and unity of plot in individual episodes. Given the complex compositional history of Hebrew Genesis, where smaller units of tradition were first stitched together into larger sources and later compiled to form the Pentateuch, Abraham’s story particularly lacks what many Greek readers might reasonably have expected, i.e., narrative signposts to signal how each episode relates to the next and how they serve in series to develop and then release narrative tension by way of a transformational event. In Aristotle’s terms, the plot structure of Abraham’s story is quite vulnerable to two potentially-related critiques. If there is no connective tissue linking each part of the narrative causally to what precedes and what follows, a reader is

21 Baden, *Composition*, 179: “... from Exodus 6 onward, P is far lengthier and fuller than J and E. In Genesis, however, where J and E have substantial narratives, P frequently comprises little more than a brief notice. Thus, Abraham’s departure for Canaan and his settlement there—told in detail by J in Genesis 12:1-4a, 6-9, complete with the divine promise and the establishment of cultic sites—is told in reportorial form by P in 11:31-32 and 12:4b-5 (and 11:32 is only a genealogical notice). The story of Lot and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the J story of which covers the majority of Genesis 13, 18, and 19, is represented by only a handful of verses in P: 13:6, 11b-12ba; 19:29.”

22 LAB 8.1–3 massively abridges Gen 12–25, but its reordering of the narrative reflects a critique of its haphazard sequence/arrangement: (1) Abraham, Sarah, and Lot leave for Canaan; (2) Sarah’s infertility leads
likely to find fault with the story for having an episodic and character-driven plot. While it would be possible to construct such a refutation by carefully working through the Hebrew text, as was done in the case of Noah, this point may be supported satisfactorily by appeal to an outline of the contents of this story’s major parts, although I will analyze many specific sequential ambiguities and sources of disunity in relation to G’s translation choices in §8.3, where I walk through the entire text of Abraham’s story in order.

---

Jubilees reflects both critiques. First, it furnishes the narrative with a coherent structure by framing it as a series of tests culminating in Gen 22 (see note 254). Second, it excludes or abbreviates elements that do not fit into this framework, e.g., stories involving Lot (Gen 19 is summarized by Jub 16:5–6), Hagar (Gen 16:7–14 is omitted by Jub 14:21–24), and Abimelech (Gen 20 and 21:22–23 are omitted entirely). Genesis Apocryphon, though only preserved up to Gen 15:4, makes at least two plot improvements by forging new links in its causal chain. First, the clause עד כען לא דבקתה לטורא קדישא (“You have not yet reached the Holy Mountain”) in 1QapGen XIX, 8 (cf. Gen 12:6) provides a novel, if cryptic, reference forward to account for God’s progressive revelation of his promise to Abraham. Second, 1QapGen XII, 27–34 links the covenant of Gen 15 back to the preceding narrative in relation to God’s orchestration of Abraham’s acquisition of wealth, having Abraham ask God not “what” (מה) he will give but “why” (למא) this wealth has been given when he has no heir. Moshe Bernstein has established the plot critique in Genesis Apocryphon more generally by arguing that it improves the canonical narrative by rearrangement, anticipation, and harmonization (“Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon,” DSD 3 [1996]: 37–57).
Abram travels to Canaan upon accepting God’s covenantal promise.

Abram sojourns in Egypt and passes Sarah off as his sister.

Abram and Lot separate on account of quarreling.

Abram rescues Lot from war.

Abram enters into a covenant with God.

Abram fathers Ishmael by Hagar at Sarah’s request.

Abraham enters into a covenant with God again.

Abraham and Lot receive heavenly guests with divergent outcomes.

Abraham sojourns in Gerar and passes Sarah off as his sister again.

Abraham fathers Isaac by Sarah and casts Ishmael out with Hagar.

Abraham and Abimelech make a covenant.

Abraham is tested by God and almost sacrifices Isaac.

Abraham acquires a burial plot for Sarah.

Abraham acquires a wife for Isaac.

Abraham dies and is buried by Isaac and Ishmael.

To be sure, the analysis of a text into literary units is an interpretive task, as is summarizing those units by supplying descriptive titles, and yet this relatively neutral presentation of the material in Abraham’s story illustrates the main narrative problem that its plot would have presented for Hellenistic readers: while the story clearly centers on Abraham’s receipt of God’s promise, the causal course from beginning to end is left largely uncharted, resulting in a loose narrative unity held together by continuity of character and theme.

For the sake of clarity, the characters Abraham and Sarah will generally be referred to by these traditional names, even though they are consistently named differently in the Hebrew and Greek texts before and after the covenant text of Gen 17. However, in translations of Hebrew and Greek text or where another name is of direct relevance, the names will be transliterated.

This is not to say that Hellenistic authors had to spell everything out for their readers. Actually, allowing the reader to experience surprise or discovery may encourage sympathy for the author’s poetics, but the bait must be visible to be taken. This is, in part, what Aristotle means when he says that the best plots have events that proceed παρὰ τὴν δόξαν δι’ ἀλληλα (contrary to expectation on account of one another) (Poetics 1452a.4). Cf. also §7.3.2 note 42.
To be specific, the lack of signposts to guide the reader has two main underlying causes: (i) certain aspects of Hebrew narrative poetics that differ from Greek sensibilities and (ii) infelicities resulting from the compositional history of the text. In terms of poetics, it may be said that biblical Hebrew narrative makes artful use of ambiguity to a greater extent than is acceptable in Greek narrative prose. While this may be demonstrated in one way by gesturing to the relative prominence of the single conjunction ו ("and") in contrast to a diversity of Greek connectors and connecting structures, it may also be illustrated by way of example. Consider the introduction to Gen 13:14 in relation to its narrative context.

**Genesis 13:14**

ויהוה אמר אל אברם אחריו הפרד לוט מעמו ...  

And Yahweh said to Abram after Lot separated from him ...

In this case, the experienced reader of Hebrew narrative will appreciate the fact that, while the phrase "after Lot separated from him" (אחרי הפרד לוט מעמו) overtly establishes only a temporal link between the two halves of Gen 13, it covertly suggests a causal one: God was unable to reveal to Abraham the full extent of his promise of land as long as Lot was in the way, and the expansion of the promise in 13:14–18 vis-à-vis the abbreviated form in

---

26 The Rabbis were aware that ו לת מעמו was not always just temporal but sometimes also causal, but their attempts to make such an orthographic distinction (i.e., by differentiating the biforms אחריו and אחר) proved unsuccessful, as is clear from the fact that opposing traditions in Genesis Rabbah 44.5 take opposite views as to which form just means "after" and which one also suggests "since."

27 On Grossman's literary reading of Abraham's story, Abraham's separation from Lot is the delayed fulfillment of God's command in 12:1 to separate "from your father's house" (מבית אביך): "Abraham took his orphaned nephew under his wing, but decided to part ways as a result of their dispute; in doing so, Abraham finally fulfills God's initial command to separate from his father's home. If so, we can assert that the episodes
12:7 ought to be understood on this basis. Yet, as defensible as such an interpretation is, it must be admitted that it is only implied by the Hebrew text, and the author’s trust in the reader’s ability to connect the dots could prove misplaced, much more a reader from another time and culture.\(^\text{28}\)

Just as the author of Hebrew prose often expects the reader to read between the lines by understanding ָּ (“and”) as “and so” or ֵ (“after”) as “then” or “because,” he is also often subtle or silent when it comes to the ethical evaluation of the characters in the story.\(^\text{29}\) Rarely does the narrator provide direct evaluation of a character’s actions (e.g., 20:4), and the occasional moments when a trusted character, such as God or a divine emissary, does so (e.g., 22:16–18) are invaluable for the reader in his or her attempt to evaluate the characters with warrant from the text. Even in such cases, the interpretation often remains uncertain, as can be seen in Gen 16. Though the angel seems to imply sympathy toward Hagar in 16:10 with the phrase ָּ (“because Yahweh has heard your oppression”), this is complicated by the use of the same root ָּ (“oppress, submit”) in the initial leading up to God’s revelation to Abraham in Bethel and the explicit blessing of offspring and inheritance of the land explore Abraham’s relationship with several entities that call his right to the blessing into question: his relationship with the land, with his wife, and with his nephew Lot. Abraham retains and reaffirms his connections with the two entities God is interested in — the land and his wife — but he takes leave from his nephew, who will not walk along the path that leads to a covenant with God” (Abram to Abraham, 129–130; cf. 93–96).

\(^\text{28}\) In particular, it is likely that Abraham conceives of Lot as a potential heir, and so a threat to the promise from the joint perspective of narrator and reader. Josephus, \textit{A.J.} 1.7.1 §154, for example, claims that Abraham adopted (εἰσποιήσατο) Lot on account of having no legitimate child (γνησίου παιδὸς ἀπορῶν). Cf. Jub 13:18.

\(^\text{29}\) Grossman is especially attuned to the interpretive problem of ambivalent characters, such as Lot or Abimelech (Abram to Abraham, pp. 305 and 328 for Lot and p. 377 for Abimelech).
command that Hagar should return and “submit” (וְתַעֲנֵה) to Sarah (16:9). Yet, when this J material is read with an eye on its doublet in E (Gen 21:9–21), where God verbally endorses Hagar’s expulsion, Sarah’s plan seems evil. But if this is so, should the reader side with Sarah in her complaint to Abraham (16:5), fault her for blindness to her own guilt (16:2–3), or censure Abraham (like Adam) for his passive acceptance of his wife’s plan (16:3–4, 6; cf. 3:17)? While it is a virtue of Hebrew narrative to develop a story and its characters by way of implication, insinuation, and gaps, where a certain degree of ambiguity is both necessary and effective, this style of narration can present problems for Hellenistic literary ideals. In fact, Aristotle claims that good plots are not moved along just because characters make choices with ramifications, but because the characters and the choices they make are

30 In contrasting Homeric epic and Old Testament histories as archetypes for his study of Western literature, Erich Auerbach crisply captures the interpretive problem that the “obscurity” and “background” of traditional Jewish narrative present for readers steeped in the tradition of Greek epic with expectations of “externalization” and “foreground:” “It would be difficult, then, to imagine styles more contrasted than those of these two equally ancient and equally epic texts [i.e., Odysseus’s recognition in Homer, Odyssey 19; Abraham’s near-sacrifice of Isaac in Gen 22]. On the one hand, externalized, uniformly illuminated phenomena, at a definite time and in a definite place, connected together without lacunae in a perpetual foreground; thoughts and feeling completely expressed; events taking place in leisurely fashion and with very little of suspense. On the other hand, the externalization of only so much of the phenomena as is necessary for the purpose of the narrative, all else left in obscurity; the decisive points of the narrative alone are emphasized, what lies between is nonexistent; time and place are undefined and call for interpretation; thoughts and feeling remain unexpressed, are only suggested by the silence and the fragmentary speeches; the whole, permeated with the most unrelieved suspense and directed toward a single goal (and to that extent far more of a unity), remains mysterious and ‘fraught with background’” (Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003]: 11–12 [cf. 3–23]). On the subtlety of Hebrew narrative, see also Sternberg, Poetics, esp. 186–229.
specifically good or bad. In light of this fact, a Greek reader’s evaluation of how two events relate to one another will often depend upon his or her ethical evaluation of a character and the choices he or she makes.

The sequentiality and unity of Abraham’s story are not just hampered by the poetics of Hebrew prose, however, but also by the compositional history of Hebrew Genesis. The redactor’s guiding principal of chronological arrangement introduces three types of problems for the causal logic of the larger story: (i) events that were causally related in one of the redactor’s sources may now be separated by intervening material from another source; (ii) events from multiple sources that were never causally related may now be

31 For Aristotle, character (ἠθος) reveal ethical choice (προαίρεσις): ἕστιν δὲ ἠθος μὲν τὸ τοιοῦτον δ δηλοὶ τὴν προαίρεσιν (Poet. 1450b8–9). Moreover, it is specifically by what individual characters say (ὁ λόγος) or do (ἡ πράξις), that they and their choices are marked ethically as good or bad: ἐξεῖ δὲ ἠθος μὲν ἐὰν ὡσπερ ἐλέχθη ποιήματα δὲ ἀληθείαν ἡ πράξις προαίρεσιν τινα <κ’ τις δεν> ἡ, χρηστὸν δὲ ἐὰν χρηστὴν (1454a17–19). Furthermore, character and plot are interwoven with one another, as Aristotle favor those plots that represent an “ethically moderate” character (ὁ μεταξύ), i.e., “one who is not distinguished in virtue (ἀρετή) and justice (δικαιοσύνη) and who does not fall into misfortune (δυστυχία) due to vice (μοχθηρία), but rather due to some mistake (ἀμαρτία): ὁ μὴ ἀρετῇ διαφέρων καὶ δικαιοσύνην μὴ διὰ κακίαν καὶ μοχθηρίαιν μεταβάλλων εἰς τὴν δυστυχίαν ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀμαρτίαν τινα (Poet. 1453a.8–10). While this point highlights the importance of character and choice in relation to a plot’s overall structure, it is Aristotle’s statement about the second-best type of plot (held by some as first-best!) that is particularly relevant for the structure of Abraham’s story, i.e., the “double structure” (διπλὴ σύστασις) exhibited by the Odyssey, which has opposite outcomes (τελευτώσα εξ ἐναντίας) for relatively better characters (τοῖς βέλτιοι) and relatively worse ones (χείροις): δευτέρα δ’ ἡ πρώτῃ λεγομένη ὑπὸ τινῶν ἕστιν σύστασις, ἡ διπλὴν τε τὴν σύστασιν ἔχουσα καθάπερ Ἡ Ὀδύσσεια καὶ τελευτώσα εξ ἐναντίας τοῖς βελτίοις καὶ χείροσιν. δοκεῖ δὲ ἐχεῖ πρώτῃ διὰ τὴν τῶν θεάτων ἀσβέσειαν (Poet. 1453a.30–34). Though the Abraham narrative has no single arch-villain, it will be demonstrated in §8.3 that G’s construction of this story’s plot in terms of complication, transformation, and resolution results in a positive outcome for Abraham based on his ethical progression in relation to God’s gradual fulfillment of his promise, while a number of minor characters serving as ethical character foils to Abraham do not have such illustrious ends (e.g., Pharaoh in 12:10–20; Lot in 19:30–38; Abimelech in c. 20; 21:22–34).
juxtaposed, also due to chronological considerations; and (iii) very similar events narrated in multiple sources may now be repeated in the compiled narrative. An illustrative case of situation (i) is seen by considering Gen 21:2 in its prior context within its source document.

**Genesis 21:2**

וַתַּחֲרִית וַתָּלָד שֵׂרָה לַאֲבָרֶהֶם בֶּן לֵזָקְנוֹ לְמוּדָּה אֲשֶׁר דֹּבְרָה אֲלֵיהָ

And Sarah conceived and bore a son to Abraham in his old age at the time that God had told him.

In the priestly text, this verse originally followed directly on the heels of the covenant of circumcision in Gen 17 and the promise to Abraham of Isaac by Sarah found there, in which case the causal relationship of promise and fulfillment was once quite clear. Yet, the Sodom narratives in Gen 18–19 (J) and Abraham’s sojourn in Gerar in Gen 20 (E) would not make sense chronologically if Isaac’s birth preceded these events—consider Sarah’s role in each case—and so the redactor of the Pentateuch has inserted them between the P texts of Gen 17 and 21, which were originally neighbors. In this way, the compiler’s principle of chronological arrangement frustrates the logic of sequence and causality at many points in Abraham’s story. Not only has the logical sequence of Isaac’s promise, conception, and birth been spaced apart in the redacted text of Hebrew Genesis, but to be very specific, the causal link indicated by the reference in 21:2 to the “time” (מועד) that God spoke to Abraham has been destabilized, as it may now refer either to the statement in 17:21 (לֹא מועֵדוּ הָאָדָם) or to the one in 18:14 (לֹא מועֵדוּ [הָאָדָם]). This case also exemplifies in a minor way the kind of interpretive difficulty that may result from (ii) the juxtaposition of events that previously were causally

---

32 Only the canonical text’s form makes us consider these two texts as different stories (Baden, *Promise*, 59).
unrelated (i.e., because they come from distinct source documents), but this second type of issue is better illustrated by the sequence of Gen 14 (J) and 15 (E). Though originally unrelated, the reader may reasonably wonder whether God’s self-introduction in 15:1 with the command אַל תירא (“Do not fear!”) has something to do with the danger presented by the battles of Gen 14, especially given the memorable use of the root מָגַן in both 15:1 and 14:20. Yet, the way they relate is left implicit in the Hebrew text.

The third type of problem involving (iii) the repetition of similar events is certainly presented by a number of well-known parallel accounts (e.g., the sister-wife stories in 12:10–20 // 20; and the escape/expulsion narratives in 16 // 21:8–21), but the problem of redundancy is most acutely felt in relation to the recurring promise texts (12:1–3; 12:7; 13:14–16; 15; 17; 18:9–15; 22:11–18), and especially the two lengthy covenant passages of Gen 15 and 17. In theory, there is nothing inherently troubling about repeating a promise. In fact, there are many reasons why someone might do this.33 The promisor might wish to emphasize a commitment to fulfilling the promise, calm any doubts held by the promisee, clarify or qualify certain aspects of the promise, or even expand, contract, or alter its

33 John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 32.2 (PG 53 294.63–295.5) addresses this problem directly, claiming that the repetition of the promises serves the purpose of demonstrating Abraham’s devotion to God (τὸ φιλόθεον): Καὶ ἐπαγγελίας ἐπαγγελίαις συνάψας, καὶ μεγάλας τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ποιησάμενος, πάλιν μικρὸν διαναβάλλεται, ἵνα ταύτῃ μάλιστα δειγῇ τοῦ πατριάρχου τὸ φιλόθεον, ὑπὸ τας ὑποσχέσεις ὅρων τέως ἐκβαίνοντα τὰ πράγματα ὁ μακάριος, οὐκ ἐδορυβεῖτο, ὑδέ διεπαράττετο, ἀλλ’ ἀκίνητον ἐτέλεσε τὸν λογίσμον, πεπεισμένος δι’ ὅτι τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅπαξ αὐτῷ ἐπαγγελθέντα βέβαια καὶ πάγια τυγχάνει. Cf. *Hom. Gen.* 34.4 (PG 53 317.14–22). While John’s view of Abraham’s unwavering virtue overlooks aspects of the development of his character, his appeal to ethics to account for the repetition of the promise seems essentially correct. On occasion, however, John claims that Abraham’s trials foster his growth, as in *Hom. Gen.* 45.2 (PG 54 415.35–37): Καὶ σκότει, πῶς καὶ δι’ αὐτῶν τῶν παρακολουθούντων πειρασμῶν ἢ τοῦ δικαιοῦ ἀρετῆς μέλλον ἐξέλθεται, τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερὸν αὐτὸν διὰ πάντων δεικνύντος.
contents or conditions. The literary problem presented by God’s repetition of these promises is not that he could have no possible or believable reasons for doing so, but that his reasons are generally left unstated.\textsuperscript{34} However, the problem of the main two covenant texts (i.e., Gen 15 and 17) is more acute. In contrast to a promise, it is more difficult to rationalize the repetition of the ceremonial entrance into a formal agreement. Are these covenant texts to be taken as distinct agreements, or does the second reaffirm, develop, or restrict the first in some way? In addition, does the interposition of Gen 16 somehow explain their relationship? The Hebrew text simply does not say. Yet, regardless of the source or type of problem—be it poetics or compositional history, on the one hand, or disjointed sequence of events or overall lack of narrative unity, on the other—the recurring issue faced by G was in a sense common throughout: seeking to elucidate the plot as a logical and believable development from beginning to end through the middle by way of complication, transformation, and resolution, G was constantly concerned with clarifying how \textit{post hoc} coincides with \textit{propter hoc}.

\textbf{8.3 Elucidating plot structure}

As I will show, there is significant evidence that the Genesis translator takes the sequentiality and unity of his plot seriously, as he deliberately develops the implicit causal

\textsuperscript{34} Joel Baden overstates the narrative difficulties presented by the repetition when he says that “every time the circumstances of the promise, or the covenants and other statements attached to it, seem to undermine the preceding promise texts almost entirely” (\textit{Promise}, 22–23). While Baden is attuned to the problem, he does not allow, e.g., positing gaps to explain difficulties. The problem is better characterized as excessive ambiguity: as it is, the canonical text is not impossible but requires the reader to do too much interpretive work.
links in the narrative chain of Abraham’s story. For G, the plot is relatively simply in structure: God progressively reveals and fulfills his promise of progeny and land to Abraham as Abraham progressively proves his worthiness to receive it by demonstrating his virtue and faith in God. The story begins with God’s initial promise to Abraham and Abraham’s initial submission to God’s call, but this relationship is complicated over time as God’s promise and Abraham’s fitness are both called into question. This tension reaches a tipping point via the change that takes place in Gen 17 when God and Abraham clarify the nature of their agreement: Abraham must please God and God will begin to bring his promise to physical fruition. The outworking of this newly clarified deal is brought to completion in Gen 22 when Abraham ultimately proves his faith in God in a final test and God seals the promise once for all with a solemn oath. This resolution then leads to Abraham’s foretaste of the promise beyond the scope his lifetime, as he secures a burial plot for his wife Sarah (Gen 23) and an approved wife for his son Isaac (Gen 24). My argument, that G interpreted Abraham’s story in his translation according to this basic plan, will follow the plot in narrative order, alternating between summary of the events and close analysis of G’s targeted translation choices that work to support and form such a structure.

8.3.1 Beginning and complication (Gen 11:27–16:16)

The beginning of the Abraham narrative in Hebrew already exhibits poetic excellence of plot in at least two regards. First, the opening sequence of events follows a clear, logical progression. God calls Abraham to leave his home, promising him land and progeny, and Abraham travels to Canaan (12:1–9). When a famine strikes and they seek refuge in Egypt,
Abraham’s fear for his own life leads him to pass Sarah off as his sister, which first brings him great wealth but later gets him sent back to Canaan when Pharaoh is plagued as a result of this deceit (12:10–20). Back in Canaan, their new wealth and lack of pasturage cause quarreling between Abraham’s and Lot’s shepherds, and Lot elects to settle in Sodom (13:1–13). Once he is gone, God elaborates his twofold promise to Abraham (13:14–18). Some time later, a war breaks out, and Abraham must intervene to rescue his nephew Lot, thus securing regional fame (14:1–24).

In addition to this clarity of structure, the first paragraphs also showcase the central themes of land and progeny, which govern the plot’s progression from start to finish. G shows that he is highly attuned to the narrative significance of these themes by using the Greek imperfect to introduce them, launching narrative threads that anticipate subsequent resolution. When the narrator brings Sarah onto the stage in 11:30, he characterizes her solely in terms of her infertility.

11:30 καὶ ἦν Σάρα ἱκοberos καὶ οὐκ ἔτεκνοιεις.35

Sara was barren; she had no child. Sara was barren and could not produce children.36

---

35 ἔτεκνοιεις | The Hebrew noun וָלָד only occurs here in Genesis, and G only uses τεκνοποιέω again in 16:2 // 30:3 to translate וָלָד. Furthermore, G rarely translates the cognate יֶלֶד as τέκνον (2/19: 33:6, 7), but uses τέκνον instead as a minor match for יֶלֶד (18/393).

By using the imperfect verb ἐτέκνοποιεῖ (“she could (not) produce children”) to translate the Hebrew noun יְלָה (“child”), G aptly announces the far-reaching significance of Sarah’s infertility. In a similar way, when Abraham enters Canaan, the theme of land is given prominence by another comment by the narrator.

Now at that time, the Canaanites were in the land. Now at that time, the Canaanites inhabited the land.

Here, too, G draws out this comment’s implied significance in translation. Not only does he mark it at the level of discourse as a narrator comment by translating the conjunction ἄν as δέ (“now”), but by translating the adverbial predicate ἐν τῷ ἔδρα (“[were] in the land”) of the Hebrew verbless clause verbally in Greek with the imperfect κατῴκουν τὴν γῆν (“inhabited the land”)—partly to avoid replicating the verbless clause in Greek—G portrays the Canaanite possession of the land as a more direct obstacle to the promise God makes in the next verse, that Abraham’s progeny will possess this very land. Once again, when Abraham and Lot set out for Canaan, G uses the imperfect to launch a third major narrative thread.

37 The interpretation that 11:30 anticipates resolution is accepted by R. Levi, who claims that יְלָה יָנָה always expects a reversal (Genesis Rabbah 38.14). Similarly, Brayford states that this formulation “sets up narrative tension for what follows” (Genesis, 289).

38 δέ | For G’s use of postpositive δέ to mark a narrator comment, see §4.1.1.

39 κατῴκουν | G typically uses κατοικέω to translate יָשָׂב (33/72) or יָשֶׂה (7/8), often in relation to the theme of land. G distinguishes the simplex οῖκέω (“dwell”) from the compound κατοικέω (“settle”) by the degree of permanence of the residence (see §5.2.2.5). Here, the compound assumes the Canaanite right to the land.

40 Didymus, In Gen. 216 refers to this as a passing comment (τῷ παρεσημανθέν) and interprets it as an indication that the one making progress (τῷ προχόπτοντι)—his common designation for Abraham—is not ready to inherit the land since he still has something of his old habits (τινὰ καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς συνήθειας).

41 For G’s use and non-use of verbless clauses, see §3.2.2.
And Abram went as the Lord told him, and Lot went with him.

G contrasts the initial movement of Abraham and Lot in two ways. To begin with, G presents Abraham’s movement as exact obedience to God’s preceding command by translating ἐκάθασεν ("as") as καθάσεως ("just as"), where the enclitic particle -περ furnishes an extra ounce of emphasis. But what is more, by translating the same form ἐκάθασεν ("and he went") variously, i.e., with the aorist ἐπορεύθη ("he went") in reference to Abraham and with the imperfect ἐκέχεστο ("he set out") in reference to Lot, G insinuates that these two men begin but do not end their journey together, which is relevant to their geographic

---

43 καθάσεως | G only translates ἐκάθασεν (39) emphatically as καθάσεως on one other occasion (50:6), although he often could have used this form, such as in translating ἐκάθισεν as καθά (17), καθὸς (3), or καθότι (2). For the extra emphasis of enclitic -περ, especially on relatives, see KG II §508; Smyth §2965; LSJ, s.v. "περ." Beyond καθάσεως, G uses this particle only on ὑπερ (5:37:9; 38:11; 41:2, 18, 22).

44 ἐκέχεστο | To render ἐκάθασεν in the qal (115), G typically uses πορεύομαι and cognates (66) or ἐρχομαι and cognates (27), but rarely in the imperfect (2/8: 18:16; 37:25), preferring rather ἐρχομαι and cognates (5/8), a root confined to the imperfect (cf. LSJ, s.v. "ὀφείλομαι"). This means that G’s choice to present Lot’s departure in a different manner than Abraham’s involves a combination of lexical and morphological factors.

45 Many ancient interpreters of the Greek text understand Abraham’s departure ethically. Philo, Migr. 2, 109 calls God’s call in Gen 12:1–3 an opportunity for salvation (ἀφορμὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν), later saying that the promise is for one who is going to be wise (τῷ γεννησαμένῳ ... σοφῷ). Josephus A.J. 1.7.1 §155 connects Abraham’s departure to the fact that he had begun to take greater pride in his virtue than others (φρονεῖν μεῖζον ἐπ’ ἀρετῇ τῶν ἄλλων ἡγομένος) and sought to change their convictions. Didymus, In Gen. 210–211 interprets the promise of being a great nation as implying virtue (Μέγα δὲ ἑστὶν τῷ ἄντι γινώμενος ἔθνος, ὅταν ἐξ ἀρετῶν κοσμήται) and that of being a blessing as implying progress toward complete virtue (τὴν ἐπὶ τελείαν ἀρετὴν προκοπῆν).

46 For the common use of ἐρχομαι in reference to departure, see LSJ, s.v. "ὀφείλομαι" I; Voitila, Présent et imparfait, 189; for the inchoative imperfect, see Smyth §1900; SSG §28c(iv).

47 Philo, Migr. 148–150 is aware of the difference indicated here, allegorizing καὶ ἔχεστο μετ’ αὐτοῦ Λῶτ as a sign of Lot’s inconsistency and wavering (ἀπόκλησις). Cf. Didymus, In Gen. 213. Genesis Rabbah 39.13 also wishes to downplay Lot’s participation, interpreting ἐκάθα ("he went") as ἦν ("he was merely attached").
separation in Gen 13 and G’s embellishment of their contrastive characters in Gen 18–19, as I will argue below.

Yet, even as G effectively elicits the driving relevance that the themes of land and progeny have for the entire plot by amplifying several muted features of his source, he educes another theme with only subtle warrant from the Hebrew text in order to explicate the causal relationship between the events of these initial chapters and the episodes that follow. In particular, G characterizes Abraham’s movement and conflict during this initial period in military terms by elaborating the intertextual allusions to the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan.\(^\text{47}\) G develops these themes of exodus and conquest, which are directly mentioned prophetically in Gen 15:13–21, in order to clarify the narrative relationship between the events of Gen 12–14 and the interactions between God and Abraham in Gen 15.

After presenting the Canaanite possession of the land as standing in tension with God’s promise (12:6–7), G describes Abraham’s subsequent movements using verbs with varying degrees of military connotations with no direct lexical support from the Hebrew.\(^\text{48}\)


\(^{48}\) Jan Joosten has noted this military language, but his claim that “there is nothing in Genesis 12 to call forth such martial connotations” is only partially correct (“Language as Symptom: Linguistic Clues to the Social
Genesis 12:8–9

G’s translation of Abraham’s first movement in this passage seems to explain it as a response to what precedes. By translating בֵּיתוּ ("he moved on") as ἀπέστη ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ’ ἀνατολάς Βαΐθηλ, καὶ ἐστησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνήν αὐτοῦ, G intimates Abraham’s fear of conflict with the Canaanites in light of God having promised him their territory. Then, as Abraham continues south past Bethel and Ai, G develops the military motif more explicitly. Whereas in Hebrew Abraham “sets out” (נשא), G has Abraham “pull out” (απαίρω), and while G’s source describes Abraham’s subsequent travels as ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὄροις κυριακοῦ ("gradually moving toward the Negev"), G transforms this quite radically into καὶ πορευεῖς ἐστρατοπέδευσεν ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ ("and after he traveled he encamped in the desert"). By using the verb στρατοπεδεύω ("encamp"), G describes

Background of the Seventy,” Text 23 [2007]: 79; cf. Harl, La Genèse, 63–4, 154). Though the Hebrew text makes no overt references to military activity, the intertextual allusions to the exodus and conquest and the battles in Gen 14 do provide some degree of “martial connotations,” and enough for G to work with.

49 ἀπέστη | G only translates כָּעָשׁ as ἀφίστημι here, selecting ἀπαίρω elsewhere (2: 26:21, 22). As for the verb ἀφίστημι, G uses it on five other occasions, each time to translate a different Hebrew verb.

50 For the sense, see LSJ, s.v. “ἀφίστημι” B.1; DGE, s.v. “ἀφίστημι” A.I.2; Lee, Lexical Study, 35–36. The revisers found ἀπέστη inaccurate: μετήρεν and μετήγευν are attributed to Aquila, and ἀπῆρεν to Symmachus.

51 For the elliptical use with an implied object, see LSJ, s.v. “ἀπαίρω” A.II.2; DGE, s.v. “ἀπαίρω” II.2.

52 ἀπῆρεν | G typically renders יָשַׁב (12) as ἀπαίρω (7) or ἔξαίρω (1) and only uses ἀπαίρω elsewhere for יָשָׁב (2).

53 In recognition of the overt military connotations of στρατοπεδεύω, John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 32.3 (PG 53 296.61–297.7) goes as far as to say that here scripture uses “strange diction” (ξένη λέξις), presenting Abraham’s travel in a manner more customary for speaking of wars (καὶ ἀπήρευ ἐπὶ τῶν πολέμων ἔθος ἐστί λέγειν). John takes Abraham’s solider-like mobility as a sign of his virtue. Didymus, In Gen. 224 also interprets the warfare motif here in terms of Abraham’s character: Κάι γὰρ τελείος τις ἢ, οὐκ ἀπαλλάττεται τῶν πολεμοῦντων.

54 στρατοπεδεύων | G only uses this verb here. For his more usual translation of כָּעָשׁ as ἀπαίρω, see note 52.

401
Abraham’s movements in unambiguously military terms, and yet with the subtler change of the allative הָנְגֶּבָה (“toward the Negev”) to the locative ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ (“in the desert”), as necessitated by the Greek verb he has used, G presents Abraham’s journey not as gradual progress toward a specific goal but, like the Israelites leaving Egypt, as encampment in the desert. What is more, when Abraham returns from Egypt, G again anticipates the Israelite wandering by continuing to translate נֶגֶב as ἑρήμος (13:1, 3), i.e., as if it were מִׂדְּבָר (“desert”).

In the account of Abraham and Sarah in Egypt, G advances this military theme by portraying this episode’s conflict in political and military terms. By translating the inciting incident כָּבֵׁד הָרְעָב (“the famine was severe”) as ἐνισχύειν ὁ λιμὸς (“the famine grew strong”), G insinuates by connotation the military nature of the ensuing conflict, even as G’s use of the same translation in relation to the famine under Joseph maintains the intertextual link to the exodus (43:1; 47:4, 13; cf. 41:31). Yet, as this episode’s plot unfolds,

55 It is G’s introduction of martial terms that leads Philo, Abr. 245 to praise Sarah, inter alia, for the multiple times she encamped with her husband during wars (τὰς ἐν πολέμοις συστρατείας). Similarly, Josephus, A.J. 1.7.2 §159 cites Nicolaus of Damascus as saying that Abraham came from Babylon with an army (σὺν στρατῷ ἀφυγμένος ἐκ τῆς γῆς τῆς ὑπὲρ Βαβυλῶνος Χαλδαίων λεγομένης), which makes sense given his mode of travel in Gen 12.

56 ἑρήμῳ | Other than its three occurrences before and after Abraham’s time in Egypt, G usually translates לִבְּנָה (7) as λίπ (3) or ἀνατολή (1). Otherwise G only uses ἑρήμος as a consistent match for מִׂדְּבָר (8).

57 G’s translation of הָנְגֶּבָה was corrected by Aquila to νότονδε and by Symmachus to εἰς νότον. A conflation of both corrections (νότονδε εἰς νότον) is also attributed to Symmachus. Regardless, ἑρήμος was rejected for νότος.

58 ἐνισχύειν | To be sure, G usually uses ἐνισχύω (4) or ἰσχυρός (2) to translate כָּבֵׁד (9), but this is used almost exclusively in relation to famines. The only exception is in 50:11 (ἰσχυρός).

59 Aquila used βαρύνω (either ἐβαρύνθη or ἐβάρυνεν), preferring the idea of “heavy” to that of “strong.”

402
G enlists more overt transformations in order to militarize the threat to Abraham and Sarah, the punishment of Pharaoh, and the patriarch’s deportation. First, G develops the violent nature of the threat to Abraham and Sarah by casting it in military terms and increasing the agency of Sarah’s captors. In translating Abraham’s fear, G presents Sarah as war spoils by rendering וַאֲתַךְ יָחְיוּ ("but they will let you live") with περιποιέω60 in the middle voice as σὲ δὲ περιποιήσονται (“but you they will save61 for themselves” or “you they will take as their own special possession [περιποίησις]”). Furthermore, G presents these nameless and stationless Egyptians, Pharaoh’s “officials” (רש), as ἄρχοντες62 (12:15), a term which may have general political (“rulers”) or, as often, specifically military (“commanders”)63 connotations. Finally, G intensifies the threat they pose by increasing their agency via a transformation of voice.

12:15 καὶ εἰσῆκασαν64 αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν αἰτὸν Φαραώ and the woman was taken to Pharaoh’s house and they led her into Pharaoh’s house

By crediting Pharaoh’s ἄρχοντες with Sarah’s capture, G emphasizes the violence of this act.

---

60 περιποιήσονται | The piel of הָיָה (4) is rare in Genesis, and G varies his translations: διατρέφω in 7:3; περιποιέω here; and ἐξανίστημι in 19:32, 34. Elsewhere, G only uses περιποιέω (“acquire”) for ṣב (2/4: 31:18; 36:6).
61 LSJ, s.v. “περιποιέω” A.II.1. Erroroneously based on this verse, LSJ A.II.2 gives the active meaning “keep safe” (cf. A.I.1) for the middle, but this acknowledges neither G’s cognizance of the distinction between the active and middle voice nor the contextual fit of the attested sense of the middle here. Cf. Brayford, “Taming and Shaming,” 198–199 note 429; Genesis, 291; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 181. Grasping the innovation of περιποιήσονται, Aquila corrects it to ζωόςουσιν.
62 ἄρχοντες | G always uses the root ἄρχ- for ṣב (25), but usually as a prefix. G only uses ἄρχωn again in 47:5.
63 A military sense is listed as primary by both LSJ, s.v. “ἀρχων” A.I and DGE, s.v. “ἀρχων” I. In addition, G’s use of ἄρχω in 14:7 within a martial context favors this sense here.
64 εἰσῆκασαν | For G’s use of active for passive, see §6.1.2.3. Lexically, G’s use of εἰσάγω for πῆλ (142) is rare, with a lone parallel in 7:2, and focuses more on the goal of their movement.
G also constructs the resolution of this episode in similar terms. First, while God’s “punishment” of Pharaoh “with plagues” (נֶג עָע ... נֶגעים) unquestionably alludes to the plagues narrative in Exodus, G curiously presents this action as God subjecting Pharaoh to a careful military inspection: God “reviewed (lit. ‘tested’)”\(^{65}\) (ἤτασεν) him and his household “with great and painful tests”\(^{66}\) (ἔτασμοις μεγάλοις καὶ πονηροῖς).\(^{67}\) Then, when this divine audit leads Pharaoh to recognize his tactical error, G has him treat Abraham as if negotiating a truce with an enemy delegate. To begin with, G translates Pharaoh’s command ἃ (“go”) in

---

\(^{65}\) LSJ, s.vv. “ἐτάζω, ἐτασίς, ἐτασμός, ἐξετάζω, ἐξέτασις, ἐξετασμός.” The nouns terminating in -ς and the compounds in ἐξ- are more common than nouns ending in -μός and simplex forms. (Note that Antiatticista 96 glosses ἐτάζειν as ἐξετάζειν and ἐτασμόν as ἐξετασμόν, cf. Lee, Lexical Study, 44–45.) Yet, this entire family shares a base meaning: “examine” or “test.” While the martial connotation of “military review/inspection” is not required, such a context is both common and basic (cf. ἐξέτασις [A.2] and ἐξετασμός [A.2]). LSJ gives erroneous senses to some of these forms on the basis of LXX: “visit, try, afflict” for ἐτάζω (A.2); “trial, affliction” for ἐτασίς/ἐτασμός; and “visitation” for ἐξετάσις/ἐξετασμός (A.II). In this way, LSJ assigns Hebrew meanings to Greek words: “LSJ includes a large amount of LXX material, but as is mostly well known, is often in error. A particular fault is its tendency to equate the LXX word with the Hebrew it translates when there is no good reason to do so. In some instances, the meaning given seems to be adopted directly from one of the English versions of the OT” (Lee, Lexical Study, 8). John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 32.6 (PG 53 301.44–49) asks what this means (Τί ἐστιν, Ἑτασεῖ) and glosses it as διόν ἐπήγησε (“he punished [lit. ‘exacted punishment’]”), substituting the action (“inspect”) for its result (“punish”). Josephus, A.J. 1.8.1 §162 interprets it as νόσος (“illness”) based on Gen 20 and Exod 7–12, but his use of the political term στάσις τῶν πραγμάτων (“subversion of his affairs”) is telling (cf. his use of στασιαζόντων for the shepherds’ dispute in Gen 13, A.J. 1.8.3 §169). In contrast, G’s “examination” of Pharaoh differs from the portrayal of 1QapGen XX, 14–18, where Abraham asks God to judge (יְדַע) Pharaoh, and God sends a spirit to afflict him (רוח מכדש לְמִכתש).

\(^{66}\) Aquila found fault with G’s translation of בָּעַס ... שָׁם, though two different corrections are ascribed to him: the direct equivalent ἥτασεν ἄφαίς and the more interpretive ἔβασάνσεν (and also a conflate reading).

\(^{67}\) ἥτασεν ... ἐτασμός | G only translates שָׁם (8) as ἐτάζω here, using mainly ἔπτω (5), since שָׁם often has a sense that is less violent. Both nouns, שָׁם and ἐτασμός, as well as the verb ἐτάζω occur only here in Genesis.
12:19 as ἀπότρεχε (68 (“retreat”), 69 reminiscent of Abraham’s prior withdrawal from Canaanite territory (12:8). Furthermore, G has Pharaoh’s subordinates not just “send (Abraham) away” (ונישלחו) but “escort” (συμπροπεμψαι) 70 him and his family out of Egypt, as if cautiously expelling a hostile dignitary. To a far lesser extent, G allows the portrayal of this conflict in Egypt to bleed over into the family conflict between the herdsmen of Abraham and Lot that follows, interpreting their “quarrel” or “dispute” (מריבה, ריב) as a “battle” 72 (μάχη). 73 Yet, since Abraham’s entourage not only moves like an army (12:8–9) but also acts

| 68 ἀπότρεχε | G only uses ἀποτρέχω in the form of the present imperative ἀπότρεχε, here and in 24:51 to translate the qal imperative of חל (19), and in 32:9 to translate the qal imperative of בוש (7).
| 69 John Lee has convincingly shown that ἀποτρέχω basically functions in Hellenistic/Koine Greek as the present stem of ἀπέρχομαι and thus has the sense of “depart, go away” or even “go back” (Lexical Study, 125–128). Yet, this neither sufficiently accounts for the translation of חל as ἀποτρέχω (see note 68) nor excludes a martial sense for ἀποτρέχω, especially where the context suggests it (see DGE, s.v. “ἀποτρέχω” I.2; cf. the sense “strike” [of workers] in LSJ, s.v. “ἀποτρέχω”).
| 70 While the prefix συν- gives συμπροπέμπω a comitative sense, like προπέμπω it means “conduct or escort (away)” and invokes the political scene in which an ambassador or dignitary is ceremonially sent on their way. See LSJ, s.v. “προπέμπω” A.II.1. John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 32.8 (PG 53 303.37–53) understands these political connotations, since he interprets Abraham’s farewell escort as a sign of his fame (δόξα) and celebrity status (περιφάνεια) in contrast to the fear (φόβος) and trembling (τρόμος) with which he entered Egypt.
| 71 συμπροπέμψαι | G translates בוש (66) as συμπροπέμπω only here and again in 18:16, most often using ἀποστέλλω (41) or ἐξαποστέλλω (10). G does not use συμπροπέμπω otherwise.
| 72 To be sure, μάχη can be used to mean “contention” or “strife,” but this general sense is a metaphorical extension of military conflict imagery to everyday social skirmishes (LSJ, s.v. “μάχη”). Philo, Abr. 214–215 elaborates the military context implied by μάχη: the battle grew quite fierce (μάχης δὲ ἐμβριωτάτης γενομένης), and Abraham preferred defeat (ἠττη) to victory (ἐχρι νίκης ἐλθεῖν), gaining peace (εἰρήνη) and preventing future factions (στάσεις) and battles (πολέμους) through reconciliation (κατήλλαξεν) by conciliatory speeches (συμβατηρίοις λόγοις). Prestel and Schorch state that G’s use of μάχη strengthens the drama (“verstärkt die Dramatik”) (“Genesis,” 181).
| 73 μάχη | The nouns ריב and מְרִיבָה only occur here in Genesis, and otherwise G never uses μάχη. In addition, G translates the verb ריב (5) as μάχομαι (3), but the fact that he also uses the verbs χρίω and λοιδορέω indicates that he could have presented this dispute in more judicial and less martial terms.
like a special forces squad (14:14–16), it is not surprising that such internal disputes would escalate into violence.

If the military motif that G introduces into the opening of the Abraham story is motivated, on the one hand, by the exodus and conquest allusions infused into these chapters, it receives additional support from the conflicts described in Gen 14, where Abraham is explicitly portrayed as a strategic and effective military leader able to rescue his nephew Lot from the forces of a powerful coalition of eastern kings. Given this chapter’s content, it is not surprising to find G using warfare vocabulary here. The eastern coalition “declared war on” (ἐποίησαν πόλεμον μετά) the kings of the Jordan Valley (14:2), who had “revolted” (ἀπέστησαν) after twelve years of enslavement (14:4) and “conspired” (συνεφώνησαν) in the Valley of Salt (14:3). When the eastern kings began a successful military campaign the next year (14:5–7), the conspirators “formed ranks” (παρετάξαντο) to fight (14:8–9), but they were forced to flee (14:10–13). Yet, G also enhances this

74 The strongest allusions to the exodus narrative already present in the Hebrew text are found in (i) 12:10–20, entry into Egypt during a famine to be expelled by Pharaoh as a result of divine judgment; (ii) 15:13–14, direct reference to the exodus; (iii) 15:18–19, direct reference to the conquest; and (iv) 16:1–16, Hagar’s flight and return as a type of Moses leading up to the exodus. In addition to the literature cited above in note 47, see David Daube, The Exodus Pattern in the Bible, All Souls Studies 2 (London: Faber and Faber, 1963); Matitiahu Tsevat, “Hagar and the Birth of Ishmael,” in The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies (New York: Ktav, 1980), 53–76; Phyllis Trible, “Hagar: The Desolation of Rejection,” in Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives, OBT 13 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 9–36.

75 G’s choice of the active ("declare war") over the middle ("wage war") is contextually appropriate, as this action is prior to the military conflict that ensues. See KG II §374.5b; Smyth §1722; SSG §27ce, esp. note 7; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 182.

76 Aquila rejected συμφωνέω for συμβάλλω, a verb that, alongside συνέφρωναι, is also attributed to Symmachus.
terminology without direct support from his source. For example, G translates (‘the days of Amraphel’) contextually as τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῇ Αμαρφαλ (‘the kingship of Amraphal’). Second, he refers to Lot’s רכש (‘possessions’) with the technical term ἀποσκευή, which likely denotes not only “baggage” but also “(soldier’s) family” (14:12; cf. 14:16). Third, G consistently interprets the phrase רכש סדם (14:11, 16, 21) not as Sodom’s רכש (‘possessions’) but their שׁרֶכֶ (‘horses’), translating רכש as ἡ ἱππος (‘cavalry’).

Furthermore, perhaps at a loss as to the precise meaning of the form וירק (“and he emptied”), G has Abraham rather “count” (ἡρίθμησεν) his troops in preparation for his search-and-rescue mission. Finally, G dramatically captures Abraham’s military progress by

77 βασιλείᾳ | Only here does G translate שִׁ (154) as βασιλεία (3), which he otherwise reserves for מְלָכָה (2).

78 ἀποσκευή | More often G uses the more general terms ὑπάρχοντα (4) and κτῆσις (1) to translate רכש (11) interpreted as שׁרֶכֶ (8). G also uses ἀποσκευή in three cases to render שׁ (7).

79 For the semantic development of this technical term in Hellenistic/Koine from “baggage” to “baggage and people,” specifically the members of a soldier’s family, see Lee, Lexical Study, 101–107. Cf. also Harl, La Genèse, 159; Prestel and Schorsch, “Genesis,” 183. Cf. §5.2.2.2.

80 ἡ ἱππος | G only uses ἱππος (3) in the feminine here in Gen 14. When interpreting רכש (11) not as לְךָשׁ but as שׁרֶכֶ, G uses ὑπάρχοντα (4), ἀποσκευή (3), or κτῆσις (1), which all denote possession of some type.

81 ἡρίθμησεν | G’s rendering of רֵיק (2) as κατακενώ in its other occurrence (42:35) signals his comprehension of the form, though the sense of “empty” may have seemed as inappropriate to him here as it does to modern interpreters (HALOT; s.v. “רֵיק” hiphil 5). G may have read זריך with SP, but the conjectural lemma זַרְי in the sense “review, muster” (cf. HALOT, s.v. “זַרְי וו”) derives from the same context motivating G’s interpretation as ἀριθμέω, likely based upon the number 318 in this clause (Wevers, Notes, 194–195). Regardless, G’s interpretation fits a military context.
first having him “chase after”\(^{82}\) (καταδιώκεν) Lot’s captors and them “chase (them) off”\(^{83}\) (ἐκδιώκεν),\(^{84}\) although both times he is translating רדף (“pursue”).

By taking over from the Hebrew text the depiction of Abraham as a military leader on the world political scene and then enhancing it in Greek translation in the ways described above,\(^{85}\) G bolsters his prior development of military themes. Yet, it is also important to note that in doing so G also thoroughly integrates this military theme in Gen 14 with the exodus and conquest motifs. First, in reference to the campaign of the coalition of eastern kings, G translates the proper names רְפָאִים (“Rephaim”)\(^{86}\) as γίγαντας\(^{87}\) (“giants”) and זוזים (“Zuzim”) as ἔθνη ἤσχυρά\(^{88}\) (“strong nations”),\(^{89}\) each of which evokes the tall and powerful foes encountered by the Israelites on the verge of conquering the land of Canaan.\(^{90}\) Furthermore, G uses the technical term ἀποσκευή both here and again in 15:14, which

\(^{82}\) See LSJ, s.v. “καταδιώκω” A.1, which gives the gloss “follow hard upon, pursue closely.” While this verb denotes hot pursuit, it may but does not necessarily imply achievement (catching).

\(^{83}\) See LSJ, s.v. “ἐκδιώκω” and DGE, s.v. “ἐκδιώκω” 1, according to which ἐκδιώκω denotes chasing off/away.

\(^{84}\) G always renders the verb ἥδρω (5) with compounds of διώκω but varies cognates based on context: καταδιώκω (“chase after/down”), ἐκδιώκω (“chase off”), and ἐπιδιώκω (“chase after”). Most often G selects καταδιώκω (3), also used to translate רְדַפַּה (31:36) and דַפְק (33:13), hapax legomena in Genesis.

\(^{85}\) Philo, Abr. 225–226 argues that this chapter is the surest proof (σαφεστάτη πίστις)—implying the existence of additional evidence—that Abraham was courageous (ἀνδρεύς) and apt in battle (πολεμικός).

\(^{86}\) Aquila rejected G’s interpretation and preferred to transliterate as ‘Ραφαήν.

\(^{87}\) γίγαντας | The proper noun רְפָאִים (2) occurs again in 15:20, where G transliterates it as ’Ραφαήν. G has a certain affinity for γίγας, as he uses it as the sole match for both מִלִּים (6:4) and נָבָר (4:6; 10:8; 9+).

\(^{88}\) ἔθνη ἤσχυρά | Both the proper noun ἔθνος ἢσχυρόν and the collocation ἔθνος ἤσχυρόν only occur here in Genesis.

\(^{89}\) Symmachus rejected G’s interpretation and preferred to transliterate as Ζοιζομέω.

\(^{90}\) Both Greek phrases allude to the conquest: ἔθνη ἤσχυρά is an allusion to the גויים גדלים/רבים ועצמים of Deut 4:38; 7:1; 9:1; 11:23; Josh 23:9, and γίγαντες—as in Genesis—describes the tall and powerful pre-conquest residents of Canaan, including the נְפִילִים, רְפָאִים, and the עָנִים (Num 13:34; Deut 1:28; Josh 12:4; 13:12).
prophetically refers to the generation of the exodus, and his etymological interpretation of Abraham’s designation יִשְׂרָאֵל (“the Hebrew”) as ὁ περατής (“the crosser”)\(^91\) gestures to the common phrase בְּעֵר הָיוֹרֵד, typically translated as πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Like the Israelites, who possess the land of Canaan by crossing the Jordan River,\(^92\) Abraham is now defending the kings who live across the Jordan.\(^93\)

By highlighting the promise themes of land and progeny at the outset of Abraham’s story and then developing the military allusions to the exodus and the conquest in Gen 12–14, G forges a new narrative link between the events of Gen 12–14 and the interaction between God and Abraham in Gen 15, where the plot’s central complication is more fully introduced by mounting tension concerning the promise. In particular, G envisions Abraham, like the Israelites on Jordan’s eastern shore, as fearful of conquering Canaan and doubtful of God’s promise, which so far seems empty. G’s most far-reaching adjustments to the interpretation of this passage come in the opening dialogue, where he develops Abraham’s fear and doubt and embellishes God’s emphatic objection to these concerns. Then, as Abraham accepts God’s reassertion of the promise on faith, God receives Abraham’s faith, in turn, as a token of his just character, and the relationship formerly

\(^91\) While Aquila etymologized יִשְׂרָאֵל similarly as περατής, Symmachus preferred Ἐβραῖος. Philo, Migr. 20 interprets περατής ethically: Abraham crossed from an inferior to a more excellent way of life. This may also fit the conquest theme, however, as the Israelites were first barred from the land for their disobedience.

\(^92\) Joshua 24 makes the explicit comparison between the life of the patriarch and the lives of the Israelites who conquered the land: while Abraham came מָחְצֶה הָעָרָה (“from across the river [Euphrates]”), the Israelites conquered the land after defeating the Amorites who lived בְּעֵר הָיוֹרֵד (“across the Jordan”).

\(^93\) John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 35.3 (PG 53 326.11–19) reasonably interprets this curious appellation in terms of Abraham crossing over the Euphrates (πέραν ... τοῦ Ἑὐφράτην) when he left Chaldea across the Euphrates (πέραν τοῦ Ἑὐφράτου), but this only strengthens the analogy to the Israelite conquest of Canaan.
based upon promise and obedience is now formalized as a bilateral agreement in the form of a covenant.

**Genesis 15:1–6**

> ἐξαιταὶ δὲ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα κυρίου πρὸς Αβράαμ ἐν ὀράματι λέγων Μὴ φοβοῦ. Αβράαμ· ἐγώ ὑπερηφανίζομαι σοι· ὁ μυσθός σου πολὺς ἦσται σφόδρα. 2 λέγει δὲ Αβράαμ Ἰσραήλ ὁ Θεός σου μὲν ἔστη ἀναπάντησες, τί μοι δώσεις· ἐγώ δὲ ἀπολύμαι ἄτεκνος· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μάσεκ τῆς οἰκογενείας μου, οὔτος Δαμασκὸς Ἐλιζαβήτ. 3 καὶ εἶπεν Αβράαμ Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἐδωκας σπέρμα, ὁ δὲ οἰκογενής μου κληρονομήσει με. 4 καὶ εὐθὺς φωνὴ θεοῦ ἐγένετο πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων Ὡς κληρονομήσει σε οὔτος, ἀλλ` ἐς εξελύστηκα ἐκ σοῦ, οὔτος κληρονομήσει σε. 5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξω καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ανάβλεψον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἄριστην τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνητὸς ἀκαταρίθμηται αὐτοῦ. καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἦστα τὸ σπέρμα σου. 6 καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Αβράαμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἔλογισθα αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

With God’s first words, G begins to develop both Abraham’s fear and his doubt. First, by translating the Hebrew command גָּאַרְנָא (‘do not be afraid’) using the negated present imperative מַהְוַפָּבֵו (‘stop being afraid’), G implies that Abraham is and has been afraid.

---

94 מַהְוַפָּבֵו | The modal-aspectual choice of present imperative might be lexically conditioned (for the short list of imperative verbs that G inflects as both aorist and present, see §6.1.1.4 note 99), since G always translates גָּאַרְנָא and cognate formulations with the present imperative instead of the aorist subjunctive, except in 35:17, where he translates גָּאַרְנָא synthetically as גָּאַרְנָא, which definitely interprets the Hebrew expression as implying a present state of fear by representing the negative בָּא lexically in the verb. Muraoka, in commenting on Jer 26:27–28, where the two Greek constructions occur in close sequence, judges that differentiating them semantically “sounds like pressing data into [a] strait jacket” (SSG §29ba(ii) note 5). Yet, G’s approach to translation is not the same as the translator of Greek Jeremiah. In general, G’s control of Greek tenses and moods shows that he understands the difference between the present and aorist stems, including with commands and prohibitions (see §6.1.1.4; cf. KG II §397.3; Smyth §§1840–1841; McKay, “Aspect,” 201–226). Furthermore, it makes sense that a command such as “do not be afraid” would most often use the present, since it pragmatically implies a current state of fear in the absence of context clues that would suggest otherwise (e.g., Josh 11:6 מַחְוַפָּבֵו ἀπὸ προσώπων αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ ἔριξαν τούτην τὴν ὀργὴν ἐγὼ παραδίδωμι τετραπομένους αὐτοῖς ἐναντίον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; for several other cases where a Septuagint translator uses the negated aorist subjunctive of φοβέω to point more to the future, see Num 21:34; Deut 3:2; Josh 10:8; 11:6). However, in specifically discussing φοβέω alongside other verbs of fear used in prohibitions, Muraoka cautions against
of the military threats elaborated in the preceding chapters. In response to this fear, G 
embraces the vivid metaphor of God as defender by translating the verbless clause "I [am] your shield" verbally as ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου ("I am shielding you from above"), a striking metaphor that imagines God holding a shield over Abraham’s head to pressing any aspectual difference: “From the aspectual opposition in μὴ φοβεσθε μηδὲ δειλιάσητε De 1.22 (actually 1.21) are we to conclude that the process of φοβέομαι had already set in, whilst that of δειλιάω had not? A survey of these fear-related lexemes points up a considerable variation which cannot be satisfactorily explained in terms of purely aspectual opposition and warns us against pressing such too far ... Did Greek authors and translators extend the feature of variatio to a purely morphosyntactic matter such as aspect?” (SSG §28ha(iii)). Yet, the use of stylistic variation—a literary device used to avoid the infelicities of repetition and redundancy—does not entail semantic indifference, even it does involve a certain degree of subjectivity, as noted by McKay: “... in many contexts the choice of aspect is relatively unimportant or is ultimately decided by a subjective judgment of what is appropriate, but this does not mean that aspectual differences are meaningless: we must judge the force of the different aspects from those contexts in which the choice is significant ...” (“Aspect,” 202–203). In the case of Deut 1:21 (as with another example Muraoka cites from Deut 31:6), it seems significant that the aorist subjunctive comes last, pointing to a specific future moment where bravery is required, such that a demanded sense of bravery (μὴ φοβεσθε) is hoped to produce an actual act of bravery (μηδὲ δειλιάσητε), an interpretation that fits the context. Also, this kind of aspectual advancement from present to aorist is very similar to the modal advancement from non-indicative to future indicative that was noted in analyzing G’s translation of sequences of weqatal forms in §6.1.1.3.

95 Reading the Hebrew, Genesis Rabbah 44.4 records several interpretations of Abraham’s fear and reward: (i) he feared he had killed an innocent man; (ii) he feared revenge; or (iii) he feared he had already received his full reward, i.e., military protection. 1QapGen XXII, 27–34 links Gen 15 to what precedes in a very different way (see note 23). Readers of the Greek, however, present a more consistently military interpretation: Josephus, A.J. 1.10.3 §183 interprets Abraham’s payment as owing to his success (ἐύπραγγελας) in the military conflict of Gen 14; John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 36.3 (PG 337.20–34) takes ῥήματα in 15:1 as referring to the dialogue after the preceding battle; and Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 66 explains that Abraham’s question in Gen 15:8 concerns the manner of conquest: πολέμου νῶμι δῆκα πολέμου ζώντων ἑκείων, ἀναιρουμένων, ἔξελαυνομένων. 

96 υπερασπίζω | In Genesis, the root μὲ only occurs here as a noun (μὲ) and in 14:20 as a verb. G does not use this rare verb or cognate forms outside of this verse. For noun => verb, see §5.1.1.1.

97 Symmachus is attributed with the reading ὑπερμάχομαι καθάπερ ὅπλον.

98 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 36.4 (PG 53 337.51–60) describes at length the emphasis (ἐμφασις) that this metaphor contributes to God’s comforting statement, making clear its emphasis with his own use of copious anaphora: Πολλὴν ἔχει καὶ αὐτὴ ἢ λέξις τὴν ἐμφασιν. ἔγὼ δ’ ἀπὸ τῶν Χαλδαίων σὲ ἀναστήσας, ἔγὼ δ’ ἐνταῦθα σε
protect him, a declaration that should calm Abraham’s fears. On the other hand, by translating רָכֶשׁ ("your pay/reward") as μισθός⁹⁹ ("pay"), God recognizes that Abraham, like a “mercenary” (μισθοφόρος), expects to be paid for his military service, and by supplying the future-tense copula ἔσται¹⁰⁰ ("it will be"), G has God explicitly defer this payment, subtly anticipating Abraham’s coming objection that his compensation is overdue.

Even as G interprets God’s introductory words as addressing both Abraham’s fear and his doubt, G particularly elaborates Abraham’s doubt by developing the strategic logic of his response. While G has Abraham acknowledge the asymmetrical power relationship between the two parties by translating the rare name יהוה ("Lord Yahweh") distinctively as δεσπότης¹⁰¹ ("master"),¹⁰² he also converts this mercenary-sovereign dynamic into a

---

⁹⁹ μισθός | G always translates רָכֶשׁ (7) and the cognate מִשְׂכֹּר (3) as μισθός and only uses μισθός for this root.
¹⁰⁰ ἔσται | For G’s addition of verbs in main clauses and its interpretive significance, see §3.2.2.1.
¹⁰¹ δεσπότης | The divine name יהוה יוצר only occurs twice in Genesis and only in this chapter. G translates it synthetically as δέσποτα in 15:2 but as δέσποτα κύριος in 15:8. G does not use δεσπότης otherwise.
¹⁰² LSJ, s.v. “δεσπότης.” The term δεσπότης is used to signal the superior party in a general sense as “master, owner” (A.II) or in a variety of analogically-related domains, e.g., household, nation, universe (A.I), and Abraham’s relationship to God has familial, political, and theological aspects. Philo, Her. 5–7 takes this use of δεσπότης to imply that Abraham is a δούλος/οἰκέτης, and T.Ab. also refers to God as Abraham’s δεσπότης (A 1:7) and to Abraham as God’s οἰκέτης (A 9:5), but this relationship may also be understood in a military context, since the archangel Michael, too, has God as his δεσπότης, but his role is ἀρχιστράτηγος (“head general”).
bargaining tactic, as the powerful party is also responsible for compensation. Then, by translating תְּרֵא ("I am going") quite radically as ἀπολύομαι ("I am released"), perhaps justifying this translation as a loosely metaphorical extension of תְּרֵא, G insinuates that Abraham is threatening to quit, cutting his losses by being released from service without full compensation: although he is still “childless” (ἄτεκνος), perhaps the son of his

103 Philo, Her. 22 recognizes the complexity of Abraham’s combined directness (θάρσος) and deference (ἐυλαβεία): Ἀλλὰ σκόπει πάλιν, ὅτι εὐλαβεία τὸ θαρρεῖν ἀνακέραται, τὸ μὲν γὰρ „τί μοι δώσεις;” θάρσος ἐμφαίνει, τὸ δὲ „δέσποτα” εὐλαβείαν. Philo describes Abraham’s questions in 15:2–3 as a case of παρρησία (“frank speech”) and εὐτολμία (“confidence”), which, if well-timed, are virtues in a subordinate (θυμιάματοι δὲ ἀρεται ἣ τε εὐτολμία καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ δέσποτα παρρησία πρὸς τοὺς ἀμείνους), and even a sign of friendship (Her. 5, 21). Furthermore, just as a slave is warranted in speaking openly when he has not wronged his master, so the servant of God may engage in παρρησία when he is free of sins (ἔτι ἀμαρτημάτων καθαρεύει) (Her. 5–6). Cf. Brayford, who says that Abraham follows this title expressing “deference” with words that “lack any sense of gratitude” (Genesis, 297).

104 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 36.4 (PG 53 338.14–19) takes Abraham’s words as a sign of his grief (ἔως τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἐδώνη) and dejection (ἀδυμίαν) at not having received his promised payment (μισθῶν), i.e., a son.

105 ἀπολύομαι | G’s use of ἀπολύομαι is unique as a translation of תְּרֵא in the qal (115) and is used for no other word in Genesis. Furthermore, it is quite rare in the Septuagint as a whole (Exod 33:11 [= דּוּש]; Num 20:29 [= מש]; Ps 33:1 [= שׁוֹר]).

106 The basic meaning of ἀπολύω—frequently passive—is release from any restraint or obligation, including specifically military service (LSJ, s.v. “ἀπολύω” C.1). Though it can be used in a metaphorical sense as a euphemism for death, i.e., release from life (C.112), the more tangible context of release from the binding relationship begun in 12:1–3 is likely in view, especially given the talk of pay (μισθῶν, 15:1), giving (δῶσεις, 15:2), and the ways that G subsequently enhances Abraham’s dialogue with God, to be discussed below. Although John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 36.4 (PG 53 338.20–27) understands this as “release from life,” he does not fail to comment upon Abraham’s philosophical manner of speech (ἐφιλοσόφης): Ὄρα πῶς ἐν προσῳλέωι ὁ δίκαιος ἐφιλοσόφη, ἀπόλυεις καλῶν τὴν ἐντεύθεν ἔξοδον. Οἱ γὰρ μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὴν ἀρετὴν μετιόντες, ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἐντεύθεν ζωῆς μεταστάσειν, ἀληθῶς ὅσπερ ἀπολύεις τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν ἀνίσταται. Καὶ γὰρ μετάθεσις τὴς ἔστι τοῖς ἐναρέτως βιοῦντι ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω, ἀπὸ τῆς προσκαίρου ἕως ἐπὶ τὴν δινήκη καὶ ἀβάνων καὶ πέρας οὐκ ἔχοντας. Ἐγώ δὲ, φησίν, ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος. John’s ever-positive evaluation of Abraham precludes the bartering interpretation given above, but he directly acknowledges that ἀπολύω really means “release.”

107 ἄτεκνος | The adjective תַּעַנ only occurs here in Genesis, and G’s translation ἄτεκνος suitably conveys the meaning of the Hebrew. Yet, by choosing a word built upon the root τεκ-, G directly echoes the earlier
homeborn maidservant Masek can fulfill the role of heir. Finally, G drives home the full force of this negotiation strategy by translating ἀπέτυχε ("behold") in the phrase ἦν λεί αὐτή νοῦς ὑμῖν ("Behold! You have not given me offspring") with the emphatic causal conjunction ἐπείδη ("since in fact"), which directly blames God for the diminished severance pay that Abraham is purportedly willing to accept.\(^\text{109}\)

Regardless of whether Abraham’s doubt is sincere or manipulative, G underscores God’s emphatic denial of this proposed settlement. First, he makes God’s objection in 15:4 decisive and direct by translating the particle ἔργα ("behold") temporally as εὐθὺς ("immediately")\(^\text{110}\) and by exchanging the impersonal δείκνυσι τὸν θεόν ("the word of Yahweh") for the palpable φωνή θεοῦ ("voice/utterance of God"), which clearly tells Abraham that his heir will not be this homeborn slave, “but he who will come forth from you” (ἀλλ’ ἐς

---

\(^\text{108}\) ἐπείδη | The translation of ἦν as ἐπείδη is singular. Elsewhere G interprets it as ὑμῖν (HALOT, s.v. “ἡ” 1) by selecting ὑμῖν (4: 3:22; 11:6; 19:34; 47:23) or in its Aramaic conditional sense (HALOT, s.v. “ἡ” 2) by choosing εἶ (4: 4:14; 27:37; 39:8; 44:8). Elsewhere, G uses ἐπεί (2) and ἐπείδη (5) to translate a variety of Hebrew constructions in a causal or temporal way.

\(^\text{109}\) John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 36.4 (PG 53 338.38–45) says that God rewards Abraham’s prior self-restraint, even though with the ἐπείδη clause he begins to speak boldly (παρθροσίζεται): Σκόπει μοι καὶ ἐντεύθεν τοῦ δικαίου τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς τούτους στρέφων ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ σου ἐδυσάμαστον, ἐδυσάμαστο βαρύ τι ἐφθέγξατο· ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν προτραπέεις ἐν τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν ῥημάτων, παρθροσίζεται πρὸς τὸν Δεσπότην, καὶ τῶν ἐνδοθεν λογισμῶν τὴν ταραχὴν κατάδηλον ποιεῖ, καὶ διέκνει τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τὸ έλθον· δι’ ὃ καὶ ταχείαις τὴν ιατρείαν ἐδέξατο.

\(^\text{110}\) εὐθὺς | G typically renders ἔτι as ἐσθοῦ (78/129) and only uses adverbial εὐθὺς for this form (cf. 24:45; 38:29).

\(^\text{111}\) Philo, Her. 66 says that God effectively cuts Abraham off (ἐπισπεύσας ... ἔφθασε τὸν λαλοῦντα): τότε καὶ ἐπισπεύσας ὃ θέδος ἔφθασε τὸν λαλοῦντα, τῆς ῥήσεως προσποστείλας ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν διδασκαλίαν. "εὐθὺς" γάρ φησι ... φωνή | G typically translates ὑμῖν (64) as ῥῆμα (46), only using φωνή again in 11:1. Otherwise φωνή (27) is G’s standard rendering of νῦν (23/25).
ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ). Finally, G presents God’s symbolic gesture toward the countless stars in the sky as an emphatic reassertion of the prior comparison of the numerous grains of sand on the shore (13:16), first by harmonizing the synonyms סנ (Gen 13) and מנה (Gen 15) in translation as (ἐξ)ἀριθμέω (“count”), and then by using the compound ἐξαριθμέω as an intensifying corrective\(^\text{113}\) of the preceding simplex in 15:5: ἀριθμήσων τοὺς ἀστέρας εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμήσαι αὐτοὺς (“Count the stars, if you can count them all”). In this way, G has God insinuate Abraham’s utter inability to conceive of the great extent of his progeny, which, in turn, implies God’s ability to do what he said he would do.

When Abraham’s direct expression of doubt is met by God’s direct reassurance, G brings these salary negotiations to a close with arguably his most famous transformation.

15:6

καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἄβραμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἠλογίσθη ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνην.

And Abram believed the Lord, and he (?) considered this as his righteousness.

While both versions have Abraham accepting on faith what God has just promised, the second clause has two possible interpretations in Hebrew that hinge on the interpretation of the subject of ἠλογίσθη as either Abraham or God.\(^\text{116}\) The main datum in favor of Abraham as

\(^{113}\) For G’s use of simplex followed by cognate compound as an intensifying corrective, see §5.2.2.5.

\(^{114}\) ἠλογίσθη | For active => passive, see §6.1.2.3.

\(^{115}\) δικαιοσύνη | The importance of this term for G was explored at length in relation to Noah (see §7.4.1).

the subject is an otherwise unmarked change in subject, but the association between God and righteousness in Neh 9:7–8 also supports this interpretation:\textsuperscript{117}

\textbf{Nehemiah 9:7–8}

\begin{quote}
אתה הוּה יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶחָד הָדַרְתָּ בַּאֲבָרֶם וַיִּמְצָא אֵלֶּה
לָבֹא נָאִם לְפָנָיו וַיִּמְרָה לָהֶם אַתָּה אֲרוֹן הַגֶּבֶרֶת הָאָדָם הַמְּצֻחַ וַיְקַלְּלָה הָאָדָם הַיֹּבֵל וַיֹּאמְרָה
לָתֵּן לֶרֶשׁ חָכְמָה אֶת דָּבָרָךְ בֶּן צֵדֵיק אֲתָה.
\end{quote}

However, G does not preserve this ambiguity in translation.\textsuperscript{118} If he had, then the two clauses could have been read as parallel with the second being understood epexegetically,
such that Abraham’s trust in God is tantamount to considering the promise as surety for its fulfillment, i.e., that God will act in accordance with his own righteousness. By rendering the active verb והשעה (“he (? considered”) passively as ἐλογίσθη (“it was considered”— unwittingly changing the course of history because of Paul’s later reception of this verse!— G closes this interpretive door and takes the two clauses as unambiguously contrastive, so that each party makes a concession: by believing God’s promise, Abraham accepts the delay of compensation; by accepting Abraham’s trust as a token of his justice, God qualifies Abraham proleptically as fit to receive his promised payment. Given the theological interpretation of this verse in the Pauline tradition and in subsequent Jewish-Christian polemics, it is easy to overlook the literary transformation entailed by G’s translation choice here: G converts the unilateral covenant of Gen 15 into a bilateral agreement by implying an ethical stipulation on Abraham, which God accepts as fulfilled on a provisional basis.119 That is what is meant by καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (“it was considered as his

119 G could also have captured this interpretation by keeping משח active in his translation (e.g., δὲ δὲς ἐλογίσατο αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην). Yet, this would be more invasive, requiring him at the very least to “supply” a subject for the verb, a type of addition that he does not typically make (§3.2). Furthermore, G likely would have used δὲ to mark the contrasting subjects, and he does not often use δὲ for the 1 of a wayyiqtol form (§4.1.1.3). Finally, if G had used the active ἐλογίσατο, he would also have translated its object as αὐτῷ or τούτῳ, which would refer loosely to the previous clause (Smyth §1253). This may be partly what G was trying to avoid by switching into the passive, since he recognized that no single word serves as the antecedent to the Hebrew pronominal suffix, but the nominal idea expressed by the clause as a whole.
justice”). For the remainder of this story, the plot will be driven by this idea, as Abraham’s receipt of the promise depends upon the progressive demonstration of this provisional appraisal of his just character.

In fact, G relates the following narrative of Gen 16 to this passage not only in terms of securing an heir, anticipated by the reassertion of the promise, but also as a first test of Abraham, anticipated by God’s provisional assessment of his character. With a variety of transformations in the opening of Gen 16, G explicates this episode’s fit into the larger plot in relation to these two ideas. In particular, G presents Sarah’s plan to procure a child for Abraham by Hagar as the logical attempt to realize God’s promise of a male heir in light of her perennial barrenness,120 and he portrays Abraham’s complicity in this plan and its horrific aftermath as a contraindication of both his faith and his justice.

**Genesis 16:1–6**

Greek text follows, transliterated in English:

120 For Philo, Sarah’s barrenness—and its reversal—means she has not yet reached moral perfection (*QG* III.20).
To begin with, G deploys an initial postpositive δέ\(^{121}\) ("now") for Hebrew י to begin a new episode and to reintroduce Sarah topically, as she has been largely absent since 12:10–20. Furthermore, by translating ההנה סל ("bore no children") with the imperfect\(^{122}\) as οὐκ ἔτικτεν ("could bear no children"), G aptly resumes the narrative thread that was initiated by Sarah’s introduction with another negated imperfect in 11:30: οὐκ ἔτεκνοποίει ("she could not produce children"). Ten years later (16:3), the situation had not changed. Moreover, with two translation choices in 16:2, G gives Sarah a medically-informed cause for her infertile condition and a person to blame: by translating the finite verb ῥύει ("prevent") as συγκλείω\(^{123}\) ("close up")\(^{124}\) and the bound infinitive μὴ μάλα ("from bearing children") with the

---

\(^{121}\) δέ | For G’s use of δέ to mark a boundary between episodes, see §4.1.1. Although it is not often given direct attention in this chapter, G’s frequent use of δέ to mark discourse boundaries of varying scope—but especially paragraphs and episodes—serves to elucidate the plot’s structure in a general but significant way. While no single occurrence is all that striking, the overall effect on the quality of the plot and the clarity of its structure should not be underestimated, since δέ in this use groups longer sequences of clauses together as a unit and separates them from neighboring textual units, which helps the reader observe the causal links between the lengthier literary blocks of the entire story as well as the internal narrative logic of each episode.

\(^{122}\) For qatal => imperfect indicative, see §6.1.1.5.

\(^{123}\) συγκλείω | G always renders ῥύει (3) as συγκλείω (cf. the parallel in 20:18) and uses συγκλείω nowhere else.

\(^{124}\) The “closed” womb is a concept native to Ancient Greek gynecology. In fact, Hippocrates, Steril. 1 cites misalignment of the uterus and closure of its orifice as the most common causes of infertility in women. The preferred term to describe this closure is συμμύω and cognates, though others are attested, e.g., ἀποπιέζω “close over with fat” (Nat. mul. 20.2; Steril. 229.2) and συμφύω “grow together” (Aristotle, Gen. an. 773a). Yet, the specific term συγκλείω, which shares the συν- prefix with συμμύω and συμφύω, is used by Hippocrates when he explains why Scythian women are not particularly fertile (Aër. 21.10). Of course, Sarah names God as the ultimate cause of her infertility, but this also accords with ancient medicine, since Hippocrates begins his treatise on gynecological health as follows: “it is the divine that is most responsible in human affairs” (μάλιστα μὲν τὸ θεῖον ἐν τοῖσιν αὐθρώποισιν ἀντίον εἶναι) (Nat. mul. 1.1–2). It is not clear, however, that συμμύω can be used with an explicit agent, and so G’s choice of συγκλείω may reflect the need to attribute this action to God. Both Aquila and Symmachus reject this use of συγκλείω, preferring rather ἐπέσχε(ν) and συνέσχε(ν), respectively.
genitive articular infinitive τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν125 (“so that I cannot bear children”), G has Sarah attribute her closed uterus to God, who did not simply allow but directly willed it to shut. G, in turn, makes this the explicit motivation for Sarah’s plan by translating the particle ΝΑ in the next clause causally as οὖν126 (“so”). Then, with two less subtle changes, he alters the logic of her plan.

First, by rendering the particle ‘Perhaps’ (“perhaps”) as ινα (“in order that”),129 G reveals that Sarah intends to provide a child for Abraham by Hagar and also believes her plan will succeed.130 Second, by altering the sense, voice, and person of the verb ἐμφάνει (“I will be built up”) from her. ... in order that you may produce a child by her.

—

125 τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν | G’s use of the present infinitive τίκτειν aptly conveys Sarah’s state of infertility and is analogous to the use of the imperfect ἔτικτεν in 16:1. For G’s choice of aspect in translating Hebrew infinitives construct with Greek infinitives, see §6.1.1.7. The closest parallel to G’s translation of [נ + infinitive construct] as [τοῦ μὴ + infinitive] is in 20:6 (ἐφεισάμην ἐγὼ σου τοῦ μὴ ἁμαρτεῖν σε εἰς ἐμέ), but there the governing verb permits a periphrastic interpretation of the genitive, whereas the construction here is more likely final. This fits G’s other uses of [τοῦ μὴ + infinitive], which express purpose or result, especially to translate [לבלתי + infinitive construct] (3:4:15; 19:21; 38:9; cf. 31:20; 47:29). Cf. Prestel and Schorsch, “Genesis,” 185.

126 οὖν | G’s rendering of the particle νο (12) as ινα (41) is unusual but not without parallel (cf. 12:13; 18:21; 40:8). For his treatment of νο in its various uses, including its frequent omission, see §3.1.5.1. Most often G introduces a causal idea with οὖν where none is explicitly present, either as a translation of ו (25), especially in ועתה (see §4.1.1.1), or as an element unrepresented in the Hebrew but supplied in translation (9) (see §3.2.3.1).

127 ινα | Only here does G translate νο as ινα, usually preferring a Greek form implying contingency of some kind: ἐὰν (6:18:24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32), μὴποτε (4:24:5, 39; 27:2; 43:12), or ἵπτως (32:20).

128 τεκνοποιήσῃς | G translates ἐμφάνει (16) as τεκνοποιέω once again in a parallel context (30:3), almost exclusively preferring the direct equivalent of οἰκοδομέω (13). For passive => active, see §6.1.2.3.

129 Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all rejected G’s interpretation and corrected ινα to εἰς ποτε.

130 “LXX-G makes it clear that Sarai’s plan will succeed” (Brayford, Genesis, 302). Of course, this requires Sarah’s knowledge of what God has promised Abraham. Though the Hebrew text does not state this explicitly, G seems to make this assumption, as do later readers. According to Josephus, Anti. 1.10.4 §§186–187, God told...
up”) with the rendering τεκνοποιήσῃς (“you may produce a child”), 131 G has Sarah remove herself from God’s plan for Abraham’s progeny. Finally, by correctly interpreting ἵνα ... λλ’ (“[he] listened to”) as ὑπήκουσεν 132 (“he obeyed”), G indicates Abraham’s complicity in Sarah’s plan, 133 even though listening to her voice means abandoning his prior faith in God’s voice (15:4).

In Hebrew and in Greek, Sarah’s plans do not have quite the effect she intended, but G modulates the way in which they go wrong in translation. According to the Hebrew text, Hagar interprets her pregnancy as a sign of her high status vis-à-vis Sarah in light of Sarah’s inability to conceive, as the clause ἡττήκελ λοιπὴν θέσεται (“and her mistress was as nothing in her sight”) in 16:14 implies Hagar’s contempt for Sara. Yet, by translating ἡττήκελ λοιπὴν θέσεται (“[she] was as nothing in her eyes”) passively as ἡτιμάσθη ... ἐναντίον αὐτῆς 134 (“she was/felt...”) without any interactive element, G tends to downplay Hagar’s reaction.


131 Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all rejected τεκνοποιήσῃς lexically and morphologically: while Aquila corrected it to οἰκοδομήθησομαί, which replicates the usual denotation of γίνεσθαι, Symmachus and Theodotion both preferred τεκνωθῆ.

132 ὑπήκουσεν | G usually translates ᾿ακούσῃ (64) neutrally as ᾿ακόω (45), but he does use ᾿υπακούω on several other occasions (4) as well as other cognate compounds (12). Otherwise G only uses ᾿υπακούω to translate פנוי in 41:40. In each case, however, ᾿υπακούω denotes “listen” in the sense of “obey.”

133 Philo, Prel. 68 makes a point out of the fact that Abraham did not just hear ᾿ακούων) but obeyed (ὠπακούων) Sarah’s instructions, although since Sarah represents wisdom, he interprets this obedience favorably: εὑρήκει ώπακούων ἀλλὰ ὑπακούων ἐσιάγηται. τὸ δὲ ἐστὶ τοῦ συναινεῖν καὶ πείθερεῖν εὐθύμοπλοταις δύναμιν.

134 ήτιμάσθη | Though ἰηρὸν occurs seven times in Genesis, there are no good parallels, the closest in reference to the floodwaters decreasing (1:8, 11). Outside Gen 16, G does not use ὕπαμαζω, although he does introduce the noun τιμή (“honor”) in reference to Abimelech’s restoration of Sarah’s honor in 20:16, a point to be discussed below. G uses τιμή (“price”) once again in 44:2 to translate ἐξαρέε. For active => passive, see §6.1.2.3.
dishonored before her”), G locates the problem in Sarah’s not Hagar’s mind: Hagar’s
pregnancy makes Sarah feel a sense of dishonor.135 This transformation, in turn, relates
to G’s adjustment to the accusation that Sarah brings against her husband, as if her dishonor
indicates that he has violated their marriage agreement.

16:5

May the wrong I have suffered be upon you. I stand wronged by you.

Though in some ways similar, these two idioms exhibit important differences. Technically,
the Hebrew formula חמסי עליך functions as an imprecation, and Sarah uses it to wish
retribution upon Abraham for causing or allowing Hagar to despise her mistress. With the
Greek construction ἀδικοῦμαι136 ἐκ σοῦ, however, which is a variant on a well-known
petitionary formula,137 G has Sarah make Abraham the cause as well as the object of her

135 Philo, Pref. 152 relates the dishonor Sarah feels to an excessive amount of honor given by Abraham to
Hagar (τὴν μὲν ὡς γαμετὴν ἔξετιμήσατε). In QG III.22, he finds significance in the passive voice of ἡτιμάσθη,
which attributes no blame to Hagar but merely states the facts.
136 ἀδικοῦμαι | G always translates the noun סתר (4) with the root ἀδικ-, but it is usually the noun ἀδικία (3). G
also uses the verb ἀδικέω in three other contexts to translate three different Hebrew verbs.
137 The petitionary formula [ἀδικοῦμαι υπὸ + alleged offender] is used to introduce the exposition of the case
116). The use of ἐκ instead of υπὸ is likely due to interference from Hebrew מִן, since Hebrew does not express
the agent by a prepositional phrase. In fact, G rarely uses υπὸ (14) and when he does, almost exclusively in a
spatial sense. G rarely uses υπὸ to express agency (26:29; 45:21, 27), and in each case υπὸ does not correspond
to a Hebrew preposition. Yet, this choice may be a subtle acknowledgment by Sarah that she was not directly
wronged by (ὑπὸ) Abraham but indirectly as a result of (ἐκ) his actions. Didymus, In Gen. 240 notes the
peculiarity of ἐκ σοῦ and interprets it either as ἀπὸ σοῦ or ἀφ’ σοῦ. For the latter possibility, cf. Philo, QG III 23.
The relational breach between Abraham and Sarah is also reminiscent of marriage contracts. The earliest
exemplum (and thus the closest to G’s translation) is P.Eleph. 1 (311/310 BC). While Hellenistic marriage
contracts typically provided a means for the contract’s dissolution, breaking the terms of the agreement
entailed consequences, especially for the husband, who was generally required to forfeit/return the dowry if he
complaint. Of course, this indictment primarily reflects Sarah’s subjective perspective, yet by translating Abraham’s command for Sarah to “do” (משפט) whatever she wants to Hagar as a standing order with the present imperative χράω (use), G establishes Abraham’s culpability for what she does next. What is more, as G renders נבש (and she dealt)

did not provide food, shelter, and clothing for his wife and remain faithful to her sexually. Regarding the latter, lines 8–12 of P.Eleph. 1 form a very nice comparandum to the situation of Gen 16:1–6: μὴ ἔξεστιν δὲ Ἦρακλείδης γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπεισάγεσθαι ἐφ’ ὑμῖν Δημητρίας μὴ δὲ τεκνοποιεῖθαι ἐξ ἄλλης γυναικὸς μηδὲ κακοτεχνεῖν μηδὲν παρευρέσει μηδὲμία Ἦρακλείδης εἰς Δημητρίαν· εἰάν δὲ τι ποῦν τούτων ἄλοσκεται Ἦρακλείδης καὶ ἐπεισεῖθι Δημητρία έναντίον ἄνδρων τριῶν, οὐδὲν ἄν δοκίμαζων ἀμφότεροι, ἀποδότω Ἦρακλείδης Δημητρίαι τὴν θέρφην ἥν προσηνέκατο (δραχμῶν) Ἀ, καὶ προσπαπετεσάτω ἄργυρου Ἀλεξανδρείου (δραχμῶν) Ἀ. While no dowry is returned in Gen 16 (but Hagar is!), the fact that Abraham has “produced children by another woman” (τεκνοποιεῖθαι ἐξ ἄλλης γυναικὸς) is a striking lexical link between these two texts. On Ptolemaic marriage contracts in general, see Sarah Pomeroy, “Some Married Women in the Papyri,” in Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra (New York: Schocken, 1984), 83–124; cf. Stephen Llewelyn, “Paul’s Advice on Marriage and the Changing Understanding of Marriage in Antiquity,” in NewDocs 6, §1 [pp. 1–17].

138 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 38.4 (PG 53 355.53–356.7) praises Abraham for the ineffable patience (τὴν ἀφατον μακροθυμίαν), respect (αἰδό), and forbearance (συγγνώμη) he shows to Sarah in her irrational accusation (τῆς ἀλλόγου ταύτης αἰτίας). He finds it irrational, because Sarah (i) personally gave Hagar to Abraham, (ii) told him to sleep with her, and (iii) encouraged the whole affair, while Abraham (iv) did not initiate the plan and (v) was not motivated by lust. Similarly, Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 68 says Sarah complained improperly (σῶκ ὅρθως).

139 χράω | Lexically, G rarely translates נַשֵּׁי (153) as χράομαι (4), and he only uses this verb in one other case as a translation of עַשׂי (12:16). Morphologically, G more often uses the aorist to translate Hebrew imperatives, but certain minimal pairs show that he understands the contextual significance of this choice (see §6.1.1.4; cf. note 94 above). G’s control over the aorist/present distinction with χράομαι is illustrated by the close parallel in 19:8, where Lot tells the men of Sodom that they may “use” (χρήσασθε) his daughters for the night. Cf. 34:31, where χράομαι is used again in a sexual context.
harshly”) as ἐκάκωσεν⁴⁰ (“she abused”).¹⁴¹ G makes it clear that neither Abraham nor Sarah have justice on their side in this disastrous family affair. Although the angel does tell Hagar to return in submission to her mistress (16:9), the favorable promise she receives on account of her abuse implies a censure of what Sarah and Abraham have done to her (10–12).

8.3.2 Middle and transformation (Gen 17–21)

Though originally unrelated, G interprets the covenant of Gen 17 (P) as a renewal and reassertion of the covenant of Gen 15 (E), particularly in relation to the events of Gen 16 (J and P, but esp. J). If God’s delay in fulfilling the promise in Gen 12–14 led to its formalization as a covenant in Gen 15, Abraham’s actions in Gen 16 contradicted his prior faith and his provisional assessment as virtuous (15:6). Yet, as the complication (δέσις) of the plot in Gen 15–16 has stemmed in large part from the ambiguity of the relationship

¹⁴⁰ ἐκάκωσεν | G only uses the verbs ταπεινώ (4) and κακώ (3) to translate ענה (5) and רע (11), typically matched in that order. The exact counts of equivalences, however, are complicated by the reconstruction in 15:3 [תלוש א وطني תרמש], which is based upon Deut 26:6. There are three plausible situations involving the order of these two verbs: (i) the order of the reconstruction may be correct, and (i.a) G translated the verbs in order or (ii.a) in reverse order, or (ii) the order of the reconstruction may be incorrect and G translated them in order. Since the textual, serial, and lexical data conflict, certainty is elusive, but situation i.a has been assumed here. What is certain in 16:6, however, is that G has translated ענה as if it were רע, which forms a new contrast with the subsequent translation of ענה in 16:9 as ταπεινώ. G portrays Sarah’s actions as harsh and the angel’s command to Hagar as a call for submission and not affliction.

¹⁴¹ Since Philo allegorizes Sarah as φρόνησις (wisdom) and virtue more broadly, he goes to great lengths to reinterpret ἐκάκωσεν in a positive way. We must pay attention not to the sound (τα τῦς φωνας) but to the true sense (τὰ δὲ υπονοιῶν σημαινόμενα) of the words: μὴ παραγώμεθα οὖν ταῖς φωναῖς, ἀλλὰ τὰ δὲ υπονοιῶν σημαινόμενα σκοπῶμεν καὶ λέγωμεν. So, he glosses ἐκάκωσεν as ἐνουθέτησε (“admonished”) and ἐσωφρόνισε (“chastened”) (Prel. 158; cf. 172), saying that it was the beneficial sort of abuse (ἡ ποια κάκωσις ὠφελιμόν) and actually a great good (μέγα ἄγαθόν) (Prel. 175. Cf. QG III.25). Similarly, Didymus, In Gen. 241 interprets κάκωσις as κατάργησις.
between God and Abraham, G presents Gen 17 as the story’s pivotal transformation (μετάβασις), where God clarifies in detail the nature of his covenant with Abraham, and each party recommits to fulfilling his part of the deal: Abraham must please God with his actions, and God will soon make good on the promise of progeny. After this watershed moment, the plot is concerned with the fulfillment of God’s promise, but especially the fact that the promise hinges on the ethical development of Abraham’s character. As Abraham progressively proves worthy of the promise, albeit with a minor setback in Gen 20 (rectified in Gen 21), God’s promise is gradually fulfilled, and the plot’s central tension is gradually resolved (λύσις), in anticipation of Abraham’s final testing in Gen 22 and the consummation of the promise enacted there.

In translating the covenant passage of Gen 17 from Hebrew into Greek, G contextualizes this important event in relation to the preceding events of the narrative sequence in several ways. To begin with, G’s treatment of three phrases in God’s opening statement presents it as an indictment of Abraham’s involvement in Sarah’s plan in Gen 16.

**Genesis 17:1**

First, by translating God’s self-identification as אל שדיא (“El Shaddai”) with the appellation ὁ θεός σου142 (“your god”), G forges a novel intertextual link to God’s self-disclosure in 15:7

---

142 ὁ θεός σου | G always translates אל שדיא as if it were a suffixed form of אלהים, but this is the first occurrence of this divine name in Genesis (6: ὁ θεός σου [17:1; 35:11]; ὁ θεός μου [28:3; 43:14; 48:3]; ὁ θεός ὁ ἐμός [49:25]).
(Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ θεός ...), thus linking the two covenant texts in a new way. Second, G disambiguates the implications of God’s command to Abraham: “walk before me and be complete” (הנהלך לפניрузים). The last mention of someone “walking” with God was in reference to Noah (6:9), but there it was stated as a fact, and so its use in a command here may be sufficient to signal God’s displeasure. Yet, by translating הנהלך (“walk”)

143 At one level, G’s chooses ὁ θεός σου/μου/ἐμός as a generic translation of the cryptic name אל שִׁדי. Yet, G’s particular choice is significant in light of the fact that he hardly ever uses these expressions for God elsewhere, no doubt due to the relative absence of suffixed forms of אלהים in Genesis (27:20; 43:24; cf. also אלהים translated as ὁ θεός μου in 30:23). Now, (i) given G’s attentiveness to the denotation of proper names in certain contexts (§5.2.2.1), (ii) his attunement to and interest in the exodus motifs in the patriarchal narratives (§8.3.1), and (iii) the significance of אלי שִׁדי in God’s self-disclosure to Moses in Exod 6:2–3, where God trades his old name אלהי אברם אל קטין בלא שִׁדי יש בהם מشهد (הנהלך לפני אלי שִׁדי), it seems that G finds the special importance of אל שִׁדי to be its connection between the personal God of the patriarchs and the national God of Israel, a connection that is also made by the even more famous self-disclosure formula of Deut 5:6 // Exod 20:2 (אֱלֹהִים ה' מֵאָרֶץ מִבֵּית עַבְדֵּי). Now, (i) given G’s attentiveness to the denotation of proper names in certain contexts (§5.2.2.1), (ii) his attunement to and interest in the exodus motifs in the patriarchal narratives (§8.3.1), and (iii) the significance of אל שִׁדי in God’s self-disclosure to Moses in Exod 6:2–3, where God trades his old name אלהי אברם אל קטין בלא שִׁדי יש בהם מشهد (הנהלך לפני אלי שִׁדי), it seems that G finds the special importance of אל שִׁדי to be its connection between the personal God of the patriarchs and the national God of Israel, a connection that is also made by the even more famous self-disclosure formula of Deut 5:6 // Exod 20:2 (אֱלֹהִים ה' מֵאָרֶץ מִבֵּית עַבְדֵּי), which is structurally and lexically similar to the one already seen in Gen 15:13–14. So, by translating אל שִׁדי consistently as ὁ θεός σου here as important, taking it a sign that Abraham is progressing toward moral perfection, since God is θεός to those who are being improved (θεός δὲ βελτιωμένων) but κύριος ὁ θεός to those who are perfect (τελειῶν δὲ ἀμφότερον, κύριος ὁ μοῦ καὶ θεός).

144 Implicitly accepting the ambiguity of Gen 17:1, traditions in Genesis Rabbah downplay Abraham’s imperfection, saying that he only lacked circumcision, his defect being akin to the stalk that simply has not been removed from a fig (46.1) or a woman who has one finger nail that is slightly too long (46.4).

145 Perhaps G found the difference between הנהלך (Noah) and הנהלך לפני (Abraham) to be significant. If the former is more personal and suggests a greater degree of parity, this could also support a comparatively less favorable evaluation of Abraham at this point in the story. However, one tradition in Genesis Rabbah takes the difference in the opposite way, such that Noah needed God to walk “with” him like one walks with a child, whereas Abraham’s walking “before” God suggests greater independence and maturity (30.10). Still, HALOT, s.v. “הנהלך” hithpael does not note any difference between the two collocations.

146 Though not finding fault with Abraham, Philo, Mut. 1–2 interprets Abraham’s age as 99 but almost 100 as symbolic of his progress (ἄφωσμα) toward perfection (τελείότης). Cf. Mut. 24; Josephus, A.J. 1.12.2 §214.
with the present imperative εὐαρέστει147 (“be pleasing”), G clearly indicates that God desires for Abraham to achieve the state of pleasing him. In addition, by translating the second command הויה תמים (“and be complete”) with the present imperative γίνου148 ἄμεμπτος149 (“become irreproachable”), G shows that God thinks Abraham has yet to achieve this state and is now open to reproach:150 similar to 15:1, where God told Abraham to stop living in fear of military threats, so here he reproaches him for the family disaster of the previous chapter, which resulted from his failure to trust God’s time and to act justly.

147 εὐαρέστει | G always uses εὐαρέστεω to translate בָּרָא in the hithpael (9) when it carries this technical sense (6: 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15), and he only uses εὐαρέστεω in one other case to translate רַשׁ (39:4). The use of the present tense of this contextual translation, however, stands out alongside the imperfect in 39:4 as the only non-aorist occurrences of εὐαρέστεω in Genesis. The imperfective aspect of the present and imperfect verb forms is meant to convey the stative nature of this verb’s usage in both contexts (see §6.1.1.4).

148 γίνου | Although the imperative of ἦν is rare (also in 12:2; 24:60), G’s use of the present imperative γίνου instead of the aorist γένομαι is striking, not only because he more commonly translates Hebrew imperatives with the aorist (see §6.1.1.4), but because of certain facts concerning the lexico-morphological relationship between γένομαι and εἴμι as translations of היה. G translates היה with γένομαι (155) roughly as often as εἴμι (150), and his choice usually corresponds with the tense he selects, as he nearly always uses γένομαι in the aorist (144/155) and rarely in the present (4: 17:1; 18:11, 18: 24:60), perfect (4: 3:22; 18:12; 32:10; 47:9), or imperfect (3: 15:17; 31:40; 38:9), tenses that are common with εἴμι. In sum, G’s use of the present imperative γίνου presents the command to Abraham to “become irreproachable” morphologically as a process and lexically as a process of achieving a state that Abraham has yet to attain. In terms of aspect, the process depicted by the present imperative γίνομαι is similar to the process (or state) conveyed by the present imperative μὴ φοβοῦ in Gen 15:1, which it was argued means “stop being afraid” (see note 94).

149 ἄμεμπτος | The Hebrew adjective תמים only occurs elsewhere in 6:9, where G translates it as τέλειος in reference to Noah. G does not use ἄμεμπτος otherwise. Though τέλειος and ἄμεμπτος both refer to an achieved state, the difference in polarity is significant, since the α-privative implies the prior removal of some form of reproach. Aquila preferred the positive term τέλειος, which does not allow the same interpretation.

150 Didymus, In Gen 250 compares God’s act of reproaching Abraham here to oiling an athlete for a competition (ἀλείψῃ δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς ἀγώνα), basically goading him on.
Yet, in spite of Abraham’s potential breach of covenant, God makes it clear that their agreement still stands. G encourages this interpretation in several ways. First, he translates the phrase ואתנה בריתי (“so that I will make my covenant”) in the apodosis of God’s opening statement as καὶ θησομαί τὴν διαθήκην μου (“and I will place my covenant”). What is remarkable here is that G does not usually use the simplex verb τίθημι in covenantal contexts close to the word διαθήκη. In fact, the only other place he does so is in 9:13, where God “places” the rainbow in the sky as “a sign of the covenant” (σημεῖον διαθήκης) he has already made with Noah (9:9).  

So, G likely conceived of the covenant interaction of Gen 17 as God expanding the Gen 15 covenant by adding the sign of circumcision (17:11), just as the covenantal sign follows the enactment of the covenant itself in God’s lengthy speech to Noah. In addition, the verb G normally uses to refer to the enactment of a covenant is διατίθημι, the same verb he used earlier in 15:18 (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ διέθετο κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ διαθήκην). Finally, while there are two first-person performatives in this chapter (17:5 τέθεικα; 17:20 εὐλάγηκα), neither refers to the enactment of the covenant itself. On the contrary, G uses the future of ἴστημι in each of God’s other statements about the covenant itself, as God promises to make it “stand” in the future, especially as he transfers the covenant to future generations.

151 G also uses the similar verb διδωμι in relation to the covenental sign of the rainbow in 9:12.
152 9:17; 15:18; 21:27, 32; 26:28; 31:34. G also has God use the future indicative στήσω in 6:18 to refer to the covenant he will make after the flood, and when that time comes he uses the present indicative ἀνίστημι as a performative to mark the covenant’s enactment.
153 When ἴστημι has διαθήκη as its object, G always inflects it as future. In 6:18 it refers to God’s future act of establishing a covenant with Noah after the flood, but it otherwise is best understood as a promise that he will
Furthermore, G clarifies that God not only intends to uphold his covenant with Abraham after the infractions of Gen 16, but that he is also ready to make good on the promise of progeny. He does this by using the Greek perfect indicative τέθεικα154 (“I hereby make”) in 17:5 to present the act of God changing Abram’s name to Abraham as a performative utterance that also makes him a father of many nations, a pragmatic force that is likely to be ascribed to the Hebrew דבר, as well.

Genesis 17:5

και εὖ κληθεσεται ετι τὸ δυναμ σοι Ἄβραμ, ἄλλ’ εσται τὸ δυναμ σοι Ἄβρααμ, ετι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν

By giving him a new name and pronouncing him a father of many nations, G has God move Abraham’s paternity from the future to the present: it is as good as done. Furthermore, by drawing attention to the performative nature of נתתי with the perfect tense τέθεικα, G signals that the transformation of Abraham’s name stands in as a metonymy for the transformation of his character and also the plot’s pivotal transformation as it moves from complication to resolution.155 This means, in contrast to Sarah’s plan, that no human

154 τέθεικα | For G’s use of the performative perfect, see §6.1.1.5.

155 Philo, Mut. 70 interprets Abraham’s change of name as a change of his character (ἡδῶν ἐπανόρθωσιν) (cf. 76; QG III.43, 53). Also, the consistent use of the name Ἄβρααμ after this point signals that he always proved worthy of the name, in contrast, e.g., to Israel who keeps being called Jacob (Mut. 83, 87). For a similar take on Sarah’s change of name, see Mut. 78. Origen, Hom. Gen. 3 (Doutreleau 114–143), also finds deep significance in the name change, claiming that God’s many oracles to Abraham do not all refer to the very same person (ad unum eundemque) (3.3 [Doutreleau 120]). He then interprets the concomitant sign of circumcision as circumcision of the heart, and thus a change of character. In this vein, Didymus, In Gen. 222
agency is required for the realization of God’s promise, a point that G later clarifies by harmonizing the name changes of Abraham and Sarah with each other.

**Genesis 17:15–16**

G has assimilated the renaming of 17:15 to that of 17:5 by passivizing the active *תקרא את שמה* (“you will call her name”) as *κληθήσεται* and supplying the future-tense copula *ἔσται* (“her name will be called”) and conforming 17:5 to 17:15 by translating the conjunction ו (“and”) as ἀλλὰ (“but”) on the model of כי (“but”). In addition, G makes the names themselves parallel in Greek in a way that they are not in Hebrew. While the change from אברם to אברהם involves the addition of a letter (ה), the change from שִׂרי to שִׂרה exchanges one letter (י) for another (ה). In Greek, however, both names double one letter, so that Αβραάμ has an extra alpha (α) and Σάρρα an extra rho (ρ). Finally, by translating ב (“son”) as τέκνον (“child”), G connects this awaited

---

156 *κληθήσεται* | For active => passive, see §6.1.2.3.
157 *ἔσται* | For G’s addition of verbs in main clauses and its interpretive significance, see §3.2.2.1.
158 ἀλλὰ | It is quite rare for G to translate ו (4,264) in a strongly adversative sense as ἀλλὰ (6: 17:5; [21:23]; 40:12; 45:1; 47:30; 48:19). As here, such cases involve negation in the preceding clause (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 61–63).
159 Philo, *Mut*. 61 notes that both names are changed in the same way by the addition of a character. It is worth noting that G’s translation of the names of Abraham and Sarah is entirely consistent, as is the Hebrew: before this point they are Ἄβραμ and Σάρα; afterwards they are Αβραάμ and Σάρρα.
160 τέκνον | In most cases G translates ב (383) as υἱός (327), but τέκνον is not rare (18). G also uses τέκνον to translate יֶלֶד (33:6, 7) and בֵּן (49:3). For G’s contextual translation of family terms, see Takamitsu Muraoka,
reversal of Sarah’s infertility to three significant narrative moments leading up to this point: Sarah’s initial infertility (οὐκ ἔτεκνοις) in 11:30; Abraham’s own identification as childless (ἄτεκνος) in 15:2; and Sarah’s plan for Abraham to produce a child (ἵνα τεκνοποιήσῃς) by Hagar in 16:2.\textsuperscript{161}

Then, when Abraham proposes Ishmael as his heir, G highlights this scene’s truly pivotal role in the plot in a third way, as he sharpens Ishmael’s exclusion from the covenant.

\textit{Genesis 17:20}

Then, when Abraham proposed Ishmael as his heir, \textit{G} highlights this scene’s truly pivotal role in the plot in a third way, as he sharpens Ishmael’s exclusion from the covenant.

\begin{quote}
First, by translating ῶβρ\textsuperscript{2} with a performative perfect εὐλόγημα\textsuperscript{162} (“I hereby bless”), \textit{G} has God effectively bring Ishmael’s blessing to a close, which, in contrast to Isaac, limits him to the promise of progeny and nothing more. Furthermore, by translating ἁγάνει ("princes") as ἔθνη\textsuperscript{163} (“nations”), \textit{G} downgrades Ishmael’s blessing by removing any regal connotations—in contrast, \textit{G} upgrades Abraham’s status in 23:6 by using βασιλεύς ("king") to translate the same noun ἁγάνει when it refers to him (see §8.3.3)—and he subsumes Ishmael’s blessing under God’s promise that all the nations (12:3 φυλαί; cf. 18:18 ἔθνη) would receive blessing through him.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{161} This harmonization is striking given the variety of Hebrew words: וָלָד (11:30), בֶּן (16:2), and בֵּן (17:16).

\textsuperscript{162} εὐλόγημα | For \textit{G}’s use of the performative perfect, see §6.1.1.5.

\textsuperscript{163} ἔθνη | Though infrequent, \textit{G} usually translates גוי (4) more directly as βασιλεύς (23:6) or ἄρχων (25:16; 34:2). Otherwise, ἔθνος is \textit{G}’s stereotyped translation of גוי (25), and he sometimes uses it to render פִּל (5/33).
But even as God explains his end of the covenant to Abraham in far greater detail than before, he also makes the implicit concession that perhaps Abraham did not have enough guidance to please him. In this lengthy speech, God explains exactly what he expects from Abraham, in particular the *sine qua non* of what he must do in order to be pleasing and become irreproachable before God, i.e. circumcise the males in his household. First, in relation to Abraham keeping the obligation to circumcise his male children, G translates the Hebrew verb "שָׁמַר" ("keep") with the compound form *διατηρέω*⁶⁴ ("observe carefully"), which connotes both scrupulous and intergenerational observance, as the prefix *δι* may be used both intensively and diachronically.⁶⁵ In addition to this, G emphasizes the importance of covenant observance by intensifying the figurative language that describes breaking this obligation, as demonstrated below.

**Genesis 17:14**

While the Hebrew expression "נבורת הנפשׁ ההוא" ("that person will be cut off") entails the exclusion of the individual from the community, G prefers to focus more directly on the violent connotations of "셜" ("cut"), translating it as *ἐξολεθρεύω*⁶⁶ ("destroy utterly"). In addition, the figurative interpretation of "פרר" ("break, invalidate") as *διασκεδάννυμι*⁶⁷ ("scatter to the winds") not only captures the gravity of such a breach of covenant, but it

---

⁶⁴ *διατηρέω* | G only uses *διατηρέω* (3) to translate "שָׁמַר" (16), but he more commonly uses *(δια)φυλάσσω* (10).

⁶⁵ Smyth §§1648; 1685.

⁶⁶ *ἐξολεθρεύω* | G only uses the intensive verb *ἐξολεθρεύω* here. For analogous uses of "רָכּ", also *niphal*, G uses *ἀποθάνει* (9:11) and *ἐκτρίβω* (41:36).

⁶⁷ *διασκεδάννυμι* | Both רָכּ and *διασκεδάννυμι* only occur here in Genesis.
also connects directly to the spatial language God previously used to describe his upholding of the covenant: he “places (it)” (τίθημι 17:2) and “makes (it) stand” (ἵστημι 17:7), provided that Abraham and his descendants do not “scatter it to the winds” (διασκεδάννυμι 17:14). It is relevant to this intensification that G marks Abraham’s obedience to this specific obligation by rendering the two passive verbs—המול (“be circumcised”) in 17:24 and נמלו (“were circumcised”) in 17:27—actively as περιέτεμεν168 (“he circumcised”),169 so that Abraham is more consistently credited with circumcising both himself (17:24; cf. 17:23) and all the males in his household (17:27). By his active and immediate obedience in this regard, Abraham signals that he is prepared to pursue a new life to match his new name.

According to G’s construal of Abraham’s story, Gen 17 serves as a fulcrum or pivot for the entire narrative, or as Aristotle would call it, the transitional moment of μετάβασις (“transformation”). With the translation choices he has made, G has tied the narrative knot sufficiently tight up to the present chapter in the story by way of δέσις (“complication”), complicating the covenantal relationship between the two main characters on account of Abraham’s flagging faith and God’s postponed promise. As a result of this chapter’s transformation, he now begins to disentangle it through a process of λύσις (“resolution”), resolving the relational tension between Abraham and God with more interpretive translation choices expressing various degrees of innovation vis-à-vis the Hebrew text. Yet in a way, G’s plot transformations in Gen 11–17 comprise the heavy lifting of his literary

168 περιέτεμεν | For passive => active, see §6.1.2.3.
169 This contrasts with the disputed interpretation of R. Levi in Genesis Rabbah 47.9 that the use of the niphal ל COPYING and not the qal ל COPYING in this passage is meant to convey that Abraham was already circumcised.
reworking of Abraham’s story. In particular, G has developed the complication of two related aspects of the plot, such that his reader now anticipates their resolution: God must give Abraham his promised heir, and Abraham must prove himself worthy of the covenantal promise. Though the first of these points receives its obvious fulfillment with the birth of Isaac (21:1–7), G fits the remaining episodes into the plot by focusing on the development of Abraham’s character, the final assessment of which comes in the ultimate test of Gen 22.

This resolution begins in Gen 18–19, which forms a complex episode with multiple subsections that progress logically in the Hebrew version. First, God appears to Abraham in the form of three men, and Abraham welcomes them with great hospitality to rest and dine at his home (18:1–8). Assuming that Sarah is inside the tent, God tells him that she will give birth the next year, but when Sarah is caught eavesdropping because she laughs at this news, she voices her doubt and is challenged by God (18:9–15). When Abraham sends them off, God decides to reveal his plan to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah (18:16–21). While two of the men proceed to Sodom, Abraham intercedes with God on behalf of any righteous people living there, lest they be swept away along with the wicked (18:22–33). Then the two divine emissaries arrive in Sodom and are welcomed by Lot into his house (19:1–3). Later on, the wicked men of Sodom ask to rape his guests, and Lot offers them his daughters instead, but the violent rabble threaten to break down his door, and he must be rescued by the visitors (19:4–11). Inside, Lot’s guests inform him that they have come to destroy the city, and they help Lot and his daughters escape to Zoar, though Lot’s wife is turned into a pillar of salt because she looks back during her flight (19:12–22). The next day, Abraham sees the massive destruction (19:23–29), while Lot takes up residence in a cave near Zoar,
where his daughters conspire to get him drunk in order to have children by him and continue their family line (19:30–38). In this sequence, G encourages an interpretation that focuses on Abraham’s progress toward virtue in relation to other characters: Abraham contrasts with Lot in terms of hospitality and justice, on the one hand, and with Sarah in terms of faith, on the other. Furthermore, with several transformations in God’s aside (18:16–21), G indicates that God approves of the changes that he observes in Abraham’s character in these regards.

G’s translation choices reflect and encourage such an interpretation of Gen 18–19 from the beginning. Even when God first appears to Abraham near his tent, G seeks to emphasize Abraham’s hospitality in several ways.\(^\text{171}\)

**Genesis 18:3–5**

\[
\text{18:3} \text{ καὶ εἴπεν Κύριε, εἰ ἂρα} \text{ εὐρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, μὴ παρέλθῃς} \text{ τὸν παιδά σου· 4
καὶ λημψήτω} \text{ ἄρα ὦδωρ, καὶ νυστάτωσα} \text{ τοὺς πόδας υμῶν, καὶ καταψύξατε} \text{ ὑπὸ} \text{ τὸ δένδρον· 5 καὶ λήψομαι ἄρτον, καὶ φάγεσθε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο} \text{ παρέλευσε} \text{ εἰς τὴν ὀδὸν υμῶν, οὐ εἶνεκεν ἐξεκλίνατε} \text{ πρὸς τὸν παιδά υμῶν.}
\]

To begin with, G casts Abraham’s speech in a deferential tone with his deft use of particles. By translating ἂν ἡν (“if in any way”)\(^\text{172}\) in Abraham’s initial request as εἰ ἂρα\(^\text{173}\) (“if...
indeed”), G implies that Abraham considers it unlikely that he has already found favor with
his Lord, thus having Abraham imply his social inferiority to his guests. Then, by
rendering the emphatic particle נא (“surely”) in the following verse as δή (“then, at
once”), an inferential particle that also implies emphatic confidence, G presents Abraham as
a host who is not only skilled but also poised to entertain his guests well. In a similar
way, G develops Abraham’s deferential attitude by having him intimate a double debt to his
guests. First, by rendering תخرى מעלי (“pass from”) as παρέλθωσιν (“pass by”), G conveys the
submission implied by the Hebrew, but later when Abraham refers to his guests’ acceptance
of this invitation, G translates the same verb with ἐκκλίνω (“bend away”), which now
implies a certain inconvenience for the travelers, who had to go out of their way to allow
Abraham the chance to display his hospitality. Yet, G shows that it was worth their while,
as he plays up the benefits they receive. In 18:4, he renders the second-person command
רבותי רגליכם (“wash your feet”) in the third person as νιψάτωσαν (“let

174 KG II §543.8–10; Smyth §2796; Denniston, The Greek Particles, 37–38.
175 δή | G only uses δή for נא here, but twice for ג׳ in parallel contexts (27:34, 38). In all three cases δή follows
an imperative. For G’s translation of נא in different constructions, including after imperatives (see §3.1.5.1).
176 KG II §500.4; Smyth §2846; Mayser, Grammatik, II.3.133–134 (§164.7); Denniston, The Greek Particles,
236–240.
177 παρέλθωσιν | The Hebrew verb עבר (qal) collocates with a range of prepositions in Genesis, this being the only
case of עבר מעלי or another abtalal preposition. Although G uses παρέχομαι/παραπορεύομαι to translate עבר
(qal) with relative frequency (7/20), only the usage in 32:31 is transitive like the present example. Also, this is
the only case in Genesis where G renders מילוי (31)—usually ἀπό (20)—with the definite article, see §3.3.1.1.
178 ἐκκλίνω | This is the only case in which G translates עבר (20) as ἐκκλίνω, which he also uses to translate
וסי (19:2, 3) and נסנה (38:16). The assimilation of this verse to 19:2–3 will be discussed below.
179 νιψάτωσαν | G rarely alters the person of an imperative in translation (2/302, also in 23:15) (see §6.1.2.1).
them wash your feet”), and so has Abraham offer for others to wash his guests’ feet, and he translates י 순간 (“relax”) more specifically as καταψύξατε (“cool off”), and so has him offer them shade from the noonday sun (18:1). Also, G multiplies Abraham’s offer of פאלחם (“a bite of bread”) by translating it in 18:5 simply as ἄρτον (“bread”), and he magnifies Abraham’s service by having him not “set” (נתן) their food before them but “wait on” (παρέθηκεν) them personally. Finally, when the guests are ready to depart in 18:16, G does not have Abraham simply “send them off” (לשׁלחם) but “escort them on their way” (συμπροπέμπων), so that he treats them like kings from start to finish.185

While the parallel opening of Gen 19, in which Lot welcomes two of these visitors into his home, already invites a comparative—or even contrastive—reading of the two scenes, G encourages a parallel but specifically contrastive reading such that Lot’s hospitality is viewed as a foil to Abraham’s.187 First, G compares the two scenes from the

180 The detail of the active voice is very important in T.Ab. When he receives the archangel Michael as a guest, Abraham also washes his feet (A 3:7–9; B 3:6–8) and recalls this prior occasion (A 6:6; B 6:12–13).

181 καταψύξατε | Both י 순간 and καταψύχω occur only here in Genesis.

182 The same may be true of מועים in 18:4, but י 순간 has conservatively been reconstructed as a minus in V.

183 παρέθηκεν | G only translates נתן (150) as παρατίθημι (5) here, a verb he typically uses for שׂים (48) in contexts involving hospitality (3:24; 43:31, 32), but once for יצג (30:38).

184 συμπροπέμπων | This echoes Abraham’s send-off from Egypt in 12:20 (see note 71 for translation details).

185 Philo, Migr. 173 takes συμπροπέμπων as a sign of Abraham’s virtue, apostrophizing ὁ παγκάλης ἐπαινισώτεως (“O, what great parity!”), although he interprets συν- such that Abraham is also being escorted on his way (καθ’ ἑν ὁ παραπέμπων παρεπέμπετο). He then uses Exod 23:20–21 to conclude that Abraham has not yet reached a state of moral perfection: ἔως μὲν γὰρ ὁ παραπέμπων, ἡγεμόνι τῆς ὀδοῦ χρὴται λόγῳ θείῳ.

186 For example, the visitors first decline Lot’s offer, preferring to spend the night in the town square (19:2), and Lot provides a relatively Spartan meal, i.e., wine and bread (19:3). Cf. Origen’s comparison in note 187.

187 Though he praises Lot’s hospitality, Philo, Abr. 211 says that Abraham and Lot are related by blood (γένει) but estranged by judgment (γνώμη): τοὺς γένει μὲν οἰκείους, γνώμη δ’ ἥλιοτρωμένους. Similarly, Josephus, A.J.
outset by translating the disparate time phrases (“in the heat of the day”) (18:1) and (“in the evening”) (19:1) in a parallel fashion with an adverbial genitive of time as μεσημβρίας ("at midday") and ἑσπέρας ("in the evening"). Second, he translates the verb in reference to the visitors’ “turning aside” to stay with Lot in 19:2–3 as ἐκκλίνω ("bend away"), the same way he handled the verb ἐκκλίνω ("cross") in 18:5. Yet, he also invites a contrast in several ways. For example, instead of upgrading (as with Abraham), he downgrades Lot’s offer of foot-washing, using the Greek middle νίψασθε ("wash [for yourselves]”) for the same second-person command, which indicates that the guests will do this themselves. Perhaps G translates the initial rejection of Lot’s hospitality לא (“No”) emphatically as οὐχί (“No way!”) due to this discrepancy in service. G also heightens the

1.11.3 §200 finds Lot’s hospitality simultaneously praiseworthy and derivative, since he learned it from Abraham (μαθητῆς τῆς Ἀβραὰμ χρηστὸτητος). Cf. Origen, Sel. Gen. (PG 116): ὁ ἐκεῖνος συγγενὴς καὶ μαθητὴς τῶν τρόπων. Origen begins Hom. Gen. 4.1 (Doutreleau 145–146) with a point by point comparison of Abraham’s superior and Lot’s inferior hospitality (Conferamus primo …) (4.1 [PG 12 183]), but this σύγκρισις shortly devolves into exegesis of Gen 18 alone: (i) Abraham receives three men, Lot two; (ii) Abraham receives his guests at noon in full sun (= revelation), Lot at evening; (iii) Abraham also receives the Lord, Lot just the two angels; (iv) Abraham also receives him who saves, Lot just those who destroy; (v) Abraham hastens to serve excellent food, Lot food that is inferior; (vi) Abraham’s guests stand above him [= submission], while Lot’s guests sit in the street.

188 μεσημβρίας | In its other occurrence, G translates חֹם as καῦμα (8:22) and otherwise only uses μεσημβρία to translate θερμή (42:16, 25).

189 ἑσπέρας | G typically translates ערב as ἑσπέρα (11/13) and does not use ἑσπέρα otherwise.

190 ἐκκλίνω | ἐκκλίνω (qal) occurs again in 49:19, but it is not a good parallel (49:10). For ἐκκλίνω, see note 178.

191 νιψάσθε | A comparison of the other two occurrences of νιψάσθε reveals the same distinction: in 49:24 Joseph’s servant brings water to wash (νιψάσθε) the brothers’ feet, but in 43:31 Joseph washes (νιψάμενος) his own face.

192 Differentiating νιψάστωσαν and νιψάσθε, Muraoka suggests that G intends “to underscore this host’s poor standard of hospitality” (“Translation Techniques,” 19; cf. Brayford, Genesis, 317).

193 οὐχί | Though G often translates-svg as οὐ (162/217), he reserves the emphatic form οὐχί for special cases and does not use it to translate other Hebrew words (6:18:15; 19:2; [23:14]; 40:8; 42:10, 12).
contrast by linking Lot with the men of Sodom, since both parties apply “coercion” (паραβιαζομαι) to achieve their goals (19:3, 9). To be sure, Lot “trying to force” (κατεβιαζετο) the messengers to lodge with him is less offensive than the men of Sodom “trying to force (contrary to nature)” (παρεβιαζοντο) Lot into handing over the visitors, but the bare association is not positive.

G also works the implicit contrast between Abraham and Sarah in order to imply his faith in the visitors’ news by embellishing her doubt and their harsh response. When Sarah overhears that she will soon give birth to a son (18:10), she laughs to herself:

194 As has been argued by G. B. Caird, the verb παραβιαζομαι is difficult to translate (especially in contrast to καταβιαζομαι), because παραβιαζομαι combines flaunting what a culture holds to be natural (παρά)—here, heterosexual relations—with the application of excessive force (βία): “The definition [of παραβιαζομαι] is overloaded, because it combines the literal and the metaphorical. One may use physical violence without being immoral, and one may do violence to one’s principles without the use of overt force. Plutarch (ii. 1097) uses the expression παραβιασμοι και κλαυσιγελωτες to denote unnatural and bitter-sweet pleasures, and for παραβιασμος LSJ gives: ‘forcing of nature or law’. The definition of the verb would appear to have been an elaboration of that of the noun …” (“Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II,” JTS 20 [1969]: 27).

195 κατεβιαζετο ... παρεβιαζοντο | In each of its occurrences, G translates רשות (3) with a different cognate (βίας in 33:11; καταβιαζομαι in 19:3; παραβιαζομαι in 19:9). G does not use these verbs otherwise. G’s use of the imperfect for both verbs aptly conveys the conative sense. For wayyiqtol => imperfect indicative (see §6.1.1.1).

196 Later (i.e., in 19:8), the phrase is reminiscent of Gen 16, and so G’s translation may indicate Lot’s mistake. Origen, Sel. Gen. (PG 116) takes Lot’s need to use force as a sign of his being inferior in hospitality to Abraham: Ἐπειδὴ μὴ τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ Λωτ ὁς ὁ Ἀβραάμ, διὰ τούτο, ὀκνοῦντες διελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν, βίας χρησαυτοῖς.

197 It is very interesting that Genesis Rabbah 48.17 cites the demonization of Sarah as one of the perversions of the text produced for King Ptolemy (according to tradition), although the evidence it cites is not reflected in G, i.e., a translation conveying that Sarah did not laugh בקרבה (to herself) but בקרוביה (to her relatives). Emanuel Tov says that “most interpreters” ascribe this tradition to the major differences in the translation of Gen 18:12 (“The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the ‘Alterations’ Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX,” JSФ 15 [1984]: 65–89).
Will I feel pleasure after I am worn out? Well, it certainly has not happened for me yet!

Apparently interpreting the infinitive construct "לעתי布莱יה (I am worn out)" as the homographic conjunction ("lest") and the noun "ידענה (pleasure)" as a form of the preposition "עד (until). G has substantially altered the meaning of Sarah's objection, transforming the laughable idea that a worn-out and post-menopausal woman would feel the delights of youth and conceive a child in her old age into the sarcastically ironic statement that "it certainly has not happened yet." To be sure, Sarah intends for this statement to imply her doubt, as when God (mis)quotes what she thinks as "האףlicalד (Will I really truly bear a child?)", the sarcasm of which G aptly captures by translating into "אֶרֶם גֵּה, a particle combination that carries a similar pragmatic force. Yet, even as G's

198 Aquila corrects G's interpretive rendering to μετὰ τὸ καταρτιβήναι, Symmachus to μετὰ τὸ παλαιωθήναι.
199 Aquila corrects this translation to τρυφερία, Symmachus to ἁκμή.
200 G's translation avoids the sexual connotations of the Hebrew (Prestel and Schorch, "Genesis," 188). Susan Brayford argues at length that—with this and other translation choices—"Gen [= G] transformed Sarah from a sexual Jewish matriarch into a shameful Hellenistic wife," ultimately a reflex of G's Hellenistic social ethics ("Taming and Shaming," 155). Her argument in chapter 4 (154–212) leans heavily on G's treatment of Eve (3:16, 20) and Sarah (12:12–13; 16:2; 18:10, 12; 20:4, 16) in relation to the men in their lives. While the concepts of honor and shame certainly influenced G's translation choices, the literary explanations given here account not only for G's avoidance of social improprieties but also his selections. Brayford's sole dependence upon social factors leaves her unable to explain, e.g., why G changes the person of אבנה in 16:2 (τεκνοποιήσῃς) but not in 30:3 (τεκνοποιήσουμαι), as she herself admits: "Gen, for some reason, not only allows Rachel to be the subject of the verb, but also emphasizes it with his retention of the emphatic (i.e.) unnecessary first person independent pronoun κἀγὼ for the Hebrew נַכְל ("Taming and Shaming," 194 note 423).
201 ἀρά γε | G uses this particle combination to express incredulity once again in 37:9 when Jacob questions Joseph's dream. In both cases, what the speaker questions seems impossible but actually happens. The Hebrew particle combination only shows up two other times in Genesis (18:23–24, in continuous speech). G translates the first as μή, which implies doubt with less emotional force, and leaves the second untranslated.
202 KG II §§508.12; 589.7; Denniston, The Greek Particles, 46–47, 50.
translation of Sarah’s own question implies her doubt in the way suggested by this misquotation, G’s clever translation also ironically203 presents an accurate description of the facts, one that situates the present episode within the larger plot sequence, as it implies to the reader that Isaac’s birth, which Sarah finds impossible, simply has not happened yet. G rounds out Sarah’s disbelief with his treatment of two other parts of the visitor’s response. First, by introducing the question הָיִם לָא מִלְכוּ הָ retal (“Is anything impossible for Yahweh?”) with μή,204 which anticipates a negative response, the question functions pragmatically as reproof of Sarah’s doubt of God’s power. Second, G confirms the visitor’s hostile attitude toward Sarah by translating his final objection לא צחקת (“No, you did laugh.”) with gusto as Οὐχὶ205 ἀλλὰ ἐγέλασας (“No! You did laugh.”).206 With this translation, G not only conveys the meaning of the Hebrew, but he also captures its intensity in a particularly Greek way, especially since G reserves this emphatic form of οὐ for special cases.

Before disclosing his plans to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, God speaks to himself in an aside, and here G makes several transformations to clarify that Abraham has passed

203 I will propose additional cases of ironic translation in the next chapter, which explores G’s enhancement of tragic aspects of the Joseph story in relation to Jeff Jay’s proposal that Hellenistic and Koine prose writers often composed “in the tragic mode” (The Tragic in Mark). The existence of more cases not only increases the likelihood that G was aware of ironic interpretative possibilities and even deliberately introduced them in translation.

204 μή | For G’s translation of the Hebrew question particle, see §3.1.5.2.

205 Οὐχὶ | See note 193.

206 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 41.7 (PG 53 384.4–8) understands this rebuke as coming from Abraham, which would significantly enhance the character foil: ἀλλ’ ὁ πατριάρχης φησὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν, Οὐχὶ, ἀλλὰ ἐγέλασας. Yet, while G retains the ambiguity of the Hebrew, the speaker is likely the visitor, because Abraham plays a mere supporting role in this scene and only speaks at the very outset (18:9).
this first test of his character. In particular, God is pleased by Abraham’s demonstration of hospitality and faith.

**Genesis 18:17–19**

To begin with, G presupposes God’s favorable disposition toward Abraham by using μή to introduce the Lord’s opening rhetorical question, since this implies that he should, in fact, tell Abraham his plan. Yet, with the following set of transformations, G seems to base this evaluation on Abraham’s demonstrations of hospitality and faith in the preceding episodes. First, G interprets God’s statement that Abraham will become a great and mighty nation as modulated not by certainty but by gradual progress, translating the collocation "will certainly be") as γινώμενος ἔσται\(^{207}\) (“will gradually become”), a very curious Greek formulation\(^{208}\) that clearly echoes God’s command in 17:1 that Abraham “become” (γίνου)

\(^{207}\) γινώμενος ἔσται | The use of a cognate participle with a finite verb is G’s most common translation of the Hebrew construction involving an infinitive absolute and cognate finite verb, one of several strategies he uses to maintain quantitative equivalence (see §6.1.1.8). While this particular combination is known for being unidiomatic Greek, the use of a participle of γίνομαι alongside a finite form of εἰμί is especially odd. The only Septuagintal parallel is in 3 Kgdms 13:32.

\(^{208}\) John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 42.3 (PG 54 388.39–43) discusses the curious expression γινώμενος ἔσται, claiming that it darkly expresses (αἰνίττεσθαι) what he understands as Abraham’s choice of virtue, submission to God’s instructions, and demonstration of his obedience: Οἶμαι δὲ καὶ ἐτερόν τι αἰνίττεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, Ἀβραὰμ δὲ γινώμενος ἔσται εἰς θένος μέγα καὶ πολὺ, ἀντὶ τοῦ. Σὺ μέν ὃ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐλέμονα, καὶ τοῖς εἰμίς προστάγμασι πειθόμενος, καὶ τὴν ὑπακοὴν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, εἰς θένος μέγα καὶ πολὺ γενήσῃ. John’s combined use of aorist (ἐλέμονας) and present participles (πειθόμενος, ἐπιδεικνύμενος) signals that Abraham’s virtue entails both past and ongoing commitment.
Irreproachable, a precondition of the promise. Additionally, G strengthens the intertextual link to God’s prior promises by translating עֶשְׂנִי (“mighty”—unique in Genesis here—as πολύ (“numerous”) (17:4–6; cf. 13:16; 15:5). Yet, G’s divergent interpretation of the reason God gives for his prediction is most significant:

For I have chosen him to instruct his sons … For I knew that he will instruct his sons …

While the technical use of the verb ידע (“choose”) here indicates God’s agency in selecting Abraham and in ensuring that he will carry out his covenantal obligations, G prefers the more typical sense of ידע (“know”), despite its unusual combination with a final clause (למען אישר). As a result, G’s translation ἦδειν γὰρ ὅτι (“for I knew that”) entails a different situation. Some recent development (i.e., Abraham’s hospitality and faith in 18:1–15), has confirmed what God already knew: God is confident that the covenant promises will come to fruition, because he sees that Abraham is on the right track. Finally, by translating the phrase כל אשר דבר עליה (“everything he has said about/on behalf of/to him”) personally as

---

209 While Aquila etymologizes עֶשְׂנִי as ὀστέινον, Symmachus interprets it as ἰσχυρόν.
210 For this usage, see HALOT s.v. “ידע” qal 7.a and the parallels listed there, i.e., Jer 1:5; Hos 13:5; Amos 3:2.
211 Wevers, Notes, 256–257; Harl, La Genèse, 176–177.
212 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 42.2 (PG 54 388.5–14) understands God’s claim as a great extension of Abraham’s virtue (Πολλὴ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἕπιτασις), since he will ensure his own and his progeny’s virtue.
213 HALOT; s.v. “לע.” IBHS §11.2.13. Nailing down the meaning of לע here is difficult, because it could mean “about” (HALOT 3; IBHS §11.2.13g), “for the benefit of” (HALOT 2; IBHS §11.2.13c), or even “to,” especially in late forms of Hebrew where לע was often used interchangeably with ל and ל (HALOT 6; IBHS §11.2.13g). If G took לע in this last sense, he had linguistic justification for his translation.
πάντα δὲ σὺ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς αὐτὸν (“everything he has said to him”), G directly alludes to God’s prior promises to Abraham.

In the remainder of Gen 18, Abraham reveals another dimension of his developing character: his just concern for God’s justice (δικαιοσύνη). God has privately expressed his confidence that Abraham will, inter alia, instruct his progeny ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν (“to exercise justice and judgment”) (18:19), but Abraham himself suggests this fact in his dialogue with God in 18:23–33, where he is concerned that God might unjustly destroy the “just” (δικαίος) alongside the “impious” (ἀσεβής). Given this chapter’s formulaic content, it is not surprising to find the word δικαίος showing up eight times here. Yet, in the following narrative of Lot’s rescue from Sodom’s destruction, G continues to expand the role of Lot as a character foil in order to bolster Abraham’s growing sense of justice. Moreover, by inserting the concept of justice into Gen 19, G explicates the relationship between these two passages: God rescues Lot because he “remembers” Abraham’s compassionate justice, not just his kinship with Lot (19:29).215 First, G characterizes the wicked men of Sodom in terms of justice by translating Lot’s command רֶכ לָאנַשׁי נַא לַתַעֲשׂוּ דְבָר (“Just don’t do anything to these men!”) in 19:8 as μόνον εἰς τοὺς ἀνδρας τούτους μη ποιήσητε μηδὲν ἄδικον216

214 πρὸς | G rarely translates the Hebrew preposition בּ as πρὸς (5), and the other cases are not parallel. The three other uses of [πρὸς + accusative] involvement movement and so are allative (18:5; 19:31; 30:28), and the use of [πρὸς + dative] in 28:9 has the sense “in addition to.”

215 Т.Аб. Б 6:13 implies this interpretation in having the visitor tell Abraham “I am on my way to protect your brother Lot from Sodom” (ὑπάγω τηρήσαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν Λῶτ ἀπὸ Σοδόμων).

216 μηδὲν ἄδικον | G’s contextual rendering of דבר (64) is unparalleled in Genesis, and ἄδικος is not used again. For other expansive translations, see §3.4.5.
(“Just don’t do anything unjust to these men!”). Yet, as Lot also offers for these wicked men to rape his own daughters, this request ironically portrays him in a negative light, too. Later on, G reinforces this new δικαιοσύνη link between Gen 18 and 19 by having Lot say that his rescue is a sign not of the visitors’ χάρις (“faithfulness”) but their δικαιοσύνη217 (“justice”) (19:19). In a similar way, while both Abraham and Lot speak of finding Ἰλ (“favor”) with their visitors (18:3; 19:19), G interprets this as χάρις (“favor”) for Abraham but ἔλεος218 (“pity”) for Lot.

In addition, G makes yet another lexical connection between these two chapters by the way that he translates the visitors’ warning to Lot that he might be destroyed because of the city’s sin.

Genesis 19:15

 Anastas λάβε τὴν γυναῖκα σου καὶ τὰς δύο θυγατέρας ἂς ἔχεις καὶ ἔξελθε ἵνα μὴ καὶ σὺ συναπόλη ταῖς ἀνομίαις τῆς πόλεως

217 δικαιοσύνη | More often G translates ῥῆ (12) as ἔλεος (6) or ἐλεημοσύνη (1), although the translation δικαιοσύνη (5) is not uncommon. Notoriously difficult to translate, the Hebrew term overlaps semantically with both Greek concepts, but ἔλεος often implies (at least rhetorically) a difference in status, the higher party showing mercy/pity to the lower one. For G’s widespread use of the root δικ-, see §5.2.2.6.

218 ἔλεος | Unlike the alternation between ἔλεος and δικαιοσύνη as equivalents for ῥῆ, G always translates Ἰλ (14) as χάρις except in this verse. G only uses ἔλεος (7) for these two terms.
By translating ספה ("destroy") with the compound συναπόλλυμι ("destroy along with") and fronting the emphatic subject גם אתה ("you as well") for extra emphasis, G reminds the reader of the comitative idea Abraham previously expressed in 18:23, that the righteous might be destroyed along with the wicked. Altogether, G uses these choices to contrast Abraham and Lot in terms of justice and to clarify Abraham’s just concern for God’s justice as the express cause for Lot’s deliverance. The end of Lot’s story, moreover, completes his role as a character foil with his ironic relation to the themes of land and progeny. In terms of land, he is afraid to “settle” (κατοικέω) in Segor and so merely “lives” (οἰχέω) in a cave (19:30), the ultimate resolution of having “set out” (ἀχετο) with his uncle (12:4); in terms of progeny, Lot’s only heirs are conceived incestuously with his own two daughters (19:31–38).

Just as I have argued with Gen 18–19, G focuses the complex narrative sequence of Gen 20–21 on Abraham’s ethical metamorphosis by means of his prior framing as well as

---

219 συναπόλλυμι | G has three translations of ספה (4): ἀπόλλυμι (1), συναπόλλυμι (2), and συμπαραλαμβάνω (1). Though the compound συναπόλλυμι only occurs in 18:23 and 19:15, G uses the simplex ἀπόλλυμι throughout this passage for שׁחת (7: 18:28+, 29, 30, 31, 32; 19:13), as well as to translate הרג in 20:4 and אבד in 35:4.

220 For G’s fronting of verbal arguments for emphasis, see §4.2.2.

221 Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 190.

222 While Origen, Hom. Gen. 5.1 (Doutreleau 162–167) claims Lot escaped only on account of his hospitality (ob hoc solum, quod domum suam patefecit hospitibus), he ultimately attributes the credit for Lot’s rescue more to Abraham than to Lot (magis ad honorem Abrahae, quam ad meritum pertinet Lot) (5.3 [Doutreleau 170]).

223 κατοικέω ... οἰχέω | G distinguishes between these two verbs in terms of permanence (see note 39 and §5.2.2.5). The impermanence of Lot’s final dwelling matches the impermanence of his initial departure (ἄχετο).
his active development of the plot, especially by contrasting Abraham with other characters.

In the first scene, G approves of Abimelech and condemns Abraham by presenting their actions as just and unjust, respectively.224 First, G extends the concept of justice into this passage by introducing Greek legal terminology. When God warns Abimelech in a dream that he will die for taking Sarah because she is בֵּית לֶבֶן (“possessed by a husband,” lit. “owned by an owner”), G locates her status in the Greek legal sphere by translating this as συνωκόρων ἀνδρὶ225 (“living with a man”).226 In a similar way, G’s repeated use of the technical term ἀποδίδωμι227 (“give back”) to render נָשָׁב (“return”) in 20:7 is reminiscent of the kinds of legal restitution envisioned by Ptolemaic petitions and also marriage contracts.228 What is more, G develops Abimelech’s legal innocence by changing the narrator’s testimony in 20:4 that he did not “approach” (רָע בָּא) Sarah into a claim that he did not “touch” (ἀπτω)229 her, which now harmonizes with God’s version of the story (20:6).

224 Origen, Hom. Gen. 6.3 (Doutreleau 192) justifies his allegory of this passage by saying that the plain sense of the text casts Abraham in a morally questionable light as a liar and a pimp: Abraham ... non solum mentitum esse Abimelech regi, sed et pudicitiam conjugis prodidisse.

225 συνωκόρων ἀνδρὶ | The verb בָּעַל and the cognate noun בָּעַל—apart from its usage in idioms (14:13; 37:19; 49:23)—only occur in this verse. Likewise, G only uses the verb συνοικέω here.

226 The Greek verb συνοικέω is used as a technical term for marriage in contracts (LSJ, s.v. “συνοικέω” A.I.2). In Hellenistic culture, both marriage and divorce are understood in terms of cohabitation.

227 ἀποδίδωμι | Most often G translates the hiphil and hophal of בָּשׂ (27) as ἀποστρέφω (11), but he also uses ἀποδίδωμι (6) and ἀποκαθίστημι (4) with some frequency. In reverse, G more often uses ἀποδίδωμι as a translation of מָכָה (9), but also נתן (2) and יָבִי (1).

228 Recall ἀποδότα from the marriage contract of P.Eleph. 1 (see note 137 above). In petitions, however, the verb ἀποδίδωμι is commonly used near the end where the demands are made for “restitution” (DiBittono, “Frammenti di petizioni,” 119–136). For an early example, see P.Cair.Zen II 59145.9–16 (256 BC): δέομαι οὖν σου, εἰ καὶ σοι δοκεῖ, ἐλεησά με γράφας Λεοντίσκωι τῷ ἀρχιφυλακίτῃ ἐπισκεψάμενον τὴν λείαν ἀποδώναι.

229 ἀπτω | Other than this case, G always translates בָּשׂ (5) directly as ἐγγίζω (4). Similarly, G only uses the verb ἀπτω as a translation of מָכָה (8) elsewhere (5).
Most palpably, G draws attention to Abimelech’s just actions with his translation of Abimelech’s response to God’s warning.

**Genesis 20:4–5**

By translating וַיְהֵרָג ("and with innocence in my hands") as καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνη χειρῶν ("and with justice of hands"), G converts Abimelech’s innocence into virtue. But what is more, with a rare expansive translation in which G represents גוי גם צדיק ("a truly righteous nation") as ἐθνὸς ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δικαιὸν ("an unwitting and just nation"), he justifies Abimelech’s actions on the explicit grounds that Abimelech acted in ignorance. In addition, by rendering תָּהֵר ("will you kill ... ?") as ἀπολέεις ("will you destroy ... ?"), G echoes Abraham’s debate with God about Sodom, so that it is Abimelech who now assumes the role of just defender of the innocent. Later when Abimelech asks Abraham to defend his act of deception, G confirms Abimelech’s innocence another way.

**Genesis 20:9**

And how have I sinned against you ...? We have in no way sinned against you, have we ...?

First, by introducing the question with μή, G indicates that Abimelech expects a negative response from Abraham, thus implying his own innocence and Abraham’s guilt. Also, by transforming the question particle מה ("what") into the indefinite pronoun τι ("anything" or anything else), G introduces an expansive interpretation of Abimelech’s position.

---

230 δικαιοσύνη | The Hebrew noun ניקיון only occurs here in Genesis. For G’s uses of δικ-, see §5.2.2.6.

231 For other cases of uncommon substantive additions by G, see §3.2.8.

232 ἀπολέεις | G only translates ἀπολέεις (17) as ἀπολλυμι, elsewhere using ἀποκτείνω (16). For G’s use of (συν)ἀπολλυμι, see note 219.
“at all”), G constructs Abimelech’s defensive rebuke of Abraham as a more explicit self- absolution from any misdeed.

Also, G’s portrayal of Abimelech as the just party in this affair contrasts with his depiction of Abraham’s actions and motivations. Most importantly, G translates Abraham’s excuse for his deceit in such a way as to suggest that Abraham acted on prejudice and self-interest.

**Genesis 20:11–13**

First, in translating Abraham’s unsubstantiated assumption that the people of Gerar were godless, G represents יראת אלהים (“fear of God”) as an absence of θεοσέβεια (“piety”), thus creating resonance with the binary opposition of δίκαιος (“just”) and ἀσεβής (“impious”) that was central to Abraham’s defense of Sodom in Gen 18. In addition, G has Abraham admit the subjective nature of his prejudice by translating רק (“surely”) as ἄρα ("it seems").

---


234 θεοσέβεια | Neither the phrase יראת אלהים nor the compound θεοσέβεια occur again in Genesis. For G’s use of synthetic translation resulting from Greek compounding, see §3.3.2.3.

235 ἄρα | G usually translates רק (11) according to its restrictive sense as πλήν (2), μόνος (2) or χωρίς (2). For references, see §7.4.1 note 89. On the subject of G’s use of the particle ἄρα, see note 173.
Then, by connecting the next clause with τε\(^{236}\) (“and so”) and fronting the emphatic pronoun ἐμέ\(^{237}\) (“me”), he gives prominence to the fact that Abraham’s prejudice led to acting out of cowardly self-interest. Furthermore, G acknowledges the pathetic and unpersuasive nature of Abraham’s second excuse, first by translating וגו ("and yet") as καὶ γάρ\(^{238}\) (“and actually”), and then by infusing irony into his gesture toward Sarah’s complicity in the con, a sign not of her דבש (“loyalty”) but her δικαιοσύνη\(^{239}\) (“justice”). Finally, when Abimelech makes restitution to Abraham, G certifies Abimelech as the innocent party by the manner in which he translates what Abimelech says to Sarah.

**Genesis 20:16**

τασσόμενος 20:16 τῇ δὲ Σάφρᾳ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ δέδοκα χίλια δίδραχμα τῷ ἁδελφῷ σου· ταῦτα ἔσται σοι εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ προσώπου σου καὶ πάσας ταῖς μετὰ σοῦ· καὶ πάντα ἀλήθευσον.

First, G interprets the money that Abimelech gives to Abraham as specifically meant to restore Sarah’s “honor” (τιμὴ), translating כְּסוּת עָינֵי (“covering of eyes”) as εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ προσώπου σου (“for the honor of your face”). If Sarah’s marital relationship to Abraham had been compromised, dishonor would have resulted.\(^{241}\) Second, while Abimelech emphasizes

\(^{236}\) τε | G rarely uses the Greek particle τε, usually where it has no quantitative equivalent in Hebrew (9) (cf. §3.2.3), but sometimes as a translation of 1 (5) (cf. §4.1.1.4).

\(^{237}\) ἐμέ | For G’s fronting verbal arguments for pragmatic emphasis, see §4.1.2.3 and §4.2.2.

\(^{238}\) καὶ γάρ | G uses the particle combination καὶ γάρ on three other occasions (9:5; 16:13; 35:16). Since G frequently omits ג ו in the presence of another conjunction, it is significant that he represents it as γάρ here (cf. §4.1.1).

\(^{239}\) δικαιοσύνη | For G’s treatment of דבש and his use of δικαιοσύνη, see note 217.

\(^{240}\) τιμὴ | The Hebrew noun תָּמִי only occurs here in Genesis, and G’s only other use of τιμὴ is in the sense of “price” (44:2), a contextual translation of＄כֶסֶף.

\(^{241}\) Pomeroy, “Married Women,” 95–98.
Sarah’s innocence by saying וַאֲתָךְ כָּל נְכַחַת (“and you are entirely vindicated”), G renders this as καὶ πάντα ἀλήθευσον242 (“and tell the whole truth”), which either means that she is to corroborate that Abimelech did not touch her243 or that she is not to tell such half-truths in the future. In either case, G’s translation focuses on not Sarah’s but Abimelech’s innocence.

Fortunately for Abraham, this is not the end of his story with Abimelech, and yet the resolution to the narrative tension that G has developed in Gen 20 is postponed—with a felicitous dramatic effect!—by the interruption of 21:1–21,244 which tells of the birth, circumcision, and weaning of Isaac and the consequent expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael. In contrast to Hagar’s flight in Gen 16, where (I have argued) Abraham’s complicity in Sarah’s spiteful abuse drew God’s compassion on Hagar and his censure of Abraham, G’s translation choices in this scene serve to illustrate Abraham’s compassionate justice towards Hagar and Ishmael in sharp contrast to Sarah’s hatred for them. For the most part, G sticks

---

242 ἀλήθευσον | The niphal of והי only occurs here in Genesis. The hiphil occurs more frequently (5), and G renders it as ἀλέγχω (3) and ὡτομᾶξ (2). Elsewhere G only uses ἀληθεύω once as a synthetic translation of בָּאָבָק הָז, but the equivalence between ἀληθ- and וָה (6) is nearly consistent (cf. 24:49).

243 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 45.5 (PG 54 420.32–37) takes this interpretation: Τί ἐστι, Πάντα ἀλήθευσον; Πάντες, φησί, παρὰ σοῦ μανθανέτωσαν, ὅτι οὐδὲν γέγονε παρ’ ἐμοῦ παράνομον, ὅτι ἀνέπαφος ἐξῆλθες ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τῆς ἐμῆς. Δίδαξον, φησί, τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν σὸν, ὅτι ἀθώος εἰμὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας· μανθανέτω παρὰ σοῦ, ὥς οὐδὲν εἰργασται μοι. It is a curious fact that G’s wording here (i.e., πάντα ἀλήθευσον) is nearly identical to the first part of a line from Batrachomyomachia, where the meaning is very similar: Ξεῖνε τις εἰ; πόθεν ἤλθες ἐπ’ ἱόνας; τις ὁ φύσας; // πάντα δ’ ἀλήθευσον, μὴ ψευδόμενον σε νοήσῃ (13–14). It seems unlikely that this Alexandrian translator copied the phrase πάντα ἀλήθευσον directly from the roughly contemporaneous epic satire—even if he knew it—especially since he does not have δ’, which serves to prevent hiatus (KG I §§46–49; 53; Smyth §§46–47; 70–75). Rather, it is more likely that it was in the common phrase-book of the two writers.

244 It will be argued directly in §8 that G finds meaning in such narrative interruptions based on his view of the role that the story of Judah and Tamar plays within the context of the Joseph narrative as a whole.
close to his source, but in several ways he encourages the reader to view Abraham and Sarah in opposing lights. The first relates to what Sarah sees Ishmael and Isaac doing, or what exactly it is that sparks her ire in this scene.

**Genesis 21:9**

Genesis 21:9  ίδοὺ δὲ Σάρρα τὸν ὑιὸν Ἄγαρ τῆς Ἀιγυπτίας, δὲ ἐγένετο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, παίζοντα μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ ὑιοῦ αὐτῆς, ...

In translating what Sarah sees, G departs substantially from his source. While the Hebrew version has Ishmael either “mocking” or “molesting” (נָחַשֵׁנ) Isaac,²⁴⁵ G interprets this action quite neutrally as “playing with”²⁴⁶ (παίζω μετά), reading ἐν (DDOM) as ἐν (PREP). This alteration has the effect of making Sarah’s desire to cast Hagar and Ishmael out of their household seem exceedingly harsh, since it supposedly stems not from retributive justice but jealousy and spite.²⁴⁸ Furthermore, it makes sense of several facts, such as why

²⁴⁵ HALOT, s.v. “נים” gives two senses for the piel: (1) “joke” or “make fun of” and (2) “fondle.”
²⁴⁶ LSJ, s.v. “παίζω, ἐμπαίζω.” While παίζω can move from “playing” (A.1.3) to “jesting” or even “mockery” (A.2.3), the collocation with the preposition μετά rules out the latter sense. Furthermore, had G intended to convey such a sense, he could have used the compound, as in 39:14, 17.
²⁴⁷ παίζειν | The piel of נוח occurs five times in Genesis, and G renders it as παίζω (21:9; 26:8), ἐμπαίζω (39:14, 17), and γελοιάζω (19:14). G does not use (ἐμ)παίζω otherwise.
²⁴⁸ Accordingly, readers of the Greek assume that Ishmael committed no crime. Josephus, A.J. 1.12.3 §§215 rationalizes Sarah’s actions on the basis of her supposed prediction that Ishmael would try to assert himself as heir over his younger brother after their father’s death: οὐκ ἔχων παρατρέφεσθαι τοῦ τὸν Ἰσμαήλλον ἄντα πρεσβύτερον καὶ κακουργεῖν δυνάμενον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπολουνόντος. Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 7.3 (Doutreleau 202), in his Paul-inspired allegorical interpretation that Ishmael (flesh) was pulling Isaac (promise) away from virtue (cf. Gal 4:21–5:1), also assumes Ishmael’s innocence: Et tamen secundum ea quae scripta sunt, non video qui moverit Sarram, ut filium ancillae juberet expelli. Ludebat cum filio suo Isaac. Quid laesaret, aut quid nocuerat, si ludebat? Quasi non hoc in aetate illa etiam gratum esse debuerit, quod luderet filius ancillae cum filio liberae. Also reading Gen 21 in light of Paul, Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Pent.* 136 is forced to explain this “play” as a game of chase (δίωξις), i.e., persecution (Δίωξις δὲ, ὁμαί που, τῆς παιδιᾶς ἵν o τρόπος),
Abraham furnishes Hagar and Ishmael with adequate supplies (21:14) and why God tells Abraham to go along with Sarah’s plan (21:12–13). In fact, G differentiates lexically here between God’s command that Abraham “listen” (ἀκούε) to Sarah (21:12) and his prior “obeying” (ὑπήκουσεν) her voice (16:2). Moreover, G’s translation of רעש בעיני (“displease”) in 21:11–12 as σκληρὸν φαίνεσθαι/έναι (“seem/be cruel”), corroborates this view, which signals Abraham’s disapproval of Sarah’s unfounded punishment of Hagar and Ishmael.250

With this small set of changes that portray Sarah as cruel and Abraham as compassionate, G shows that Abraham is, in fact, progressing toward virtue, as he takes another step on the path from the renewed covenant of Gen 17 to the final test of Gen 22. Sarah, however, remains in the role of cruel mistress and jealous wife/mother.

After this scene, the action returns to Abraham and Abimelech, and G interprets this second interaction as a kind of do-over for Abraham, who now acts justly toward Abimelech

and when Sarah saw Ishmael chasing Isaac, she grew upset. In sharp contrast, Genesis Rabbah 53.11 takes מְצַף unambiguously as an offense, albeit one of several possible types: (i) sexual misconduct; (ii) idolatry; (iii) murder; or (iv) pretension towards the inheritance.

249 σκληρὸν | The qal of רעש occurs five times in Genesis, and G uses three different periphrastic renderings: σκληρὸν φαίνεσθαι/έναι (21:11, 12), πονηρὸν φαίνεσθαι (35:22; 38:10), and βαρὺ φαίνεσθαι (48:17). Since רעש has a very general signification, G adapts each Greek usage to fit the context. While σκληρὸς (“cruel, harsh”) does not suit these other contexts, G does use the term σκληρὸς elsewhere in reference to Joseph’s feigned harsh speech to his brothers (42:7, 30 [= νῆσῃ]); the cruel treatment Joseph received from his brothers (45:5 [= νῆσῃ]); and with Reuben (49:3+ [= νῆσῃ]), presumably concerning the defilement of his father’s bed (35:22; cf. 49:4). The verb σκληρύνω is also used for Simeon and Levi and their cruel slaughter of the men of Shechem (49:7; cf. 34:25–31).

250 Josephus, A.f. 1.12.3 §216 says that Abraham found Sarah’s suggestion quite savage (ὤμοτατον), i.e., to cast out mother and child in a helpless state: πάντων ὀμοτατον ἡγούμενος εἶναι παιδά νήσιον καὶ γυναῖκα ἄπορον τῶν ἀναγκαῖον ἐσπέμπεν. Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 73 also says Abraham found this exceedingly savage (ὤμον ἄγαν), which is why he did not heed it without God’s endorsement (οὐχ ὑπήκουσέ· τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ...).
by striking a covenant of mutual benefit. When he sees that God is on Abraham’s side (21:22), Abimelech asks Abraham to swear an oath, although the content is a little different in translation.

**Genesis 21:23**

In Hebrew, Abimelech asks Abraham to swear not to “act deceitfully” (תשׁקר), but G recasts this in the familiar terms of “justice,” translating it as ἀδικήσειν (251) (“to commit injustice”). In addition, while Abimelech characterizes his previous treatment of Abraham as ḥasad ("loyalty") in Hebrew, G interprets this as δικαιοσύνη (252) ("justice"), sealing the contrast by translating the clausal-ι between these two elements adversatively as ἀλλά (253) ("but"). When Abraham and Abimelech peaceably settle their dispute over wells by making a covenant, it seems that, for the first time in his story, Abraham is on equitable terms with the surrounding political powers. Moreover, the close connection of oath and covenant prefigures what follows, where Abraham passes the final test, sealing God’s oath that the covenantal promise will be fulfilled.

---

251 ἀδικήσειν | The Hebrew verb רַסִּיף only occurs here in Genesis. For G’s use of ἀδικεώ, see note 136. The future infinitive is exceedingly rare in G. In fact, the only other place he uses it is in the phrase μή ποιήσειν μεθ’ ἡμῶν κακόν (26:29), which is part of the oath between Abimelech and Isaac that directly refers to this earlier situation (cf. §6.1.1.2). Soisalon-Soininen only counts 11 in the entire LXX and notes their frequent use after ἀνομία and other verbs of speech/thought (Infinitive, 150–151).

252 δικαιοσύνη | On רְשִׁי and δικαιοσύνη, see note 217.

253 ἀλλά | On ι translated as ἀλλά, see note 158.
8.3.3 End and final resolution (Gen 22:1–25:11)

If G has explicated the plot structure of Abraham’s story such that its initial scenes complicate Abraham’s character and God’s promise (δέσις) and such that Gen 17 marks a pivotal transformation (μετάβασις) that initiates the resolution of this narrative and relational tension (λύσις), then Gen 22 is the climactic fulfillment of this resolution, with Gen 23–24 serving as a kind of denouement or epilogue. Having progressed toward the justice provisionally ascribed to him on the basis of his faith in 15:6, Abraham now faces a final and harrowing test:254 God asks him to sacrifice his promised son Isaac. When Abraham passes this test, God spares Isaac and seals their covenant with an oath (Gen 22). Afterwards, Sarah dies and Abraham purchases a plot of land for her burial, thus obtaining a foretaste of the promise of land (Gen 23), and then Abraham secures a wife from his homeland for his son Isaac, thus ensuring the promise of progeny (Gen 24). With these original threads having being tied up, the story comes to a close with Abraham’s death and burial alongside Sarah (25:7–11). While G has little work to do in order for these scenes to find their logical place in the larger plot, he makes strategic translation choices to situate

---

254 Jubilees shares the idea that Gen 22 is the last of a series of tests (see Jub 17:15–18; 19:3–4, 8). Philo, Migr. 139–140 conceives of Abraham’s testing in Gen 22 as the final perfection of his moral character. Symmachus, by translating נאש as ἐδόξαζεν (“he began to bring glory/honor to”) instead of G’s ἐπείραζεν, signals the major role of this episode in the whole plot. As Marguerite Harl has noted, however, the reception of the Hebrew and Greek versions later diverges in reference to who is tested, i.e., Abraham or Isaac: “Dans la tradition juive de l’Aqéda, la scène de Genèse 22 est centrée sur la figure d’Isaac: c’est lui qui est mis à l’épreuve, lui qui montre son courage et sa foi. La tradition chrétienne mettra plutôt l’accent sur Abraham: Abraham est mis à l’épreuve et montre son courage et sa foi” (“La ‘ligature’ d’Isaac (Gen. 22,9) dans la Septante et chez les Pères grecs,” in Hellenica et Judaica hommage à Valentin Nikprowetzky, ed. André Caquot, et al. [Leuven: Peeters, 1986], 460). This interpretive difference likely stems in part from G’s reframing of the larger plot and his interventions in this chapter, including the focus of Harl’s study, i.e., the translation of ἡρῴσθαι καὶ συμποδίσας.
them firmly in this sequence. Most importantly, G develops Abraham’s final test in Gen 22, along with its intense emotional and psychological demands, by connecting it to the theme of promise in the preceding narratives in several new ways: (i) by highlighting Isaac’s status as a metonymy for the promise and (ii) Abraham’s obedience as the condition of the promise; and (iii) by embellishing God’s solemn, covenant-sealing oath as ensuring the promise once and for all.

First, in recognizing the heart-tugging role of Isaac in the Hebrew narrative, G seeks to convey this pathos in Greek translation in several ways. To be clear, Isaac’s importance as Abraham’s special and beloved child is unambiguous from the outset in the Hebrew version, as it is made clear by the unusually long phrase used to bring Isaac onto the stage of the narrative:

**Genesis 22:2**

Before naming Isaac, God first refers to him as “your son” (בנך), “your only one” (unistd), and “whom you love” (אשר אהבת), conjuring up the diverse but related notions of kinship, uniqueness, and paternal love, respectively. Furthermore, this expression is stylistically as well as semantically emphatic on account of the anaphoric use of את. In translating this

---


256 *HALOT*, s.v. “unistd” 1.
heavy descriptor into Greek, however, G concentrates the emphasis more potently in regard to paternal love by rendering יָחִּיד (“only”) as ἀγαπητός257 (“beloved”)258 (also in 22:12, 16). This also alters the text’s style, since G’s translation involves repetition of the root ἀγαπ- in the phrase τὸν ἀγαπητόν, ὃν ἡγάπησας (“your beloved one, whom you love”). Of course, G may have avoided using μόνος (“only”) or a similar alternative for יָחִּיד on account of the fact Isaac is not strictly Abraham’s “only” son, because he also has Ishmael,259 but this minor correction seems more intended to capture Abraham’s paternal love for Isaac (cf. 22:2),260 especially as G increases the focus on Isaac in another way in 22:3.

22:3

וַיֵּקַח אֶת שְׁנֵי נַעְרֵיָו אֶתְוָו וַאֲתַיְצַא כְּבוֹן

And he took his two “boys” (i.e., slaves) with him, and his son Isaac.

257 ἀγαπητός | יָחִּיד and ἀγαπητός only occur here. Otherwise, G uses ἀγαπάω just for בָהָר (10) and בָּרָר (1).
258 Aquila and Symmachus both reject this translation: the equivalents μονογενής and μοναχός are attributed to Aquila, while Symmachus is credited with μόνος.
259 Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 194. While their suggestion that G interpreted יָחִּיד as ἀγαπητός by analogy to יָדִּיד is hard to prove, Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn are right to argue that G’s translation is not Messianic but fits the narrative context (“Your Only Son, Your Beloved One’ (Genesis 22): When Septuagint and Messianism Meet,” in Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust, ed. Marc Vervenne and F. García Martínez [Lueven: Lueven University Press, 2005], 19–31).
260 Origen, Hom. Gen. 8.2 (Doutreleau PG 216), argues that ὃν, ἀγαπητόν, and ὃν ἡγάπησας are all designed to pull at the strings of Abraham’s heart and so make his test more difficult: Sed vide tentationis pondus. Caris et dulcibus appellationibus iterum ac saepe repetitis, paterni suscitantur affectus, ut amoris evigilante memoria ad immolandum filium paterna dextera retardetur, et adversum fidem animi tota carnis militia repugnet. Cf. a similar idea in Ephraem Syrus, Sermo i in Abraham et Isaac 227.14–228.6 as well as Genesis Rabbah 55.7.
261 μὲν ἑαυτῷ | For G’s fronting of clausal constituents for pragmatic emphasis, see §4.1.2.3 and §4.2.2.
262 δύο παιδας | Outside Gen 22 G only translates ἐφο (27) as παῖς (95) in 18:7, where a slave is also in view. More often G uses the diminutives παιδίον (11) and παιδάριον (6) or νεανίσκος (5). This fits with the fact that παῖς is G’s default translation of דְּם (85/93). For G’s anarthrous translation of suffixed forms, see §3.1.3.1.
G draws extra attention to Isaac in part by downgrading his companions, i.e., the other “boys” that Abraham takes along on the journey to Mt. Moriah. First, he translates the phrase אֲחָetti נָעָרֵי (“his two boys”) as indefinite and omits the pronominal suffix in translation, so that these two characters are mere props in comparison to Isaac. What is more, G fronts his translation of the prepositional phrase בָּנָי (“with him”), which brings the discrepancy between the indefinite noun phrase δύο παιδίας (“two boys”) into more obvious contrast with the phrase Ἰσαὰκ τὸν νίὸν αὐτοῦ (“Isaac his son”), which follows. Finally, G regularly differentiates his translations of the Hebrew word נער (“boy”) in this chapter, translating it as παιδις (“child, slave”) (22:3, 5, 19) in reference to these two extras and reserving the affectionate term παιδάριον263 (“little child”) (22:5, 12) in reference to Isaac. Yet, in addition to νίὸς (“son”) and παιδάριον (“little child”), G also uses the term τέκνον264 (“child”) to translate בֵּן as a designation for Isaac (22:7, 8), and when he does, he omits the pronominal suffix as he inflects it in the vocative, which also mirrors the way that

263 παιδάριον | G uses the diminutive παιδάριον as a minor match for the nouns νησῷ (6/27) and ἔτη (3/19), and only in reference to the children of the patriarchs (esp. Isaac, Joseph, and Benjamin) when they are in danger. For G’s other translations of ἔτη, see note 261.

264 τέκνον | G very often translates בֵּן as νίὸς (327/383), less frequently using τέκνον (18) or παιδίον (7). G’s use of τέκνον (21) as a term of endearment is confirmed by its frequent use in the vocative (12: 22:7, 8; 27:13, 18, 20, 21, 25, 26, 37, 43; 43:29; 48:19) and in reference to childbirth (5: 3:16; 17:16; 30:1; 31:43; cf. 49:3 [= ἄνω]). This fits Philo’s claim that Rebecca’s use of τέκνον to address Jacob in 27:43 is a sign of her good will (εὐνοία) and his youth (ηλικία): διὸ καὶ τέκνον αὐτῶν προσέπε, τὸ δ’ ἐστὶν εὐνοίας καὶ ηλικίας δομα ἐν ταῦτῃ (Prel. 40).
Isaac calls Abraham πάτερ (“father”) (22:7). While this seems particularly affectionate when it occurs in the phrase τί ἐστιν τέκνον (“What is the matter, child?”), used to translate the Hebrew expression הנני בנך (“Here I am, my son”), G only uses τέκνον for Isaac elsewhere in the pivotal chapter of Gen 17, where God promises to Abraham that he will give him a “child” by his wife Sarah (δώσω σοι εξ αὐτῆς τέκνον) (17:16). In fact, G’s lexical choice here marks the end of a long narrative thread that he has woven throughout the entire Abraham story by translating a variety of Hebrew terms with Greek words formed on the root τεκν-, as I have noted at several points in this chapter: in 11:30, Sarah “could not produce a child” (σώκετεκνοποίει [Heb. ילית]); in 15:2, Abraham claimed he was “childless” (ἄτεκνος [Heb. Truyền]); in 16:2, Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham so that he could “produce a child” (τεκνοποιήσῃς [Heb. בנה]); and in 17:16, God promised to give him a “child” (τέκνον [Heb. בָּן]) specifically by Sarah (and not Hagar). Now in Gen 22, God has asked Abraham to give up that same “child,” the child who stands in as a metonymy for the promise that has been the plot’s thematic center throughout the entire story up to this point. Not only

265 πάτερ | G always translates יבש functioning as a form of address with the vocative πάτερ (7: 22:7; 27:18, 34, 36, 38+; 48:18) and typically drops the suffix when he translates a suffixed noun in the vocative (see §3.1.3.1).

266 Origen, Hom. Gen. 8.6 (Doutreleau 222) says that the word πάτερ struck Abraham’s deep fatherly feelings (viscera paterna concussit), while τέκνον expressed his own affection (reddit tamen etiam ipse affectionis vocem). Cf. Genesis Rabbah, 56.4

267 τί ἐστιν | Only in 21:17 does G use the question τί ἐστιν in direct statement to translate לַחַם. In its three other occurrences, it serves as a translation ofバン, but each case involves the speaker expressing concern for the other person. As with יְסָמ, more generally, G usually translates the suffixed form יְסָמ as יְסָמ (9/13).
does obeying God mean sacrificing his beloved son, but it also means relinquishing his surety of the promise.  

Even as Abraham’s test is a catch-22, since both options entail a loss of the promise, G underscores Abraham’s obedience to God’s command, which again relates back to the covenantal condition that God placed upon Abraham in 17:1 that he must please God and become blameless. This is seen first when Abraham is about to slaughter his son but is stopped by an angel of the Lord, who addresses him from the sky:

**Genesis 22:12**

22:12 καὶ εἶπεν Μὴ ἐπιβάλλῃς τὴν χειρά σου ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριόν μου ἰδέη ποιήσῃς αὐτῷ μηδέν· νῦν γὰρ ἐγνών  

First, G makes use of the dramatic aorist of γινώσκω in translating "for now I know" as νῦν γὰρ ἐγνών ("for now I know"), instead of using οἶδα in the perfect or pluperfect (as in the similar formulation κείντα in 18:19). This accentuates rather than obscures the fact that God is claiming to know something now that he did not before. In this way, G has the angel signal the end of the covenantal probation begun in 17:1:

Abraham has, in fact, pleased God by proving that he fears him. Furthermore, in

___________________________

268 Josephus, *AJ* 1.113.1 §§223–224 develops G’s embellishment of the difficulty of this test even further by having God enumerate his promises to Abraham as he orders him to sacrifice his promised son Isaac.

269 KG II §386.9; Smyth §1937; Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 29–30 (§8.3.2).

270 G does not shy away from the theological impropriety this translation could imply. John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 47.3 (PG 54 431.63–432.10) both rationalizes the expression as accommodation (συγκατάβασις) and explains its literary significance: it is not that God now knows (ἐγνών) but that Abraham has made known (ἐγνώρισε) his fear of God by passing the test (cf. the reading νῦν ἐθανάτας attributed to Ἰ βραχίος). Wevers gives a similar interpretation but stays closer to the text, taking νῦν γὰρ ἐγνών as “I now recognize” (*Notes*, 323).
connecting Abraham’s test here to the ethical stipulations of the covenant, G decides to focus on the reason for Abraham’s obedience, translating \( \man \) in the phrase \( \משׁח \man \) (“withhold from”) causally as \( \deltaία \) (“because of”), so that the angel acknowledges not just that Abraham has not withheld his son, but that he has done this because of God (cf. 22:15). Later, G has the angel name Abraham’s actions explicitly as obedience, as he accurately translates \( \שׁמעת \) בקולי (“you listened to my voice”) in 22:18 as \( \υπήκουσας \) 272 τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς (“you obeyed my voice”). Finally, G develops Abraham’s obedience in reference to the meaning Abraham ascribes to the place’s name: \( \Kύριος \) εἶδεν (“the Lord saw”). While the yiqtol form \( \יראה \) could be read as \( qal \) (active) or \( niphal \) (middle/passive), G interprets it actively and translates it with past reference rather than future, thus linking it back to what Abraham said in 22:8, i.e., that God would see \( (\δψεται) \) a sheep. The place name \( \Kύριος \) εἶδεν, then, ironically conveys that God saw Isaac, the “sheep” that Abraham intended to provide, and so Abraham has passed his most difficult test.

Finally, G reinforces the climactic character of this scene in the plot structure of Abraham’s story by rhetorically and dramatically embellishing the oath God makes to Abraham in 22:15–18. First, G translates the formula \( \ב י נשתבעה \) (“I swear by myself”)

\[\text{271 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 47.3 (PG 54:432.12–13) glosses } \deltaία \text{ as } \διὰ \text{ τὸ } \πρὸς \text{ τὸ } \ἐμυν, \text{ which acknowledges the emphasis that G has placed on the reason for Abraham’s obedience. }\]
\[\text{272 } \υπήκουσας \text{ | For G’s treatment of } \שׁמע \text{ and his use of } \υπακοῦω, \text{ see note 132. }\]
correctly as a performative κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὡμοσα (“I hereby swear by myself”), making contextually appropriate use of both the solemn preposition κατά with the genitive and the performative aorist. Then, in introducing the apodosis of the oath, G translates the Hebrew conjunction י (”that”) with the particle combination ἦ μὴν (“verily”), commonly used to introduce an oath. Finally, in reference to Abraham obeying God’s voice (יְהֹוָה), G retains and fronts the possessive pronoun for emphasis: τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς (“my very voice”).

In sum, these emphatic choices capture the solemnity of God’s oath. Abraham will certainly receive the covenantal promises, since he has now fulfilled his obligations by passing this final, most difficult test. This last set of translation choices, in particular, has a dramatic quality (cf. also νῦν γὰρ ἐγνων in 22:12), a fact that should probably be explained in

273 κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ | G only uses κατά with the genitive in two other cases, again as a translation of י (31:54), also as a modifier of δύνης in an oath, and later also as a translation of ב (50:20). For the idiomatic use of κατά in oaths, especially with δύνης, see LSJ, s.v. “κατά” A.II.4.a.

274 ὡμοσα | G’s use of the aorist for a performative translation of qatal in direct speech is quite distinctive, as he more often uses the present and perfect (see §6.1.1.5). This fits with the other dramatic embellishments here.

275 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 47.4 (PG 54 433.39–46) acknowledges the Greek idiom used here when he explains that with this oath God makes use of human customs (τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ συνήθεια χρησάμενός) in order to emphasize the certain fulfillment of the promise.

276 ἦ μὴν | G only uses this particle combination again in 42:16 to convey the solemnity of Joseph’s oath accusing his brothers of being spies: νη τὴν υἱείαν Φαραώ ἦ μὴν κατάσκοποι ἐστέ (see §9.3.4 and notes 246–247 there). For the common use of ἦ μὴν in solemn oaths, see LSJ, s.v. “ἦ” 1.1; Mayser, Grammatik, II.3.146 (§164.14.2a); Denniston, The Greek Particles, 350–351.

277 ὡμῆς | G translates a suffixed form of בְּ with the emphatic pronounal adjective in only one other instance (26:5), and it is surely significant that the occurrence there directly refers back to Abraham’s obedience to God’s voice here. Concerning G’s consistent fronting of the possessive adjectives, see §4.1.2.2.

278 Genesis Rabbah 56.11 explains the oath by the common idea that this was Abraham’s tenth and final test.
reference to the classically tragic character of this story about a father nearly killing a son. In Aristotle’s view, however, this would be the worst type of tragic plot, since Abraham is on the verge of committing a horrendous act with full knowledge of what he is doing but desists just in time. Sherryll Mleynek has argued that the Hebrew version of Gen 22 has all of the essential features of a Greek tragic plot with the exception of creating an opportunity for katharsis, since the tragic act is aborted. This leaves the story open-ended and morally ambiguous, which accounts for its anxious reception among religious, philosophical, and literary readers throughout the ages. Yet, the most important aspect of G’s translation of Gen 22 as far as tragic theory is concerned is not the particular structure he sees in this chapter’s plot but his flair for the dramatic embellishment, which prefigures the way he translates the Joseph narrative “in the tragic mode,” as I will argue in the next chapter. In terms of plot structure, however, G uses his translation of Abraham’s test to close out the larger narrative’s plot in a remarkably Aristotelean way, even if it still lacks moral closure internally. With the promised child’s rescue from death and God’s solemn

---

279 For Aristotle, the best tragic material, i.e., the subject matter most conducive of pity and fear, involves suffering in relationships (ἐν ταῖς φιλίαις ... τὰ πάθη), especially family relationships, “such as when a brother kills or almost kills his brother, or a son his father, or a mother her son, or a son his mother” (οἶον ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν ἢ υἱὸς πατέρα ἢ μήτηρ υἱόν ἢ υἱὸς μητέρα ἀποκτείνῃ ἢ μείλῃ) (Poet. 1453b.19–21).

280 After describing all possible plots given two variables, i.e., (i) whether the action is committed or not and (ii) whether the agent is cognizant of the action’s significance or not, Aristotle proceeds to say: “And of these, the worst is when he knows what he is doing and is about to do it but does not, because it is defiled and untragic, for it has no suffering” (τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν γινώσκοντα μεθησάται καὶ μὴ πρᾶξαι χείριστον· τὸ τε γὰρ μιαρὸν ἔχει, καὶ οὐ τραγικὸν· ἀπαθὲς γὰρ) (Poet. 1453b.37–39).

281 Mleynek, Abraham, Aristotle, and God,” 118.
affirmation of Abraham's virtuous and obedient character, the plot's narrative complication is all but resolved.

So, the last chapters of Abraham's story bring God's sworn promises of progeny and land to a close, even as they anticipate future developments in later stories: Abraham acquires a plot of land to bury Sarah (Gen 23) and procures a wife for Isaac to ensure that the covenantal line continues (Gen 24). Even in these chapters, which constitute a logical closure to this story's plot, G tips his hat to the unwinding of these twin themes.

Translating נָשִׂיא אלהים (“prince of God”) as βασιλεύς ἃπαντος 282 παρά ἐπού (“king from God”) in 23:6, G exaggerates Abraham’s political status in the eyes of the Hittites, which contrasts with his prior fear of destruction (15:1). Also, G uses the technical term ἐκυρώθη 284 to translate γένος (“it was confirmed”) 285 to translate γένος (“it became”) in order to certify Abraham’s legal possession of this slice of his promised inheritance. 286 Then, in 24:40, G effectively translates התהלכתי התייה. 286

---

282 βασιλεύς | G’s most neutral translation of נָשִׂיא is ἄρχων (25:16; 34:2). Whereas the rendering as ἀρχάς in relation to Ishmael’s progeny was a downgrade, the use of βασιλεύς here is an upgrade, especially in light of the fact that G only uses βασιλεύς elsewhere to translate מֶלֶךְ (44/45). The effect is not lost on John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 48.1 (PG 54.34.63–435.2, 435.12–16). Prestel and Schorch claim that G constructs a “foreign perspective” (“Außenperspektive”) on Abraham by presenting him as a “king legitimized by God” (“ein von Gott legitimierter König”) (“Genesis,” 197).

283 παρά | For G’s use of prepositions to explicate the relationship of an adnominal modifier to its noun head, see §3.2.4, especially §3.2.4.1.

284 ἐκυρώθη | G does not use κυρέω elsewhere, and γένος is translated variously according to its diverse usages.

285 For the legal usage, see LSJ, s.v. “κυρέω” A.1.

286 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 48.1 (PG 54.434.45–46) properly claims that with this Abraham “first initiates his acquisition” of the land: καὶ ταύτην πρώτην ἀρχὴν κτήσεως ποιεῖται ὁ πατριάρχης διὰ τὴν τῆς Σάββας τελευτὴν.
לפניו ("I walked before him") with the aorist εὐρέστησα ("I pleased") in order to signal Abraham’s attainment of the state named by God in 17:1.

In effect, both parties to the covenant have finally done what they pledged.289

8.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that translating a chain of narratives such as constitute the stories about the patriarch Abraham in Gen 12–25 has required G to attend to new virtues of plot that are of particular concern to lengthier compositions, namely the poetic virtues of sequence and unity. In order to translate this material in such a way as to clarify the unifying logic of its sequence of episodes, G has lightly (and at times not so lightly) reconfigured the plot of the overarching narrative in a way that resonates with Aristotle’s idea that a plot should develop logically from beginning to end by representing a single action that evolves through some “complication” (δέσις) to some “resolution” (λύσις) by way of some pivotal “transformation” (μετάβασις). In particular, G furnishes Abraham’s story with this type of plot structure, common to many good stories, by introducing narrative

287 εὐρέστησα | For G's translation of ἠλπίν (hithpael) and his usage of εὐρέστεω, see note 147.
288 In reference to the prophetic reference to Abraham’s death in Gen 15:15, Didymus, In Gen. 232 says that Abraham will be pleasing to God (εὐρέστος ὀν Θεός) when he goes to his fathers. Similarly, Ephraem Syrus, Sermo i in Abraham et Isaac 230.8–11 says God was pleased (ἡράκεσθη) with Abraham’s obedience in Gen 22. In Sermo ii in Abraham et Isaac 250.8, he apostrophizes Abraham as having become complete (τέλειός τε γέγονας) because he withstood the test of many trials (ἐν πολλοῖς πειρασμοῖς εὐρεστείς δόκιμος).
289 Josephus, A.J. 1.17.1 §256 claims that Abraham was full of virtue and honored by God at his death: Τελευτᾷ δὲ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ μετ’ ἀλληγο, ἀνὴρ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἄξρος καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν σουδῆς ἄξιος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τετιμημένος.
tension in relation to the thematic center of Gen 12–25: God’s promise to Abraham. He has clarified and enhanced the narrative’s plot structure, creating in translation a sequential and unified narrative, in particular by complicating the plot in terms of God’s unfulfilled promise and Abraham’s unsatisfactory character up to the pivotal transformation of Gen 17, when their covenantal relationship is clarified and both parties commit to perform their obligations: God will make good on the promise, and Abraham will progress toward virtue. The plot then proceeds logically in this vein until its final resolution in Gen 22, when God approves Abraham’s virtuous character in a final test and Abraham receives God’s solemn oath that the promise will endure with future generations. In this way, G presents the story of Abraham, composed of (for the most part) internally coherent but rather disjointed episodes in its Hebrew version, as a sequential and unified narrative in Greek translation.

By applying the specifically tragic structure of δέσις-μετάβασις-λύσις to Abraham’s story, G may have had a variety of secondary purposes in mind. For example, if he was historically minded, he may have desired to present the disjointed episodes taken from different parts of Abraham’s life as a plausible account of events that could have actually taken place. Or, he may have intended an apologetic function, wishing to highlight the cultural prestige of this Jewish origin story that tells of how the nation of Israel began with the patriarch Abraham, a just and faithful man. Yet, it is particularly interesting to note how G’s plot improvements also draw attention to the ethical development of this story’s main
character in terms of Greek ethics,²⁹⁰ such that he may have meant for it to be taken up as a source for philosophical and theological reflection, just as it was actually read by Philo and the church fathers.

My analysis of the plot structure of the Greek version of Abraham’s story is not meant to be exhaustive; rather, I have chosen to focus on G’s translation choices that are most salient for reconstructing his interpretation of this story’s plot. A relatively rapid pace of exposition has been necessary for the current step in the extended argument that G aimed to produce a virtuous plot in his translation, because evaluating a plot’s sequentiality and unity requires securing a lofty vantage point from which one can view the entire story at once, so as to assess the way that the individual parts fit together as a whole. Though G has been bound by his Hebrew source in many obvious ways, the host of (mostly) subtle transformations that I have discussed above reflects an attempt to fashion an impressive synthetic interpretation of the whole story, such that G has shifted a character-driven and episodic plot towards being a sequential, unified, and ultimately believable one, in which each episode in sequence introduces the build-up and release of narrative tension in relation to a single complex issue. To do this, G has stitched together parts of the Hebrew text that have been arranged chronologically but dislocated from their original narrative contexts and juxtaposed with formerly unrelated material. To resume the metaphor used at the beginning

of this chapter, G has positioned the dominoes of this story in a logical order from beginning to middle to end by controlling various aspects of the Greek language, especially by developing the theme of God’s inevitable promise in relation to the less-obvious theme of Abraham’s ethical development.

In the next chapter, however, we will turn to the story of Joseph, which is also an extended narrative built out of smaller narrative units. Yet, despite some minor interpretive problems, the Hebrew version already has a clearly sequential and unified narrative structure, and so I will argue that G aimed to enhance the virtue of this story’s plot in Greek translation by developing certain poetic virtues that it already had, namely, the tragic aspects of its plot that make it a compelling and entertaining read. In fact, I have already touched on the tragic in G’s translation in my analysis of Gen 22 in the Greek version, but I will take up this line of inquiry directly and at length in relation to G’s translation of Joseph’s tragic story and the fact that many Greek writers at this time sought to imbue their compositions with a tragic flare in order to make them more pleasant and more enjoyable to read.
9 THE TRAGIC PLOT (JOSEPH: GEN 37–50)

9.1 Introduction

In terms of virtues of plot, Joseph’s story significantly differs from those of Noah and Abraham in that its plot does not need substantial improvements in regard to the virtues of consistency and concision, on the one hand, and those of sequentiality and unity, on the other. In fact, the story of Joseph and his brothers has such a strong and logical plot line that Gen 37–50 has been termed the Joseph “novella” by modern biblical scholarship. This is not to say that Joseph’s story contains no narrative problems that result from the kinds of source-critical fractures and discontinuities that are found in Gen 6–9 and Gen 12–25 and that were shown to attract so much of G’s translational attention there. Rather, the problems are often local, less pronounced, and hidden by the otherwise clear narrative logic that has made Joseph’s story so compelling to readers throughout the ages. Since this is the case, we do not observe G investing his intellectual effort primarily in fixing the narrative problems or connecting the logical dots of this particular story’s plot. Yet, was his intent to produce a translation with a virtuous plot of such a kind that translating a relatively coherent and cohesive story like that of Joseph and his brothers required little effort and creativity on his part? As I will argue in this chapter, the answer to this question is no: for G, the pursuit of a virtuous plot involves more than repair work, since in translating Joseph’s story he focuses his interpretive energy on cultivating and extending a Greek virtue of plot that this story already exemplifies in its Hebrew version, namely, its tragic characteristics.
I am not the first to associate G’s style of translation with Greek tragedy. In a thorough and philologically impressive monograph that treats the interpretation of the Cain and Abel narrative (Gen 4:1–16) in the main Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Aramaic versions, Mark Scarlata has convincingly argued that G embellishes aspects of the Cain and Abel story in a tragic manner à la Aristotle’s Poetics.¹ Scarlata first claims that a Greek reader would likely have classified the Cain and Abel story as tragic, as its plot hinges on fratricide, which is paradigmatically tragic in the Aristotelean sense, because it involves “suffering in relationships” (πάθη ἐν ταῖς φιλίαις), a type of πάθος that is especially horrible (δεινός) and pitiable (οἰκτρὸς/ἐλεεινός).² But he takes his argument one step further by demonstrating how G’s specific translation choices serve to “dramatize and heighten his portrayal of Cain as a veritable tragic hero.”³ The most convincing textual evidence that Scarlata adduces to support this claim is as follows:

(i) G refers to Cain’s מִׂנְּחָה (“offering”) as “sacrifice” (θυσία) but Abel’s as δῶρα (“gifts”) (4:4–5);⁴
(ii) G uses tragic emotions to describe Cain’s affective response to God not accepting his sacrifices: not only does Cain “grieve” (ἐλύπησεν [= בָּרָה “got angry”]) (4:5), but God also

¹ Scarlata, Outside of Eden, 207–212. In Scarlata’s own words, “the overall interpretive strategy of the LXX translator [of Gen 6:1–16] was to nuance the Hebrew narrative in such a way as to produce a Greek story that reflected elements of classical Greek tragedy” (Outside of Eden, 208).
² Scarlata, Outside of Eden, 207–208. Aristotle, Poetics 1453b.14–22 gives as prime examples of “suffering in relationships” only cases of murder within the nuclear family: ποῖα οὖν δεινά ἡ ποῖα οἰκτρὰ φαίνεται τῶν συμπιπτόντων, λάβωμεν, ἀνάγκη δὴ ἢ φίλων εἶναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὰς τοιαύτας πράξεις ἢ ἐχθρῶν ἢ μηδετέρων. ἐὰν μὲν οὖν ἐχθρὸς ἐχθρὸν, οὔθεν ἔλεεινόν οὔτε ποιῶν οὔτε μέλλων, πλὴν κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος· οὔδὲ ἄν μηδετέρως ἔχοντες· ἢταν δὲ ἐν ταῖς φιλίαις ἐγγένεται τὰ πάθη, οὖν ἡ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφόν ἢ υἱὸς πατέρα ἢ μήτηρ υἱόν ἢ υἱὸς μητέρα ἀποκτείνῃ ἢ μέλλῃ ἢ τι άλλο τοιοῦτον δρᾶ, ταῦτα ζητήτεον.
³ Scarlata, Outside of Eden, 208.
⁴ Scarlata, Outside of Eden 54–57, 209.
asks him why he is “deeply grieved” (περίλυπος [also = לְרָע]) (4:6).\(^5\)

(iii) G has God imply that Cain is culpable for his tragic mistake (ἁμαρτία) of sacrificial division (διαιρέω), i.e., implying that Cain knew how to divide his sacrifice properly but did not, since he translates God’s question “Is it not that if you do well there is uplift/forgiveness? But if you do not do well, at the door, sin is crouching”)\(^6\) quite innovatively as οὐχ, ἐὰν ἔρθος προσενέγκῃς, ἔρθος δὲ μὴ διέλθῃς. ἁμαρτεῖς; ἡσύχασον. (Is it not that, if you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, you have made a mistake? Calm down!) (4:7).\(^7\)

(iv) G translates God’s curse that Cain will be “a fugitive and wander” (נָע וְנַד) with tragic pathos as “groaning and trembling” (στένων καὶ τρέμων) (4:12, 14).\(^8\)

and (v) G has Cain recognize not that his “punishment” (עָון) is too great “to bear” (נשׂא), but that his “guilt” (ἁμαρτία) too great for him “to be forgiven” (ἀφεθῆναι), which conveys tragic despair (4:13).\(^9\)

Based on such evidence, Scarlata has persuasively shown that G intended to imbue the already tragic story of Cain and Abel with enhanced and novel tragic qualities, such that its fine tragic plot would appeal to his Greek audience by entertaining them and fostering their sympathies and emotions. Furthermore, Scarlata’s well-supported claims would suggest that G might have intended to translate the tragic story of Joseph in a similar manner, by cultivating this story’s tragic features. In fact, Marguerite Harl has hinted at this possibility by directly associating G with Aristotle’s Poetics on account of his use of ἀναγνωρίζομαι (“recognize”) in the dramatic recognition scene at the end of Joseph’s story.\(^10\) Yet, as strong as Scarlata’s argument is, one might object by questioning the link he has established between Aristotle’s ideas about Greek tragedy and the Jewish scriptures: why should we

\(^5\) Scarlata, Outside of Eden 57–59, 209.

\(^6\) Scarlata’s translation. For the textual and interpretive difficulties of the Hebrew, see Outside of Eden, 74–82.


\(^10\) Harl, La Genèse, 290.
think that Greek tragedy and Greek tragic theory have any relevance for a Hellenistic Jew’s translation of his sacred texts?

The slightly more recent work of Jeff Jay that carefully documents and analyzes how Greek prose writers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods commonly composed their narratives “in the tragic mode” supplies the implied link in Scarlata’s argument that anticipates this potential critique.\(^{11}\) While his ultimate goal is to demonstrate that Mark’s Gospel was composed in the tragic mode, Jay first erects a scholarly scaffolding to support the construction of this thesis. Building on Alistair Fowler’s distinction between genre and mode, Jay asserts that a genre “establishes a contract” between reader and writer and sets expectations by way of conventional configurations of literary features such as “representational aspect, metre, external structure, size, scale, special subjects, topics, motifs, style, tone, mood, values, quality of character, social settings, and occasions,” whereas a mode is a “‘selection or abstraction’ from a genre” that incorporates some of its more flexible characteristics (i.e., usually excluding more fixed generic features such as representational aspect or length).\(^{12}\) This distinction allows a critic to analyze a text as belonging to one genre while exhibiting certain features of another genre in a meaningful way. Since, as Jay describes it, “mode is to genre as an adjective is to a noun,”\(^{13}\) this

\(^{11}\) Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*. Although Scarlata only works with Aristotle’s *Poetics* and Greek Genesis, the way he writes about the tragic connections between the two texts suggests that he would embrace Jay’s theory of the tragic mode, since he does not say that G intended to turn the story of Cain and Abel into a tragedy, but to “shape” and “colour” this story in such a way that it would “reflect the ‘tragic’ as it was understood in his time” (*Outside of Eden*, 208).


distinction is useful, because it allows us, for example, to group and analyze epic novels as novels (genre) that have a significant set of features drawn from epic (mode). In the case of Scarlata’s argument, we would say that G translated the narrative about Cain and Abel in the tragic mode as a tragic narrative.

But this important and useful literary-theoretical distinction is only the first layer of Jay’s literary and historical scaffolding, as he proceeds to show meticulously that (i) Greek writers applied the tragic mode to a diverse set of narrative genres (e.g., biography, historiography, and novel) and over a long period of time (e.g., Polybius [2nd century BCE] to Cassius Dio [3rd century CE]);14 (ii) the Greek writers who composed some of their works in the tragic mode include Jews (e.g., 2–4 Maccabees, Josephus, and Philo);15 and (iii) a relatively well-defined (but inexhaustive) typology of the tragic mode can be inferred by analyzing the recurring tragic features used by such writers, although—in contrast to a genre—a mode is far more flexible in terms of which and how many of its features must be present in a given text written in that mode. The features of the tragic mode that Jay identifies as “most salient” are (i) reversal; (ii) revenge; (iii) recognition; (iv) lamentation; (v) emotions; and (vi) the supernatural.16 Because Jay has produced this typology

14 Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 25–78. Greek authors also criticized each other for writing in the tragic mode, even those who engaged in producing such compositions themselves (*The Tragic in Mark*, 42–49). In this way, many prose authors freely took up the tragic mode in order to entertain, to create suspense, and to trigger their readers’ emotions, but in doing so they also ran the risk of overdoing it and making their plots more susceptible to critiques of unbelievability (see §§7.1; 8.1). G’s interventions are not excessive, as is clear from the fact that later authors who retell this story, such as Philo (Ios.) and Josephus (*A.J. 2.2.1–2.8.2 §§7–200*), deepen this tragic embellishment to a favorable effect.


inductively by triangulating ancient Greek tragic theory, actual Greek tragedies, and Greek
texts of other genres composed in the tragic mode, it can serve as a theoretical bridge to the
tragic features of the Cain and Abel story that Scarlata has identified as peculiar to the
Greek version (e.g., Cain’s recognition of his reversal from privileged firstborn to
unforgivable convict and Cain’s emotions of grief, groaning and trembling). Furthermore,
Jay’s literary-historical contextualization of the tragic mode helps account for why (as
Scarlata has shown) the Hellenistic, Jewish translator of Greek Genesis attempted to make
the Hebrew story of Cain and Abel more tragic in Greek translation: the tragic mode was in
vogue among his readers and literary peers.

By bolstering Scarlata’s intuitions about G’s translational aims with Jay’s theoretical
model, I will demonstrate that G’s interest in the tragic mode is not isolated to the short
narrative of Gen 4:1–16 but can be seen at work much more extensively in the tragic story
of Joseph and his brothers. By doing so, I will show that G’s interest in producing a virtuous
plot in his translation is not limited to the negative activity of repairing the narrative
problems of his source text but extends to the positive endeavor of cultivating the Greek
virtues of plot that his Hebrew Vorlage already exemplified.17

17 Susan Brayford describes the conclusion of Greek (and Hebrew) Genesis as a “masterful story” about Joseph
and his brothers, and she names some of its poetic virtues: “Not only does it incorporate some of the same
themes found earlier in LXX-G, it also includes other motifs characteristic of many well-told stories. There is
suspense, irony, and romance embedded in a plot that features sibling rivalry, unwanted affection, false
charges, a heroic rise to power, a recognition scene, family survival, and ultimate redemption” (Genesis, 389).
9.2 The tragic in Joseph

In order to contextualize the tragic features of Joseph’s story, it is necessary to survey the major events of the narrative: Joseph’s brothers hate him because he is their father’s favorite son, even though he is the second youngest, and so they plan to murder him but then decide to get their revenge by selling him as a slave and telling their father he was eaten by a wild animal (Gen 37). Then comes a digression involving Judah and his daughter-in-law Tamar (Gen 38, see §9.3.2), but meanwhile in Egypt, although Joseph quickly earns his new master’s favor, his fate suddenly worsens when he is accused of sexually assaulting his master’s wife and is then thrown in prison (Gen 39). There, he again rises in favor until he one day serves as dream interpreter for two court officials imprisoned by Pharaoh, and he successfully predicts the one’s restoration and the other’s hanging (Gen 40). Some time later, Pharaoh has two troubling dreams and can find no one in his court to interpret them, and so Joseph is brought before Pharaoh when the chief cupbearer recalls Joseph’s supernatural powers of dream interpretation. Joseph predicts seven years of plenty to be followed by seven years of famine, and Pharaoh appoints Joseph second in command over all Egypt and administrator of the grain supply (Gen 41). When the famine strikes, Joseph’s brothers must travel to Egypt to buy grain, and Joseph recognizes them but disguises himself in order to get even with them: after charging them as spies and detaining them in prison for three days, he keeps Simeon behind bars but sends the rest back to Canaan, warning them not to return without their youngest brother Benjamin (Gen 42).

\[18\] For an ancient plot summary of the Hebrew account of Joseph and his brothers, see LAB 8.9–10.
After Judah convinces their hesitant father Jacob to send Benjamin with them by pledging his own life as security for his father’s new favorite son, the brothers return and are frightened when Joseph invites them to dine at his house, because—they think—they “stole” the money they paid for the grain on their first visit (Joseph secretly had it returned) (Gen 43). When they set out for Canaan the next day with more grain, Joseph chases after them and accuses Benjamin of stealing the divination cup he had his servant plant in his sack, but Judah offers to take Benjamin’s punishment as his substitute (Gen 44). At this, Joseph can no longer keep up the charade, and so he reveals his true identity, forgives his brothers, and explains that the whole series of events was God’s plan to provide for them during the famine (Gen 45). Joseph then brings his family to Egypt to weather out the remaining years of famine (Gen 46–47), and Jacob lives to bless Joseph’s two sons as well as Joseph and his brothers before he dies (Gen 48–49). Then Joseph returns to Canaan to bury his father Jacob, and as his brothers now fear that Joseph will finally get his revenge now that their father is gone, Joseph reassures them of his love and forgiveness and God’s good plan to provide for them (Gen 50).

As is clear from the above summary, the Joseph story has clear similarities to the tragic narrative of Cain and Abel, but also important differences: unlike Abel, Joseph is not actually murdered, and his tragic fate is inextricably linked to divine providence, and

---

19 Ancient readers often compare the two stories directly. 1 Clement 4:6–9 sees Cain and Joseph’s brothers as prime examples of jealousy, which kills concord. John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.2 [PG 54 527.10–23] says that Cain was moved to hatred by God’s favor toward Abel, so Joseph’s brothers despise Joseph for being the favorite. Furthermore, both Abel and Joseph continue to treat their brothers as brothers, assuming the best and not suspecting their ill-will. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 289.41–48.
unlike Cain, Joseph’s brothers experience forgiveness, as the entire affair was part of God’s plan to ensure that Jacob’s family would have food during a seven-year, worldwide famine. However, if we apply Jay’s tragic theory to the Joseph story, we see that it exhibits not one or several but all of the features of his typology of the tragic mode. So, before arguing at length that G intended to translate this story in the tragic mode, I will briefly illustrate how the Hebrew story already exhibits each feature of Jay’s typology.

9.2.1 Reversal

Reversal is an especially important feature of tragedies and narratives written in the tragic mode, and it relates to plot as well as character. In either case, reversal involves the sudden and total alteration in the plot’s development or a character’s situation. Moreover, even as characters share responsibility for their own destinies, their reversals up and/or down are often guided by a sense of inevitability and fate (τύχη), as the lots they draw are also subject to divine control.21

In Joseph’s story there are numerous reversals. Most obviously, Joseph rides his fortune like a roller-coaster, as he falls from favorite child to foreign slave (Gen 37); is promoted to head of Potiphar’s house only to be thrown in prison for a crime he did not commit (Gen 39); is again raised to a position of power but then forgotten by the subordinate inmate whose fretful dream he favorably interpreted (Gen 40); and then finally rises all the way to the top as Pharaoh’s right-hand man (Gen 41). But other characters

20 Cf. Aristotle’s μεταβολή (“transformation”) analyzed in §8.
experience reversals in Joseph’s story, as well. For example: in Gen 37, Jacob changes from joy to lamentation when he learns of Joseph’s “death;” in Gen 38, Judah falls from honor to shame as wronged Tamar is vindicated; in Gen 40, Pharaoh’s chief officials are first imprisoned, after which one is restored to his former office and the other hanged; in Gen 42–45, Joseph’s brothers—and especially Judah—experience a change of heart as they come to terms with their past sins; and throughout the entire story, Jacob’s family moves from danger to safety in relation to the famine. What is more, as God’s hand is said to drive the entire sequence of events from behind the scenes (45:4–11; 50:15–21), the plot’s upheavals and the characters’ ever-changing circumstances are all ruled by fate and fortune.

9.2.2 Revenge

Revenge is also an important tragic trait, and it often serves as the specific mechanism by which reversals are accomplished. Common themes involve revenge upon kings as retributive justice for their past crimes and upon mortals who are punished by the gods for defying them. Furthermore, revenge simultaneously reflects the legal and civil realities of lex talionis in the ancient world and prompts theological and philosophical critiques for the endless violence propagated by such principles and practices.²²

Revenge figures into the story of Joseph and his brothers in two related acts: the brothers’ act of revenge upon Joseph by selling him as a slave (Gen 37) and Joseph’s retributive act of deception that teaches his brothers a lesson in a humorous and sanitized application of an eye for an eye (Gen 42–45). Beyond these core examples, Tamar also gets

²² Jay, The Tragic in Mark, 83–86.
revenge upon Judah in a similar act of deception (Gen 38), and Potiphar’s wife settles the score with Joseph for rejecting her attempt to seduce him (Gen 39). As is clear from these examples, revenge and reversal are intricately interwoven throughout Joseph’s story.

9.2.3 Recognition

Recognition (ἀναγνώρισις) is a key component of the tragic in Greek literature apart from Aristotle’s Poetics, but it is also an archetypically Aristotelean tragic feature. Recognition involves the realizations that characters make about the true identities of other characters and/or the truth about past events. Often, recognition is hampered by a false assumption or inference (παραλογισμός) made by characters—or the audience—and Aristotle classifies the main means by which such epistemic obstacles may be overcome: “signs” or “tokens” (σημεία), “memory” (μνήμη), and “deduction” (συλλογισμός). The worst kind is when the moments of recognition are “contrived by the poet” (πεποιημέναι ύπό τοῦ ποιητοῦ), but Aristotle prefers those that develop naturally out of “the events themselves” (ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων), and it is especially fine when recognition occurs together with reversal. Since recognition involves the elimination of ignorance or false beliefs, it presents special opportunities for irony, but as irony plays a major role in Joseph’s story not just in relation to recognition, I will treat this as a distinct feature of the tragic mode that stands alongside those that form Jay’s typology. 23

Joseph’s story is as rich with recognition as it is with reversal and revenge, and all three tragic features often overlap. Jacob correctly recognizes the token of Joseph’s special

tunic and falsely deduces Joseph’s death (37:31–33); Judah fails to recognize Tamar as his daughter-in-law (38:15) but later learns her true identity also by way of tokens (38:24–26); Joseph recognizes his brothers when they come to Egypt to buy grain, but they do not recognize him (42:8), and Joseph takes advantage of this fact to accomplish his own act of revenge (Gen 42–45), and as a result, Joseph’s brothers recognize their own guilt in regard to Joseph (42:22-21; 44:16); and Joseph finally reveals his true identity to his brothers after they experience a reversal of character (45:1–15). Since the central recognition of Joseph’s story is paired with the brothers’ reversal and develops by necessity and probability out the events that precede, it is the very best type of recognition by Aristotle’s standards.24

9.2.4 Lamentation

Scenes of lamentation are common in tragedies and the tragic mode, as characters mourn their losses and their lost ones, often as the result of revenge and reversal. In the case of mourning for the dead, lamentation scenes are true to real life, where characters weep, shout, rend their clothes, sing laments, strike their breasts, rip out their hair, and perform other rites of grieving.25

In the Joseph story, lamentation is slightly less prominent than reversal, revenge, and recognition, and yet it also has its own clear place. When Reuben learns of Joseph’s disappearance, he rends his clothes in grief (37:29–30); Jacob, too, tears his clothes, puts on

24 Nevertheless, Celsus mocks the theatricality of the “recognition scene” (ἀγνωρισμός), calling it “absurd” (ἀτόπος), though Origen cannot see why (Origen, Cels. 4.47; cf. Harl, La Genèse, 289).

sackcloth, enters into a period of ritual mourning, and refuses to be comforted (37:34–35); when Joseph’s divining cup is discovered in Benjamin’s sack, the brothers likewise rend their clothes in grief over the anticipated loss of their youngest brother (44:13); and as the story closes with Jacob’s death, Joseph weeps and puts on a grand funeral procession at Egypt’s expense like the Canaanites had never before seen (50:1–14). While these scenes of lamentation are relatively restricted in length, they are integrally bound up with the plot of the Joseph story as a whole.

9.2.5 Emotions

The tragic emotions are many, and it is both the characters on the “stage” and the spectators in the “audience” who experience them. While Aristotle privileges fear (φόβος/δέος) and pity (ἔλεος/οἴκτος), Jay accurately characterizes the emotional palette of the tragic mode as “a richly textured array of passions.” More than the type, it is the intensity of emotion that characterizes it as tragic.26

It is beyond the scope of this overview to catalogue all of the subjective experiences of the characters in Gen 37–50, but certain prominent terms explicitly named in the Hebrew that Greeks would likely class as “emotions” (πάθη)—or as related to them—deserve individual mention: אֵֽהֻּנָּה (“love” [37:3, 4; 44:20]); רָחִים (“love/mercy” [43:14, 30]); שִׂנְאָה (“hate” [37:4, 5, 8]); בֶּכְיָה (weeping” [37:35; 42:24; 43:30+; 45:2, 14[+], 15; 46:29; 50:1, 3, 4, 17]); אֵֽבֶל (“mourning” [37:34, 35; 50:10, 11++]); גָּיִן (“grief” [42:38; 44:31]); עֵֽצֶב (“pain” [45:5]); אִֽרְרָה (“being angry” [39:19; 44:18; 45:5; 49:6]); אֵֽרִים (“anger” [39:19; 44:18; 49:6, 7]);

26 Jay, The Tragic in Mark, 92–94.
In this palette of emotions, hate, mourning, anger, and fear figure prominently, such that the emotional texture of Joseph’s story in Hebrew is ripe for a tragic interpretation by a Hellenistic audience even before its translation into Greek.

9.2.6 The supernatural

The gods play a major role in Greek tragedies and in Greek compositions written in the tragic mode, and the supernatural concerns divine agency within tragic plots. It must be remembered, too, that Greek tragedies originally held religious significance, since they were performed at a festival honoring the Greek god Dionysus. In particular, Jay identifies two dimensions of the supernatural that are especially important for the tragic mode: oracles and the *deus ex machina*. While writers of tragedies and the tragic mode often utilize oracles to clue the audience or reader in on what will take place in the future, the characters themselves often miss or misunderstand the significance of supernatural signs, an ironic literary motif already well-established by the role of oracles and oracular dreams in the *Histories* of Herodotus. Yet, since oracles are divine, and thus not subject to error, oracular pronouncements often contribute to the inexorability of reversal that is futile to resist. The *deus ex machina* (lit. “God [hanging] from the crane [μηχανή]”), in turn, was a part of the stagecraft of ancient Greek tragedy, where a drama would be resolved by the introduction of a divine character hanging over the stage. While flashy, such endings were often criticized in antiquity and beyond as artificial and inartistic, even though they are integrated into the
tragic form and actual tragedies in various ways. That is to say, when the *deus ex machina* is used appropriately, it may serve a variety of functions, such as to tie up loose ends, to foretell events beyond the scope of the narrative, or to provide a moral resolution to the (often troubling) events of the preceding tragic drama.  

In comparison to the rest of Genesis, God is curiously absent from Joseph’s story. Only once does he make an onstage appearance, when he addresses Jacob on his way to Egypt (46:1–4). At the same time, God’s offstage presence is felt throughout the Joseph story in two main ways: (i) as the supernatural force of fate and providence that secures provision for Jacob’s family by means of a sequence of events that is wild and unpredictable from one perspective but necessary and inexorable from another (39:1–6, 21–23; 41:37–52; 45:4–11; 49:25–26; 50:15–21); and (ii) as the divine power inspiring this narrative’s many dreams (37:5–10; 40:9–19; 41:1–36; 41:1–7 // 41:17–24) and portents or prophesies (38:27–30; 43:33–34; 48:8–22; 50:24–25) that all accurately predict future happenings. Since God only acts from off and behind the stage, however, he never appears above it, so that Joseph’s


story does not literally end with a *deus ex machina*. As such, this is the only tragic feature of Jay’s typology that is technically absent from the Joseph story.

9.2.7 Irony

Jay does not list irony as a distinct feature of the tragic mode, although he does discuss irony as it relates to recognition, and what he says is worth repeating in full:

> Recognition, moreover, depends for its dramatic effect on an uneven distribution of knowledge, for in tragedy, as in life, characters do not prepossess the knowledge that will in the course of events erase their ignorance. Yet both the implied audience and the fifth-century Athenian spectators usually already know almost everything that will occur, although it is hidden from the characters themselves, given the audience’s prior familiarity with the myths as well as the privileged position from which they are able to witness all the events of the drama. The result is a persistent and often playful irony, which imbues utterances with a bifurcated meaning, one for those who know and one for those who do not.29

Now irony in the Joseph story does relate to the tragic feature of recognition, since the reader is aware of Joseph’s true identity throughout his deception of his brothers, where the possibility of “bifurcated meaning” is ripe at very many points (Gen 42–45). Yet, there is a second, significant source of irony in Joseph’s story that relates more to the supernatural, since the reader—like Joseph—can easily infer the significance of the narrative’s many dreams and portents (see §9.2.6 above) and guess how the plot will develop as it proceeds, even though the other actors on the stage cannot. Because irony is pervasive in Joseph’s story, and (I will argue) because of the fact that G was especially interested in exploiting both of these main sources of irony in translation, it seems best to list irony—which is quite

29 Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 88–89.
amusing and pleasurable for the audience or reader—as an independent feature of the tragic mode.

9.3 Translating in the tragic mode

As I have shown above, the Hebrew story of Joseph and his brothers is excellent raw material for a Greek narrative composed in the tragic mode. This means that any accurate translation of this text would probably seem tragic to Greek eyes and ears. Yet, there is substantial evidence that G did not just unintentionally convey the tragic qualities of Joseph’s story in translation but deliberately aimed to represent, intensify, tweak, and develop those features that are already present and even to introduce new tragic features that are lacking or only implicit in the Hebrew version. In view of this fact, I will not detail every point where, by a close and careful rendering of the Hebrew into Greek, G has replicated the tragic features of Joseph’s story in his translation. Rather, in my argument I will focus on the translational evidence that reveals G’s special care and consideration for the tragic in Joseph. In actuality, then, G’s translation of Joseph’s story is even more tragic than is suggested by the evidence marshalled in this section, since G’s clearly intentional translation choices are combined in the translated text with those interpretive choices that seem more mundane. For example, in scenes of lamentation, characters often “rend” their clothes (קרע [37:29, 34; 44:13]), and G always represents this act of grief accurately in Greek by using the verb διαρρήγνυμι. But in isolation, this translation is too unexceptional or conventional to infer that G intended anything more than to represent the semantic content of the Hebrew verb. However, because, as I will show, G’s interest in the tragic in Joseph is
deliberate, creative, innovative, and widespread, it is rather likely that he did notice, appreciate, and aim to convey many such obvious features of the tragic mode in his translation. In conjunction, the two types of evidence—the conventional and the unconventional, the expected and the deliberately tragic—constitute a solid basis for observing and appreciating the ways that G has captured and enhanced the tragic qualities of the Joseph story that have delighted readers throughout the ages.

9.3.1 Revenge, emotion, and lamentation (Gen 37)

Not only does the Hebrew version of the Joseph narrative exhibit every major feature of the tragic mode when Gen 37–50 is considered as a whole, but all of these features can be found in the opening narrative sequence of Gen 37 alone: Joseph’s supernatural dreams and the reversal of his status as the favored son brought about by his brother’s revenge; Jacob’s true recognition of Joseph’s bloodied and torn cloak and the lamentation that ensues from his false inference that Joseph has died; the emotions of Joseph’s angry and jealous brothers, his fretful brother Reuben, and the lamentation of their distraught and bereaved father; and the ironic implication of Joseph’s portentous dreams that he will not only return to but actually exceed his former state of favor and honor. Yet, even as Joseph’s story has all the right ingredients of the tragic mode from its opening chapter, revenge and emotion are the main tragic themes here, since this chapter’s plot centers on Joseph’s brothers’ emotion-driven act of revenge and Joseph’s father’s emotion-filled response of lamentation. Furthermore, the key significance of these themes was not lost on G, because, with the translation choices that he makes in representing this narrative in Greek guise, he develops
particular aspects of the role played by revenge and emotion in this inciting incident of Joseph’s story. In particular, G fleshes out and synthesizes the complex factors that motivate the brothers’ act of revenge and then influence its particular enactment, and he dramatically portrays the emotional reactions of Reuben and Jacob when they learn of Joseph’s real and imagined fate, respectively. Beyond this particular scene, however, G’s attention to tragic features in Gen 37 constitutes a crucial piece of evidence that he intended to translate Joseph’s story in the tragic mode from the outset.

In the Hebrew version of Gen 37, Joseph’s brothers’ act of revenge is motivated by at least three potential factors: (i) the fact that Joseph “brings” (ויבא) a bad report about his brothers (דתם) to their father (37:2); (ii) the fact that Jacob “loves” (אהב) Joseph “most of all his sons” (מכל בני) and so makes him a “special tunic” (כתנת פסים) (37:3–4); and (iii) the fact that Joseph has two dreams that smack of arrogance because they imply Joseph’s superiority not only to his brothers but also to his parents (37:5–11). Furthermore, it is clear that this third factor is meant to exacerbate the enmity initiated by one or both of the first two, because Joseph’s brothers “proceed to hate him even more” (ווספו עוד שׂנא אתו) in response to Joseph reporting his first dream to them (37:5, 8). Yet, in representing these three motives for revenge in Greek, G both sharpens and connects them.

**Genesis 37:1–4**

Katôke kai de Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ γῆ, οὗ παρὼν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, ἐν γῇ Χανάαν. 2 οὕτως δὲ οἱ γενέσεις Ἰακὼβ. Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ἐκεῖ ἔπτα ἐτῶν ἦν ποιμαίνων μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ πρόβατα ὅν νέος, μετὰ τῶν ὕιῶν Βάλλας καὶ μετὰ τῶν ὕιῶν Ζέλφας τῶν γυναικῶν τούτων πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. **κατήγχευεν δὲ Ἰωσὴφ ψύχον ποιησῆν πρὸς Ἰσραήλ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν.** 3
G makes the first of these motivating factors sting by translating עלב (“and [Joseph] brought”) more aggressively as כ面白いון (“and [Joseph] brought against”)

רעה (“a bad report [?] about them”) forcefully as פוג (“vile invective”) (37:2).

G enhances Joseph’s condemnatory role by presenting this report as a demonstration of Joseph’s intellect and persuasive power in a rhetorical display of פוג (“invective”), a genre

30 ἰακωβ | In Hebrew, Jacob is referred to by two names: יעקב (“Jacob”) and ישו (“Israel”). Assuming that V read ישו here, G has preferred to use the more usual name in Greek (i.e., ἰακωβ), as also in 49:28. This is something of a puzzle, though, since G has used the name ישו in the preceding verse: why avoid it here? Having considered it more likely that G would translate “Israel” as “Jacob” than vice versa, I have reconstructed ישו ישו in V in 37:2 but not יעקב in this verse. Any text-critical decision must take into account G’s treatment of Hebrew proper nouns more generally (see esp. §5.2.2.1).

31 כנוח | Forbam in the hiphil (46), G typically uses אוג and cognates (26) or φάρω and cognates (17), but this is G’s only use of the particular compound כנוח in all of Genesis.

32 The verb כנוח is used in forensic contexts (LSJ, s.v., “כנוח” IV), as is פוג. Harl calls it “agressif.” While she says the Greek permits the interpretation that Joseph brought to Jacob’s attention the brothers’ invective against their father, it is more likely Joseph who is railing against his brothers (La Genèse, 259). In particular, the כנוח- of כנוח seems to suggest that Joseph is bringing blame “against” someone else (as in the Hebrew), since he is the subject. Less likely is Wevers’ suggestion that the כנוח- prefix signifies “back,” i.e., “he brought back (from the fields)” (Notes, 613). Cf. Prestel and Schorsch’s use of the verb “hinterbringen” (“bring back”) (“Genesis,” 226).

33 פוג | Both פוג and פוג are hapaxlegomena in Genesis.

34 For the collocation of פוג and πονηρός, consider Plutarch, Phoc. 1.6: τοσοῦτον δὲ τῇ τύχῃ δοτέον ἀντιπαπτομένη πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας ἱσχύειν, δουν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀξίας τιμῆς καὶ χάριτος ἐνίοις ψόγως πονηροῖς καὶ διαβολάς ἐπιφέρουσων, τὴν πίστιν ἀκούσετέραν ποιεῖν τῆς ἀκτής.

35 LSJ, s.v. “ψόγος” II. Prestel and Schorsch claim that G presents this “bad report” (üble Nachrede) as “a serious indictment” (“ein ernsthaftes Vergehen”), a “semantic shift that strengthens the narrative tension” (“eine die erzählerische Spannung verstärkende Bedeutungsverschiebung”) (“Genesis,” 226).
of epideictic rhetoric that stands in opposition to ἑγχώμιον (“encomium”).

What is more, G connects Joseph’s powerful inventive to Jacob’s gift of the special garment by translating the Hebrew י that joins the two clauses with δὲ instead of καί: 'Ἰακώβ δὲ37 ἡγάστα τὸν Ἰωσήφ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ (“but Jacob loved Joseph most of all his sons”) (37:3). While the reader might expect Jacob to disapprove of his son Joseph railing against his brothers with such vituperative force,38 Joseph’s father does not find fault with him but instead makes him a “colorful/embroidered tunic”39 (χιτώνα ποικίλον (= כנות כפש “ornamented? sleeved? colorful? tunic”)), a garment fit for gods and kings.40 Prejudicial or not, however, Jacob’s

36 On the pairing of ψόγος and ἑγχώμιον in early authors as genres of speeches, see Plato, Leg. 829c.3; Aristotle, Poet. 1448b.27; and esp. Rhet. Alex. 1425b.37–1426b.21. For a definition of ψόγος, see Aphthonius, Prog. 9, (Rabe 27.13): Ψόγος ἐστι λόγος ἐκθετικὸς τῶν προσόντων κακῶν. Cf. Theon, Prog. 9; Hermogenes, Prog. 8; Nicolaus, Prog. 8.

37 δὲ | For G’s use of δὲ for disjunctive-τα, see §4.1.1.1.

38 In fact, working with a text that read κατήνεγκαυ, such that the brothers rail against Joseph, John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.1 (PG 54 552.55–526.7) takes this event as a sign of the brothers’ excessive vice (κακίας ὑπερβολῆ), as they attempt to shake (διασαλεύσαι) their father’s love by fabricating (πλάττονται) lies (τὰ μὴ ὄντα) and slandering (διαβολή) their brother: Ὁρα κακίας ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἁγάπην διασαλεύσαι ἐπεξέρχοντο, καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα πλάττονται κατὰ τὸ ἀδέλφου, τοσοῦτο μόνον ἀνύστης, ἵνα τὸν οἰκεῖον φθάνῃ κατάδηλον ποίησις. Καὶ ἴνα μάθης, ὅτι τούτο μόνον ἐκέρδηνον, τὸ φανερὸν ἑαυτῶν ποίησιν τὴν λανθάνουσα νόημα, ὥστε τὸν πατέρα καὶ μετὰ τὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν διαβολήν ἐξεχόμενον τοῦ παιδός, καὶ πάντων αὐτῶν προκρίνοντα. Ιακώβ δὲ, φησίν, ἡγάστα τὸν Ἰωσήφ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι υἱὸς γῆρως ἢν αὐτῷ. Ἐποίησε δὲ αὐτῷ χιτώνα ποικίλον. Cf. Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 96; Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 288; Brayford, Genesis, 390: “Thus the brothers are portrayed as the tattletales.”

39 LSJ, s.v. “ποικίλος;” BDAG, s.v. “ποικίλος.” While G’s influential interpretation of כמות as ποικίλος has traditionally been understood as “many-colored” (cf. KJV “coat of many colours”) the Greek adjective only denotes variety (i.e., “varied”). In fact, Philo, Ios. 32–34 allegorizes this variety in relation to statesmanship (ποικίλον γὰρ πολιτεία καὶ πολιτρόπον). But in this case, the adjective likely refers to the incorporation of different colors and/or materials in Joseph’s tunic. Cf. Harl, La Genèse, 259.

40 Consider the following parallel usages: Athena wears an “embroidered peplos” (πέπλος ποικίλος) (Homer, Il. 5.733–737 // 8.384–388); the Persians in Xerxes’s army wear “colorful, sleeved tunics” (χιτώνες χειριστέων ποικίλων) (Herodotus, Hist. 7.61.3–4); Xerxes himself wears “colorful clothes” (ποικίλα ἐσθήματα) (Aeschylus,
reaction is based on his paternal love for Joseph, a love that G complexes in Greek by translating ἀγάπῃ first in terms of ἀγάπη ("love") (37:3) and then in terms of φιλεῖ ("friendship, affection") (37:4). Finally, by rendering ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἠδηγοί λέγειν ("and they could not greet him kindly") as καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο λαλεῖν αὐτῷ οὐδὲν εἰρηνικόν ("and they could not say anything peaceable to him") (37:4), G ends this opening scene by focusing on the lack of concord between Joseph and his brothers, who feel both jealousy (ζηλοῦν [ἐς τῷ])

Pers. 834–836; the Persian nobles in Cyrus’s entourage are commanded to help get wagons out the mud while wearing “expensive shirts and colorful pants” (πολυτελές χιτώνας καὶ τὰς ποικίλας ἀναξυρίδας); and in παρὰ ἡγοῦντα, Heraclides Ponticus, after discussing how pleasure causes kings/despots and Persians/Medes to have the virtues of μεγαλοψυχία (“magnanimity”), μεγαλοπρέπεια (“magnificence”), and ἀνδρεία (“bravery”), he claims that, as long as the Athenians “lived in luxury” (ἔτρυφας), they bred (ἐτρφέων) the “most magnanimous men” (μεγαλοφυγοτάτους ἀνδρας), who wore “purple clothes” (ἀλουργῆ ἰμάτια) and “colorful tunics” (ποικίλους χιτώνας) (Frag. 55). Cf. also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. rom. 2.70.

41 ἀγάπῃ | The verb ἀγαπάω is G’s regular equivalent for both the verb ἀγαπάω (10/14) and the noun ἀγάπη (1), and he does not use ἀγαπάω otherwise.

42 LSJ, s.v. “ἀγαπή” A.1; DGE, s.v. “ἀγαπή” I.2.

43 φιλεῖ | In contrast to ἀγαπάω, G less commonly uses φιλέω for ἀγαπάω (4), and this is G’s only use of φιλέω in the sense of “love” with an animate object (the object is ἔδεσματα in 27:4, 9, 14). In the sense of “kiss,” however, G also uses (κατα)φιλέω to translate πέσι (10/11).


45 HALOT, s.v. “φιλεῖ” 3.

46 οὐδὲν εἰρηνικόν | G translates πάντα (15) in a variety of ways, but most often as θυγαῖνο (5), σωτηρία/σωτήριος (4), or εἰρήνη/εἰρηνικός (see also 15:15; 26:29). G also uses εἰρηνικός to translate πέσι in 34:21, and as the regular equivalent of περ in later in Joseph’s story (5: 42:11, 19, 31, 33, 34), thus creating a novel intertextual link between Gen 37 and Gen 44. For the addition of οὐδέν, see §3.2.8.

47 Harl, La Genèse, 259–260: “pacifique.” After asking the meaning of this expression (Τι ἐστιν, οὐδὲν ἠδηγοί λαλεῖν αὐτῷ εἰρηνικόν;), John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.1 (PG 54 526.44–49) interprets εἰρηνικός politically: the brothers are “dominated by passion” (ἐκφρίσεις αὐτῶν τὸ πάθος), “just like captives” (καθάπερ αἰχμαλώτου) who are “living under its tyranny” (τυραννούμενοι). It is interesting that Philo describes the attack of Joseph’s brothers on Joseph in terms of battle: “they captured him like an enemy of war” (ὡς πολέμιον συλλαβόντες). Cf. Josephus, A. J. 2.3.1 §20.
(37:11) and spiteful hate (μισέω [= שׂנֵי]) (37:4; cf. 37:8) toward Joseph because their father did not punish but rather rewarded him magnificently for his strong verbal attack on them and their character.

After this incident, Joseph has two dreams that make matters much worse. In the first, Joseph sees himself and his brothers binding sheaves of grain in the field when suddenly his sheaf stands erect and the others bow down to it (35:7); in the second, Joseph imagines the sun, moon, and stars likewise bowing down to him (35:9). Both Joseph’s brothers and Joseph’s father find his two dreams, which clearly share a common interpretation, offensive and even laughable (35:8, 10). Yet, as in the case of Joseph’s father rewarding him for his censorious invective, G also escalates the rhetorical exchange between Joseph and his family on the subject of the dreams.

**Genesis 37:5–11**

5 Ἐνυπνιασθεὶς δὲ Ἰωάννη ἐνύπνιον ἀπόγγιείλεν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, 6 καὶ ἔλεην αὐτοῖς τὴν ἡμῖν δόσην. 7 ἐνύπνιον ἦν ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πεδίων, καὶ ἀνέκτη τὸ ἐμὸν δράγμα καὶ ἄρρηθα. 8 ἔλεην δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Μωζεὺς βασιλεύσεις ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ κυριεύσεις ἡμῖν κυριεύσεις. 9 ἔλεην δὲ ἐνύπνιον ἐτέρων διηγήσατο αὐτῷ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεην Ἰησοῦν ἐνυπνιασθέντα ἐνύπνιον ἐτέρων. 10 ἔπειτα ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεην αὐτῷ Τι τὸ ἐνύπνιον τοῦτο, ἢ ἐνυπνιάσθης ὥσπερ ἐδείχνεις ἀλευσάμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ἡ μητέρα σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου προσκυνήσατε σοι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. 11 ἔξωσαν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς δὲ πατήρ αὐτοῦ διετέρησεν τὸ βήμα.

When Joseph tells his brothers the dream about the sheaves, which only involves him and them, G translates the pronominal suffix on עלמרנה (“my sheaf”) more emphatically than
usual, by selecting the pronominal adjective ἐμὸς ("my") and moving it before its head noun to indicate its special salience in this context, where it signals a sharp contrast between Joseph and his brothers: τὸ ἐμὸν δράγμα ("my sheaf") (37:7 [twice]). Now as the narrative has it, Joseph may have intended to convey astonishment and surprise by phrasing it this way, but this tiny word surely drove Joseph’s brothers mad with rage and made him sound like an annoying and braggadocios brat in their ears. G aptly conveys the sarcasm of their reaction by introducing the rhetorical questions they ask with μή, which presupposes an answer in the negative ("you won’t ... will you?") and gives some contextual significance to the doubling up of emphatic infinitive absolute constructions that are pleonastic when represented formally in Greek translation:

37:8

Will you really be king over us or really rule over us?
You won’t reign over us as king or lord over us as lord, will you?

In addition, G translates משל ("rule") more regally as κυριεύω ("be lord, dominate"), also to ensure that the Greek reader does not miss the sarcasm—and irony—of the Hebrew question. Then, when he represents Jacob’s reaction to Joseph’s second dream about the

48 ἐμὸς | On G’s emphatic rendering of Hebrew pronominal suffixes with Greek possessive adjectives—which he always fronts—see §4.1.2.2.
49 μή | For G’s contextual translation of the Hebrew question particle τι, see §3.1.5.2.
50 βασιλεύων βασιλεύσεις ... κυριεύων κυριεύσεις | This is G’s most common way to handle the Hebrew infinitive absolute paired with a cognate finite verb (13/40), but he also uses other techniques (see §6.1.1.8).
51 Brayford, Genesis, 391, 420. G’s use of κυριεύω is also ironic, since Joseph’s brothers later call him κύριος (15: 42:10, 30, 33; 43:20; 44:7, 8, 9, 16+, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 33).
52 Philo, Somn. 2.7 sees the brothers’ sarcasm as expressing “a violent threat” (σφοδρὰ ἐπανάτασις). Cf. Ios. 7.
sun, moon, and stars bowing down to him, G makes another interpretational intervention in order to convey Jacob’s shock and incredulity, this time translating the Hebrew question particle ה quite suggestively as ἀρά γε ("really truly"): 54

37:10

בָּנָי כָּנַנְנִי ἀρά γε ἐλθόντες ἐλευσάμεθα
אֵין אַמְךׁ וְאָבִיךָ קֶרֶם קַי אֲדֶלֶפֶּהֶּהָ σου
לַשׁתַּחֵם כָּל אֲרֻבָּה

Will we really come, Will we really truly come, after we have come,
your mothers, brothers, and I, your mother, brothers, and I,
to bow down to you on the ground? to bow down to you on the ground?

Even as G’s translation choice here also serves to convey the boldness—albeit the well-placed boldness!—of Joseph’s dream reports, 55 his use of the aorist participle ἐλθόντες ("after we have come") for the Hebrew infinitive absolute ironically suggests the particular fulfillment of Joseph’s dream realized later in the narrative, since Joseph’s family will, in fact, come to see him in Egypt during the world-wide famine. Of course, just by infusing these two Hebrew rhetorical questions with particles expressing doubt and incredulity, G gestures to their deep irony in the larger plot sequence, since what Joseph’s brothers and Joseph’s father find impossible actually takes place, as the reader knows or surmises. 57 What is more, G also signals the irony of this scene in a handful of other ways. To begin with, he

53 ἀρά γε | G only uses this particle combination in a rhetorical question in one other instance (18:13), but (as was discussed in §8.3.2 and note 201) that case already expresses incredulity directly in Hebrew via האף.

54 KG II §§508.12; 589.7; Denniston, The Greek Particles, 46–47, 50. Wevers says that ἀρά γε in this verse conveys “sceptical impatience,” paraphrasing the question as of the type: “Surely you don’t mean to suggest that […]” (Notes, 617).

55 Philo, Somn. 2.7 says that Jacob’s question stems from “righteous anger” (ὁργὴ δικαία).

56 ἐλθόντες | G rarely uses the aorist participle for the Hebrew infinitive absolute (see also 12:9; 26:28).

57 Brayford, Genesis, 392: “The rhetorical questions of his brothers and father ironically foreshadow the later events of the story, when all his brothers will indeed bow down to him.”
conveys the subjective character of Joseph’s dreams, which hints that their interpretive significance lies in the real world of the narrative. He does this chiefly by the way that he translates the Hebrew particle combination "(and behold)" introducing each dream:

37:7 והנה אנחנו מלכים אלמים בתוך השדה ὥσπερ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη und στερεός προσεκύνου με.

37:9 והנה חלמתי חלום עוד והנה השמש והירח καὶ ἡ σελήνη καὶ ἕνδεκα αστέρες προσεκύνου με.

In the first case, the first-person construction ὥσπερ58 ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα ("I imagined we were binding sheaves") directly assumes Joseph’s subjective perspective;59 in the second, G’s use of ὥσπερ60 ("as if") suggests that the sun, moon, and stars are stand-ins for real

58 οἴμαι | As a rule, G translates ὥσπερ (129) as ιδού (78) or omits it (15) (see §3.1.5.3). G only uses οἴμαι—as a match for ὥσπερ or otherwise—in the dream reports of Joseph’s story (see also 40:16; 41:1, 17).

59 Martin Meiser, “Der Traum in der griechisch-römischen Antike, im antiken Judentum und im antiken Christentum,” in Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 265–266. Philo, Somn. gives great attention to G’s use of οἴμαι: this (he says) is an “expression” (ἀνάφθεγμα) of a person who “is unclear” (αδηλοῦντος), “vacillates” (ἐνδοιάζοντος), “conceives dimly” (ἀμυδρῶς ὑπολαμβάνοντος), and “does not see firmly or distantly” (οὐ παγίως καὶ τηλαυγῶς ὅρως); furthermore, this word befits “those who are just waking up from a deep sleep” (τοῖς γὰρ ἐκ βαθέως ὕπνου διανισταμένοις) and “those who are still dreaming” (ἐτὶ ὕπνιείς βρισκόμενοι) (2.17–18). Wevers says that by οἴμαι (which he translates as “I supposed, I imagined”), “Gen betrays his understanding of the dream experience” (Notes, 615). In relation to Pharaoh’s dreams, he adds that G conveys “the notion of irreality” by translating ὥσπερ as ὅπως καὶ ὥσπερ (Notes, 675).

60 ὥσπερ | G only translates ὥσπερ as ὥσπερ in dream reports (see also 41:18, 22; cf. 41:2 where ὥσπερ = καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥσπερ), a fascinating scrap of evidence that G attends to narrative context and literary form in selecting lexical and grammatical equivalents. G uses ὥσπερ on one other occasion, to translate ἐνυπνιασμένος (he translates: “I dreamed for myself”) consistent with the imagined and unreal state of affairs expressed by ὥσπερ (Notes, 617). While this interpretation should not be ruled out—given G’s control of Greek voice in general (see, e.g., §§6.1.1.4; 6.1.1.7; 6.1.2.3)—Muraoka may be correct that this is a case “functional neutralisation” between middle and passive forms (SSG §27e), such that the difference is only one of form and not of meaning.
entities outside of his dream. More subtly, the fact that G has Joseph’s sheaf not just “stand up” (נצבה) but “stand upright” (ὤρθωθη) also suggests that Joseph’s felt (and actual) superiority to his brothers has an ethical dimension, a point that is unambiguously confirmed as the narrative progresses from start to finish. Given the reactions of Joseph’s brothers and Joseph’s father, there is no doubt that they see right through the facile symbolism of the dreams—even though the Egyptians later cannot!—and G puts structural emphasis on their final reaction by consistently translating the Hebrew conjunction 1 neutrally as καί beginning with the second dream report’s initial 1 (four times on the level of narrative) (37:9) until he reaches the final clause of 37:11:

37:11

εξήλωσαν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ,
ἀπεισάμην ἀδελφὸς τὸ ῥῆμα.

And his brothers were jealous of him, So, his brothers were jealous of him, but his father kept the matter. but his father carefully observed the account.

By structuring the clauses of the second dream sequence in this way, G throws the summary statement of the reaction of Joseph’s brothers into relief, thus neatly presenting their spiteful hate (ἐμίσησαν) and jealousy (ἐξήλωσαν) as the end result of the entire opening scene in which G has carefully drawn out the disfunctional dynamics among Jacob’s

61 ὀρθόθη | G typically uses ἰστημι or cognates for נצב in the niphal (4/6) and the hiphil (5/5), and G does not use ὀρθῶ elsewhere.

62 For the metaphorical usage of ὀρθῶ, see LSJ, s.vv. “ὀρθῶ” A.II; “ὀρθός” A.III. Philo, Somn. 2.78–79 understands ὀρθῶ as indicating Joseph’s superiority (a sign of his vainglory [κενὴ δόξα]).

63 As John Chrysostom claims in Hom. Gen. 61.2 (PG 54 527.41–528.5), the fact that the brothers “interpret the dream themselves” (αὐτοὶ τὸ ἰδιακρίνουσιν) reveals their excessive “blindness” (πήρωσις) and “stupidity” (ἄνοια): why did they attempt to thwart the plan that God foretold in this way?

64 δέ | Concerning G’s use of δέ to structure the narrative, including a more detailed discussion of this particular example, see §4.1.1.3.
children and enhanced and connected Joseph’s brothers’ motives for revenge. At the same
time, G’s translation of the final clause of this scene may insinuate that Jacob gave Joseph’s
reported dream more serious consideration than is suggested by his initial reaction, as he
“carefully observed” (διετήρησεν [= רָם “kept”]) what Joseph said. Regardless,
however, G intimates to the reader with the verb διατηρέω that Joseph’s dreams portend
future events.

Given the hateful and jealous reaction of Joseph’s brothers, it was only a matter of
time before they tried to get even with him. So, when they spy him coming to check on
them while they are off grazing their father’s flocks, they plot their revenge: they will kill
him, throw his corpse in a pit, and claim he was eaten by a wild animal. In his attempt to
represent the classically tragic scheme of Joseph’s brothers adequately in Greek, G makes
several notable translation choices that capture and even enhance their plans for revenge in
terms of their intentionality and brutality.

---

66 διετήρησεν | G normally uses φυλάσσω (8) or διαφυλάσσω (2) to translate שׁמר (16), and his other use of
διατηρέω (17:9, 10) also conveys a special emphasis on observance in its context (see §8.3.2). G does not use
διατηρέω elsewhere.
67 HALOT, s.v. “שׁמר” qal 3.
68 Philo, Ios. 8 interprets διατηρέω as Jacob “watching what would come to be” (σκοπούμενον τὸ ἐσόμενον), and in Somn. 2.141 he explains that an aged and noble soul such as Jacob wisely examines all things, respects
God’s unchangeable power, and considers “what end will befall it” (τι ἄρα ἀποβήσεται τὸ τέλος αὐτῆ). John
Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.2 [PG 54 528.16–20] takes the tension between Jacob’s two reactions as a sign that
Jacob only rebuked Joseph to calm his brothers’ nascent envy (τὸν τικτόμενον ... φθόνον): in reality, he guessed
(στοχαζόμενος) that the revelation came from God: Εἰδὼς τὸν τικτόμενον αὐτῷ φθόνον παρὰ τῶν ἄδελφῶν ὁ πατήρ,
dιὰ τὸ τοῦτο ἐπετίμησε τῷ παιδὶ, καὶ διακρίνει καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ ὄναρ, καὶ στοχαζόμενος παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν αὐτῶ
γεγεννήσαι, διετήρει τὸ ῥῆμα. Cf. Josephus, A.J. 2.2.3–2.2.4 §§13–17; Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 291.
First, even as the Hebrew version has Joseph’s brothers plot their revenge when they see him “from a distance” (מרחק), G reinforces this fact by translating the Hebrew verb ראה (“see”) with the Greek compound verb προοράω (see ahead), which gives Joseph’s brothers ample time to make their evil plans:

and they conspired against him to kill him and they began plotting evil to kill him

In translating this clause, G’s lexical choice of πονηρεύομαι (“plot or intend evil”) presents Joseph’s brothers’ conspiracy not just as secretive but as “evil” (πονηρεύομαι), and his morphological choice of the Greek imperfect implies sufficient time for them to deliberate about their premeditated crime. In addition, G coins the term ἐνυπνιαστής (dreamer) as an apt representation of the sarcastic Hebrew idiom 방ל הלחמתי (“lord of dreams”) that Joseph’s brothers use to refer to him as he approaches (37:19), and he also makes use of the

---

69 προοράω | This is G’s only use of the compound verb προοράω, although the simplex is his standard equivalent for the qal of ראה (115/129). Wevers lauds G’s choice here as “peculiarly appropriate” (Notes, 620). Cf. Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 227.
70 Wevers, Notes, 620.
71 Philo, Ios. 12 says that Joseph’s brothers do not “address” (προσαγορεύειν) him “by name” (ὄνομαστί) but called him ἐνυπνιαστής (“one who is startled by dreams”)—perhaps because he takes dreams too seriously—ἐνυπνιαστής (“dreamer”), and “other such names” (τοιαῦτα).
72 In fact, dating back at least to Tyndale and the King James Version, many English translations (including modern versions) have commandeered G’s elegant solution to this particular translation puzzle.
compound κατεσθίω (“devour”) for the more general Hebrew בビ (“eat”) in order to depict more graphically their cover story that Joseph was devoured by a wild animal (37:20). In combination, G’s two choices here present the evil and premeditated revenge of Joseph’s brothers as equally brutal, since they mock their own kin and jest at his imagined mauling. Intentionally plotting to murder their own brother in cold blood, how could their plan for revenge be any more tragic?

In fact, this plan is too perfectly wicked for certain of Joseph’s brothers. Older and wiser, Reuben proposes that they just throw him in a pit—actually planning to rescue him (37:21–24)—but while Reuben is gone and Joseph is trapped in the pit, Judah recommends that they sell him instead, so that they can also make a handsome profit from their treachery (37:25–28). In relation to Judah’s greed for dishonest gain, G makes several interpretive moves that highlight the baseness of this revised wicked plan:

37:26

And Judah said to his brothers, Then Judah said to his brothers, “What gain is there if we kill our brother and cover up his blood?” “What advantage is there, if we kill our brother and conceal his blood?”

73 κατεσθίω | G usually represents בするのは (64) as ἐσθίω (49) but uses κατεσθίω in a handful of cases where it is contextually appropriate (8: 31:15, 38; 37:20, 33; 40:17; 41:4, 20; 43:2).

74 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.3 (PG 54 530.3–9) describes the brothers’ “savagery” (ὡμότης) and “inhumanity” (ἀπανθρωπία): “like some kind of fierce beasts” (καβάπερ τινὲς ἄγριοι θήρες) “they pounce” (ἐπιπηδοῦσι) upon a “lamb” (ἀρνίον). Cf. Hom. Gen. 62.1 (PG 54 532.56–61). Similarly, Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 289.39 says that Joseph’s brothers “flew into a mad rage in the manner of beasts” ([url]θηρῶν δίκην ἐπιμεμενήκαστι[/url]) due to their jealousy.
Two points are of interest in G’s translation of Judah’s proposal: (i) G represents בֶצ ע (“[unjust] gain”) as χρήσιμος (“advantage”) and (ii) כסה (“cover up”) as κρύπτω (“hide, conceal”). With χρήσιμος, G does not explicitly convey the shady connotations of בֶצ ע, but he introduces the concept of τὸ συμφέρον (“advantage”), which is the central topos of deliberative rhetoric, where the matter at hand is of the type: “Should we do X or Y?” In this way, G presents Judah not just as maliciously greedy—which he undoubtedly is—but as equally calculated in his attempts to persuade his brothers to adopt his proposed course of action. This, in turn, relates to G’s translation of כסה (“cover up”), since κρύπτω (“hide, conceal”) suggests a greater extent of deceit. Yet if, in highlighting Judah’s cold and cruel calculus, G focuses the reader’s attention away from Judah’s greed for gain, he compensates for this loss by substantially marking up Joseph’s sale price, exchanging עשרים כסף (“twenty

---

75 χρήσιμος | Both בֶצ ע and χρήσιμος are hapaxlegomena in Genesis. Moreover, χρήσιμος does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch, and the equivalence between בֶצ ע and χρήσιμος is unique in the Septuagint as a whole (Wevers, Notes, 624–625).

76 κρύπτω | G typically uses compounds of καλύπτω (4) to translate כסה (8), but the equivalence with κρύπτω is also found in 18:17. Otherwise, G uses κρύπτω (and cognates) for Hebrew verbs that are more explicitly furtive, i.e., הוב (3/3), הסר (1/2), and הנב (1/12).


78 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.4 (PG 54 530.26–27, 30–31) says that Judah “recommends” (συμβουλεύει) the sale of their brother, and he paraphrases their acceptance of this proposal in 37:27 by saying that they “accepted” (δεξάμενοι) “the recommendation” (τὴν συμβουλὴν). Cf. Philo, Jos. 16; Josephus, A.J. 2.3.3 §32.
pieces of silver”) for εἰκοσι χρυσῶν⁷⁹ (“twenty pieces of gold”).⁸⁰ So, while Joseph’s brothers are persuaded by Judah’s proposal, it is not to their credit that in their thirst for revenge they have rejected the unimaginable brutality of fratricide for the heartlessly cold but profitable crime of human trafficking.⁸¹

With Joseph’s tragic betrayal complete, the rest of his story will deal with the unintended aftermath of his brothers’ act of revenge. Yet, within the limits of this opening sequence of events, Joseph’s disappearance gives way to tragic emotions, as Reuben searches in vain for the lost brother he tried to protect and as Jacob erroneously infers that his favorite child is forever gone. In his translation of the rest of Gen 37, G shows as much interest in Reuben’s panic and Jacob’s lamentation as he has shown so far in the tragic theme of revenge. When Reuben finds Joseph missing from the pit, G aims to present his frantic mindset vividly to the reader in at least three ways:

---

⁷⁹ χρυσῶν | G regularly translates כֶּסֶף (43) with ἀργύριον and cognates (38), only using χρυσοῦς again in 45:22, multiplying Joseph’s gift to his beloved full-brother Benjamin in an interestingly parallel way. Unsurprisingly, χρυσίον (5) and χρυσοῦς (2) are G’s standard matches for זָהָב (9), and G does not use these nouns for any other Hebrew term apart from the two exceptions noted here.

⁸⁰ No other versions follow the Greek here. Twenty pieces of gold is a more reasonable price for a slave based on contemporary rates. Twenty pieces of silver would have been “abnormally low” (Lee, Lexical Study, 63–65; cf. Hiebert, “Translation Technique,” 87–89; Wevers, Notes, 626; Harl, La Genèse, 262; Brayford, Genesis, 395; Prestel and Schorsch, “Genesis,” 227).

Genesis 37:29–30

אַחֲרֵֽי׃ וַהֲנָה אֵין יַעֲשֵׁנִ֣י בְּנֵי לְאַּבְרָּם; וַיַּנָּ֣כְרָֽיְנֵ֔נִי בִּי לָכְּךָ, וַיְלַשֵּׁ֤נִ֙ו וְלָבָ֔שׁ עָלָ֔יו בְּכִלָּלִ֖ים, וַיִּשְׁלָֽקְנֵ֑ו אִמְּתִֽי אֵ֖ינוֹ אֵ֛ינוּ בּוֹרָ֖ו. 30 כִּֽי־אֵ֣נֶה שְׁקִֽדְּנֵ֗נִי עֲלֵָ֖י לֵאמָֽר׃ וֹאָֽלַּיְ֤וָנֵ֨י לַאֲדוֹלְפֵּ֣ס אֵֽין אָֽדֹלְפֵּ֔ס אֵ֖ינוּ בּוֹרָ֑ו. 30 כִּֽי־אֵ֣נֶה שְׁקִֽדְּנֵ֗נִי עֲלֵָ֖י לֵאמָֽר׃ יָֽוְאָֽלַּ֛י לַאֲדוֹלְפֵּ֖ס אֵֽין אָֽדֹלְפֵּֽס אֵ֖ינוּ בּוֹרָ֑ו.

To begin with, G uses the active historical present ὁ ρᾷ ("he did not see") to translate the Hebrew negative existential construction in the clause "and behold, Joseph was not in the pit!". By using an active and personal construction in Greek, G aligns the reader's perspective with that of Reuben upon finding his brother missing, while the historical present vividly captures his anxious disorientation. Next, Reuben turns to his brothers to say that "the boy" (הַלֶּדֶּ) is missing, which G translates as παιδάριον ("little guy"),83 capturing the fraternal affection of a caring, older brother with a guilty conscience.84 Then, he dramatically exclaims "As for me, where else will I go?" (37:30). This Hebrew is impossible to represent exactly in English translation, but it makes rhetorical use of the repeated first-person pronoun אני, which is already emphatic where it occurs only once in a clause. To capture the sense of the Hebrew, G departs from its form and translates this as ἐγὼ δὲ πού πορεύομαι ἔτι ("As for me, where else will I go"), supplying ἔτι ("else") to convey the emphasis of the Hebrew anaphora.86 But in both versions, this

82 ὁ ρᾷ | On G's use of the historical present to translate wayyiqtol with dramatic vividness, see §6.1.1.1.
83 παιδάριον | G's normal translation of יֶלֶד (19) is παιδίον (12), although he also uses παιδάριον in 33:14 and 42:22 and to translate נֶפֶשׁ (6: 22:5, 12; 43:8; 44:22, 30, 31).
85 Some Hellenistic and Koine authors use some diminutives with no special meaning, but this does not apply to G in this case. In the Joseph narrative, G only uses παιδάριον in reference to the two youngest (and dearest) brothers/sons, i.e., Joseph and Benjamin. The significance of the use of this term for Benjamin will be treated in §9.3.4. Elsewhere in Genesis, G twice uses παιδάριον as an emotionally-laden reference to Isaac in Gen 22 (22:5, 12) (see §8.3.3), and once more in 33:14.
86 Philo, Ios. 16–17 presents Reuben searching and lamenting for Joseph even more theatrically.
question is rhetorical, and Reuben uses it to express that he has nowhere left to turn: Joseph is gone.

G also uses the Greek language to enhance the pathos of Jacob’s mourning and lamentation when Jacob “recognizes” (ἐπιγινώσκω) Joseph’s special tunic and infers his death, even as this last scene is already dripping with tragic emotions and intense lamentation in the Hebrew version:

**Genesis 37:31–35**

The first tragic embellishment relates to the fact that G does not have Joseph’s brothers “dip” (טבל) the special tunic in goat’s blood but rather “stain/defile” (μολύνω) it (37:31). By using this ethically-charged term, G draws the reader’s attention to the brutal savagery of the brothers’ original plan and of their actual act of deception. In this same vein, G has Jacob say—just as the brothers originally proposed—that a wild animal “devoured” (κατέφαγεν) Joseph (37:33), which helps to explain his torn and blood-stained tunic. But, instead of assuming that a wild animal “tore” (סחַר) him (i.e., his flesh), in Greek Jacob says

---

87 μολύνω | Both טבל and μολύνω are hapaxlegomena in Genesis.
88 LSJ, s.v. “μολύνω” A.I.1; BDAG, s.v. “μολύνω” 2; cf. Wevers, Notes, 627; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 227.
89 κατέφαγεν | See note 73 above.
that it “snatched Joseph away” (ἤρπασεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ) (37:33). While the idea of a wild animal hungrily dragging Joseph’s body off to its hidden lair to devour his flesh in private is no less horrific—and nicely explains why Joseph’s tunic could be found but not his body—G’s clever use of ἄρπάζω ironically discloses what actually happened to Joseph: he was not eaten but sold by his brothers and snatched away by traders.92 What is more, G packages this image in a stylistically effective way by using anaphora where there is none in the Hebrew, i.e., he translates both חיה (“animal”) and the infinitive absolute of תרף (“tear”) as θηρίον (“beast”). In this way he captures the brothers’ feigned emotion by transforming the last two clauses of 37:33 into parallel cola, translating חיה רעה אכלתהו טרף טרף יוסף (“a wild animal has eaten him, it has torn Joseph to pieces”) as θηρίον πονηρὸν κατέφαγεν αὐτὸν, θηρίον ἤρπασεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ (“a wicked beast has devoured him, a beast has snatched Joseph away”).

At this traumatic realization, Jacob rends his clothes, puts on sackcloth, and enters into a period of ritual mourning (πένθος; cf. πενθέω93 [ἑλκ] in 37:34, 35).94 This leads to G’s

---

90 ἤρπασεν | G only translates χήρας as ἄρπάζω here (but cf. ἄρπαξ in 49:27). In its other three occurrences, G uses θηρίον (37:33) and the cognate θηρίοβρωτος γίνομαι (44:28+ [= στρέφεται]). While G does not use ἄρπάζω anywhere else in Genesis, he does use the compound διαρπάζω twice to represent בזז (34:27, 29).

91 In noting the difference between χήρας and ἄρπάζω, Wevers judges that “Gen has toned down the gruesome picture which Jacob conjures up” (Notes, 628). While G pushes this horrific picture further off stage, he also allows it to seep deeper into the imagination of both the actors and the audience.

92 In commenting on Jacob’s false inference, John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 61.4 (PG 54 531.60–61) notes another aspect of its irony, since Joseph’s fate was just like falling among “beasts:” Καὶ γὰρ ἄληθες, καθάπερ θηρίοις περιπεσὼν, οὕτως ἀνήλικός ἦν πάντως ὑπέμεινε. Cf. Philo, Somn. 2.65–66.

93 πενθέω | G uses πενθέω to translate the verb לָבָנ (37:34), the cognate verbal adjective לֵבֶן (37:35)—their only occurrences—and כֶּן (2:16; 23:2; 50:3). Similarly, G selects the noun πένθος for צוּחַ (2:35:8; 50:4) and יָבָנ (5:27:41; 50:10, 11++). G does not use πενθέω/πένθος otherwise.

94 Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 293.32; 304.44 describes Jacob’s lament theatrically with the term κατοιμώζω, a verb derived from the common tragic expression ὁμοία (“Woe is me!”).
second tragic embellishment, which makes effective use of the aspectual distinctions of the Greek verbal system. Although G translates נַחַם (“comfort”) as παρακαλέω in both its occurrences here, he inflects it as aorist when Jacob’s children come “to comfort” (παρακαλέσαι) him, but as present when Jacob does not wish “to be comforted” (παρακαλεῖσθαι).95 While Jacob’s sons and daughters hope to succeed in consoling their father so that he ends his period of mourning, he refuses their comfort not just at the present moment but in principle, planning to carry his grief to his grave.96

From a horrific act of revenge born out of Joseph’s brothers’ hatred and jealousy to the panic, mourning, and lamentation of Reuben and Jacob, the beginning to Joseph’s story is pervasively tragic, and I have argued that G has aimed to translate it in the tragic mode by developing its tragic themes of revenge, emotions, and lamentation in particular ways. In addition, I have shown that G has enriched its levels of irony with certain clever translation choices that permit different interpretations for the characters on the stage and the readers of the story. Such irony artfully anticipates the story’s conclusion as its braided strands of reversal and recognition are tightened and then loosened with the help of irony and the supernatural. I will demonstrate G’s diverse interest in representing and cultivating all things tragic as we turn to other parts of the Joseph story, where what was meant as revenge ultimately results in reversal by way of recognition.

95 παρακαλέσαι ... παρακαλεῖσθαι | For G’s control and contextually appropriate use of aspect on Greek infinitives, including a discussion of this example, see §6.1.1.7.
96 Philo, Ios. 22–27 dramatically elaborates Jacob’s lament.
9.3.2 A tragic digression: Judah and Tamar (Gen 38)

Within the context of the Joseph story, the account of Judah and Tamar in Gen 38 is a “digression” (παρέχβασις). This is not to say that its content is irrelevant to its surrounding literary context, but that this chapter marks an unambiguous shift away from the plot sequence begun in Gen 37, and—as is so often the case in Hebrew poetics—the way this narrative is meant to function within the Joseph story as a whole is not explicitly stated. I would argue that the Hebrew version of Gen 38 functions like a play within a play, such that its events serve as a kind of allegory of the Joseph narrative as a whole, similar to how the dreams of Gen 37 and 40–41 function in relation to their encompassing literary contexts. Yet, while the exact purpose of Gen 38 in the Hebrew version of Joseph’s story is not directly of concern here, I will argue that the translation choices that G makes in this passage indicate that he shared, and even encouraged, such an interpretation. In particular, G uses his translation of Gen 38 to encourage his readers to anticipate the way in which the larger narrative that he has already begun to translate in the tragic mode will be resolved by way of the tragic features of reversal and recognition.

Before we consider how G’s tragic translation of Joseph’s story bleeds into his representation of the account of Judah and Tamar in Gen 38 such that he foreshadows the resolution of the outer narrative by analogy to the inner narrative, I will defend the

---

relevance of this digression to the surrounding material by noting major similarities of their respective plots. First, as is true of Gen 37 and the rest of Joseph’s story, the Hebrew account of Judah and Tamar has all the elements that a Greek reader would expect for a narrative composed in the tragic mode: Judah’s reversal from honor to humiliation (and humility) and Tamar’s reversal from expropriation to vindication; Tamar’s crafty act of revenge on Judah by concealing her identity until it is dramatically revealed by Judah’s recognition by means of signs; Judah’s fear that his third son will die like the first two; their lamentation and mourning for dead sons and husbands; the divine punishment of Judah’s wicked sons and the supernatural, portentous birth of twins in which the “younger” son manages to force his way out first. Yet, the story of Judah and Tamar does not just share the marks of the tragic mode in general, but it particularly resembles the tragic story of Joseph in numerous and specific ways, as is demonstrated below in Table 20:
TABLE 20. COMPARISON OF GEN 38 (JUDAH AND TAMAR) AND GEN 37, 39–50 (JOSEPH)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling rivalry (Er/Onan)</td>
<td>(38:9) Sibling rivalry (Joseph/brothers)</td>
<td>(37:1–11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wicked sons (Er/Onan)</td>
<td>(38:7, 8–9) Wicked sons (Joseph’s brothers)</td>
<td>(37:18–34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Innocent Tamar wronged</td>
<td>(38:11) Innocent Joseph wronged</td>
<td>(37:28, 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mistake made out among flocks</td>
<td>(38:12) Mistake made out among flocks</td>
<td>(37:12–17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bereavement (Er/Onan)</td>
<td>(38:7, 10) Bereavement (Joseph)</td>
<td>(37:33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Judah fears for youngest (Shelah)</td>
<td>(38:10) Jacob fears for youngest (Benjamin)</td>
<td>(42:4, 36–38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tamar conceals her identity</td>
<td>(38:14–19) Joseph conceals his identity</td>
<td>(chs. 42–45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tamar changes clothes</td>
<td>(38:14, 19) Joseph changes clothes</td>
<td>(41:14, 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tamar’s trick causes foreboding</td>
<td>(38:20–23) Joseph’s trick causes foreboding</td>
<td>(42:21, 28; 44:16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One important feature of this impressive list of similarities is the fact that, while many aspects of Gen 38 correspond to elements of the Joseph story that the reader has already encountered in Gen 37 (above the line), just as many anticipate events to come (below the line), especially the dramatic unfolding of the plot up to the point where Joseph finally reveals his true identity. This is so, because the story of Judah and Tamar constitutes a self-contained tragic plot that is similar to the tragic story of Joseph that it interrupts.

With this in mind, the fact that G gives special attention to the role of recognition throughout Gen 38 suggests that he judged that this narrative digression is intended to foreshadow the dramatic recognition scene that resolves the main narrative tension of the outer story. Furthermore, this explanation is corroborated by the translation choices that G makes in the portentous birth scene that serves as an epilogue to this chapter’s story.
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First, G presents Tamar masking her own identity in a way that does not just capture but modulates the act’s deceit and effectiveness, as he emphasizes her resulting attractiveness. In the Hebrew version of 38:14, Tamar prepares to trick Judah in three stages: (i) she “removes” (סף) her widow’s clothes; (ii) she “covers” (כסה) her face with a “veil” (ענן) (cf. 38:15); and (iii) she “wraps herself up” ( yakınה), presumably in the flashy clothes of a prostitute.\(^98\) Now, while G also has Tamar change her clothes, he expresses this fact not with the first and third clauses, but with the first and second, such that the verbal prefix περι- and the middle voice of both (i) περιαιρέω (\(^99\) (“take off from around oneself”) and (ii) περιβάλλω (\(^100\) (“put around oneself”) convey the reflexive wrapping expressed by (iii) περιαιρέω.

\(^{98}\) Wevers, Notes, 638: “she wrapped herself ... presumably in garments more appropriate to a prostitute.”

\(^{99}\) περιαιρέω | For the hiphil of הפש (8), G only uses περιαιρέω in reference to Tamar (see also 41:42) and Joseph (41:42) (but cf. αφαίρεω in 48:17). G only uses περιαιρέω in the middle, as fits each of these contexts—for G’s appropriate use of the middle voice, see §6.1.2.3—and he does not use this verb otherwise. In Wevers’ estimation, G has chosen “exactly the right word” (Notes, 638).

\(^{100}\) περιβάλλω | G also translates כסח (8) as περιβάλλω in 24:65, and he uses this verb for παντελές in 28:20. For G’s treatment of כסח more generally, see note 76 above.
in the *hithpael*, whether G understood this rare verb or not. Yet, G's use of καλλωπίζομαι (“put on makeup”) for הַעֲטָרָה (“wrap oneself up”) and θέριστρον (“light summer garment”) for הָעֵפֶן (“veil”) has greater interpretive significance. Instead of having Tamar mask her identity with a veil, G has her disguise herself by dressing her in the seductive clothes and makeup of a prostitute. In fact, since G has eliminated the veil from

---

101 Given the fact that הָעֵפֶן only occurs here in the Pentateuch and is far from the meaning of καλλωπίζω, Prestel and Schorch claim that G presumably divined its meaning from the context: “die Übs. [i.e., Übersetzer] stellt daher vermutlich eine kontextuelle Deutung dar” (“Genesis,” 228).

102 καλλωπίζομαι | Both הָעֵפֶן and καλλωπίζομαι are hapaxlegomena in Genesis.  

103 LSJ, s.v. “καλλωπίζω” A.II.1 (cf. A.I). As Brayford says, G’s choice of καλλωπίζω is “bolder” than the Hebrew, as Tamar does not conceal her appearance, but draws attention to it in order to “attract” Judah: “In fact, making oneself beautiful is almost the opposite of covering oneself” (“Genesis,” 399–400). Cf. Jdt 10:4 καὶ ἐκαλλωπίσατο σφόδρα εἰς ἀπάτην ἀφαλμὼν ἀνδρῶν, δόσει ἐν ἰδίων αὐτήν (mentioned by Harl, *La Genèse*, 265).  

104 θέριστρον | Apart from Tamar’s θέριστρον (see also 38:19), G also translates the other occurrence of הָעֵפֶן in Genesis—in reference to Rebecca—in this way (24:65). Of interest there is that Rebecca puts on this same type of garment before approaching her future husband Isaac for the first time, no doubt because she wishes to impress him with her outward appearance (cf. note 105 on the meaning and usage of θέριστρον).  

105 LSJ, s.v. “θερίστριον,” Harl, *La Genèse*, 205. In discussing the word σείρινα used by Lycurgus in περὶ τῆς διοικήσεως, Harpocration compares this garment to θερίστριον, because they are both “thin” (λεπτός) and “loose-fitting” (ἀσπάθητος) (J. J. Keaney, *Harpocration: Lexis of the Ten Orators* [Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1991]: s.v., “σείρινα”). That a θέριστριον/θερίστριον was indeed the kind of dress a prostitute would wear is indicated by the letter preserved by Alciphron written by a courtesan Leaina to her male friend Philodemus in which she insults the physical appearance of his bride (Ep. 4.12). She begins the letter by saying she spied Philodemus’s “bride” (νύμφη) “wearing a beautiful θέριστρον” (καλὸν περιβεβλημένην θέριστρον), but then she compares her to a “tortoise” (χελώνη) and shamelessly criticizes her “complexion” (χρώμα), “hair” (θρίκες), excessive “whitening” makeup (ψιμύθιον), jewelry (ἀλυσίς [“necklace”], περισκελίδες [“anklets”], “feet” (πόδες), and “bad breath” (βαρὺ προσπνεῖ). Apparently, his bride’s θέριστρον was the only nice thing about her, but it is especially relevant to the case of Tamar that Leaina admits to wearing makeup herself, just not quite as much as Philodemus’s bride: καὶ ἡμᾶς τὰς ἑταῖρας λοιδοροῦσιν ὅτι καλλωπίζομεθα (“And they revile us courtesans for wearing makeup!”). Perhaps the underlying issue is that Leaina was jealous of the dress worn by her target (or competition [?]). Cf. Philo, *Somn*. 2.53; Libanius, *Declarationes* 33.6; Synesius, *Ep*. 54.
38:14, it is more likely the makeup that Tamar used to “cover up her face” (κατεκαλύψατο τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς) in 38:15 where Judah fails to identify her as his own daughter-in-law. Sometimes it is easiest to keep hidden when one remains in plain sight, and Tamar’s costume works, because Judah “thinks she is a prostitute” (ἔδοξεν αὐτὴν πόρνην εἶναι). What is more, G even explicitly adds the tragic flourish that Judah “did not recognize her” (οὐκ ἔπέγνω αὐτὴν) without any apparent support from the Hebrew (38:15).

Building on this set of translation choices that makes Judah’s daughter-in-law look like a prostitute, G develops Judah’s false belief (δόξα) that Tamar is a prostitute in an ironic way. First, when Judah tries but fails to retrieve the personal items he gave to Tamar as surety, G translates his statement of resignation in a way that heightens his premonition that the situation will come back to haunt him, and he deepens the solemnity of his claim to have done due diligence, both choices contributing to the overall irony of what he says:

106 ἔδοξεν | G only translates בחשב (5) as δοξέω here, but he also uses δοξέω for ב/path> in 19:14. G’s choice of δοξέω accurately represents the meaning of בחשב (“assume X to be Y”) (HALOT, s.v. “חשב” qal 3), which implies a mistaken assumption. In Greek, δόξα (“belief, opinion”) forms a philosophical and rhetorical contrast with ἐπιστήμη (“knowledge”) (LSJ, s.vv. “δόξα” A.II.1; “ἐπιστήμη” A.II.1).

107 πόρνην | G levels the distinction in the Hebrew between זונה (“prostitute”) (38:15) and דֵׁשָּה קְ (“cult prostitute”) (38:21+, 22), which may further establish the effectiveness of Tamar’s disguise. Cf. Wevers, Notes, 642; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 229.

108 καὶ οὐκ ἔπέγνω αὐτὴν | On G’s rare addition of whole clauses or other larger discourse units such as this, see §3.2.8. Prestel and Schorch note that this addition fills a “narrative gap” (Erzählücke) (“Genesis,” 229).

109 Given the numerous harmonizations assumed to be present in G’s Vorlage (see §2.2), this clause could have been supplied by a scribe by analogy to זוהם לא הכרהו in Gen 42:8, when Joseph recognizes his brothers but they do not recognize him. But given G’s tragic embellishments and his special interest in Tamar’s prostitute disguise—as well as the fact that eliminating her veil could make her more recognizable—it seems more likely that G contributed this clause himself.
And Judah said, “May she keep (them) to herself; lest we become a derision! Behold! I sent this goat’s kid, but you did not find her. Then Judah said, “Let her have them! But (I fear) we may be mocked. As for me, I have sent this goat’s kid; as for you, you have not found (her)!

In this single verse, G has made a number of subtle interpretive interventions. First, by modifying the syntax of the first sentence, he alters its sense and pragmatic force. He does this in two ways: (i) by translating the prepositional phrase לָּה (“to herself”) as αὐτά110 (“them,” i.e., the tokens), as if it were the direct object of the verb; and (ii) by translating פֶּן (“lest”) expansively as ἀλλὰ μὴ ποτε111 (“but [I fear] that”), such that μὴ ποτε now introduces a fear clause instead of a negative purpose clause (“lest”). Practically, this makes a big difference. In Hebrew, Judah wishes that Tamar keep the tokens to herself, because he will be humiliated if she does not. In Greek, however, Judah expresses the resignation that he will never recover his personal effects and then the fear that his inability to retrieve them will turn out badly for him. Of course, since Judah fails to keep his skeleton in the closet as the story unfolds, the fear he voices drips with irony before the Greek reader’s eyes.

Building on this, G adds to the solemnity of Judah’s next statement that he and Hirah have done everything possible to find the prostitute and give her the goat’s kid in exchange for the items he pledged, essentially by distributing the emphatic force of הנה (“behold!”)

110 αὐτά | On the strong correlation between לָּה and the dative case in G’s translation, see §3.1.1.1 and note 7 there.

111 ἀλλὰ μὴ ποτε | Typically, G translates פֶּן (18) as μὴ ποτε (10), ἢνα μὴ (4), or μὴ (2), but nowhere else as ἀλλὰ μὴ ποτε. Wevers’ claim that ἀλλὰ “is probably intended to show contrast” is surely correct (Notes, 643).
throughout the utterance in several ways: (i) by recourse to the rhetorical balance of the construction ἐγὼ μέν ... σὺ δέ 112 (“as for me, ... as for you, ...”), which (ii) also requires him to “supply” the emphatic first-person pronoun ἐγὼ 113 in the first clause; and (iii) by translating the two qatal verbs with the Greek perfect indicative, 114 which presents their efforts as past and gone.

As Judah soon learns, what goes around comes around, and yet, when he gets word that his daughter-in-law Tamar is pregnant, G strengthens the arrogant self-confidence that makes Judah so sure that Tamar is at fault, only for the poetic justice of the true recognition of her identity and his guilt to hit him like a ton of bricks.

Genesis 38:24–26

ὡς ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τρίμηνον ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Ἰούδα λέγοντες Ἐκπορνεύουσι Θαμάρ ἢ νύμφη σου, καὶ

G strengthens Judah’s blind confidence, both in reference to Tamar’s assumed πορνεία (“prostitution”) and the punishment he feels this deserves, by using the compound verbs ἐκπορνεύω and κατακαίω, which, like their Hebrew counterparts הָנָן and שָׂרַף, mean “prostitute oneself” and “burn,” respectively, but are stylistically and rhetorically more

112 μέν ... δέ | On G’s occasional use of this construction, see §4.1.1.1. Cf. Wevers, Notes, 644.
113 ἐγὼ | For other cases where G supplies a pronominal subject for emphasis, see §3.2.5.1.
114 ἀπέσταλε ... ἐδρήκας | For G’s translation of the Hebrew qatal with the Greek perfect indicative (especially in direct speech), see §6.1.1.5. In comparing these perfects with later variants showing the aorist, Wevers judges that “the perfect inflection is better suited to the context” (Notes, 644).
forceful on account of the intensive/perfective prefixes ἐκ- and κατα-:115 thus, Judah demands that Tamar be “burned completely”116 (κατακαυθήτω),117 because of the fact that she has “(utterly) prostituted herself”118 (ἐκπεπορνευκέν).119 In addition, G’s use of the perfect instead of the aorist to translate זנה adds more fuel to the fire, since the Greek perfect tense expresses not only that Tamar is believed to have played the whore (past action), but that she is a whore (present state). Then Judah’s ironically misplaced confidence is shattered when Tamar produces the tokens she received from him as a pledge, and he instantly recognizes (ἐπιγινώσκω) them as his. G then finishes the tragedy of Judah’s reversal and Tamar’s revenge with a final flourish, as he translates Judah’s pronouncement that “Tamar is more righteous than I, because I did not give her to my son Shelah” (_refresh_ [המר] ממינה נ LATIN Shelah בֶּn) with the Greek performative perfect indicative as δεδικαίωται120 Θαμὰρ ἡ ἔγώ (“[I hereby acknowledge that] Tamar stands more justified than I”) (38:26).

Once vindicated, Tamar must nevertheless bear the consequences of her cunning scheme to get revenge on Judah, and the portentous scenario of her twin sons’ birth darkly hints that Judah’s reversal of Joseph’s status in Gen 37 will itself be reversed, just as the

115 On G’s penchant for compound verbs, especially those with intensive/perfective prefixes, see §5.2.2.5.
116 LSJ, s.v. “κατακαίω” A.I.1.
117 κατακαυθήτω | In its other occurrence, ἐκκαίω means “fire,” as in “fire bricks,” and G accurately translates it as ὀπτάω “bake” (see LSJ, s.v. “ὀπτάω” A.2). G does not use κατακαίω elsewhere.
118 LSJ, s.v. “ἐκπορνεύω” A.1; DGE, s.v. “ἐκπορνεύω” I.1.
119 ἐκπεπορνευκέν | Both ἐκπορνεύω and ἐκπορνεύω are hapaxlegomena in Genesis. But G translates the noun ἡρί with the cognate πόρνη (34:31; 38:15).
120 δεδικαίωται | On G’s use of the performative perfect (more often in the first person) to represent Hebrew qatal as speech acts, see §6.1.1.5.
“younger” infant manages to escape his mother’s womb before his “older” brother. What is more, G’s translation of this short epilogue suggests that he grasped its function as a tragically supernatural bridge between Gen 37 and its containing narrative. At the end of labor, the first son pokes his hand out of the womb, and the midwife marks it with a red thread, but when he pulls it back in, his brother manages to get out first:

38:29 לָיָיו בָּאָו וַיֶּהֶלֶל יָנָיו אֵלֵּיהוּ.

And when he retracted his hand, indeed immediately his brother came out.

Instead of translating הנה (“behold!”) as ἴδον (“behold!”) or omitting it altogether, G uses the rare translation εὐθύς121 (“immediately”) to portray the second son’s exit as sudden and eager.122 Then, with his vivid translation of the aetiology behind the victorious child’s name Perez, rendering פרץ עליך פרצת מה (“What a breach you have breached for yourself!”) as

121 εὐθύς | G translates הנה adverbially as εὐθύς on two other occasions: in 15:4 (see §8.3.1) and 24:45. For G’s normal treatment of this particle, see note 58 above. Wevers hyposizes the biblical narrative by claiming that G’s choice of “εὐθύς interprets the context rather better [!] than MT’s הנה” (Notes, 647). Prestel and Schorch characterize εὐθύς as “adding drama” (“dramatisierend”) (“Genesis,” 230).

122 Wevers notes the relatively uncommon stylistic improvement of G’s unusual omission of כי in the first clause (Notes, 647; see also §3.1.7.6). This may also serve to heighten the vividness of the “younger” child’s “sudden” and unexpected emergence from the womb.
Τί διεκόπη διὰ σὲ φραγμός (38:29), G conveys not only the violent suddenness but also the supernatural significance of the event, since he does not have the midwife (or perhaps Tamar) simply marvel at this sign (“What!”) but question its prophetic significance (“Why?”). If, as I have argued in this section, G has specifically developed the tragic motif of recognition in the story of Judah and Tamar in order to highlight and foreshadow its significance for the Joseph story as a whole, this portent would suggest that Joseph’s time for sudden reversal and subsequent recognition is at hand, as the youngest begins to take his place as the first.

9.3.3 Reversal and the supernatural (Gen 39–41)

After the literary digression of Judah and Tamar in Gen 38, the Joseph narrative picks up where it left off, but Joseph’s brothers step offstage for a few scenes as this story’s second act unveils the first layer of unintended consequences that Joseph’s brothers’ tragic...
act of revenge has upon Joseph, whose fate continues to decline despite his virtuous innocence until he experiences a sudden, total, and supernatural reversal. This transformation comes as a result of God’s providence and interest in Joseph, on the one hand, and Joseph’s masterful, God-given power to interpret dreams, on the other. The plot of this part of Joseph’s story develops through a series of ironic near-reversals, where Joseph’s status is first improved by his own virtuous character and God’s bounteous favor as if to suggest that Joseph’s day has finally come, but his actual reversal is ironically postponed until a later time. Throughout this suspenseful sequence of events, G latches on to the tragic irony that Joseph is first punished and then forgotten despite his commendable conduct and supernatural endowments. In doing so, G makes the tragic aspects of this narrative even more compelling in Greek translation than they already are in the Hebrew composition, as he encourages the reader—like God himself (39:21)!—to pity Joseph and anticipate his final reversal and vindication. Furthermore, by developing the suspense and irony of Gen 39–40, where two distinct reversal opportunities misfire for Joseph (or backfire on him), G also amplifies the degree of Joseph’s sudden and total reversal, when he is relocated from Pharaoh’s prison to Pharaoh’s side, just as he contextualizes the importance of this event in the larger narrative, since it does not take place until the precise

---

129 John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 62.3 (PG 54 535.58–536.2) describes with rhetorical flourish Joseph’s many upheavals and “the many things this noble athlete endured” (ὅσα ὁ γενναῖος ἀθλητὴς ὑπέμεινε): despite his numerous “contests” (ἀγώνες), “temptations” (πειρασμοί), and “shipwrecks” (ναυάγια), the “pilot” (κυβερνήτης) was not “thrown into the sea” (κατεποντίζετο), and even when “the storm grew more intense” (σφοδροτέρου τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐπανοικαζόμενο), he “sat at the rudder” (ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκῶν καθήμενος) and “held the ship’s course” (τὴν ναῦν ἰδον).
moment that God intended, when Joseph’s influential presence in Pharaoh’s court is needed to secure the provision and prosperity that his family needs.

The first scene of Joseph’s dramatic reversal takes place in the household of Potiphar the Egyptian, where Joseph was ultimately sold as a slave. Although Potiphar is so impressed by Joseph’s (divinely enhanced) performance that he entrusts him with everything in his household (39:1–6), Potiphar’s wife convinces her husband to throw Joseph in prison by alleging that he tried to rape her so that she can punish Joseph out of spite for declining her sexual advances (39:7–20). In this account and its initial aftermath (39:21–40:4), G takes special interest in conveying and enhancing this scene’s irony chiefly by developing the contrast between Joseph and Potiphar’s wife, such that the reader cannot miss her lust, violence, and deceit, on the one hand, and his tragic virtue and commendable faithfulness, on the other. By playing these actors against each other, G thus draws attention to the painful injustice of Joseph’s circumstances.

In terms of Potiphar’s wife, G makes a number of notable translation choices that serve to present her as a wicked seductress in Greek. To begin with, G enhances her motives to pursue Joseph in two ways: (i) by translating Potiphar’s title סָרִּיס (“official,
adviser”) by two different Greek words that denote “eunuch” (σπάδων in 37:36 and εὐνοῦχος in 39:1), thus insinuating that he was impotent to please a female partner; and (ii) by differentiating his translation of the adjective יָפֶה (“handsome”), rendering this term first as καλός (“handsome”) and then as ὁραῖος (“attractive”), and also by supplying the adverb σφόδρα (“very”) to modify the second of these.

---

130 René Péter-Contesse, “Was Potiphar a Eunuch?: (Genesis 37.36; 39.1),” _BT_ 47 (1996): 142–146; HALOT, s.v. “סרף”; Brayford, _Genesis_, 396–397. Based on the contexts in which סָרִיס is used in the Hebrew Bible as well as the probable etymological derivation from Akkadian ša reši (“the one at the head”), this term originally and in most cases denotes a powerful position of trusted authority and only later came to be associated with castration. G probably had this derived meaning in mind when he selected his Greek translations for סָרִיס, as is indicated by the lexica and the interpretations given by G’s readers (see note 131).

131 LSJ, s.vv. “σπάδων,” “εὐνοῦχος” A.I.1; Robert J. V. Hiebert, “Lexicography and the Translation of a Translation: The NETS Version and the Septuagint of Genesis,” _BIOSCS_ 37 (2004): 77–78; Brayford, _Genesis_, 397–398, 402–403; Wevers, _Notes_, 630; Philo, _Somn._ 2.184. In _Ios._ 2.58–60, Philo calls the eunuch’s marriage with a woman “entirely contrary to opposite reason” (τὸ παραλογώσατον). Theodoret, _Quaest._ _Oct._ 100, after posing the question “How is it that the chief butcher had a wife, since he was a eunuch?” (Πῶς εὐνοῦχος ὁ δὲ ἀρχιμάγειρος γυναῖκα ἔχει) and then making the initial concession that εὐνοῦχος is typically used synonymously with ἑκτομίας (“castrated male”), he explains this odd situation on the historical grounds that “eunuchs” often had wives “to attend to ‘internal’ affairs” (τῶν ἐνδόν ἐπιμελουμένην πραγμάτων), i.e., housework.

132 σπάδων, εὐνοῦχος | G always translates סָרִיס as σπάδων (37:36) or εὐνοῦχος (3: 39:1; 40:2, 7) and does not use these Greek nouns otherwise.

133 καλός ... ὁραῖος | Most often G translates יָפֶה (9) as καλός (6), but also as ὁραῖος in 29:17 (see note 135 below). The adjective καλός is G’s main equivalent for בָשׁ (32/41), and G also uses it for כָּרָה (1/2) and רַבְּרוֹת (1). As for ὁραῖος, it also serves to translate בָשׁ (1) and רַם (2). Wevers judges this variation a sign of G’s “fine literary taste” at this point (_Notes_, 652; cf. Brayford, _Genesis_, 403; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 230).

134 σφόδρα | For this and other “additions,” see §3.2.8.

135 If this addition is due to G—and not a textual variant—it seems unlikely that G supplied it in order to harmonize with Rebecca’s description in 24:16 (καλή τῇ ἔψει σφόδρα), since G differentiates his translation of יָפֶה in order to embellish Joseph’s physical appearance here (cf. §§3.2.8; 5.2.2.4). G’s lexical embellishment renders is likely that he also added σφόδρα for a similar effect, even though harmonization is a common trait of the textual tradition of Hebrew Genesis (see §2.2).
And Joseph was handsome in form and handsome in appearance.

So, G not only gives Potiphar’s wife a concrete motive for seeking out a sexual partner other than her husband, but he also strengthens one reason why she would be attracted specifically to Joseph: he was both handsome and very attractive.136

Yet, even if this causes the reader to feel a fleeting sympathy with Potiphar’s wife and gives the episode an enticing edginess, the other ways that G develops this female character in Greek translation are not so flattering, since he works to present her as lustful to the point of violence and as a crafty liar motivated by spite.137 G develops his presentation of Potiphar’s wife from her very introduction:

136 According to Jos. Asen. 7.3, it was not just Potiphar’s wife, but “all the wives and daughters of the Egyptians” (πᾶσαι αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ δυνατέρες τῶν Αἰγυπτίων), who, “when they saw Joseph, suffered greatly at his good looks” (ὡς ἐόρων τὸν Ἰωσήφ, κακὸς ἔπασχον ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλει αὐτοῦ).

137 For John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 62.4 (PG 54 537.16–26), Potiphar’s wife is also an instrument of the devil himself. He introduces her as “a deep pit” (βόθρος βαθύς), “a high cliff” (κρημνός … μέγιστος) “birthing his ruin” (τίκτονα τὸν ὀλέθρον), and “a violent storm” (χειμών … σφοδρός) designed to cause his “shipwreck” (ναυάγιον). For Chrysostom’s use of the nautical metaphor, see note 129 above. Later in Hom. Gen. 62.4 (PG 54 537.41–47), he says that “the lusty woman’s shamelessness” (ἡ ἀναιδεία τῆς ἄκαλαστον γυναικός) is itself “Satanic” (σατανικός): Ὑπὸ τὴν ἀναιδείαν τῆς ἄκαλαστον γυναικός. Οὐχ ὅτι δέσποινα εἶναι ἑνομίζετο ἐν διανοίᾳ ἐλαβεν, οὐχ ὅτι ὅτι οἰκέτης ἦν ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῆς εὐμορφίας ἠλούσα, καὶ τὸν ἐμπροσμόν τῶν σατανικῶν δεξαμένη, ἐπιπήδων ἐπεχείρει λοιπὸν τῷ νεανίσκῳ, καὶ τὸν πονηρὸν τούτων λογισμὸν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ συνέχουσα, καὶ τὴν ἐρημικὴν τὴν δυναμενὴν ἀυτή συμπεράξει πρὸς τὴν παράνομον ταύτην ἐπιστρέφειν. For John’s creative elaboration on the intensity of Joseph’s temptation and the greatness of his virtuous victory over it, see Jos. (PG 56 587.1–590.46); cf. T. Jos.
While the Hebrew text has Potiphar’s wife “lifting up” (נשׂא) her eyes “to” (ל) Joseph, i.e., “taking notice of him,” G presents her “casting” (ἐπιβάλλω) her eyes “upon” (ἐπὶ) him, an action brimming with lust and violent intent. Moreover, G carries over the violence of this woman’s eyes into what she does with her hands when Joseph repeatedly refused to let her have her way with him:  

The action of Potiphar’s wife is already violent in the Hebrew, as she invades Joseph’s personal space by “grabbing” (שׂחַת) him by his clothes, but G escalates the violence by using (i) the verb ἐπισπάω (καταδείκνυμι) to move her violation beyond grabbing to pulling...
and (ii) the middle voice as an indirect reflexive (“to herself”)\textsuperscript{143} to depict the desired and final outcome of her actions: she grabs Joseph’s clothes, pulls, and forces his body to come in toward hers.\textsuperscript{144}

Then, after Joseph manages to squeeze out of her embrace by slipping out of his clothes (39:12), G sublimates the violent lust of Potiphar’s wife into calculated craftiness, as she plans to project her own shamelessness onto Joseph in order to mar his character and get even with him for slighting her. G does this by subtly manipulating her versions of what took place when she and Joseph were alone inside the house, first in her account to the other household servants (39:13–15) and then in that to her husband (39:17–18):

\footnotesize

with ψηφις is unattested in the entire Septuagint (Wevers, Notes, 656). As Prestel and Schorsch note, this unparalleled translation choice “is clearly intended to serve the sense of drama” (“soll offensichtlich der Dramatisierung dienen”) (“Genesis,” 230).

\textsuperscript{143} On G’s deliberate use of the middle voice as an indirect reflexive, see §6.1.2.3.

\textsuperscript{144} Philo, Ios. 41 interprets ἐπισπάω as Potiphar’s wife “dragging” Joseph to her bed: “finally in the height of her passion she employed violence, took ahold of his robe, and vigorously dragged him to her bed by greater strength” (βίᾳ λοιπὸν προσπαθοῦσα ἐχρῆτο καὶ λαβομένη τῆς ἀμπεχόνης ἐυτόνως ἐχρὶ τῆς εὐνῆς ἐπισπάσατο ῥόμη κραταιοτέρα). John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 62.4 [PG 54 538.28–50] understands the violent character of Potiphar’s wife pulling on Joseph: he marvels at Joseph’s resistance as more “marvelous” (θαυμαστός) than the deliverance of the three from the fiery furnace, since he did not give in, even though he was “held down by his clothes” (κατασχεθέντα τῶν ἱματίων) “by this defiled and insatiable woman” (ὑπὸ τῆς μιαρᾶς ταύτης καὶ ἀκολάστου). Brayford also sees ἐπισπάω as “more forceful,” but she suggests that Potiphar’s wife was trying to pull Joseph’s clothes off, not that he wiggled free (404–405). Similarly, Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Pent. 321.23–28 says that Joseph was “shoved down with great violence” (σὺν βίᾳ πολλῇ κατασχεθέντος), and that “the Egyptian woman” (ἡ Αἰγυπτία) “tried to force him” (κατεβιάζετο) “in no small way” (οὐ μετρίως) “into unwished for sin” (εἰς ἀνεθέλητον ἁμαρτίαν).
Genesis 39:13–18

καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς εἶδεν ὃτι κατέλιπεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς χερου ἀυτῆς καὶ ἐφυγεν καὶ εξῆλθεν ἢξω, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν 

When Joseph flees and his clothes are left behind in the hands of Potiphar’s wife, she “calls” (Ἀπαίζω)145 her male household servants in so that she can accuse Joseph (and ultimately her husband) of bringing Joseph into the house to “mock” (ἐπικάλεσαι)146 both her and them (39:14). In her two verbal descriptions of this event, however, G has Potiphar’s wife exaggerate this fact three times by translating ἄρνησι ("and I called/cried [out]") as καὶ ἐβόησα147 ("and I shouted")148 (39:14, 15, 18), which subtly alters her vocalization from a call for help to a reaction of fear and even pain. After calumniating Joseph before his fellow servants, Potiphar’s wife keeps her hands on his clothes, “depositing” (ἡμᾶς) them in safekeeping until her husband gets home (39:16). By (i) choosing to translate this verb rather anomalously as καταλημπάνω/καταλείπω149 ("leave [behind]")—

145 καλέω | This is G’s regular match for ἄρνησι (84/112).
146 ἐπικαλέσαι | Although G translates ἄρνησι (11) twice as παίζω (21:9; 26:8), he only selects the compound ἐπικαλέσαι here (39:14, 17), one important difference being a matter of playfulness and aggression, respectively.
147 ἐβόησα | G only translates ἄρνησι as βοάω in these three cases (cf. note 145 above). Each of G’s other uses of βοάω (4:10; 29:11) and the compounds ἀναβοάω (3: 21:16; 27:34, 38) and διαβοάω (43:16) convey great volume and/or high emotional intensity.
148 LSJ, s.v. “βοάω” A.I.1; DGE, s.v. “βοάω” A.I.3.
149 καταλημπάνω | This bi-form of καταλείπω only occurs here. For the other two instances of ἄρνησι in the hiphil, G uses τίθημι (2:15) or ἁφίμι (42:33), while καταλείπω (11) normally translates ἢξω (7) or ἄρνησι (3).
the same verb G uses to describe Joseph frantically “leaving” (עָזָב) his clothes in her clenched hands (39:12, 13, 15, 18)—and (ii) inflecting it in the historical present, G presents this action to the reader both vividly and ironically, since he has Potiphar’s wife perform the very act she charges against Joseph, even as G has already made it clear that Joseph did not simply leave his clothes behind: rather, she removed them by force. With a final interpretive choice, G completes the emerging picture of Potiphar’s wife as a woman who says what must be said to get what she wants by modulating his translation of לְצָחֵךְ (“to mock”) aspectually when it is spoken to Potiphar instead of the household servants:

In speaking to her servants, G has Potiphar’s wife use the present infinitive (ἐμπαιζειν) to describe the mockery that the “Hebrew servant” (παῖς Ἑβραῖος) regularly brings upon “us,” pandering to the jealousy of these servants who are Joseph’s subordinates. But when she recounts her story to Potiphar, G has her alter this to the aorist infinitive (ἐμπαιζαι), so that she accuses her husband of purchasing Joseph for the express purpose of bringing her

150 Wevers, Notes, 657: “Particularly unusual is the use of the historical present tense, used to create a more lively style, thereby creating a certain tension in the story.”

151 Philo, Ios. 52: “The garment his wife produced, allegedly left behind by the young man, was proof of the violence not that he enacted but that he suffered from her” (ἡ ἔσθης, ἢν προωφερεν ἡ γυνὴ ὡς ἀπολείφθεισαν ὑπὸ τοῦ νεανίσκου, πίστις ἢν βίας, οὐχ ἢν ἐκεῖνος εἰργάζετο, ἀλλά τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἢν ὑπέμεινεν ἐν τῇ γυναικί).”

152 While it is possible (as Harl, Wevers, and Brayford claim) that ἐμπαιζει has sexual connotations (La Genèse, 269; Notes, 657; Genesis, 406), this may be reading the context of παίζω in 26:8 (Isaac and Rebecca)—where G uses the simplex παιζω—into this passage. See LSJ, s.v. “ἐμπαιζει” A.I.1; DGE, s.v. “ἐμπαιζει” I.2.
shame at this particular moment in this particular way.\footnote{ἐμπαιξέν ... ἐμπαίξαι | Concerning G’s deliberate selection of aspect on infinitives, including a discussion of this example, see §6.1.1.7 and also Wevers, \textit{Notes}, 658; Brayford, \textit{Genesis}, 406; \textit{SSG} §28ha(i).} In this way, Potiphar’s wife punishes Joseph for refusing to satisfy her insatiable and illicit lust by craftily cajoling her servants and manipulating her cuckolded husband. While Potiphar’s wife is no model of virtue in the Hebrew version of Gen 39, I have argued that G successfully enhances her several vices with the choices that he makes in representing her character in Greek. What is more, when these interpretive decisions are paired with contrastive translational interventions concerning Joseph’s character, it seems that G intended not only to make this failed seduction story more entertaining for his readers, but also to augment the irony of Joseph spiraling further downwards despite the honorable choices he makes and the divine favor he enjoys.\footnote{John Chrysostom, \textit{Hom. Gen}. 62.5 (PG 54 538.51–54) notes the irony. Although Joseph won the “victory” (νίκη) by his “bravery” (ἀνδρεία) and “deserved to be crowned and heralded” (ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν στεφανωθῆναι ... ἀνακηρυχθῆναι), “again he suffers terrible things as if guilty” (πάλιν ὡσανεὶ ὑπεύθυνον τὰ μυρία ὑπομένοντα δεινά): Ἀλλ’ ἐρα μετὰ τοσαύτην νίκην, μετὰ τοσαύτην ἀνδρείαν, υπὲρ οὖν ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν στεφανωθῆναι, υπὲρ οὖν ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν ἀνακηρυχθῆναι, πάλιν ὡσανεὶ ὑπεύθυνον τὰ μυρία ὑπομένοντα δεινά.}

For the second time now, one character or group of characters has intentionally induced another character into a false inference based on the true recognition of Joseph’s clothes, all to Joseph’s tragic demise. In this case, Potiphar gets mad upon hearing his wife’s slanderous accusation (39:19), and G brings this emotion to the foreground by translating the Hebrew idiom ויחר אפו (“and he grew angry,” or lit. “his nose grew hot”) in an intensive
but stylistically Hebrew fashion as καὶ ἐθυμῶθη ὄργῃ (155) (“and he grew angry with rage”). So, despite Joseph’s past performance, Potiphar “puts (him)” (נִאֶפֶל) in prison (39:20), but by using the verb ἐμβάλλω (156) (“throw into”), G not only casts this act in a violent light, but in the same light of his brothers “throwing” Joseph “into” the pit earlier (37:22; cf. 40:15). Of course, the tragedy of this incident is that Joseph was innocent, which explains why G bolsters Joseph’s virtuous character as a faithful servant in several ways. This first happens in Joseph’s response to Potiphar’s wife after she asks him to share her bed:

**Genesis 39:8–10**

| ὁ δὲ οὖν ἤθελεν, εἶπεν δὲ τῇ γυναικὶ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ Ἐλ ὁ κύριός μου ὀγκώσκει δι᾽ ἐμε ὀυδὲν ἐν | τῷ οὖν αὐτῷ καὶ πάντα, ὥστε ἀντί αὐτῷ, ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς χεῖράς μου, 9 καὶ οὕτω ὑπερέθευεν ἐν τῇ ὁμίλῃ ταύτῃ ὀυδὲν ἐμοὶ ὀδύνη ὑπεκρήτησεν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ οὐδὲν πλήν σου, διὰ τὸ σὲ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ εἶναι, καὶ πῶς ποιήσω τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ πονηρὸν τούτο καὶ ἀμαρτήσωμαι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ; 10 ἥνικα δὲ ἐδάλευ τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, καὶ οὕτω ὑπέκουσεν αὐτῇ καθεύδει μετ᾽ αὐτῆς τὸν συγγενέσσαι αὐτῆ. |

In Hebrew, Joseph gives two related reasons why he cannot accept the proposal of his master’s wife: (i) it would be a betrayal of a good master who has entrusted Joseph with everyone and everything that he owns (39:8–9a); and (ii) it would be wrong in God’s eyes to do such a thing (39:9b). In translating the first of these reasons, G makes subtle adjustments to convey Joseph’s superior status as second-in-command over Potiphar’s

---

155 ἐθυμῶθη ὄργῃ | Where ἄσι alone means “anger,” G translates it as θυμός (27:45; 49:6, 7). In the two other occurrences of the phrase ἄσι ἐθύμησε, G represents it similarly as θυμός, but he provides no quantitative representation of ἄσι, unlike this case, where ὄργῃ is especially emphatic, and in a way that is similar to G’s translation of the emphatic Hebrew construction [infinitive absolute + cognate finite verb] by a Greek finite verb with a cognate dative (see §6.1.1.8).

156 ἐμβάλλω | G only translates ἔσπερ (150) as ἐμβάλλω here. Most often, G uses διδωμί and cognates (125) or τίθημι and cognates (14) for ἔσπερ. G also represents ἂσι (5: 31:34; 40:15; 43:22; 44:1, 2) and ἦσσ (37:22) with ἐμβάλλω. Wevers describes G’s lexical choice as “expressive” (Notes, 660).
entire household, which, in turn, reflects well on Joseph's character, since it is by his (divinely-assisted) merit that he rose to such a position of authority:①

39:9 ἄνω δέν διδάξεις βάρθις Θεόν ἡμᾶς
And nothing is above me in this household, and he has taken nothing out from under me but you

By using the Greek verbs ὑπερέχω ② (“be above, surpass”) and ὑπεξαιρέω ③ (“take out from under”), which have the contrasting verbal prefixes ὑπερ- (“above”) and ὑπο- (“below”), G transforms the everyone-and-everything merism (“none” [גָדוֹל] and “nothing” [איננו]) into one of nothing-above-and-everything-below, ④ even as he binds the syntax of the two clauses together more tightly in Greek by translating איננו as οὐδέ. ⑤ In regard to the second reason, namely, that sleeping with Potiphar's wife would also offend God, even though G regularly translates the Hebrew root שָׁחֵר with the Greek root ἀμαρτ-, his use of the verb

——

① As Wevers convincingly argues, G also highlights Joseph's worthiness of such great responsibility in 39:4 by translating ὑπεξακοαίτηται εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ταυτής οὐδὲν ἑμοὶ ("and he served him"), which focuses on Joseph's subservience, as εὐπρέπεται δὲ αὐτῷ ("and he was pleasing to him"), which draws attention rather to the excellence of Joseph's service (Notes, 650). Cf. Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 230. In its only other occurrence, G represents ᾧ χείρος, his use of the merism παρίστημι (40:4) and otherwise only uses the εἰσαγωγεῖ for the hithpael of לֶビュー (see §5.2.2.3).

② ὑπερέχω | Typically, G translates the adjective ὑπερήπτυς (34) as μέγας (25), πρέσβυς (4), or πολύς (3), and the verb ἑπέρα (15) as μέγας + γίνομαι/εἰμί (5), μεγαλύνω (2), υψώ (4), or αὐξάνω (3). Only here does G select ὑπερέχω as an equivalent for לֶビュー, although he also uses ὑπερέχω for ἐπίσταν (25:23) and the verb לֶビュー (41:40).

③ ὑπεξαιρέω | G regularly translates ἐπεξαίρεται (3) as φειδουμαι (3), and he does not use ὑπεξαιρέω otherwise. In fact, ὑπεξαιρέω is a Septuagint hapaxlegomenon—but one that “is exactly right for the Hebrew here” (Wevers, Notes, 653).


⑤ οὐδέ | On G's use of οὐδέ and μηδέ, see §3.3.2.3 and note 303.
ἁμαρτάνω here seems relevant in light of G’s other tragic embellishments, since Joseph never commits a tragic “mistake” (ἁμαρτία), as he would have if he had listened to this woman’s proposal.  

In addition, G emphasizes Joseph’s faithful stewardship and loyalty also by translating שמע ("hear, listen to") as ὑπακούω ("obey") in regard to Potiphar’s wife’s repeated attempts to seduce Joseph:

And as often as she spoke to Joseph day after day, he would not listen to her, to lie down beside her in order to be with her.  

Even though Joseph is ultimately a servant, as is indicated by the fact that Potiphar’s wife has, in fact, been “taken out from under” (ὑπεξιρέω) him, he refuses to “obey” (ὑπακούω) his master’s wife out of loyalty to her husband and faithfulness to God.

However, this chapter has a pitiable and tragic outcome for the virtuous servant of Potiphar and God, as Joseph’s revenge-driven reversal begun in Gen 37 has an enduring,

---

162 John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 62.4 (PG 54 537.49–51) says that Joseph rejected the proposal of Potiphar’s wife, because he knew what great peril it would entail: Ἡδε γάρ πολλὸν αὐτῷ φέροντα τὸν ἔλεβρον.

163 ὑπακούω | Usually, G translates שמע (64) with the simplex ἀκούω (45), but everywhere he uses ὑπακούω it denotes “listen” in the sense of “obey.” Otherwise, G only uses ὑπακούω to translate שמע in 41:40 (see note 220 below).
negative afterlife for him. Nevertheless, the God-sent “fortune”\textsuperscript{164} (τύχη, cf. ἐπιτυγχάνω\textsuperscript{165} [= שלח] in \textsuperscript{39:2}) that Joseph experienced in Potiphar’s household before his disastrous encounter with this man’s wife does not abandon Joseph as he moves to prison.\textsuperscript{166}

According to G’s translation of תונ ייסו יי (“and he extended steadfast love to him”) in \textsuperscript{39:21}, God “continued to pour down pity upon him” (κατέχεε\textsuperscript{167} αὐτοῦ ἔλεος\textsuperscript{168}) in such a way and to such an extent that God causes everything Joseph does to prosper, and Joseph earns favor with the prison supervisor and gains charge over the entire prison and all its inmates (39:21–23).\textsuperscript{169} In Gen 40–41, God’s care for Joseph and Joseph’s ultimate reversal from prison to palace come by way of Joseph’s God-given powers to interpret dreams, and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{164} LSJ, s.vv. “τύχη” A.II.1; “ἐπιτυγχάνω” A.III.3. After asking about the meaning of Joseph’s “fortune” (Τί ἐστιν, Ἐπιτυγχάνω), John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 62.3 (PG 54 536.38–42) explains it as God’s persistent (πάντα ... πανταχού) and transparent (φανερά) providence (κατευώδου ... προωδοποίει): Τί ἐστιν, Ἐπιτυγχάνων. Πάντα αὐτῷ κατευώδου, πανταχοῦ προωδοποίει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀνοιχτή χάρις, καὶ οὕτω φανερὰ ἢ ἡ ἐπανθεότητα αὐτῷ χάρις, ὡς καὶ τῇ δεσπότῃ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀρχιγειρῷ κατάδηλον τούτῳ γενέσθαι. Cf. Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 99; Harl, La Genèse, 267; Wevers, Notes, 649.

\item \textsuperscript{165} ἐπιτυγχάνω | G regularly translates שלח as εὐσεβῶ (6/7). The verb ἐπιτυγχάνω only occurs here in Genesis.

\item \textsuperscript{166} Jay, The Tragic in Mark, 82: “Above all, it is the word τυχη (‘chance,’ ‘luck,’ or ‘fortune’) that provides for writers [in the tragic mode] a way to articulate the overwhelming sway of events that lie beyond the scope of the human will to control.”

\item \textsuperscript{167} κατέχεε | The match between תונ and καταχώ is singular, although G uses seven different Greek verbs to translate תונ (9). As for καταχώ, G uses it nowhere else. Concerning G’s translation of wayyiqtol by the imperfect indicative with a full range of imperfective meanings, see §6.1.1.1. Brayford sees G’s lexical and morphological choices as “enhancing” this divine favor, in terms of both intensity and duration (Genesis, 407; cf. Wevers, 660–661).

\item \textsuperscript{168} ἔλεος | G translates תונ (12) as ἔλεος (6) or the similar term ἔλεημοσύνη (47:29) slightly more often than as δικαιοσύνη (5), and he only uses ἔλεος elsewhere to translate תונ (19:19).

\item \textsuperscript{169} Asking what “poured down pity” means (Τί ἔστι τὸ, Κατέχεε αὐτοῦ ἔλεος;), John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 62.5 [PG 54 539.55–58] explains it as “bending” (ἐπικαμπτω) the head of the prison “toward pity” (ἐπὶ ὀλικον): Τί ἐστι τὸ, Κατέχεε αὐτοῦ ἔλεος; Πρὸς ὀλικον ἐπικαμψε τὸν ἄρχιδεσμοφύλακα, καὶ πολλὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν εὐνοιαν ἐπιδιδόεισαν παρεσκεύασιν.
G gives special attention to the supernatural cause of Joseph’s reversal as he translates Gen 40, in which Joseph successfully decodes the dreams of Pharaoh’s chief cupbearer and chief baker, and Gen 41, in which Joseph uses his intellectual gift to reveal the meaning of Pharaoh’s two very important dreams to him.

In Gen 40, G carefully attends to the supernatural in several ways, but especially by (i) working the contrast between Pharaoh’s court officials and Joseph in relation to dream interpretation and (ii) playing with the irony of the chief baker’s misguided expectation—based on obvious similarities with the chief cupbearer’s dream—that his dream will also receive a favorable interpretation. G develops the contrast between Joseph and the two court officials by focusing on the fact that the officials fear their dreams and are helpless to decode them, on the one hand, while Joseph is competent and confident in his supernatural abilities, on the other. The first intervention G makes to characterize Pharaoh’s court officials as fearful and incompetent comes when the narrator first mentions their dreams:

**Genesis 40:5–8**

This passage begins when the narrator informs us that the two men each had a dream:
And both of them dreamed a dream, each man his dream in a single night, and each man according to the interpretation of his dream

While the Hebrew has each of the two men dream “according to the interpretation of his dream” (אישׁ כפתרון חלמו), G translates פתרון (“interpretation”) as ὁρασις170 (“vision”) and also alters the syntax by leaving כ (“according to”) untranslated171 and inflecting its object in the nominative case, which then requires taking ἐν μιᾷ νυκτί (“in a single night”) as the predicate of the third clause in this sentence (pace Wevers’ punctuation). In this way, G avoids associating Pharaoh’s two officials too closely with the ability to interpret dreams.172 Their inability to parse what they have seen then produces an emotional reaction that Joseph observes when he comes in to check on them the next day. In the Hebrew version, Joseph sees that they are זעפים (“looking weak/thin”)173 (25:6), and he asks them why their faces are רעים (“sad,” lit. “bad”)174 (25:7). G substitutes these two feelings for more emotive

170 ὁρασις | Elsewhere, G translates פתרון as διασφάσις (40:8) or σύγκρισις (2:40:12, [18]), and he leaves it “untranslated” in 41:11. G uses διασφάσις, in turn, in (2:40:12, [18]), for ה־קְרָא וּלָהְיָה (24:62; 25:11), for ה־קְרָא (2:5:9), and for ה־קְרָא (31:49). For G’s regular translation of פתרון as συγκρίνω, see note 184 below.

171 This treatment of כ is unparalleled in Genesis (see §3.1.1.1).

172 Wevers suggests that “this probably reflects a certain rationalization that the actual interpretation was not revealed until the next morning rather than ‘in one night’” (Notes, 664–665). Prestel and Schorsch agree that G intended to avoid “the notion that the meaning was revealed right along with the dream” (“die Auffassung, mit dem Traum sei bereits seine Bedeutung offenbart worden”) (“Genesis,” 232). It is more than just a matter of timing however, as the two men were never able to grasp the interpretations themselves but required Joseph’s assistance the next day.

173 HALOT, s.v. "זעף II."

174 HALOT, s.v. "רע" 9.
ones, however, having Joseph see them τεταραγμένοι (‘‘disturbed’’) and inquire as to why their faces are σκυθρωπά (‘‘gloomy’’). Just as G captures the anxious dejection of these two men in this way, he also finds means to express Joseph’s cool confidence. When Joseph learns that the two men’s emotions stem from the lack of an interpreter, he says to them:

Ωὐχὶ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ διασάφερας αὐτῶν ἔστιν; διηγήσασθε ὅπως μοι.

Don’t interpretations belong to God? Their clarification comes through God, doesn’t it? Please tell me (the dreams). So, tell me (the dreams).

First, G accurately represents the Hebrew rhetorical question with ἀνάλημα by introducing it emphatically with οὐχί, which also expects—or demands!—a positive response. Next, by interpreting the ה suffix of פתרנים (‘‘interpretations’’) as a possessive suffix (αὐτῶν [‘‘their’’]) instead of as a masculine plural morpheme, G takes Joseph’s question not as a general

175 τεταραγμένοι | The Hebrew verb ה is a hapaxlegomenon in Genesis, and G uses ταράσσω to translate a range of other verbs, especially in the Joseph story: הפנים (41:8), רדה (42:28), רדחה (43:30) (!), and ℓήθα (45:3) (also ℓήθα in 19:16). Although emotion was more directly in focus in the treatment of Gen 37, G’s interest in ταράχη (‘‘being disturbed/confused’’) and other tragic emotions can be observed in Gen 40–45, as well.

176 LSJ, s.vv. ‘‘ταράσσω’’ A.I.2; ‘‘ταράχη’’ A.2.

177 σκυθρωπά | G represents יר (25) with a range of more typical equivalents: πονηρός (15), αἰσχρός (5), and κακός (3). The word G selects here is a hapaxlegomenon in Genesis.

178 LSJ, s.v. ‘‘σκυθρωπός’’ A.I. As Harl says, G’s choice is ‘‘more specific’’ (‘‘plus précis’’) than the Hebrew term (La Genèse, 270).

179 Philo, Ios. 89–90 says the two men were ‘‘full of anxiety and depression’’ (συννοίας καὶ κατηφείας γέμοντας), ‘‘were filled with distress and dismay’’ (ἀσθος καὶ ἀδημοσίας πεπλήρωμαι), and felt ‘‘extreme grief’’ (σφοδρὰ λύπη). John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 63.1 (PG 54 541.27–32, 35–39) describes the men’s emotions in terms of ‘‘mental disturbance and confusion’’ (τεταραγμένους καὶ συγκεχυμένους τὴν διάνοιαν ... τὴν ἐνδον ταραχήν) and ‘‘despondency’’ (ἀθυμία).

180 οὐχί | Although G translates נ (217) as οὐ quite often (174), he reserves the more emphatic form οὐχί for special cases (6: 18:15; 19:2; [23:15]; 40:8; 42:10, 12). G does not use οὐχί otherwise.
principle that God has the power to interpret all dreams, but rather as the specific claim that he can provide “clarification” (διασάφησις) of the very dreams that have them fretting and dejected.\textsuperscript{181} In addition, by translating the imperatival particle נא causally as观音\textsuperscript{182} (“so”), G has Joseph ground his own confidence to interpret their dreams in his relationship with God: if the interpretation of their dreams comes through God, then Joseph is the very man for the job.\textsuperscript{183} Finally, while G’s usual translation of פתר (“interpret, solve”) as συγκρίνω\textsuperscript{184} (“combine, compare”) and פתרון (“interpretation, solution, meaning”) as σύγκρισις\textsuperscript{185} (“combination, comparison”) does not necessarily emphasize Joseph’s divine gift of dream interpretation any more than the Hebrew,\textsuperscript{186} the word family that G chooses to represent the Hebrew root פתר is notable given the symbolic nature of dreams throughout Joseph’s story, the proper interpretation of which requires “comparing” a sign in the dream with what it signifies in the real world of the narrative.\textsuperscript{187} This is the divine power that

\textsuperscript{181} Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 233: “In der LXX nicht eine generelle Aussage wie im MT, sondern mit direktem Bezug auf die beiden Träume.” So also Wevers, Notes, 666–667: “[G] renders the Hebrew word [i.e., פתר] by ‘their clarification,’ hence interpretation, a reference specifically to the two dreams in the story.”

\textsuperscript{182}观音\textsuperscript{182} | Most often, G leaves观音 “untranslated,” but when he represents it quantitatively, he selects from a range of Greek equivalents (see §3.1.5.1). G represents观音 in a few other cases (3: 12:13; 16:2; 18:21) (cf. §8.3.1 and note 126). More often, G uses观音 as a translation of 1 (25), especially in פתרה (see §4.1.1.1), or because he adds it (9) (see §3.2.3.1).

\textsuperscript{183} Wevers finds Joseph’s choice of conjunction “a bit arrogant” (Notes, 667).

\textsuperscript{184} συγκρίνω | G represents פתר (9) as συγκρίνω except in 41:8, where he translates it as ἀπαγγέλλω (cf. note 215 below)—for פתר in the long omission of 41:12, cf. §3.1.8. G does not use συγκρίνω otherwise.

\textsuperscript{185} σύγκρισις | For G’s treatment of פתר, see note 170 above.

\textsuperscript{186} HALOT, s.vv. “חדר” and “חדרון”; LSJ, s.v. “סחיינו” and “סחייס.”

\textsuperscript{187} Neither συγκρίνω nor σύγκρισις is normally used of dream interpretation, which suggests that G specifically wishes to signal the “comparative” nature of this particular type of interpretation, conceived of by G as a rhetorical exercise in “comparison” (σύγκρισις) (Theon, Prog. 10; Hermogenes, Prog. 8; Aphthonius, Prog. 10; Nicolaus, Prog. 9). G’s interpreters do not replicate his usage here, or with διασάφησις (Harl, La Genèse, 270; cf. Wevers, Notes, 666; Brayford, Genesis, 408–409).
Joseph possesses and that these two men do not, namely, the ability to assign the appropriate meanings to each of the symbols in the dreams.

The cupbearer is the first to tell his dream to Joseph: he saw a vine with three tendrils, and when it soon blossomed and produced ripe grapes, he pressed its grapes into Pharaoh’s cup and offered the wine to him (40:9–11). Joseph explains the three tendrils as three days and predicts that Pharaoh will restore the chief cupbearer to his former position in three days’ time (40:12–13). The baker, whose similar dream involved birds eating Pharaoh’s food from one of three baskets on his head, is ironically encouraged by the auspicious (lit. “good” [טוב]) interpretation of the cupbearer’s dream. This encouragement arises from his false inference that his dream will also have a similarly favorable interpretation. Likely, he reasoned on the basis of the common motif of the number three, the clear symbol of each man’s former occupations, and the word שאר (“head”), which figured positively into Joseph’s explanation of the first dream: Pharaoh will “lift” (נשא) the cupbearer’s “head” (שא). G invites his readers to note this irony with the way he translates the baker’s response to this first interpretation, the dream itself, and Joseph’s interpretation of it:

**Genesis 40:16–19**

To begin with, G modulates the ironic introduction of this passage with his translation of why the chief baker gains confidence about the meaning of his own dream, i.e., not because he saw that Joseph interpreted the first dream “favorably”\(^ {189}\) (טוב), but rather “correctly” (ὀρθῶς).\(^ {190}\) Of course, the baker’s own ability to judge the correctness of Joseph’s interpretation leads to his over-confidence: even as he correctly recognizes that the baskets of his dream also represent his former position as chief baker and that the number three signifies three days, he fails the this-equals-that operation of “comparing” (συγκρίνω) the sign of birds eating Pharaoh’s food from baskets on his head with its future meaning in the real world. Then in translating the dream itself, G plays further with this dark humor by having the chief baker assimilate his dream to that of the cupbearer so that he overlooks its most important and ominous sign. First, G accurately translates the emphatic introduction to the baker’s story, rendering אַף אֲנִי forcefully as κἀγώ\(^ {191}\) (“I, too”) in the clause אַף אֲנִי, so as to ensure that the reader sees the two dreams in parallel. More inventive, however, is the fact that G “inserts” the word αἴρειν\(^ {192}\) into the next clause as a complementary infinitive of ωμην, which gives the baker a greater sense of agency:

\(^{189}\) HALOT, s.v. “טוב 1” 2.

\(^{190}\) ὀρθῶς | G usually translates טוב (41) as καλὸς (32) (cf. note 133 above) or καλῶς (1), and ὀρθῶς is without parallel as an equivalent. However, G uses ὀρθῶς twice in 4:7 to translate טוב in the hiphil (for a translation, see §9.1). Cf. Wevers, Notes, 670.

\(^{191}\) κἀγώ | For other rare cases of G’s emphatic use of κἀγώ, see §3.3.2.2.

\(^{192}\) αἴρειν | G does not often add content words in translation (for examples, see §3.2.8).
And behold! There were three breadbaskets upon my head. And I imagined I was lifting three baskets of coarse meal loaves upon my head.

With this translation, the baker sees himself—just as the cupbearer did—performing his former role in a dream-like way, as he lifts Pharaoh’s food onto his head, presumably for Pharaoh to eat what he has prepared. Furthermore, the baker “lifting” (αἰρέω) baskets on his head darkly foreshadows the “lifting off” (ἀφαιρέω) of the head itself (40:19). Yet, the baker’s presumption blinds him to the fact that it is the birds who are “eating” (אכל) from his head, and, as he has before, G translates בשר more violently with the animalistic verb κατεσθίω (“devour”), which clues the reader in to the likelihood that the baker’s dream is not as favorable as he believes. Finally, when Joseph gives the interpretation, G captures this ferocity in another way, by translating בשר (“flesh”) as σάρξ (“flesh”) in the plural, so that the reader imagines the birds in a feeding frenzy, still pecking away at bits of the cupbearer’s flesh even after he dies.

---

193 κατεσθίω | See note 73 above.
194 This is the only instance that G uses σάρξ in the plural in reference to a single body. For G’s translation of Hebrew singular nouns with Greek plurals, see §6.2.2.2.
195 Wevers, Notes, 672: “בשרך is of course in the singular, but [G] uses the plural τὰς σάρκας σου, since birds pecking away at flesh eat bits of flesh. The plural makes good sense in Greek.” Furthermore, if Brayford’s suggestion is correct, that Joseph changes the baker’s πετεινά to ὄρνεα in order to substitute smaller, more harmless birds for larger birds of prey (Genesis, 410), this would complement the ferocity implied by σάρκας, but it may be stylistic variation: e.g., in the flood account, G uses both πετεινά (11:6; ḫ:7; 7:3[+], 8, 14, 21, 23; [8:1], 17, 19, 20) and ὄρνεα (3:6;20; 9:2, 10) interchangeably. Yet to Brayford’s point, see LSJ, s.v. “ὄρνις” I.
To be sure, the tragic irony of the baker’s dream in relation to that of the cupbearer is already present in the Hebrew text. Perhaps the surest indication of this involves the wordplay between Joseph’s contrastive interpretations:

In the Hebrew version, both interpretations begin with the exact same words ("in yet three days Pharaoh will ‘lift’ your head”), but the baker’s pronunciation has the word appended ("from off of you”) appended, which radically alters the meaning of ("lift”) and the entire sentence: the baker will be decapitated. This wordplay is possible in Hebrew, because the phrase ("lift the head"), similar to the idiom ("lift the face”), means to “cheer,” “acquit,” or “favor” someone. Because of his desire to convey this ironic wordplay to his readers and the difficulty of copying it meaningfully into Greek, G elects to translate both the verb ("lift") and its object ("head") in 40:13 according to this clause’s general sense in its immediate literary context as (Pharaoh will remember your position of authority”), although G no doubt justified his translation of ("head") as by appealing to the fact that

---

196 HALOT; s.v. “,n” qal 18.a; Wevers, Notes, 672.
197 HALOT; s.v. “,n” qal 4.a; 6.a; Harl, La Genèse, 271: “te libétera.” Cf. Wevers, Notes, 668.
198 ἐμνήσθησεν | G uses a large range of translation equivalents for the verb אמר (48) (cf. note 138 above), but he only selects ἐμμηνήσκωμαι here and in 40:20. Otherwise, G reserves ἐμμηνήσκωμαι for זכר (9/10) (cf. זכר translated by ἀναμμηνήσκω in 41:9).
199 ἀρχή | G’s main equivalent for ראש (20) is κεφαλή (16), and outside of this passage, G only uses ἀρχή for ראש in 2:10 (cf. 40:20+). Otherwise, G uses ἀρχή (16) to translate a number of Hebrew words: ראשת (3); ראתית (1); מושב (3); לך (1); and (1).
the Hebrew term—like ἄρχη—is also associated with superiority (“best”) and authority (“chief”). While G’s decision to produce a meaningful Greek translation of this verse weakens the similarities between these two pronouncements and eliminates the wordplay, he takes this opportunity to weave in another layer of irony, because, just as Joseph predicts that the chief cupbearer “will be remembered” (μνησθήσεται) by Pharaoh, he also asks the cupbearer to “remember” (μνήσθητι) him at that time and “mention” (μνησθήσῃ περὶ) him and his situation to Pharaoh, thus taking “pity” (ἔλεος [חֶסֶד] “reciprocal kindness”) on him (40:14). In keeping with the failed reversal of the previous chapter, it is needless to say that Joseph is not remembered when his predictions come to pass, the chief cupbearer is acquitted, and the chief baker is hanged: instead, the cupbearer forgets him (40:23), at least for the present time.

In Gen 41, G continues to focus on the supernatural elements of the story by emphasizing Joseph’s confident mastery of dream interpretation, but he also works to present Pharaoh’s dreams, each of which is told twice (41:1–4 // 41:17–21 about the cows and 41:5–7 // 41:22–24 about the ears of grains), from Pharaoh’s subjective perspective and as vividly in translation as they are in the Hebrew version, and at times even more so.

---

200 HALOT; s.v. “שמא” 8–9; LSJ, s.v. “ἄρχη” A.II; DGE, s.v. “ἄρχη” C. Brayford calls G’s translation “an interpretive, rather than literal, rendering” (Genesis, 409), but this does not apply to ἄρχη as much as to μνησθήσεται.

201 μνήσθητι | For the close correspondence between זכר and μιμήσκομαι, see note 198 above.

202 Prestel and Schorch note that G “thus produces a new play on words by using the verb μιμήσκω” (“Dabei erzeugt die Verwendung des Verbs μιμήσκω ein neues Wortspiel”) (“Genesis,” 233).

203 έλεος | See note 168 above.

204 HALOT, s.v. “חֶסֶד” 1: “joint obligation, loyalty, faithfulness.”
Pharaoh’s two dreams are very similar to one another and obviously share a common interpretation: seven healthy cows (or ears of grain) are consumed by seven unhealthy ones. As a result of both dreams, Pharaoh’s “soul is disturbed” (דָּרָשׂ רוחו [= ἑταράχθη 205 ἡ ψυχή 206 αὐτοῦ]) (41:8). G assumes Pharaoh’s subjective perspective, thus creating a gap between the narrative’s dream world and its real world, in the same way that he did with Joseph’s similarly parallel dreams in Gen 37:5–11, i.e., by translating the particle הנה (“behold”) sometimes as ὠλομαί 207 (“I imagine”) (41:1, 17) or ὡσπερ 208 (“as if”) (41:2, 18, 22) instead of his more usual translation equivalent ἰδοὺ (“behold”):

| 41:1 | וַהֲנֵה עֵם עַל יָהֳרָא | ἦται ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ |
| 41:17 | וַהֲנֵה עֵם עַל שְׂפַת יָהֳרָא | ἦταν ἐστάναι παρὰ τὸ χέιλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ |
| 41:2 | ... וַהֲנֵה מִן הָרוֹא עֵלָה | καὶ ἐξῆγεν ὡσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ... |
| 41:18 | ... וַהֲנֵה מִן הָרוֹא עֵלָה | καὶ ὡσπερ ἐξ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ... |
| 41:22 | וַהֲנֵה שְׁבִיא שְׁבִיל עֵלָה | καὶ ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τὰ στάχυες ἀνέβαινον ... |

Then, he accurately captures the vividness of the Hebrew as he also replicates the dreams’ sense of anticipation and fulfillment by making use of strings of imperfect indicative verbs followed by the aorist:

---

205 ἑταράχθη | The verb דרעס is a hapaxlegomenon in Genesis, but G uses τάρασσω to translate this and a range of other verbs, especially in Joseph’s story (see note 175 above).
206 ψυχή | G usually represents רוּחַ (11) as πνεῦμα (7), only here selecting ψυχή, his usual equivalent for the Hebrew noun נשע (41/43). Cf. Wevers, Notes, 678; Brayford, Genesis, 411.
207 ὠλομαί | See note 58 above.
208 ὡσπερ | See note 60 above.
Genesis 41:1–4 // 41:17–21 (dream about cows)

By giving each dream account this discourse structure in two passages in Genesis. When he switched into the aorist indicative.

Genesis 41:5–7 // 41:22–24 (dream about ears of grain)

In all four dream accounts, G translates both Hebrew participles and wayyiqtol forms with the Greek imperfect indicative until the moment when the healthy group of cows or ears of grain is “eaten up” (κατεσθίω) (41:4, 20) or “gulped down” (καταπίθηκοι) (41:7, 24), when he switches into the aorist indicative. By giving each dream account this discourse structure in Greek, where the initial events build tension that anticipates resolution, G carefully

209 πυμέν | G’s choice of πυμέν (“stock, stem”) for גִּיצָה (“tendril”) in 40:10, 12 and for גּוּפֶר (“stalk”) in this passage (41:5, 22) may be an attempt to harmonize the cupbearer’s dream with Pharaoh’s second dream, since both dreams are agricultural and involve numbers of days/years. These Hebrew and Greek words only appear in these two passages in Genesis.
represents the flow of the Hebrew in translation, even as he departs from its morphological form in order to do so. Furthermore, by using the similarly formed pair κατεσθίω (lit. “eat down”) and καταπίνω (lit. “drink down”) to translate the Hebrew verbs אכ (“eat”) and בל (“swallow [up]), G enhances the parallelism of the two dreams stylistically, even as these compound verbs are more forceful than their simplex counterparts. In this vein, G also intensifies the violence of the unhealthy ears of grain by translating מגדת (“were sprouting up after them”) in the dream’s second telling as ἀνεφύσετο ἐξομενοὶ (καταπίνω) (lit. “were growing up clinging closely to” them”), as if the unhealthy ears of grain are overeager to gobble up their healthy counterparts.

As the story goes, neither Pharaoh nor his best advisers are able to divine the meaning of his two dreams, which prompts the chief cupbearer to remember his “error” (ἁμαρτία [= חֵׁטְּא]) (41:9), and he mentions Joseph to Pharaoh, who then has Joseph brought in to unravel the mystery of his dreams. In Gen 41, as in Gen 40, G makes several translation choices that serve to boost Joseph’s status as a confident and masterful dream decoder. First, while the Hebrew text twice says that there was no one “to interpret” (פָּתַר) Pharaoh’s dreams (41:8, 24), in this case G rejects his usual translation of συγκρίνω

210 For G’s creative combination of aorist and imperfect in narration to present a series of events with a particular structure, see §6.1.1.1.
211 κατεσθίω | See note 73 above.
212 καταπίνω | Both בל and καταπίνω are restricted to this passage in Genesis.
213 ἐξομενοὶ | Usually, G translates אכ as μετά (59), μετά ταῦτα (5), or ὀπίσω (12). The match with ἔχω is without parallel in Genesis, and this is the only occurrence of ἔχω (24) in the middle voice.
214 LSJ, s.v. “ἔχω” C.I.3. Brayford takes this not as the unhealthy ears of grain eagerly pulling themselves up, but rather pulling the healthy ears of grain down (Genesis, 414).
(“interpret”) in favor of ἀπαγγέλλω215 (“report”), and so he distances those of Pharaoh’s court from the capacity to disentangle dreams from their meanings just as he did by translating כּנֶסֶת (“interpretation”) as ḥrāṣ ("vision") in the previous chapter (see above).216 More directly, after Joseph successfully interprets Pharaoh’s dreams—that seven years of plenty will be followed by seven years of famine—Pharaoh praises Joseph’s divine gift and wisdom, and G embellishes his approbation of Joseph in several ways:

**Genesis 41:38–39**

First, G uses μή217 to introduce Pharaoh’s initial question ἥνεμεν θεὶς ἀντιλθεν τοις παῖσιν αὐτοῦ ἔρρησομεν ἄνθρωπον τοιοῦτον, δὲ ἔχει πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ: 39 ἐπεί δὲ Φαραώ τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἐπείδη ἐδείξεν ὁ θεὸς σοι πάντα ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον τοιοῦτον, ἤπαντες ἄνθρωποι ἔχων ἄνθρωπον. 39 ἐπεί δὲ Φαραώ τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἐπείδη ἐδείξεν ὁ θεὸς σοι πάντα ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον τοιοῦτον, ἤπαντες ἄνθρωποι ἔχων ἄνθρωπον.

Second, G renders the temporal preposition ῥή after causally as ἐπείδη219 (“since”), which tightens the logical link between Pharaoh’s observation that God has shown so much to Joseph and his claim that Joseph is οὐδὲ διὰρεῖ τὸ στόμα: Ὑπὸ ὅτε οὐδὲ διὰρεῖ τὸ στόμα ἰδού ὑπὸ διὰρεῖ τὸ στόμα ἰδού. Similarly, Josephus, A.J. 2.5.4 §76 describes Pharaoh’s wise men as “perplexed” (ἀπορούντων), while Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Pent.* 1–3 says that they “were unable to say anything” (οὐδὲ ἐχόντων εἰπέν). Cf. Brayford, *Genesis*, 412. Wevers, however, assumes that G uses ἀπαγγέλλω in the sense of “explain, interpret” even though it “usually means ‘report, declare’” (*Notes*, 679).

215 ἀπαγγέλλω | The equivalence of ראת and ἀπαγγέλλω is unique here. (For G’s usual rendering of ראת, see note 184 above.) Otherwise, G just uses ἀπαγγέλλω as his main match for ראת in the hiphil and hophal (21/36).

216 Meiser, “Der Traum,” 267. As John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 63.3 (PG 54 544.1–3) reads G’s text, it was not that the wise men could not interpret Pharaoh’s dream, but they could not “speak” (εἰπέν) or even “open their mouths” (διὰρεῖ τὸ στόμα): Ὑπὸ ὅτε οὐδὲ διὰρεῖ τὸ στόμα ἰδού. Similarly, Josephus, A.J. 2.5.4 §76 describes Pharaoh’s wise men as “perplexed” (ἀπορούντων), while Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Pent.* 1–3 says that they “were unable to say anything” (οὐδὲ ἐχόντων εἰπέν). Cf. Brayford, *Genesis*, 412. Wevers, however, assumes that G uses ἀπαγγέλλω in the sense of “explain, interpret” even though it “usually means ‘report, declare’” (*Notes*, 679).

217 μή | See note 49 above.


“thus” peerless, a claim G chooses to express with comparative adjectives in Greek, so that “no one as discerning and wise as you” (Ἄ ἂν ἀῤτον ὑπάκουσταν ἡμῖν) becomes “no one wiser or more understanding than you” (φρονιμώτερος καὶ συνετώτερος σου). These Greek comparatives then subtly suggest Joseph’s superlative wisdom and intellect morphologically in a way that is impossible in the Hebrew language.

To this point in the narrative sequence of Gen 39–41, the plot has been driven by Joseph’s supernatural abilities, his divine favor, and the ironic postponement of his reversal, but the time has now come for that magnificent volte-face, and here G puts certain stylistic and rhetorical flares and flourishes on this transformational moment:

**Genesis 41:40–44**

First, G translates the cultural concept that all Pharaoh’s people will “(ceremoniously) kiss” at Joseph’s command notionally as they will “obey” (ὑπακούσεται) him. So, just as with G’s above-and-below merism in 39:9 (ὑπέρέχω and ὑπερξαίρεω), G also creates a rhetorical contrast here, such that all of the people are “below” (ὑπὸ in ὑπακούω) him while only Pharaoh’s throne is “above” (ὑπέρ in ὑπέρέχω) him. Furthermore, he captures the formality

---

220 ὑπακούσεται | G usually translates ρῦσι as φιλέω (7) or καταφιλέω (3). The equivalence with ὑπακούω is unique, although G’s translation “makes excellent sense” (Wevers, Notes, 694). For the usual matches of ὑπακούω, see note 163 above.
of this occasion by translating Pharaoh’s next declaration with the Greek present indicative, which functions as a performativé,²²¹ especially in the presence of σήμερον,²²² a word G supplies in translation:

41:41

ראשה חוף ראשה
על כל ארץ מצרים

Look! I hereby set you

over all the land of Egypt.

Behold! I hereby appoint you this day

over all the land of Egypt.

Next, G constructs a novel stylistic symmetry with the verbs he selects to describe Pharaoh “taking off” (σαρ) his signet ring and “placing” (גֵּט) it on Joseph’s hand, using two verbs with the prefix περι-, so that Pharaoh, “having taking (his ring) off from around” (περιελόμενος)²²³ his finger, then “put (it) around” (περιέθηκεν)²²⁴ Joseph’s (41:42).²²⁵ In addition, this scene now more closely resembles Tamar’s physical transformation, where she “took off” (περιελομένη) her widow’s apparel and “put on” (περιέβαλετο) her pretty summer dress (38:14).²²⁶ Moreover, this similarity is not meaningless, since both Tamar and Joseph use their outward appearance and demeanor in order to conceal their identity and prevent their recognition by other characters. As with Tamar’s θεριστρον discussed

²²¹ Wevers, Notes, 694: “In MT Pharaoh’s appointment is described as a fait accompli. [...] [G] stresses the fact that the appointment is taking place.”
²²² σήμερον | For other rare cases where G adds a content word in translation, see §3.2.8.
²²³ περιελόμενος | See note 99 above.
²²⁴ περιέθηκεν | For G’s more usual equivalents of גט, see note 156 above. While G does use תִּיְּדֶהוּ and cognates to represent גט, he selects the compound περιτίθημι only here. Otherwise, G only uses περιτίθημι as a rare match for לְשׁ (2/48: 24:47; 41:42) and לָשׁ (1/6: 27:16).
²²⁵ Furthermore, by using a circumstantial participle (see §§3.1.2.1; 6.1.1.1), G binds these verbs together not just lexically but also syntactically (Wevers, Notes, 694).
²²⁶ Philo, Somn. 2.44–45 compares and allegorizes the changing clothes of Tamar and Joseph.
above, here too G gives Joseph not just fine linen “clothes” (בגדים), but a fine linen “robe” (στολή)\(^{227}\) (41:42). Finally, since he was apparently unfamiliar with the obscure term רֶּבֶן (“watch out!” [?] or “kneel!” [?]),\(^{228}\) G interprets this according to the context, such that a “herald heralded” (ἐκήρυξεν ... κῆρυξ) before Joseph as he proceeded in his chariot (41:43).

All of this magnifies the grandeur of Joseph’s long-awaited but sudden and total reversal.\(^{229}\)

Now Joseph’s initial reversal is itself reversed by a second: Joseph has fallen very far because of his brothers’ act of revenge, and he has now risen higher than he ever imagined possible because of God’s supernatural gifts and provision and his timely\(^{230}\) transformation of Joseph’s fate. Throughout the stages of Joseph’s reversal, where two failed near-reversals are followed by a third success, I have argued that G has intended to focus his readers’ attention on the tragic irony of Joseph’s continued mistreatment in light of his virtuous commitment to his human and divine masters and his supernatural ability to interpret

---

\(^{227}\) \(\sigmaτολή\) | G usually represents רֶּּבֶן (14) as ἱμάτιον/ἱματισμός (12), but also as στολή in 27:15. G more often uses στολή to translate בֶגֶד (4/7), and once בֵּית (49:11). Wevers describes G’s lexical choice as “a mark of his [i.e., Joseph’s] elevation” (Notes, 695); cf. Martina Kepper, “Kontextualisierende Übersetzungspraxis in der Genesis-Septuaginta?” in Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 527–530.

\(^{228}\) HALOT; s.v. “ךְֵׁא בְּר”; Harl, La Genèse, 275; Wevers, Notes, 695; Prestel and Schorsch, “Genesis,” 236.

\(^{229}\) In discussing Joseph’s reversal, John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 63.4 (PG 54 545.33–39) notes both its suddenness (ἀθρόος, ἐξαίφνης) and its totality (from “prison” [δεσμωτήριον] to “highest honor” [ἡ ἀνωτάτως τιμή]) and “adulterer” [μοιχὸς] to “rule of all Egypt” [ἡ ἀρχὴν πάσης Αἰγύπτου]: “Ὅρα πῶς ἄφροιον ὁ δεσμώτης βασιλεὺς καθίσται πάσης τῆς Αἰγυπτίου, καὶ ὅ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιμαγείρου εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον εἰσαχθεῖ, ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς αὐτὴν ἀνέγεται τὴν ἀνωτάτως τιμῆ, καὶ ὁ γενόμενος αὐτοῦ δεσπότης ἐξαίρετος ἑώρα, διὸ ως μοιχὸν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἔμβεβληκε, τὴν ἀρχὴν πάσης Αἰγύπτου δεξάμενου. Cf. Philo, Ios. 123.

\(^{230}\) Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 101 explains how the seemingly random series of events had to unfold just as they did for Jacob’s family to receive provision during the famine, “so that the purpose of the divine management of affairs becomes clear from the final outcome” (ἐκ τοῦ τέλους σοῦ γίνεται δήλος τῆς θείας σινομομασίας ὡς σκοπός).
dreams. Furthermore, G has used this painful series of events to activate his readers’ emotions: pity for Joseph in his tragic suffering and joy for him in his postponed vindication. Having now seen G’s thorough interest in the tragic themes of revenge, emotion, and lamentation, on the one hand, and reversal and the supernatural, on the other, we will now proceed to Joseph’s own harmless but ironic act of revenge involving concealment and recognition in order to see how G redoubles his efforts to translate Joseph’s story in the tragic mode in the coming chapters.

9.3.4 Recognition and irony (Gen 42–45)

Like much of Joseph’s story, Gen 42–45 is saturated with irony, but here it is especially palpable, since virtually everything that is said and done holds a different significance for the two main actors (or groups of actors), i.e., Joseph and his brothers, and the reader enjoys a privileged vantage point from which to appreciate the difference. These divergent perspectives are the result of Joseph disguising his own identity so that his brothers do not recognize him. In this third act of Joseph’s story, the plot develops around two interrelated themes: Joseph’s comic revenge and his brothers’ virtuous reversal, all leading up to their reconciliation with the final recognition of Joseph. Throughout, I will demonstrate that many of G’s interpretive interventions are intended to draw attention to these two themes, reinforcing the dramatic irony of Joseph’s trickery, on the one hand, and the sincerity of his brothers’ ethical transformation, on the other.

When the worldwide famine that Joseph predicted strikes, Joseph’s family in Canaan runs out of food, and Jacob sends all of his sons but Benjamin to Egypt for provisions
Having oversight of the distribution and sale of grain in Egypt, Joseph sees his brothers bow down before him—just as his dream predicted—in order to secure food for themselves and their families. While Joseph recognizes them, they fail to recognize him, a point that is cleverly expressed in the Hebrew version by wordplay on the root נכר:

And Joseph saw his brothers and recognized(them), and he made himself unrecognizable to them, and he spoke harsh words to them.

While G does not manage to replicate this wordplay in Greek translation, he accurately conveys the sense by translating נכר in the hithpael by analogy to the nominal cognates נכר (“foreigner”) and נכר (“foreign”), for which he uses the adjective ἀλλότριος (“foreign[er]”), which is itself cognate to the verb ἀλλοτριόω 231 (“make strange or foreign”). 232 To be sure, this sense is already implied by the Hebrew wordplay, since Joseph’s disguise takes advantage of Joseph’s Egyptian dress, language, and position of power, 233 and yet, because G also translates the Hebrew prepositionbyn (“to”) as ἀπό (“from”), 234 he subtly enhances

---

231 ἀλλοτριόω | It all of its other occurrences in Genesis, נכר occurs in the hiphil and G translates it as ἐπιγιγνώσκω (10/11). Here it is in the hithpael. G does not use the verb ἀλλοτριόω elsewhere. However, G generally uses the cognate ἀλλότριος to represent נכר (3/4) and נכר (1) (cf.נכר = ἀλλογενῶν ἐθνῶν in 17:27).

232 HALOT, s.v. “נכר” hithpael 2; LSJ, s.v. “ἀλλοτριόω” A.I.2; DGE, s.v. “ἀλλοτριόω” B.II.5.

233 Philo, Ios. 166 describes Joseph as an “actor” (καθυποκρινόμενος) who skillfully uses his looks (βλέμμασι), voice (φωνῇ), and other dramatic resources (τοῖς ἄλλοις) to his advantage. Cf. Ios. 168, where he refers to the “grave character” (βαθὺ ἔθος) that Joseph assumes.

234 ἀπό | Of its 514 occurrences in Genesis, G only translatesbyn as ἀπό here.
Joseph’s ironic hostility toward his brothers, a point that is consistent with the fact that he proceeds to speak “harsh words” (σκληρά [= קושׁת]) to them.

G apparently had a lot of fun with the dramatic irony—and dramatic justice!—of Joseph’s harsh words, because throughout the following dialogue, in which Joseph accuses his brothers of being spies, G develops rhetorical and literary aspects of this irony in two different directions: (i) he intensifies Joseph’s harshness toward his brothers, thus making his performance more believable to them, even as (ii) he introduces ironic hints for the reader that Joseph’s deceit is really a practical joke: unlike his brothers, Joseph means well with his act of revenge, as it is ultimately the mechanism for their ethical reversal.

---

235 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.1 (PG 54 549.2–9) says that Joseph “wished to present himself to them as to foreigners” (ὡς ἀλλοτριος αὐτοῖς προσφέρεσαι ἔβούλετο) and “feigned total ignorance” (προσποιεῖται παντελῆ ἄγνοιαν) in order to gain accurate information about his father and his brother Benjamin. Cf. Josephus, A.J. 2.6.2 §99. With greater emphasis on Joseph’s patient and tortuous “contrivance” (μηχανή), see also Hom. Gen. 64.3 (PG 54 551.8–20); 64.5 (PG 54 554.6–9); 64.5 (PG 54 554.34–37). In contrast, Jubilees 42:25 explains Joseph’s plan as meant to evaluate the relationship among the brothers more generally (cf. Jub 43:14).

236 σκληρά | Generally, G represents the root מְשִׁלֶד with the root σκληρός (here and 42:30), and מְשִׁלֶד (3) as σκληρῶς (35:17) and σκληρύνω (49:7) (but δυστοκέω in 35:16). Of the three cognate Greek words, G uses σκληρός otherwise only for μετέ (21:11, 12), ρήσις (49:3+), and γνώσει (45:5 [= σκληρός φαίνομαι]).

237 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.2 (PG 54 549.18–19) judges that Joseph’s speech exhibits “great severity:” Διό καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς αὐτοῖς τῆς σφοδρότητος εὐθέως ἀποκρίνεται. Cf. Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 103. It is uncertain whether G wished to convey the idea of “foreignness,” that of “hostility” (see ἀλλοτριωσις in Philo, Ios. 166), or both (Harl, La Genèse, 279).
Genesis 42:9–16

G captures and cultivates G’s several translation choices that he makes.

First, he translates Joseph’s opening accusation that his brothers have come to see the vulnerability of the land as κατάνοησαι τὰ ἴχνη τῆς χώρας ἡκατέ. 10 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ὁχι, κύριε; οἱ παιδές σου ἠλθομεν προσθείς βρώματα. 11 πάντες ἠσμέν ὦτι ἕν ἄνθρωπον εἰρηκοι ἠσμέν, οὐκ εἰσίν οἱ παιδές σου κατάνοησαι. 12 εἴπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ὁχι, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἴχνη τῆς γῆς ἠλθατε ἰδεῖν. 13 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Δῶδεκά ἠσμέν οἱ παιδές σου ἄδελφοι ἐν γῇ Χανάν, καὶ ἱδοὺ ὃ νεώτερος μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σήμερον, ὃ δὲ ἐτερος σύχ ὑπάρχει. 14 εἴπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἱωσήφ. Τοῦτο ἡστιν, ὃ εἰρηκα ὕμιν λέγων ότι Κατάνοησαι ἡστε. 15 ἐν τούτῳ φανεὶσθε: νὴ τὴν ύγείαν Φαραώ, οὐ μὴ ἔξελθοτε ἐντεῦθεν, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἄδελφος ὑμῶν ὁ νεώτερος ἕδη ὁδε. 16 ἀποστείλατε ἔξ ὑμῖν ἕνα, καὶ λάβετε τὸν ἄδελφὸν ὑμῶν. ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀπάχητε ἐως τοῦ φανερὰ γενέσθαι τὰ ρήματα ὑμῶν, εἰ ἀληθεύετε ἢ οὐ· εἰ δὲ μὴ, νὴ τὴν ύγείαν Φαραώ, οὐ μὴ κατάνοησαι ἡστε.

238 Lit. “nakedness” (HALOT, s.v. “ἀλία” 2). Cf. Wevers, Notes, 708; Brayford, Genesis, 420; Prestel and Schorck, “Genesis,” 238.
239 κατανοησαι | G regularly translates ἀλία in the qal with ὁφρ and compounds (118/129), selecting the equivalent κατανοέω only here. G just uses κατανοέω once more (for ἐβούλησθα in 3:6).
240 ἴχνη | G usually translates ἴχνη (5) as γύρωνισις (3), but also as ἴχνος in 42:12. G does not use ἴχνος elsewhere.
242 οὐχ | See note 180 above.
As Pharaoh lives, you will not leave this place, By Pharaoh’s health you will surely not leave here, unless your younger brother comes here!

G does this by translating the idiom "חי פרעה ("as Pharaoh lives") expansively and idiomatically as νὴ τὴν ὑγείαν Pharaoh’s health”) and also by selecting the more emphatic construction οὐ μὴ ἔξελθητε (“you will surely not leave”) to translate the yiqtol-clause that follows. Later, when Joseph similarly swears that his brothers are spies if they fail this test, G translates this second oath in a similarly rhetorically-charged manner:

... but if not, as Pharaoh lives, surely you are spies! ... but if not, by Pharaoh’s health, verily you are spies!

In this case, G again uses νὴ τὴν ὑγείαν Pharaoh’s health”) for "חי פרעה (“as Pharaoh lives”), but he also translates the asseverative "κατάκλυσμα אתήμ" quite appropriately as έμήν ("verily"), which is reminiscent of God’s solemn oath to Abraham in Gen 22:17 (see §8.3.3).

---

243 νὴ τὴν ὑγείαν | According to its more typical usage, G regularly translates ήν (25) as ζωή (20) or ζάω (2). There are no parallels to this oath formula in Genesis except in the next verse (42:16), where G translates it in the same manner. G does not use the oath particle νὴ or the noun ὑγεία otherwise (but ὑγαίνω as a translation of בטש [5/15]).

244 LSJ, s.v. "νη;" Wevers, Notes, 710.

245 οὐ μὴ ἔξελθητε | For G’s choice to translate negated yiqtol sometimes emphatically with this construction instead of the future indicative, see §6.1.1.2 (cf. §3.4.3). Wevers calls this a “strong affirmation” (Notes, 710).

246 έμήν | Based on its other uses, G typically translates יב (293) as δεί (146), γεφ (89), or ἀλλά (11) (cf. §4.2.3). G only represents יב asseveratively as έμήν here and in 22:17, and he uses this particle combination nowhere else.

247 James Aitken characterizes Joseph’s speech here as “more passionate and more authoritative in its formality” in comparison to the Hebrew text (“Characterization of Speech,” 9–10; cf. Wevers, Notes, 711). For
Even as G helps Joseph play his part as the harsh and probing interrogator, he ironically works in clues for his reader that Joseph’s performance is just a charade. First, when Joseph’s brothers fiercely deny (οὐχι248 [ׁ= אָל]) the allegation of espionage, G has them say not that they are כֵּן (“honest”)249 but εἰρηνικος250 (“peaceful”)251 (42:11; cf. 42:19, 31, 33, 34), thus having them accept the militaristic thrust of Joseph’s accusation and ironically hearken back to their prior inability to speak “a single peaceable word” (οὐδὲν εἰρηνικὸν [= לְשׁוֹן]) to their brother after their father rewarded him with a special tunic for the fierce invective he brought against them (37:2–4). Second, when Joseph’s brothers explain that their youngest brother Benjamin is not with them “and the other is no more” (והאחד איננו252 (42:13), G translates this as ὁ δὲ ἕτερος οὐχ ὑπάρχει252 (“and the other does not exist anymore”). Here, G’s rare use of ὑπάρχω (“exist”) gives special emphasis to the ironic truth that Joseph not only exists but is actually standing right in front of them. In addition, it may be that G meant this as a subtle pun: ὑπάρχω is very close (and related) to the noun 

the common use of Ἰ μὴν in solemn oaths, see LSJ, s.v. “Ἰ” I.1; Mayser, Grammatik, II.3.146 (§164.14.2a); Denniston, The Greek Particles, 350–351.

248 οὐχι | See note 180 above.
249 HALOT; s.v. “ὢ” 2.a.
250 εἰρηνικός | G consistently translates Ἰ (5) as εἰρηνικός. For G’s other uses of εἰρηνικός, see note 46 above.
251 Wevers, Notes, 709; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 238. Harl’s claim that G uses the word εἰρηνικός “au sens de «loyal»” is not supported by the lexica (La Genèse, 279; cf. LSJ, s.v. “εἰρηνικός;” DGE, s.v. “εἰρηνικός”). While it is true that their claim to be “peaceable” entails that they are not bent on insurrection, and thus “loyal,” it seems that G used εἰρηνικός here in order to connect the brothers’ self-description ironically to the conflicting statement of the narrator in 37:4.
252 ὑπάρχω | Apart from the substantival participle ὑπάρχοντα, G only uses the verb ὑπάρχω here and in the parallel expression in 42:32 (cf. Harl, La Genèse, 279). Far more often G represents Ἰ as οὐ/μὴ + εἰμί (22). However, the case in 5:24 offers an interest parallel, since G wishes to communicate not that Enoch died or ceased to exist, but that he could not “be found” (οὐχ ηνίσκετο).
ὕπαρχος (“subordinate governor”),\textsuperscript{253} and Joseph’s position fits this description, as he is second in power only to Pharaoh.\textsuperscript{254} Third, G translates the \textit{niphal} of \textit{ןב} (“be tested”) as \textit{φαίνομαι}\textsuperscript{255} (“appear, come to light”) (42:15) and its periphrastic equivalent \textit{φανερὸς γίνομαι} (42:16), such that Joseph’s brothers are not tested by him but exposed: their past act of revenge will come to light as they recognize their brother and their guilt and experience a reversal of character.

Their recognition of guilt begins in this passage, as Joseph’s brothers respond to his seemingly unfounded aggression toward them. When Joseph eases up on his demands, allowing his brothers to return to Canaan to fetch their youngest brother Benjamin on the condition that they leave one brother behind in prison (42:18–20), they recognize their present predicament as divine retribution (cf. 42:28) for their act of revenge on Joseph:

\textbf{Genesis 42:21}

\begin{verbatim}
καὶ ἑσπερὶ ἐκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ Ναί· ἐν ἀμαρτίᾳ γάρ ἐσμεν περὶ τοῦ ἄδελφος ἡμῶν, ὅτι ὑπερείδουμεν τὴν θλίψιν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, δέτε λεγεθεῖτο ἡμῶν, καὶ οὐκ εἰσηκουσάμεν αὐτοῦ· ἑνεκεν τούτου ἐπήλθεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἡ θλίψις αὐτῆ.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{253} The verb itself is used in the sense “to be ὑπάρχος” (LSJ, s.v. “ὑπάρχω” C; cf. LSJ, s.v. “ὑπαρχος” A.I). What is more, Philo repeatedly uses ὑπάρχος—among other terms—to refer to Joseph’s position, especially in relation to Pharaoh (\textit{Ios.} 123, 157, 164, 248, 257).

\textsuperscript{254} Earlier in 42:6, G describes Joseph as ἀρχων τῆς γῆς (“governor of the land”). Cf. 45:8.

\textsuperscript{255} \textit{φαίνομαι} ... \textit{φανερὸς γίνομαι} | The Hebrew verb \textit{ןב} only occurs in these two verses in Genesis. Wevers judges this “not a bad translation” (\textit{Notes}, 710). G mainly uses \textit{φαίνομαι} (6) in periphrastic constructions involving expansive translation (4) (see §3.4.4).
From their first word, G shows interest in Joseph’s brothers’ recognition of guilt, as he accurately translates the asseverative אָבָל (“truly”) as ναί\(^{256}\) (“verily”),\(^{257}\) which aptly captures the grave austerity of the confession that follows:

\begin{verbatim}
42:21 Truly we are guilty in regard to our brother. Verily we are at fault in regard to brother.
\end{verbatim}

What is more, G’s translation of אָשַׁם (“guilty”) as ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ\(^{258}\) (“at fault”) is decidedly tragic, since Joseph’s brothers recognize the tragic “mistake”\(^{260}\) (ἁμαρτία) that they once made and now regret. Furthermore, G deepens their remorse in translation, as they acknowledge not “seeing” (ראה) but “ignoring” (ὑπεροράω\(^{261}\) [lit. “overlook”]) their brother as “he repeatedly and earnestly begged” (κατεδέετο\(^{262}\) [= ἡθνήν “beg for mercy”]) them for

\(^{256}\) ναί | Hebrew בָּל also occurs in 17:19, and there G also renders it as ναί, a word G does not use otherwise.

\(^{257}\) LSJ, s.v. “ναί” A.I. As noted by Wevers, ναί expresses “strong asseveration” and so is “a good translation of הבָּל” (Notes, 713).

\(^{258}\) The conjunction γάρ is difficult to translate into English in this context. Its logical force is that “this is happening to us, because ...,” but such a translation overstates the subtle implication made by γάρ.

\(^{259}\) ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ | The adjective אָשֵׁם is a hapax legomenon in Genesis. G normally associates the Hebrew root אָסַה with the Greek root ἁμαρτ-: הבָּש (8) = ἁμαρτάνω (6/7); האָסַח (4) = ἁμαρτία (2/6); ἁμάρτημα (1/1); ἁμαρτάνω (1/7); אָסָה (1) = ἁμαρτωλός (1/1); הבָּש (1) = ἁμαρτία (1/6); אָשָׁם = ἁμαρτία (1/6). Only here and with ἁμαρτία in 15:16 does G use the Greek root ἁμαρτ- for a Hebrew word of a different root. Cf. Wevers, Notes, 713.

\(^{260}\) Harl translates ἁμαρτία as “faute” (La Genèse, 62).

\(^{261}\) ὑπεροράω | Though G commonly translates לאר with ἰδρῶ and cognates (see notes 69 and 239 above), he only uses the compound ὑπεροράω here, for לאר or otherwise.

\(^{262}\) κατεδέετο | Both the hithpael of הבָּש and the verb καταδέομαι only occur here in Genesis. In the qal, G consistently represents הבָּש as ἐλέω, a verb he otherwise does not use. Concerning G’s use of a finite verb for a Hebrew infinitive construct, see §6.1.1.7. In regard to G’s use of the imperfect indicative with a range of imperfective values, see §6.1.1.1.
mercy, while they did not even “listen to” (εἰσαχοῦσαν [דיבוה]) him.264 As a typical older brother, Reuben rubs their acknowledged mistake in their face with a sharp “Didn’t I tell you so:”

Did I not tell you, saying: Did I not tell you, saying: “Do not sin against the child?” “Do not wrong the little guy?” But you did not listen. And you did not listen to me.

By having Reuben (i) introduce his question with οὐκ265 [= ἀλήθη], which anticipates an affirmative response, (ii) characterize his brothers’ “sin” (ἁμαρτία) as “injustice” (ἀδικία),266 which is the consummation of all vice,267 (iii) affectionally refer to his younger brother Joseph as παιδάριον268 (“little guy”) (cf. 37:30), similar in this regard to יֶלֶד (“child”), and (iv) remind his brothers that they should not only have “listened to” Joseph begging for mercy,

---

263 εἰσαχοῦσα | With one exception, G consistently translates שמע with ἀκούω and cognates (63/64), but the match εἰσαχοῦσα is relatively uncommon (5: 21:17; 34:17, 24; 42:21, 22). G does not use εἰσαχοῦσα otherwise.

264 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.2 (PG 54 550.9–44) says that Joseph’s brothers are plagued by “conscience” (τὸ συνείδησι) and “become their own accusers” (αὐτοὺς ἐαυτῶν κατηγόρους γνωμένους), and, now that the stuper of sin has worn off like wine, they are “coming to their senses” (εἰς αἰσθήσεις εἰρηχμένους), and they recognize the “inhumanity” (ἀπανθρωπία) and “brutality” (ὑμοτης) of what they did to Joseph. Cf. Hom. Gen. 64.3 (PG 54 551.31–35); Philo, Ios. 171; Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 105.

265 οὐκ | On G’s contextual interpretation of γ and Hebrew questions, see §3.1.5.2.

266 ἀδικήσατε | For G’s regular treatment of the root ἁμαρτάνειν, see note 259 above. This is the only case where the Hebrew root נַעֲשָׂה corresponds to the Greek root ἁμαρτά-, although G levels a strikingly large number of Hebrew roots, partially or in whole, by his wide use of the roots δικαίος- and ἁμαρτά- (see §5.2.2.6). Furthermore, this lexical equivalence is uncommon the Septuagint as a whole (Wevers, Notes, 714).

267 For the ethical significance of ἁμαρτία and δικαίος, see §7.4.1 and especially note 75 there.

268 παιδάριον | See note 83 above.
but also “listened to” (εἰσακούω) him cautioning them, G causes the other brothers’ recognition of their mistake to smart with the pain of remorse from without as well as from within, which feeds into both Joseph’s harmless revenge and the brothers’ heartfelt reversal.

Because they are speaking in Hebrew, Joseph’s brothers do not realize that he understands their every word (42:23), and Joseph allows them to leave Egypt none the wiser (at least about his identity) by taking Simeon prisoner as surety of their return, and he even has the money they used for grain secretly placed in their bags, another practical joke that causes them to fret (42:24–28). They return to Canaan, report all these events to their father, and request that he allow Benjamin to travel with them back to Egypt, but Jacob refuses their petition for fear of experiencing further grief (λύπη [= יָגון]) (42:38) if something should happen to him as it did to Joseph (42:29–38). However, when their grain runs out, Judah repeats this request (43:1–10), and as G translates Judah’s appeal, he works

269 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.3 (PG 54 550.56–57) glosses Reuben’s accusation as “you ‘did away with’ him with intent” (τῇ γὰρ γνώμῃ αὐτῶν ἀνείλετε).

270 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.3 (PG 54 550.60–63) notes the intensity of having both conscience and Reuben as accuser: Ἐννόησον δὲν ἑστὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος κατηγορεῖσθαι, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν κατήγορον διηνεκῶς ἔχειν ἐπικείμενον, καταβοῦντα καὶ τὴν παρανομίαν ὑπομιμνήσκοντα.

271 Josephus, A.J. 2.6.4 §107 interprets Reuben’s chastisement as rebuking his brothers for a repentance of no benefit to Joseph (i.e., because it came too late) (ἐπιπλήττων αὐτῶς τῆς μετανοίας, ἐξ ἓς ἐφελος οὐδὲν Ἰωσήφῳ γίνεται). Though Reuben is unaware of it, their delinquent “change of mind/heart” (μετάνοια; cf. μετάμελος in §108) does not come too late and provides great “benefit” (ἐφελος) not only to Joseph but to his entire family.

272 λύπη | The Hebrew noun יָגון occurs here and in 44:31, where G translates it as ἀδύνη. More often, G uses λύπη to translate שעש (3:316, 17; 5:29) and בזש (3:16) (cf. בזש = λυπέω in 45:5), but he also uses λύπη for רעה (44:29) and λυπέω for חנה (4:5).
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to present him as now better attuned to his father’s grief and pain and more remorseful for the role he has played in causing it:

**Genesis 43:8–9**

To begin with, G has Judah use παιδάριον273 (“little guy”) in reference to Benjamin, the same affectionate term that Reuben has used twice in speaking of Joseph (37:30; 42:22), although the underlying Hebrew terms differ, i.e., נער ("boy") and יֶלֶד ("child"), respectively. In this way, G signals that Judah has begun to have the proper fraternal feelings for Benjamin that he should have had for Joseph in the opening act of Joseph’s story. In addition, G adds weight to the gravity of Judah’s willingness to accept full responsibility for Benjamin, by translating Judah’s עָרָבָנֵי אָנָכְיָנִי (“I will stand surety for him”) as ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκδέχομαι αὐτόν ("But as for me, I hereby accept responsibility275 for him") (43:9), rendering the Hebrew yiqtol with the Greek performative present and supplying the Greek conjunction δὲ276 to throw the independent personal pronoun into greater relief: Judah takes on this burden

273 παιδάριον | See note 83 above.
274 ἐκδέχομαι | In Genesis, the Hebrew verb בְּרָו only occurs here and in the parallel expression in 44:32, where G also renders it with ἐκδέχομαι, a verb G does not use otherwise.
275 Ἐκδέχομαι in the sense “take responsibility for” or “stand surety for” is non-Classical but clearly attested by 3rd century BCE papyri and confirmed by the cognate ἐκδοχή (“[giving of] surety”) (Lee, *Lexical Study*, 59–60; Harl, *La Genèse*, 283; Wevers, *Notes*, 726).
276 δὲ | For this and other cases where G supplies a conjunction to join clauses, see §3.2.3.1. For a discussion of G’s use of δὲ to represent disjunctive syntax, especially to emphasize a subject pronoun, see §4.1.1.1.
alone. Moreover, G renders the yiqtol תבקשׁנו (“you may seek him”) imperatively as ζήτησον277 αὐτόν ("seek him!"), thus imparting Judah's commitment with greater confidence.278 In addition, by using the Greek future perfect periphrastic construction ἡμαρτηκώς ἔσομαι279 ("I will be at fault") to translate the weqatal יֶחֱטָאָת ("I will be culpable"), G accurately represents the stative and enduring nature of Judah's pledge.280 Jacob accepts this sincere vow that Judah makes, instructs his sons to take extra money (and gifts) to rectify what they received in error, and he wishes God's favor upon their travels and prays for the safe return of Simeon and Benjamin (43:11–14), even as he dramatically exclaims in resignation: ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ, καθὰ ἡτέκνωμαι, ἡτέκνωμαι ("So be it! Just as I have been made childless, I am [now] made childless") (43:14). Just like his grandfather Abraham, Jacob's emotions are deeply tied to his τέκνα ("children").

So, Joseph's brothers return to Egypt with Benjamin to get more food, and when they do, Joseph continues to enjoy his charade at their expense. Joseph invites them to dine at his house, making them fear that he intends to "make false accusations" (συκοφαντήσαι)281

______________________________

277 ζήτησον | G does not commonly represent the Hebrew yiqtol with the Greek imperative, but for other examples see §6.1.1.2.

278 Wevers calls this aorist imperative "somewhat more forceful" than the Hebrew yiqtol (Notes, 726).

279 ἡμαρτηκώς ἔσομαι | Other than the parallel example in 44:32, G only uses a periphrastic future indicative construction such as this in Gen 41:36 (cf. KG II §353.4; Smyth §§599–601; SSG §31f). In fact, there are only two others in the entire Pentateuch (Exod 12:6; Deut 28:33) (Evans, Verbal Syntax, 241, 246–247). Cf. §3.4.4.

280 Wevers, Notes, 727: “this is an attempt to render the continuity of this relationship between him and his father in the sense of ‘I shall remain culpable (over against you always).’”

281 συκοφαντήσαι | The hithpael of ἐλθέω and συκοφαντέω are only found here in Genesis. G consistently represents the qal of ἐλθέω as ἀποκυλίω (3: 29:3, [8]; 43:18), and he does not use ἀποκυλίω otherwise.
fall upon, attack”) against them (43:15–18), but when they attempt to return the money, Joseph’s head servant assures them their debt is “paid in full with legitimate coinage” (τὸ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν εὐδοκιμῶν ἀπέχω [= נַחַב "has come to me”]) (43:23), and he reunites them with Simeon (43:19–25). Joseph meets them at his house for their meal, greets them kindly (Πῶς ἔχετε [= לשלום]) (43:27), asks about their father’s health, and pronounces a blessing upon him (43:26–28). But when he sees Benjamin for the second time now, he is overcome with emotion and must retire to another room to weep (43:29–30). Having regained control of himself, Joseph, Joseph’s brothers, and some Egyptians eat their meals separately, when Joseph’s brothers marvel that they are seated by order of age, with Benjamin receiving a portion five times as large as his older brothers (43:31–34).

Then when they are ready to depart for Canaan, Joseph takes his hoax to the next level, this time returning his brothers’ money with the grain they purchased and also hiding his silver divining cup in Benjamin’s sack (44:1–3). They set out, and Joseph then orders his head servant to pursue them and accuse them of theft (44:4–5), and here too G finds ways to weave extra irony into the accusation Joseph indirectly brings against his brothers:

---

282 HALOT, s.v. "הפלל" hithpolel 1; Harl, La Genèse, 284; Wevers, Notes, 731.
284 εὐδοκιμῶν ἀπέχω | Both Hebrew and Greek expressions occur only here in Genesis, and G does not use εὐδοκιμῶ otherwise, or ἀπέχω in the sense “receive” (for the sense “be far away” [= היפילה], see 44:4).
285 Πῶς ἔχετε | For G’s usual treatment of שָׁלום, see note 46 above. G only uses the idiom πῶς ἔχετε here.
First, G translates "(return, repay)" in the accusation "למה שלמה רעה תחת טובות ("Why have you returned evil for good?") with the doubly compound ἀνταποδίδωμι286 ("return or repay in exchange"), thus insinuating to the reader that Joseph’s treatment of his brothers is a matter of reciprocity, or poetic justice.287 At the same time, G has Joseph suggest that his act is near its end by the way he translates this accusation’s final words:

44:5

You have done evil in what you have done. You have completed the evils you have done.

By (i) using the Greek perfect πεποιήκατε288 ("you have done") for the Hebrew qatal ("you did/have done") and (ii) selecting the humorously ambiguous periphrastic translation πονηρά συντετέλεσθε289 ("you have completed the evils") for הרעתש ("you have done evil"), G bifurcates the meaning of Joseph’s words, which in Greek can mean either that his brothers have “perpetrated” their evil acts—as Joseph’s brothers surely understand it—or that they

286 ἀνταποδίδωμι | The verb שלם occurs only here in Genesis, but the verbal adjective שלש occurs three times, and G represents it differently on each occasion: ἀναπληρέω (15:16); Σαλήμ (33:18); and εἰρηνικός (34:21) (see note 46 above). G also uses the doubly compound verb ἀνταποδίδωμι once to translate the היפillian of ב…” (50:15) (cf. also ἀναπόδομα [= ב”ש] there).

287 In the words of Philo, “But evil does not prosper forever; rather, always scheming to remain undetected, it finally gets caught” (ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰς ἅπαν εῦθείς κακία, λανθάνειν δ’ άει τεχνάζουσα καταφωράται).

288 πεποιήκατε | On G’s use of the perfect indicative for qatal, especially in speech, see §6.1.1.5.

289 πονηρά συντετέλεσθε | The adjective πονηρός serves as G’s main semantic match for רע (11), since he typically translates this verb with words and expressions formed from the roots πονηρ- (4), κακ- (3), and σκληρ- (2). G also uses πονηρός (24) for the cognates רע (15) and ṣe’ (3) (see note 297 below). Usually, G uses the verb συντελέω to represent the verbal root שלל or the noun שלש.
have brought their former crimes to a final end—as the attentive reader will surmise.

Joseph’s servant does as he says, and despite the innocent protestations of his brothers that such an act of theft would be “impossible” (μὴ γένοιτομ [חָלִיל]) (44:7), their sacks are searched, the item is found with Benjamin, and they all return to the city (43:6–13).

When they return, Joseph accuses his brothers face to face, and Judah admits that God has discovered the “injustice” (ἀδικία) that Reuben previously warned them not to commit (42:21; cf. 37:22), as he declares them all Joseph’s servants, but Joseph insists that only the guilty brother will be punished (44:14–17). At this, Judah completes his reversal and dramatically “begs” (δέομαι) Joseph (44:18) to allow him to assume Benjamin’s guilt, as he explains the detrimental effect that Benjamin’s loss would have upon their father (44:18–34). In translating this impassioned speech, G makes several choices to indicate that Judah cares about his brother Benjamin. Certain of these interventions carry over from previous passages, such as Judah’s use of παιδάριον (= נער) again in reference to Benjamin (44:22), as well as the perfect ἐκδέδεκται (= עברה) and the perfect periphrasis ἡμαρτηκώς ἔσομαι (= חטאתי) in relation to Judah’s pledge to serve as surety for his brother.

---

290 μὴ γένοιτο | The Hebrew interjection חָלִיל occurs four times in Genesis. Here and in the parallel expression in 44:17, G translates with the Greek idiom μὴ γένοιτο, but he uses μηδαμῶς elsewhere (18:25+). G does not use μὴ γένοιτο otherwise.

291 ἀδικία | The Hebrew noun והי occurs four times, and G translates it differently in each case: also as αἰτία (4:13); ἀμαρτία (15:16); and ἀνομία (19:15). On G’s wide use of the root (ἀ)δικ-, see note 266 and §5.2.2.6. The equivalence of והי and ἀδικία becomes more common in later Septuagintal texts (Wevers, Notes, 747).

292 δέομαι | The self-imprecation ו occurs in the parallel expression in 44:18, where G also represents it as δέομαι, and in 22:16, where G has God solemnly swear “against himself” (κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ) (see §8.3.3 and note 273 there). G also uses δέομαι to represent נא in 19:18 and to translate ἐμαυτῷ in 25:21.

293 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.6 (PG 54 555.45–46) finds Judah’s appeal ironic, at least where he mentions Joseph’s death: Ἐννεώ μοι ἑνταῦθα, τίς ἢν ταῦτα ἀκούσῃ ὁ Ἰωσήφ.
Benjamin (44:32). But more importantly, G also reveals that Judah loves his father Jacob and finally grasps the intense grief that he has caused him to suffer. G does this primarily when he translates Judah’s version of what Jacob told him in 43:1–14:

**Genesis 44:27–29**

First, by switching the person of ואמר (“and I said”) into the second person as καὶ εἴπατε²⁹⁴ (“and you [pl.] said”), G has Judah take responsibility for tricking their father into thinking that Joseph was devoured by a wild animal.²⁹⁵ According to the narrative of Gen 37:31–33, this is strictly untrue, as the brothers only ask their father to identify Joseph’s tunic, such that he is the one who makes this false inference. Nevertheless, by attributing this lie to himself and his brothers, G has Judah take the blame. What is more, by translating עד הנה (“since,” lit. “until now”) as εἴτι καὶ νῦν²⁹⁶ (“again even now”), G puts the understanding of Jacob’s longing for Joseph on Judah’s lips. This understanding is then confirmed by G’s

---

²⁹⁴ εἴπατε | For rare cases where G alters a verb’s grammatical person such as here, see §6.1.2.1.
²⁹⁵ Wevers, Notes, 751: “[G] puts the blame more directly on the brothers εἴπατε: it was you who spoke.” Cf. Prestel and Schorsch, “Genesis,” 243. As Brayford suggests, this change in person may also be to give Jacob’s statement “a slightly accusatory tone” (430), which would then make Judah more pitiable. Cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 289.
²⁹⁶ εἴτι καὶ νῦν | G usually translates ύστερον (67) as εἶτα (52) (actually εἰς πρὸς in 38:1). The expression εἴτι καὶ νῦν is unique in Genesis, as a representation of ύστερον ς or otherwise.
translation of רעה (“grief,” lit. “evil”) as λύπη (“grief”), the same tragic emotion G had
Jacob voice in 42:38 (= יָגוֹן). Furthermore, G translates יָגוֹן (“agony”) in the parallel
formulation of 44:31 not as he did there, but as δύνη (“pain”), such that Judah
understands that if Benjamin does not return home, their father will die from both “grief”
(λύπη) and “pain” (δύνη).

Overcome with emotion at Judah’s reversal, Joseph can no longer maintain his
composure and must end his ironic act of revenge, and he dismisses all of his attendants
before the long-anticipated, dramatic moment when Joseph finally “reveals himself”

297 λύπη | G usually represents רעה (10) as κακός (3: 19; 26:29; 50:15), κακία (2: 6:5; 31:52), or πονηρός (3:
44:4; 50:17, 20). The correspondence with λύπη is unparalleled. For G’s use of λύπη and λυπέω more generally,
see note 272 above.

298 δύνη | G only translates יָגוֹן (2) as ὀδύνη here (for λύπη in 42:38, see note 272 above). G also uses ὀδύνη in
his aetiological translation of the name בֵּן אֲוֹנִי as ὑἱὸς ὀδύνης μου (35:18) (cf. §5.2.2.1).

299 Having already used λύπη, ὀδύνη is an intensification of Jacob’s bad feelings (Harl says it is “plus fort” [La
Genèse, 282]). From another point of view, Wevers judges the intensity of ὀδύνη—which he translates as
“distress”—to be better matched to its Hebrew counterpart (Notes, 753).


301 John Chrysostom, Hom. Gen. 64.6 (PG 54 556.24–27) says that Joseph finds this “proof” (ἀπόδειξις) of (i)
his “honor for their father” (τῆς εἰς τὸν πατέρα τιμῆς) and (ii) “their affection for their brother” (τῆς περὶ τὸν
ἅδελφον φιλοστοργίας). According to Philo, Ios. 232–236, Joseph’s intent was to test his brother’s feelings for
Benjamin, and Judah’s appeal demonstrates that they have passed the test. Cf. Josephus, A.J. 2.6.7 §125. In
A.J. 2.6.8 §159, Josephus says that Judah was at this point “glad to suffer anything for the deliverance of his
brother” (Ἰούδας μὲν οὖν πάντα ὑπομένειν ὑπὲρ τῆς τάδελφοῦ σωτηρίας ἡδέως ἔχων)—a reversal indeed! In
elaborating Joseph’s response to Judah’s appeal, Josephus, A.J. 2.6.9 §161 makes it clear that Joseph accepts
their change of heart, as he says that their “virtue” (ἀρετή) and “kindness” (εὔνοια) toward Benjamin exceed his
expectations based on “the things you plotted against me” (τῶν περὶ ἐμὲ βεβουλευμένων): τῆς μὲν ἀρετῆς ὑμᾶς καὶ
τῆς εὔνοιας τῆς περὶ τὸν ἅδελφον ἡμῶν ἑπανομακρύνας ἀλλὰ κρείττονας ἤ προσεδόκων ἐκ τῶν περὶ ἐμὲ βεβουλευμένων εὐρίσκω
ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσας ἐπὶ πείρα τῆς ὑμετέρας φιλαδελφίας.

302 Theodoret, Quaest. Oct. 108 uses the language of stagecraft to describe Joseph’s final recognition scene,
first asking why he constructed the “drama” (δράμα) of putting his divination cup in Benjamin’s sack, and then
(ἀναγνωρίζομαι303 [= יד hithpael]) to his brothers (45:1). Joseph cries so loud that the Egyptians hear him from afar, and he unveils his true identity to his brothers, who respond with silence and terror (45:1–3).304 In reassuring his brothers that God meant all that happened for the good of their family (45:4–11), G translates Joseph’s opening words with tragic irony, as he so often has throughout the whole Joseph story up to this point:

Genesis 45:4–5

Here, Joseph asks his brothers to forgive themselves, because God used them to send Joseph to Egypt ahead of them, so that they would all have food during this worldwide famine. But, according to the way that G translates these words, Joseph asks his brothers not to feel “grief” (λύπη305 [= עצב “pain”]), the classically tragic emotion that they should have experienced in Gen 37 along with their father (and brother Reuben), and he also tells saying that when Joseph saw his brothers fighting in defense of their younger brother, he “threw of his mask” (φίλας το προσωπείον) and “showed his brotherly face” (το ἄδελφικον ἐπέδειξε πρόσωπον). Cf. Josephus, A.J. 2.6.9 §160 φέρειν ὑπόκρισιν (“keep up the act”).

303 ἀναγνωρίζομαι | Both the hithpael of יד and the verb ἀναγνωρίζομαι only occur here in Genesis. For יד in other stems (57), G usually selects γινώσκω (36) or οἶδα (15). Harl claims that G’s lexical choice evokes the kind of recognition scene discussed by Aristotle in Poetics (La Genèse, 290; cf. §9.2.3), and Wevers feels that this Septuagintal hapaxlegomenon is “especially well chosen” (Notes, 756).

304 Wevers suggests that G “heightens the dramatic tension” by omitting מפניו in translating כי נבהלו מפניו as ἐταράχθησαν γὰρ (Notes, 757).

305 λύπη | The verbal root עצב occurs three times in Genesis. In the hithpael, G represents it as διανοέομαι (6:6) (see §7.4.1 and notes 110–111 there) and κατανύσσομαι (34:7). Here it occurs in the niphal. G always translates the cognate nouns עִׂצָבון (3) and עֶצֶב (1) with λύπη or λυπέω (see note 272 above).
them not to find their actions “harsh” (σκληρός[^306] [= חרה “be angry”]), which is supremely ironic in light of the fact that Joseph has feigned harshness to them since they came to Egypt (42:7), whereas they are the ones whose actions were truly harsh (37:18–35). At this pivotal moment in Joseph’s story, the triple threads of revenge, reversal, and recognition have been interwoven and tied tight, and the remainder of the narrative elaborates how Jacob is reunited with his son Joseph in Egypt, where he and his sons prosper throughout the famine and beyond, until Jacob dies in peace, having recovered what once seemed impossibly lost.

9.4 Conclusion

As I have argued, essential aspects of the Hebrew version of Joseph’s story would have appealed to a Greek audience because of their tragic quality, as readers and writers in the Hellenistic period (and beyond) were fond of consuming and producing prose texts of various genres composed in the tragic mode, i.e., embellished with certain features core to the genre of Greek tragedy: reversal, revenge, recognition, lamentation, emotions, the supernatural, and irony. I have shown not only that each of these tragic features has a significant presence in the Hebrew original, but also that some of G’s translation choices are targeted efforts to convey, develop, and modulate these features, even as he occasionally introduces novel tragic elements into this thoroughly tragic story. The overall form of this chapter’s argument bears significant resemblance to that of the previous two chapters on

[^306]: σκληρός | G more typically represents חרה with λύπη and cognates (3: 4:5, 6; 34:7), θυμῶ (3: 30:2; 39:19; 44:18), or ὀργίζω (31:36). The translation of אל יחר עביו as Μὴ βαρέως φέρε (31:35) is the closest parallel. For G’s regular association of the roots σκληρ- and חרש, see note 236 above.
the stories of Noah and Abraham, but its core logic is different in one important way: instead of viewing G’s translation choices as linguistic solutions to literary problems, or repair-work to each story’s plot by which he replaces narrative vice with narrative virtue, I have taken G’s renderings in the Joseph story as attempts to cultivate a narrative virtue that its plot already exemplifies. In particular, I have shown how G develops and modulates the themes of revenge, emotion, and lamentation in the opening sequence where Joseph’s brothers sell him as a slave (§9.3.1); the themes of reversal and the supernatural through the ups and downs of Joseph’s seemingly delayed but divinely timed countermovement from adversity to prosperity (§9.3.3); and those of recognition and irony as Joseph humorously gets harmless revenge on his brothers as they come to recognize their own guilt and the identity of the brother they had long taken for dead (§9.3.4).

In keeping with the use of tragic themes and motifs among contemporary prose authors, I have argued that G’s primary motive for translating the story of Joseph and his brothers in the tragic mode was to make it more compelling to read, as its tragic features engage the readers’ minds and hearts by entertaining them, holding them in suspense, creating anticipation (and sometimes dread) of how the story will unfold, generating emotional reactions and sympathies for certain characters, and making them laugh at the ironic double meanings that are readily transparent to them but not necessarily to all of the characters on the stage. However, G’s representation and development of the tragic in Joseph also brings certain aspects of this story’s explicit moral into focus. As I stated early in this chapter (§9.2.6), the one stereotypical tragic feature that seems to be lacking in Joseph’s story is the *deus ex machina*. Yet, while God does not step onto the stage (or rather hang
above it) and furnish the story with closure by addressing the characters and/or audience, his presence is almost tangible in Joseph’s final interaction with his brothers. Moreover, God’s offstage role in Gen 50 is consistent with the normal function of the *deus ex machina* in tragic texts, i.e., to tie up loose ends and provide moral resolution, and G secures this function not only by his effort to convey the tragic earlier in Joseph’s story, but also by several choices he makes in translating its conclusion: (i) G has Joseph’s brothers express their fear that Joseph will “get revenge” (μνησικακέω) on them, where the Hebrew more directly speaks of “being hostile” (ôtel) (50:15); 307 (ii) he creates a novel intertextual backreference to Joseph’s insincere accusation that by “stealing” his divination cup they “returned (evil) in exchange for (good)” (ἀνταποδίδωμι [τῶν]) just as Joseph’s brothers now worry that he will “repay (them) in exchange” (ἀνταπόδομα ἀνταπωδῶ [both = ὑπὲρ]) for all the evils they committed against him; 308 (iii) he has the brothers admit—via words they place in their dead father’s mouth—that their treatment of Joseph was a “tragic mistake” (ἁμαρτία [= ῥαγή]) of “injustice” (ἀδικία [= ὕπο]) and requires forgiveness (50:17).

Then, saddened by the fact that his brothers still do not understand the depth of his love for them and the sincerity of his forgiveness of their past crimes, Joseph serves as the

---

307 μνησικακήση | G only uses the verb μνησικακέω here, and G translates ὑπὲρ differently in each of its other two occurrences, i.e., as ἐγκοτέω (27:41) and ἐνέχω (49:23), both of which more directly express anger and less the desire for revenge that comes from bearing a grudge (μνησικακία).

308 ἀνταπόδομα ἀνταπωδῶ | G does use the singly compound cognate ἀποδίδωμι to translate the *hiphil* of ἔσω on occasion (5: 20:7+, 14; 37:22; 42:25), but never the doubly compound ἀνταποδίδωμι. For other uses of this and the cognate noun, see note 286 above.

309 ἁμαρτία, ἀδικία | See notes 259, 266–267 above.
vehicle for the divine resolution of the entire story, when he says: “you made plans against me for evil” (ὑμεῖς ἐβουλεύσατε κατ’ ἐμοῦ εἰς πονηρά), “but God made plans on my behalf for good” (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο περί ἐμοῦ εἰς ἀγαθά). Here, G reinforces the balanced antithesis of the Hebrew by (i) translating disjunctive-κατ’ appropriately as δέ;\(^{310}\) (ii) supplying the preposition περί in the second clause to balance κατά in the first;\(^{311}\) and (iii) by representing ἁρὰ (“evil”) in the first clause as ἐις πονηρά (“for evil”) by analogy to לטבה (“for good”) in the second.\(^{312}\) What is more, the broad moral application of this story, i.e., that God intends good things for his people in spite of human evil, not only concludes the tragic plot of Gen 37–50, but in a way it also provides closure to the entire book of Genesis, which began with human moral failure. In fact, the message of Joseph’s story provides a significant point of contrast with his representation of the similarly tragic account of Cain and Abel discussed in §9.1: whereas Cain found his “guilt” (ἁἰτία) too great for him “to be forgiven” (ἀφεθήναι), God has employed Joseph not only as the means for his brothers to experience forgiveness, but also for all of God’s people to be saved from the devastating famine. In this light, it is also important to consider that Joseph would hold a special power as an ethical model for G’s Hellenistic Jewish audience, as they would have identified with Joseph, because he was a Jew living in Egypt who was also deeply acculturated into Egyptian society.\(^{313}\) Furthermore, by casting the Joseph story and the end of Genesis in a tragic light, G anticipates the stories

\(^{310}\) δέ | On this frequent use of δέ, see §4.1.1.1.

\(^{311}\) περί | G does not commonly supply the preposition περί (3/35), but cf. 19:21; 40:14. For other residual cases where G adds a preposition, see §3.2.4.5.

\(^{312}\) εἰς | in comparison to περί, G adds εἰς in more cases (33/321), but at the same rate (cf. note 311 above).

\(^{313}\) Pfeiffer, “Joseph in Ägypten,” 321–322.
that follow in Exodus and beyond, as the archetypal plot structure of sin and forgiveness or exile and return fills the pages of the Hebrew Bible and the Jewish religious imagination. In this way, G integrates the Hellenistic literary taste for tragic plots with the traditional Jewish stories about Israel and its past.
At this point, my lengthy and cumulative argument that G intended to produce a virtuous plot in his translation is complete. Beginning my case in Part I with a comprehensive analysis of the minute translation-technical details of Greek Genesis, I painted a portrait of G as a translator in order to show that he was linguistically competent in Hebrew and Greek and that his individual translation choices were made deliberately and thoughtfully. That is to say, he was the kind of translator who not only could but reasonably would attempt to improve the plots of the stories he translated, both as a means of smoothing over potential narrative problems and in order to convey and cultivate the many literary virtues already present in his source text. Then in Part II, building on this detailed portrait and philological framework for understanding G’s approach to translation, I examined three narrative units in Genesis of varying size and type. In the stories of Noah (Gen 6–9) and Abraham (Gen 12–25), I first showed how the compositional history of the Hebrew narratives resulted in certain flaws incompatible with Hellenistic literary ideals about plot, and then I demonstrated how G’s specific translation choices alleviated and resolved many of these problems, specifically serving to cultivate the narrative virtues of consistency and concision in the first case and those of unity and sequentiality in the second. In the case of Joseph’s story (Gen 37–50), however, I argued first that its plot in Hebrew exemplifies all of the features of a plot composed in the tragic mode, and then I showed how many of G’s translation choices serve to bolster and reinforce these tragic features. While I do not expect the reader to have accepted each of my explanations for G’s
translation choices, I hope that the mass of evidence adduced in Parts I and II of this work have convinced that G was concerned to a significant degree with the quality of his translation’s plot.

My thesis in this work and the argument I have designed to support it have been directly concerned with G’s intentions as a translator, specifically how certain choices he made in representing the stories of Hebrew Genesis in Greek form were designed to ensure that his translation’s plot would exhibit the narrative virtues commonly accepted in his time. Moreover, while I have consistently taken up the ancient Jewish and Christian readers of G’s translation as essential conversation partners in my attempt to understand the significance of the words and structures he chose—especially those that are formally, semantically, or statistically divergent—I have consciously exercised caution not to read their interpretations back into the act of translation itself. Still, the moment of translation was just that, a moment, and as soon as G set down his translator’s pen, the translation he had composed was instantly severed from its Hebrew source and began to be read by Greek readers within the context of not only Jewish but also Greco-Roman literary traditions. Especially as Greek Genesis came to be revered by the Jews and later the Christians, some readers began to see this and other Septuagintal texts not just as examples but as exemplary of the best that Greek literature has to offer, and this family of translated texts gradually rose from its relatively humble beginnings to achieve a looming and durable status, not only within the religious canons of Judaism and Christianity, but also within the literary canons of the western world. Perhaps most famously, the author of *On the Sublime* sets “the
lawgiver of the Jews” (in reality, our G) alongside Homer as an excellent model of the sublime:

In the same way (i.e., as in Homer), the lawgiver of the Jews (ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης), no ordinary man (οὐχ ὁ τυχών ἀνήρ), since he was able to comprehend and express (ἐχώρησε καξέφηνεν) the power of the divine (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν) aptly (κατὰ τὴν ἄξιαν), wrote right in the introduction to his laws: What did “God say?” “Let there be light, and there was; let there be land, and there was.”

In view of such a judgment and my demonstration of the fact that G himself intended to capture and cultivate narrative virtues in his translation, one cannot help but wonder how the moment of translation relates to subsequent acts of interpretation that concern the narrative virtues of this book’s plot.

In the opening to her French translation of Greek Genesis and the accompanying commentary, Marguerite Harl cuts straight to the heart of this issue:

Greek Genesis seemed to its readers to be a unique book, endowed with a title that furnishes it with its meaning. The idea that it was a collection of fragments of diverse origins, with doublets and artificial seams, was foreign to what we can know from the ancient readings of the biblical books. Genesis was thus read as a continuous narrative, connected and firmly structured in successive stages; not a succession of stories but one and the same story with a “meaning;” it recounts the progressive demarcation of a line that is destined by divine favor to inherit a land forever. [...] To be sure, Greek Genesis reproduces the structure of its Hebrew model. But one can assert that it underlines this structure, that it accentuates it, that it creates in Greek—by its title, by the repetition of covenant and promise formulae, by the lexicon of its central theme—a network of links that furnishes the whole with unity and coherence.  

---

1 Subl. 9.9: ταύτῃ καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχών ἀνήρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἄξιαν ἔχώρησε καξέφηνεν, εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἴσβολῃ γράφας τῶν νόμων “εἶπεν ὁ Θεός”, φησί, —τι; “γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο.”

2 Harl, La Genèse, 31: “La Genèse grecque apparaît à ses lecteurs anciens comme un livre unique, doté d’un titre qui en donne le sens. L’idée qu’il s’agirait d’un rassemblement de morceaux d’origines diverses, avec des
In saying that the ancient readers of Greek Genesis were not aware of the narrative flaws that result from the Hebrew text’s compositional history (e.g., fragmentation, doublets, and seams) but appreciated its continuity, sequence, structure, and unity, Harl attributes this to the text itself, since it improves upon its Hebrew source by reinforcing and highlighting those lexical and grammatical features that give it overarching unity and coherence.

However, given the demonstration of the manifold ways in which the translator of Greek Genesis himself has contributed especially to the consistency, concision, sequentiality, unity, and the pleasure of its stories, these virtues of plot can be attributed not just to the Greek text of Genesis as it was read in antiquity but also to the translator, although later interpreters certainly improved upon his work with their thoughtful and creative readings, just as he repaired and enhanced aspects of the stories in his Hebrew source. Given this fact, it becomes impossible to maintain any sharp distinction between the Greek text as G produced it and the Greek text as its readers received it. Rather, G stands in continuity with the Greek readers of his translation who subsequently appreciated and even continued to enhance the same core virtues of plot that G aimed to convey, both by capturing those

doublets et des sutures artificielles, est étrangère à ce que nous pouvons savoir des lectures anciennes des livres bibliques. La Genèse est donc lue comme une narration continue, coordonnée, fortement structurée en étapes successives; non pas une succession d’histoires mais une seule et même histoire, qui a un «sens»: elle raconte comment se définit progressivement une lignée, destinée par la faveur divine à recevoir en héritage une terre pour toujours. [...] Sans aucun doute, la Genèse grecque reproduit la structure de son modèle hébreu. On peut cependant affirmer qu’elle souligne cette structure, qu’elle l’accentue, qu’elle crée en grec—par son titre, par la répétition des formules de l’Alliance et des promesses, par le lexique du thème central—un réseau de liens donnant à l’ensemble unité et cohérence.”
virtues of plot already present in his Hebrew source and by attending to those aspects of its plot most open to critique from a Greek point of view.

This last point, that it is difficult to separate the translator from the translation or the moment of production from the moment of reception, will be agreeable to some and heretical to others, but controversial to all who are familiar with recent debates in Septuagint studies. In terms of its utility for interpreting the Greek translation, production-oriented researchers underestimate the value of reception history and reception-oriented researchers downplay the value of the Hebrew source text. While there is some sense in such a division, it is prohibitively rigid, as both the Hebrew text and later Greek readings can assist in recovering a translator’s intended meaning. What has been most hotly debated by Septuagintalists in recent decades is the identification and assessment of a translator’s interpretation of his source. In fact, Ross Wagner has recently written about this issue in relation to what he calls “the most basic question of Septuagint hermeneutics,” i.e., how to translate a translation. The extent to which this scholarly conversation is accurately described as a debate with two sides is itself a contestable point, but as it is commonly conceived, the two extreme positions are represented by the scholars associated with

3 Wagner names the key issues in the debate as (A) “the textual-linguistic character” of the Septuagint as foreign or Greek; (B) its relationship to its source as characterized by “subservience” or “independence;” and (C) “the proper focus of the modern interpreter’s attention” on either the process of translation itself (“text production”) or the Greek text independent of its source (“text reception”) (Reading the Sealed Book, 3–5). While Wagner’s assessment of (A) and (B) is relatively accurate, (C) cannot be maintained, as the French scholars exemplary of the “reception” side employ a broad palette of traditional philological and interpretive methods, in particular contributing significantly to LXX lexicography. Consider, for example, the project headed up by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten entitled “Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint.”
modern language translations of the Septuagint into English (NETS: New English Translation of the Septuagint) and French (BdA: La Bible d’Alexandrie) and the theoretical models that inform their respective approaches to translating the Greek Bible into these two languages. At its core, the two schools of thought differ as to the extent to which the Hebrew source text should regulate the meaning of the Greek translation, or from another perspective, the extent to which the Greek text should be read independently of the Hebrew original. Construing the Septuagint as subservient and so partially unintelligible, NETS maintains that it must be understood by reference to its source. In contrast, BdA conceives of the Septuagint as autonomous and intelligible as a Greek text, and so argues that it should be interpreted as any other piece of Greek literature. Practically, this means that the NETS school retains the text of the NRSV wherever the Greek could share the meaning of the Hebrew irrespective of the translation’s other possible meanings, including those.

4 The so-called “interlinear paradigm for Septuagint Studies” was developed by Al Pietersma and his doctoral student Cameron Boyd-Taylor, who has defended the theory at length in Reading between the Lines. While there is much to be praised about this voluminous work, its thesis remains unproven. Boyd-Taylor argues that the interlinear paradigm is appropriate for Septuagint Studies broadly by attempting to establish a “family resemblance” across a chain of translation styles ranging from literal (Aquila) to free (Job). Naming Greek Genesis as the Septuagintal book that holds the entire chain together (“If the interlinear paradigm does not fit Genesis, then it would be difficult to sustain the claim that it captures what is typical about the larger Septuagintal corpus” [Reading between the Lines, 267]), Boyd-Taylor’s analysis of Greek Genesis only treats Gen 1:1–5 and 11:1–9, is not always accurate, and does not engage the relevant secondary literature (e.g., the extensive research on translation technique). For a positive assessment the work, see Wagner, Reading the Sealed Book, 6–31.

5 The NETS translation manual identifies 6 steps for translating a given content word: (1) consider the possible meanings of the Hebrew and Greek lemmas separately; (2) establish the lexical equivalences through the translation unit (i.e. the book) to (3) place the paired lemmas on the scale of (i) contextual rendering, (ii) stereotype, (iii) calque, and (iv) isolate; (4) for (i-ii), translate the Greek word according to where the semantic ranges of the Hebrew and Greek lemmas overlap, unless they do not; (5) for (iii-iv), translate according to the
attributed to it by its reception history. In contrast, BdA first produces a literal translation of the Greek in terms of its own textual division, grammar, lexicon, and style, and only then considers revising it in light of its divergence from the Hebrew, its reception history, and French style.

My own method outlined in §1.4 and applied throughout this work resembles not one but both of these approaches as they have been rhetorically and methodologically constructed in recent years. I have deliberately chosen not to define my own approach or construct my own argument in relation to either one of these theoretical positions or the cloud of conversation that envelops them, because I find the debate distracting and

---

semantic range of the Hebrew lemma; (6) retain the NRSV wherever possible, i.e. the NRSV should be retained (a) for (i-ii) that semantically overlap with the Hebrew and (b) for (iii-iv). In effect, the NRSV should only be revised for (i-ii) that do not semantically overlap with the Hebrew. See Albert Pietersma, Translation Manual, 14–15.

6 NETS envisions interpreting the Septuagint as produced and the Septuagint as received as mutually exclusive enterprises: “[...] one can either seek to uncover the meaning of the Greek text in terms of its interlinear dependence on the Hebrew, or one can aim at rendering the meaning of the text from the perspective of its reception history, i.e., in terms of its autonomy” (Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, “To the Reader of NETS,” in New English Translation of the Septuagint [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007], xvi). At the same time, the consultation of New Testament quotations of the Septuagint is curiously exempt from this policy (“To the Reader of NETS,” xx).


8 The French school outlines a five-step process for its translators: (1) literal translation of the Greek text as a Greek text; (2) identification and (3) explanation of divergences from the Hebrew text; (4) consultation of reception history to elucidate both the original and incipient meaning of the Greek; and (5) stylistic revision to give it the literary quality it deserves, at times even “a more noble, traditional, ancient ring” (Harl, “Translation Principles,” 197. On the matter of style, NETS differs sharply from BdA as to whether the Septuagint should sound literary or not: “One scarcely expects literary beauty and rhetorical flourish from an interlinear text, since that was clearly not its purpose. [...] a fully idiomatic translation into English can scarcely be justified” (Pietersma and Wright, “To the Reader of NETS,” xviii).
ultimately unhelpful, inasmuch as it encourages one to think disjunctively in terms of either/or, since wholeheartedly adopting one of these “positions” risks begging the question of how the translational data should be interpreted. Instead, I have elected to work from the bottom up and have consequently framed my own argument primarily in reference to the scholarly work that directly analyzes and interprets the translational data of Greek Genesis and the Pentateuch, which is largely free from the constraints of grand theories. Yet, like NETS, I have engaged in systematic and repeated comparison of the Greek text with its Hebrew Vorlage, privileging formally and statistically divergent translation choices as the primary body of evidence of G’s interpretation of his source; and like BdA, I have also read and reread the Greek text on its own in conversation with contemporary Greek literature and later Greek readers in order to consider all of the possible meanings that the translator could have intended for each word he chose. In fact, in my research I have regularly alternated between these two “approaches” and conceive of them as being in a dialectical relationship, each having the power to critique and improve upon the other. In other words, there is a danger in overreading the Greek text by ignoring its status as a translation, on the one hand, and a danger in underreading it by failing to consider the full range of meanings that it could reasonably hold, on the other. That being said, I find a significant weakness in the NETS approach, as myopic interlinear comparison tends to overplay the foreignness of the translation and to conceal aspects of its independence within its own literary culture. To be sure, there is no doubt that the Septuagint—including the Septuagint of Genesis—is characterized to varying degrees by foreign-sounding words and constructions on account of being a translated text, but the pervasive word-level perspective of NETS presumes too
high a degree of uniformity in the translator’s approach both horizontally (from one passage to another) and vertically (from one linguistic feature to another). Within a single sentence, a translator might produce a clumsy Greek expression in imitation of the Hebrew and an interpretive rendering that betrays real literary insight. Furthermore, if the “interlinear” metaphor is related to, if not based on, the ancient school practice of producing contemporary Greek glosses for Homer, it is perhaps appropriate to consider the fact that such an exercise was often the first step toward the fresh composition of a prose paraphrase.9 While the task of uncovering the translator’s interpretation is aided by comparison of his translation with its reconstructed source, there is no convincing evidence that he meant the two to be read together.10 In essence, the theoretical standpoint of NETS is excessively restrictive and ultimately misses and/or misunderstands many important interpretive choices that the translator makes, at least as far as the Genesis translator is concerned. It is crucial to give deeper and more sustained consideration to the translator’s

---

9 Pietersma insists that many scholars have misunderstood the interlinear metaphor as a “theory of Septuagint origins” (“Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited,” in “Translation is Required: the Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, SCS 56 [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010], 11). Yet, he clearly draws on the school-room space opened up by the metaphor, with particular reference to the Hellenistic educational practice of producing Homeric glosses that is attested in papyri, on the basis of which he concludes “that there is evidence to suggest that the socio-linguistic place of origin of the Septuagint may have been the school” (“A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint,” in Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference, ed. Johann Cook [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 349).

Greek literary culture, a culture that includes not only canonical texts, predecessors, and contemporaries, but also later readers and writers.

Just as the meaning that G intended for his translation may be revealed or reinforced by reading Greek Genesis in continuity with the interpretations taken by his readers, it is likewise possible to see from the high degree to which the narrative improvements G makes in Greek Genesis conform to “Aristotelean” notions of plot that he stands in continuity with the increasingly sophisticated Jewish and Christian authors of subsequent generations. To be sure, the translator of Greek Genesis was no peer to the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria or the Christian preacher John Chrysostom, but neither was he was a common village scribe, or to repeat the judgment of On the Sublime quoted above, an “ordinary man” (ὁ τυχών ἄνηρ). Thus, his literary interventions can be historically contextualized within what scholars have recently argued as contemporary and subsequent trends to apply Aristotelean literary criticism in Hellenistic Alexandria broadly both to Homer (by the Alexandrian literati) and to the Greek Pentateuch (by Alexandrian Jews). In general, the

11 In relation to plot, Francesca Schironi argues that Aristarchus not only shares Aristotle’s technical vocabulary, but also attempts to establish a text of Homer on the basis of (i) “the criterion of believability” and (ii) “internal contradictions” (“Theory into Practice: Aristotelian Principles in Aristarchean Philology,” CP 104.3 [2009]: esp. 283–290).

12 In a recent monograph, Maren Niehoff has argued for the application of Aristotelian literary criticism to the Greek Bible among Jewish scholars (especially in the form of ἥπειματα καὶ λύσεις), beginning with pre-Philonic evidence (Aristeas, who is construed as reacting to the application of literary critical methods to the Greek Bible, as well as Demetrius and Aristobolus, who are taken to be favorable to such activity), and then mining Philo in order to show that both he and his reconstructed opponents engaged in such activity in various ways (Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011]). Similarly, for Sylvie Honigman, Aristeas’ readers were “highly educated Alexandrian Jews” (The Septuagint
posing of “questions” (ζητήματα) and finding “answers” (λύσεις)—including positing textual corruption—was a central component of this scholarly activity.\textsuperscript{13} The interpretive choices that I have focused on in my study are similar in a way to this popular question-and-answer mode of interpretation. It is only appropriate to take an example from Philo’s \textit{Questions and Answers on Genesis}:

(9) Why does he say, all things which existed upon the earth shall be consumed; for what sin can the beasts commit? (Genesis 6:13).

In the first place, as, when a sovereign is slain in battle the military valour of the kingdom is also crushed, so also he now has thought it reasonable that when the whole human race, bearing analogy to a sovereign, is destroyed, he should also destroy simultaneously with it the species of beasts likewise, on which account also in pestilences the beasts die first, and especially those which are bred up with and associate with men, such as dogs and similar animals, and afterwards the men die too.

In the second place, as, when the head is cut off, no one blames nature if the other portions of the body also, numerous and important as they are, are destroyed along with it, so too now no one can find fault with anything, since man is as it were the head and chief of all animals, and when he is destroyed it is not at all strange if all the rest of the beasts are destroyed also along with him.

In the third place, animals were originally made, not for their own sakes, as has been said by the philosophers, but in order to do service to mankind, and for their use and glory; therefore it is very reasonable that when those beings are destroyed for the sake of whom they had their existence, they also should be deprived of life, and this is the reason of this assertion in its literal sense; but with respect to its hidden meaning we may say, when the soul is exposed


\textsuperscript{13} The method of question and answer was not only a manner of interrogating a text and a mode of instruction, but a distinct literary genre—later termed ἐρωταποκρίσεις—with a long history extending back to pre-classical times. The “enormous popularity” and breadth of application of this genre (“medicine, grammar, philosophy, theology, law”) only grew with time (Scott Fitzgerald Johnson, \textit{Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism} [Aldershot: Routledge, 2006], 91–92).
to a deluge from the overflow of vices, and is in a manner stifled by them, those portions also which are on the earth, the earthly parts I mean of the body, must of necessity likewise perish along with it; for life passed in wickedness is death; the eyes though they see perish, inasmuch as they see wrongly; the ears also though they hear perish, inasmuch as they hear wrongly; and the whole body of the senses perishes, inasmuch as they are all exercised wrongly.\textsuperscript{14}

In this passage, Philo gives three different answers to a question that he and many other readers of Greek Genesis asked, no doubt because the narrative could imply that God was unjust in punishing the animals, who—at least in G’s translation—did no evil. Ironically, while G’s translation choices may effectively answer or preempt questions that the reader might ask, his answers to anticipated questions may open up new ones, as is the case here.\textsuperscript{15} Yet, since G’s literary inspiration is not sustained throughout his translation at every point or in every way, as is apparent from the generally low style of his prose that results from his close adherence to the form of the Hebrew, it is clear that he was not on par with those participating in such literary activity at its highest level, but his interpretive impulses can nevertheless be taken as consistent with that of the literary elite as well as anticipatory of the more sophisticated interpretive approaches of Egyptian Jews of later generations who had a higher level of education.

In addition to this critique of grand theories, my argument has important implications for at least two more modest assumptions that are commonly held by Septuagintal scholars, either explicitly or implicitly. The first is mainly a matter of method, namely, the tacit assumption that a translator’s choices are generally to be explained by

---

\textsuperscript{14} QG 2.9 (Yonge, 817–818).

\textsuperscript{15} Recall that readers of the Hebrew sometimes explained that the animals did sin. See §7.4.1 and note 104.
recourse to a host of binaries: either literal or free; either stylistic or literary; either linguistic or theological. Although certain contrasts are more commonly placed in opposition to one another, it is not the particular pair that is problematic, but rather the underlying idea that a translator makes a selection from a range of options for a single reason. The tendency to think this way is an extension of Occam’s Razor, or the preference for simple explanations over complex ones, but human intention and human decision making in literary activity (as in other domains) are rarely simple, a point that Theo van der Louw, who has the practical perspective of a modern-day translator, has convincingly established in a recent article. Furthermore, I have demonstrated at numerous points that G’s choices often have multiple motivations, even as these factors can be ordered to a certain extent, such that his intention to write sentences that are grammatically and semantically acceptable according to normal Greek usage is more basic and more universal than, for example, his desire to supply stylistic embellishment, to introduce pragmatic nuance, to ensure theological propriety, or to promote narrative excellence. The second issue is not unrelated to the first, but it is more openly acknowledged by some specialists in Septuagint studies, namely, the idea of segmentation, which is the assumption that the translators produced their translations by processing the text in short stretches and in order without looking back. I do not mean to say that the idea of segmentation has no explanatory power. Practically speaking, the translators of the Septuagint must have processed the Hebrew serially in chunks, since this is the normal manner in which all linguistic data is received. Furthermore, this fact does

17 Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise.”
account for certain mistakes and infelicities in their translations, common examples being the retention of apodotic-1 (see, e.g., §3.1.2.1) and the pleonastic use of resumptive elements in relative clauses (see, e.g., §§3.1.3.4; 3.1.7.1). However, I have shown throughout my argument not just that G often considered multiple factors in making a given translation choice, but also that he was aware of the effects that his choice would have on a range of discourse levels (e.g., morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, narrative, etc.). To be clear, I am not saying that G was always equally aware of all of these levels. In fact, one can often make good sense of his particular choices by reference to the immediate context alone. Yet, this is to a large extent due to the fact that he was able to imitate the form of the Hebrew while accurately representing its meaning most of the time, and I have shown by many examples that G was at times aware not only of the preceding narrative, but also of scenes that follow. Such cases reveal that he was intimately familiar with the stories he was translating and the kind of reader who was able to think both forwards and backwards as he read and translated Hebrew Genesis into Greek.18

18 Anneli Aejmelaeus has made this point cogently in the conclusion to her study of the renderings of Hebrew coordinate clauses in the Greek Pentateuch: “The stories with most free renderings [i.e., of clausal-1] seem to form a special group among the Pentateuchal translators. They comprised accounts of the Israelite ancestors who came to Egypt and of Moses, exciting stories which have fascinated people of all epochs, particularly perhaps the Jews living in Egypt. It seems that the translator was closely acquainted with these narrations even perhaps in a Greek form, not in a written translation but maybe in an oral tradition. It was easy for him to use free renderings, since he knew how the story continued” (Parataxis, 172–173). Cf. Anssi Voitila, Présent et imparfait, 230: “L'étude [i.e., of the imperfect indicative in the Pentateuch] s'est avérée intéressante en ce qui concerne la technique de traduction ‘par courts segments pris séparément’. En employant l'imparfait, le traducteur n’a pas dû seulement connaître le >texte< déjà traduit, mais aussi le >texte< à venir. Cela aurait été impossible si le traducteur n’avait considéré à la fois qu’un court segment du >texte<. L'imparfait, comme le Ph [i.e., historical present] précédemment, est donc une preuve du fait que, parfois, les traducteurs ont connu le >texte< qui n’était pas encore traduit, mais évidemment cela n’a pas toujours été la cas, loin et là.”
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Finally, one unforeseen result of the three case studies on Noah, Abraham, and Joseph has been the discovery of G’s persistent interest in ethics. Having set out to establish his concern for the virtuous plot, I have inadvertently drawn attention to his interest in virtue more broadly, such that the title of this work carries a double meaning. Read one way, the virtuous plot is that which exemplifies narrative excellence, defined in relation to contemporary literary ideas about what makes a good story; but considered from another perspective, the virtuous plot is that which exemplifies human excellence, here modeled by the patriarchal figures of Israel’s prehistory, albeit in different ways. In making the story of Noah more consistent and more concise, G also emphasized the character of Noah as the one perfectly virtuous human being deserving of God’s protection from the flood; in articulating the narrative of Abraham such that its disjointed episodes follow sequentially in an overarching unity, G also accentuated the fact that Abraham’s virtue was not static and fixed but attained progressively over the course of his life; and in highlighting and elaborating the tragic elements of Joseph’s story, G also drew attention to this virtuous youth’s tragic fate, at the same time preparing for this tragic tale’s moral closing, that God works for the good of his people in spite of moral failures. Wrapped up in his pursuit of literary excellence, then, was G’s desire to communicate something of practical value through the classic stories he was translating for them, as these patriarchal figures serve as ethical models for him and his readers. And in light of the continuity between the translator and the readers of Greek Genesis, it is quite logical that the ancient interpreters of G’s
translation so often read this text as a book of moral examples. In addition, this trend began quite early, as the translator of Sirach extols the characters of Enoch (44:16), Noah (44:17–18), Abraham (44:19–21), Isaac (44:22a), Jacob (44:22b–23), and Joseph (49:15):

Sirach 44:10–15

10 ἀλλ’ ή οὗτοι ἄνδρες ἔλεους, ὃν αἱ δικαιοσύναι οὐκ ἐπελήφθησαν, 11 μετὰ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν διαμενεῖ, ἀγαθὴ κληρονομία ἐκχονα αὐτῶν, 12 ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ἐστὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τέχνα αὐτῶν δι αὐτῶν, 13 ὡς ἄδωνες μενεὶ σπέρμα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐξαναλιθήσεται, 14 τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐπάθη, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ἐκ εἰς γενεάς, 15 σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγήσονται λαοί, καὶ τὸν ἐπαινοῦν ἑβαγγέλλει ἐκκλησία.

10 But these were men of mercy, whose acts of justice have not been forgotten; 11 with their offspring it will long remain, their descendants will be a good inheritance. 12 Their offspring have continued in the covenants, and their children for their sake. 13 Their offspring will remain forever, and their glory will never be wiped away. 14 Their bodies were buried in peace, and their names live for generations. 15 Peoples will tell the stories of their wisdom, and the assembly proclaims their praise.

It is also likely that an apologetic aim joins plot and ethics to form a triple braid of G’s purpose in fostering the virtuous plot in his translation. On the one hand, by improving the quality of his translation’s narrative according to contemporary standards, G was able to preempt stronger critiques or refutations of the book of Genesis, at least on the grounds that its narratives were contradictory, redundant, disordered, lacking unity, and boring. On the other hand, G’s representation of the characters and morals of these traditional Jewish stories in terms of Greek ethics makes them intelligible and acceptable to a Greek audience.

---

10 Harl, La Genèse, 48–49. For one example, John Chrysostom, Jos. (PG 56 587.1–11) compares the characters of scripture to the stars that guide sailors in their dangerous travels at sea: Οἱ ἐν πελάγοις μεγάλα σαλεύοντες κυβερνήται, οἱ ὁπικ ἡπειροσ, οὐκ ὅροι, οὐ βουνοί, οὐ σκόπελοί τινες τὴν χέρσον σημαίνουσι, πρὸς τινας ἀπερασ ἀπεβλέποντες, καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνους τὸ σκάφος ῥυβμιζοντες ἀνακάνγοντο διαμένουσιν. οἱ δὲ γε τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μαθήται οἱ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τοῦ βίου τοῦτο τυγχάνοντες, ὁ πρὸς ἀπερασ τινὰς ἀπεβλέποντες, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας τὸ ὄνομα τῆς διανοίας τείνοντες, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων ἱέσει πόθω ψυχῆς ἁκολουθοῦντες, εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λιμένα τῆς βασιλείᾳς λαύνουσι.
In this way, G’s pursuit of the virtuous plot is both early and central to the complex intersection of Hellenism and Judaism in Egypt.
APPENDIX I: TEXTUAL RECONSTRUCTIONS IN G’S VORLAGE

Plus: implied participant (106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>[בְּרֵדֵל [טְהֵר]] וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:24</td>
<td>וַיְהִ֣י יְהוָ֣ה [שֵׁעָרָ֔ם] לֵבֶֽךְ</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>2:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>וַיְהִ֣י יְהוָ֣ה [שֵׁעָרָ֔ם] לֵבֶֽךְ</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:7</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:5</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>16:1, 16; passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:19</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:6</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>19:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:5</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>וַיֵּֽאמְרֻ [לָתָֽן]</td>
<td>וַיִּלָּחֵם [וֹכַח] וַיִּרְאֵה</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:11</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] kai εἶπεν [αύτῷ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:8</td>
<td>דבר אביו [אברם] kai ἐλήλυσεν πρὸς αὐτούς [Αβραάμ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:7</td>
<td>ולך ולך את את אשת את אשת יואל</td>
<td>[Σοι] δῶσο τὴν γῆν ταύτην [καὶ] τῷ σπέρματί σου 26:3; 35:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] kai εἶπεν [μοι]</td>
<td>24:44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] kai εἶπεν [αύτῷ]</td>
<td>context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:26</td>
<td>רבי רבי אשת את [רבקה]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>יאמר טקעב [אלא חשל] εἶπεν δὲ Ιακὼβ [τῷ Ἡσαύ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] kai εἶπεν [αύτῷ] Ιακὼβ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>תמר (טש) את עבתו טקעב απέδοτο δὲ [Ἡσαύ] τὰ πρωτότοκια τῷ Ιακὼβ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:9</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] kai εἶπεν [αύτῷ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] Αβίμלך</td>
<td>context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:10</td>
<td>עשת ברכה את אביו ברכה</td>
<td>ὅπως εὐλογήσῃ σὲ [ὁ πατήρ σου] πρὸ τοῦ ἀποβανεὶν αὐτὸν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>מ אביו (אשת) תמר (יו) דו</td>
<td>Τῆς σου (-) ὅ διερύσας [μοι] δόθην 27:3, 5, 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] εἶπεν [Ἡσαύ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ]</td>
<td>27:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>הלו אביו [אלא חשל βך</td>
<td>Οὐχ ὕπελπιστο μοι εὐλογήσῃ [πάτερ] 27:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:19</td>
<td>יאמר [טייב] ואת שמע חולם ויאמר</td>
<td>ויאמר [יאקוק] τὸ δυσμα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:7</td>
<td>יאמר [טייב] kai εἶπεν [Ἰακὼβ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] לב</td>
<td>εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] Λαβὰν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>תמר (טל) את לא חשלATE</td>
<td>kai λαβὰν [Λαβὰν] Αἰαν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>דבר הר [טיק] kai εἶπεν [Ἰακὼβ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] εἶπεν δὲ [Ἰακὼβ] τῷ Λαβὰν</td>
<td>context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>יאמר [אלי] את לא חשל [טייב]</td>
<td>kai έδωκεν αὐτῷ [Ἰακὼβ] διέστερον τῷ Ἡσαύ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:3</td>
<td>תמר [לייב] εἶπεν δὲ [τῷ Ἡσαύ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>יאמר [טייב] kai εἶπεν [τῷ Ἡσαύ] νῦν</td>
<td>30:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>יאמר [טייב] εἶπεν δὲ [Ῥαχῆλ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>יאמר [טייב] εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] [Ἰακὼβ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>ויאמר</td>
<td>[אָוּתָיו הֲלָבָן]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev dē [אָוּתָיו] Ιακώβ</td>
<td>31:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev dē [אָוּתָיו] Λαβάν</td>
<td>31:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>ויאמר</td>
<td>[אָוּתָיו] מְלָאָשָׁא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:1</td>
<td>הַקּוֹשֶׁנ דָּא [יַאֲכָב] תָּא רָתָּא תָּא רָתָּא</td>
<td>31:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>דא</td>
<td>elpev μοι εἰκοσι ἐτη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>דא</td>
<td>elpev μοι εἰκοσι ἐτη [ἐγὼ] εἵμα ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου ἑδούλευσαι σοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [אָוּתָיו]</td>
<td>31:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:5</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [יאכֵב]</td>
<td>19:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [יאכֵב]</td>
<td>32:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [אָוּתָיו]</td>
<td>32:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:1</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [יאכֵב]</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>עבְדֵּךְ הָאָבֶד</td>
<td>31:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:5</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev ὁ [οὐδὲ Ἐμμαρ] Πάν ἡν τῷ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>שֵׁלַח</td>
<td>elpev [אָוּתָיו]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev αὐτοῦς</td>
<td>[Συμεών καὶ Λευι οἱ ἄδελφοι Δίνας καὶ Ἰλα]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:5</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [יאכֵב]</td>
<td>35:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9τ</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>ἔργον αὐτῶν [ἐν θεός]</td>
<td>35:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>Λίπαρας</td>
<td>elpev ὁ [יאכֵב] ἐκ Βαβύλων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:14</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev ὁ [יאכֵב]</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev ὁ [αὐτῶ] ὁ ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:16</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [αὐτῇ]</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [αὐτῶ]</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:11</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [αὐτῶ]</td>
<td>34:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:18</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>ἀποκρισίας</td>
<td>elpev [αὐτῶ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:26</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>ἀπόφθεγματος ὁ [Φαράω] ἐν ἑστιν</td>
<td>41:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:24</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>ἀποστραφείς</td>
<td>elpev ὁ [Юσσηφ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:7</td>
<td>יאמור</td>
<td>elpev [αὐτῶ]</td>
<td>14:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plus: expanded participant (36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:25</td>
<td>ידע הרש דוד [אח]</td>
<td>&quot;Eγνὸν δὲ Ἀδὰμ [Εὐαν] τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>ויהלָל נֶגֶר [שלש בָּנָיו]</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγέννησεν Ναοε [τρεῖς υἱοὺς] τὸν Σῆμ τὸν Χάμ τὸν</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>כי נשבה [לט]</td>
<td>ὅτι ἡχύμαλωτεῦθε [Λωτ] ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>14:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>וְיִהְיֶה לְעִלָּה הָתָת [וּתָק]</td>
<td>καὶ ἀνήφηκεν αὐτὸν εἰς ὁλοκάρπωσιν ἀντὶ Ἰσαάκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>43:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24:3</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>24:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14sp</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:5sp</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:4sp</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:1</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:27</td>
<td>vk2</td>
<td>יִהְנָה לָבִיָּה יְהוֹעַכָּה תּוֹ יָוָּא מַאֲרוֹן [יִשְׁעָל]</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plus: 1 (45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>[καὶ] ξύλον κάρπιμον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>בלתן</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>[καὶ] τῇ γυναικὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>κατὰ τὴν ιδέαν αὐτοῦ [καὶ] κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>οἱ [δὲ] γίγαντες</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[καὶ] πεντήκοντα πήχεων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων [καὶ] ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκὸς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔρπετόν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:17</td>
<td>[καὶ] πάντα τὰ θηρία</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ἔμετ' αὐτοῦ [καὶ] πάντα τὰ θηρία</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἕπὶ πάντα τὰ κινοῦμενα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ρόβα [καὶ] πληθύνεσθε [καὶ] πληρώσατε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἀπὸ κτήνων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:26</td>
<td>[καὶ] τὸν Ναχώρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>[καὶ] τὸν Ναχώρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:2</td>
<td>[καὶ] Σεννάρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:4</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἐγὼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>μᾶλλον γεμίση</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[καὶ] τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:5</td>
<td>[καὶ] μετὰ τοῦτο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:16</td>
<td>[καὶ] πάσαις ταῖς μετὰ σου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:23</td>
<td>τὸ ἐνομά μου [ἄλλα] κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:21</td>
<td>[καὶ] παρεσιώτα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>[καὶ] μετὰ ταῦτα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:36</td>
<td>[καὶ] τί τὸ ἀδίκημα μου [καὶ] τί τὸ ἀμαρτήμα μου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ὁ πόσιον μου [καὶ] ὅτι ἡμείνησας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:27</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἔξηλθον οἱ [δὲ] οἱ Παχώβ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:24</td>
<td>[καὶ] ὑιί τοῦ Ραχήλ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:10</td>
<td>[καὶ] ταῦτα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>ὁ [ὁ] οὖν θεόν</td>
<td>Oὕτοι [δὲ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>αὐτῷ [αὐτῷ]</td>
<td>oὗτοι [δὲ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28*</td>
<td>αὐτῷ [αὐτῷ]</td>
<td>oὗτοι [δὲ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:27*</td>
<td>ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν [καὶ] σάρξ ἡμῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:23*</td>
<td>καὶ [καὶ] ἀνεμόφθοροι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>καὶ [καὶ] ἀνεμόφθοροι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>καὶ [καὶ] ποιησάτω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55*</td>
<td>καὶ [καὶ] δὲ εἶναι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:19*</td>
<td>λέγετε [καὶ] ἀπαγάγετε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:16*</td>
<td>καὶ [καὶ] τὸν Βενιαμῖν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:16*</td>
<td>τῷ χυρῷ [ὑ] τί λαλῆσιμεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἀναλύεται</td>
<td>δὲ δὲ δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:16*</td>
<td>καὶ [καὶ] Ἀγγέλις [καὶ] Σαυλῆς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἀναρίθτω</td>
<td>[δὲ] ἡΡεχὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:6*</td>
<td>ἡ ψυχὴ μου [καὶ] ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:20*</td>
<td>[καὶ] ἀναλύεται</td>
<td>[δὲ] [δὲ] [δὲ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plus:** כ (35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>καὶ [πᾶσιν] τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ σύρανου</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>ἀπὸ [πάντων] τῶν ὀρνέων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπὸ [πάντων] τῶν κτηνῶν κατὰ γένος</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>καὶ ἑπεκάλυψεν [πάντα] τὰ δρὰ τὰ υψηλὰ</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>δὲ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ προσώπου [πάσης] τῆς γῆς</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:3; 8:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:9</td>
<td>υἱὸς ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ παντὶ προσώπω πάσης τῆς γῆς</td>
<td></td>
<td>41:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>τοῦ καταφθαίρει [πᾶσαν] τὴν γῆν</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:17;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>τοῦ καταφθαίρει [πᾶσαν] τὴν γῆν</td>
<td></td>
<td>9:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>καὶ ἕτερον σϕόρα ἃν οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ζωῆς</td>
<td></td>
<td>11:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:5</td>
<td>καὶ [πᾶσιν] ψυχῆν ἃν ἔκτησαν ἐν Χαρράν</td>
<td></td>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:19</td>
<td>[πάντα] ὅσα ἠλάλησαν πρὸς αὐτόν</td>
<td></td>
<td>28:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>σὺν [σὺν] τῶν τόπων</td>
<td></td>
<td>18:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:25</td>
<td>καὶ [πάντα] ἃ καὶ [καὶ] τὰ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐκ τῆς γῆς</td>
<td></td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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溴חית בהלוחת את [כל] רע הכבש

יריה [כל] הנגש אשת

היי יבשך כל [כל] הנקול

הענדו דה [))? או אחראות ספירה

תאני [כל] הנ.SQLite את_bnשחתה מות

]ןץ [ן] הפקידו למך

dחixo to ]?ך] הפה [ן] פאוץ [ן] אולפני acטקן 응호华东


47:19

4:8

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

17:17

Harm.

בך יוחנן את שמי [ן] [ן].parameters [ן] דחי פהך [ן] הפה acטקן 응호华东

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

Harm.

47:15

47:20

47:18

Harm.

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

47:19

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

47:19

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

Harm.

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

Harm.

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

Harm.

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

Harm.

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

יאמר בלב [כל] לאמר

Harm.
### Plus: other (255)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>ביא מיס למים [חר] [כ]</td>
<td>אנה מקסון וסהוס וסהוס [ואין אסון ועסיקות]</td>
<td>1:9, 11, 15, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ליקני שמים [חר] [אלים אלים]</td>
<td>סְּּהסְּּמֶּא סְּּפְּרַנֶּה [ולאין]</td>
<td>1:10, 12, 18, 21, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>יוהי כנ [חוק חום מתחת השמים]</td>
<td>ובנה סֵּמָא סְּּפְּרַנֶּה [ואין]</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[ TAX4ђ]</td>
<td>באתה שרGameOver סֵּפְּרַנֶּה</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ TAX4ђ]</td>
<td>יוּסף [פריר]</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ TAX4ђ]</td>
<td>יואר לֶא [לֶא] [לֶא]</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14sp</td>
<td>הי玛丽 ... [לֶא] [לֶא] [לֶא]</td>
<td>ינְּגַּהְטְוָא ופָּסְּרָה ... [אֶּּסְּרַנֶּה]</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>על בנק [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>קאתה סְּּפְּרַנֶּה</td>
<td>1:15, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>וּני [חומק הל{מֶּא} בֶּאֶר שְּמִים בֶּאֶר שְּמִים</td>
<td>וּני [חומק הל{מֶּא} בֶּאֶר שְּמִים בֶּאֶר שְּמִים</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>וּני [חומק הל{מֶּא} בֶּאֶר שְּמִים בֶּאֶר שְּמִים</td>
<td>וּני [חומק הל{מֶּא} בֶּאֶר שְּמִים בֶּאֶר שְּמִים</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>שְּפִּלָא [ lié ג] [רֶמֶש]</td>
<td>שְּפִּלָא [ lié ג] [רֶמֶש]</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>(הו) [חר] [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>(הו) [חר] [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>את תנקס [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>את תנקס [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19sp</td>
<td>יִימי הוֹר [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>יִימי הוֹר [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23sp</td>
<td>בֶּאֶר [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>בֶּאֶר [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>את קָלָל [חר] [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>את קָלָל [חר] [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>3:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>וּני [חר] [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>וּני [חר] [חר] [חר] [חר]</td>
<td>3:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:8&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ויאמר כל בבל אוחז [研发中心]</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν Καὶ πρὸς Ἀβελ τῶν ἄδελφων αὐτοῦ [Διέλθομεν εἰς τὸ πέδιον]</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>תחזרו</td>
<td>[καὶ συλλαβοῦσα] ἔτεκεν ύδωρ</td>
<td>5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:27</td>
<td>כל ימי מותשתל [ янיט ]</td>
<td>πάσαι οἱ Ημέραι Μαθουσάλα [άς έξησεν]</td>
<td>8:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:19</td>
<td>[ומכל הבתים מכל הרמה] ומכל</td>
<td>[καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔρπητῶν] καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων</td>
<td>7:9, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>שניים [שניים]</td>
<td>δύο [δύο]</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>מכל מים [הרמה]</td>
<td>δύο [δύο]</td>
<td>7:9, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>יאשל אלveal העית [אתך ור]</td>
<td>יאשל [אתך ור]</td>
<td>6:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>שניים [שניים]</td>
<td>δύο [δύο]</td>
<td>7:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>בן שניים ושנים [תחזרו]</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [τῶν καθαρῶν] ἐπτὰ ἐπτὰ</td>
<td>7:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>רב ענבי [מתן אשין]</td>
<td>ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ [καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν μη καθαρῶν δύο δύο ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ] διαθέσαι σπάρμα</td>
<td>7:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>שבת שניים [שתים]</td>
<td>καὶ [ἀπὸ] πάντων τῶν ἔρπητῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>7:9, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ישָׁר יוהו בָּעֹד [את הנובה]</td>
<td>καὶ ἐκλείσαν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἔξωβεν αὐτοῦ [καὶ τὴν χιλιωτόν]</td>
<td>7:4, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας [καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νῦκτας]</td>
<td>7:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπέκαλύψαν πάντα τὰ δρη [τὰ υψηλά]</td>
<td>8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאὼν כל הבהמה [יאו כל תועד]</td>
<td>8:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאὼν כל הבהמה [יאו כל תועד]</td>
<td>8:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאוהנה תרש התרב [ירש התרב]</td>
<td>8:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאוהנה תרש התרב [ירש התרב]</td>
<td>7:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאוהנה תרש התרב [ירש התרב]</td>
<td>8:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאוהנה תרש התרב [ירש התרב]</td>
<td>8:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאוהנה תרש התרב [ירש התרב]</td>
<td>1:28 (LXX), 30 (LXX); 7:14; 8:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5</td>
<td>יוחנן [ἐκ]</td>
<td>יאוהנה תרש התרב [ירש התרב]</td>
<td>6:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>וארים</td>
<td>וארים</td>
<td>וארים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>וארפכאד</td>
<td>וארפכאד</td>
<td>וארפכאד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>אָפְּהוּ לְטִּבְשׁוּןָּא</td>
<td>אָפְּהוּ לְטִּבְשׁוּןָּא</td>
<td>אָפְּהוּ לְטִּבְשׁוּןָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>ויהי</td>
<td>יוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>מִי</td>
<td>מִי</td>
<td>מִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:6</td>
<td>[גכ וכת עב]</td>
<td>ועב</td>
<td>13:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>24:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>13:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:9</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>17:7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>17:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>19:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>18:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:5</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>18:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>17:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>18:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>18:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:10</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>19:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>[ית]</td>
<td>ית</td>
<td>19:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:2</td>
<td>אל תיוה [ב] יד ליום השתי</td>
<td>'ellelfh mou 'esthin [éfofsfth gar eihein òti Gamma mou 'esthin mëpote apokteinivn auton òi ándres tis pòlesis di' aútih.]</td>
<td>26:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14sp</td>
<td>יְחִית יַבְשֹׁל כָּכָּם [אֶלַּכָּם] יָאָם</td>
<td>'elaven dé 'Amibilekh [chilía diidraçma] próbeta kai móçous</td>
<td>20:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13sp</td>
<td>ἐξ ἐθνω [μέγα] ποιήσω αὐτὸν</td>
<td>eis ñnov [mégna] poieis au toyn</td>
<td>21:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>חָשַׁם מִנָּה</td>
<td>kai ekhâsosen âpênânti [au toû] asâbohâsan dé tò paidiôn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>וַיִּמְשָׁם אָלֹה אֵלֶּהוֹ מִנָּה</td>
<td>wîy misâm a'âlo elêho mina</td>
<td>21:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>וַיִּהְרֶג אָרֶץ בְּ[יִם]</td>
<td>kai eîsen frâap údastos [zântos]</td>
<td>26:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>יְבָשֹׁל כָּכָּם [אֶלַּכָּם] יָאָם</td>
<td>'Amibilekh [kaî 'Ochoszâb õ nuphajwosz àu toû] kai</td>
<td>26:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>מֵה הָנָה בָּעַנְבִי [רָאָה] אָלָה</td>
<td>Tî esîn ai ëttâ âmnâdes [tòwn prôbaton] toûtovn</td>
<td>21:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>דִּי חָשַׁם אֱלֹה אֵלֶּהוֹ מִנָּה</td>
<td>dé tòûtò épwoimaseun [tò ðòma] (tòu) tòpou</td>
<td>22:14; 28:19; 32:3; 31; 33:17; 35:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>יְבָשֹׁל כָּכָּם [אֶלַּכָּם] יָאָם</td>
<td>'Amibilekh [kaî 'Ochoszâb õ nuphajwosz àu toû] kai</td>
<td>26:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16sp</td>
<td>וַיִּשְׁכַּם אֱלֹה אֵלֶּהוֹ מִנָּה</td>
<td>kai ouk efëisow toû uioû sou toû agântoû [di' émê]</td>
<td>22:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>וַיֶּהְרֶג אָרֶץ בְּ[יִם]</td>
<td>oûtoû [uioû uç] êteken Melêhâ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:2sp</td>
<td>בָּרֶה יָרָבָע [אל עמי] הוֹי תְבוֹר</td>
<td>ën pôleî 'Arjôk [ê 'esthin ën toû koîlâmâti] aûthî 'estîn Xenôron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>יָאָם [אֶלַּכָּם]</td>
<td>ëan ën ãh têlêh ã guônh poréouêhîn metà sou [eis tûn yîn tautûn]</td>
<td>24:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>שתחה וגו ממלל אשתה [עד אס]</td>
<td>Πίε καὶ τὰς καμήλους σου πιτὶ [έως ἐν πάσωνται πίνουσι]</td>
<td>24:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15**</td>
<td>وسلم עלח דבך [אל תבל]</td>
<td>πρὸ τοῦ αὐτῶν συνστελέσαι καλοῦντα [ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ]</td>
<td>24:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>[יוֹשֵׁבָה אֲשֶׁר] [יְהוָה]</td>
<td>[καὶ ἐπηρώθησαι αὐτήν] καὶ ἐίπεν</td>
<td>24:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ולכתוב אשר לְבוּנִים [משה]</td>
<td>καὶ λαμψὶ γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου [ἐκείθεν]</td>
<td>24:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>וְאַלָּמָה מִשָּׁמָּה</td>
<td>τῷ ἑαυτῷ θεράποντες Ισαὰκ [καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γνώσομαι δὲτὶ πεποίηκας ἔλεος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Ἀβραὰμ]</td>
<td>24:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>וְאִיתְו אֱבוֹן</td>
<td>לֹא בִּית אֱבוֹן [םָה]</td>
<td>24:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>וַיִּשְׁלָח [יוֹסֵעֵ]</td>
<td>πρὸ τοῦ συνστελέσαι με καλοῦντα</td>
<td>24:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>[שַׁעַח] [אֲבֹדָא]</td>
<td>Ἐκεκατεφαπτῷ μὲ [τίνα ἀπέλθων] πρὸς τὸν κυρίον μου</td>
<td>25:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:3</td>
<td>וְתָנָב [אֶת] [יְהוָה]</td>
<td>τὸν Σαβὰ [καὶ τὸν Θαμὰ] καὶ τὸν Δαίδαν</td>
<td>25:9; 23:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>וַיִּבְנֶה [וּדוֹ] [יַר] [וּר] [יִר]</td>
<td>וְיִוַּי דְאַד אָבִין [τῷ γαμβῇ καὶ נְבָדָה] καὶ</td>
<td>37:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8**</td>
<td>וַיִּשְׁלַח [יִשְׁלַח] [יְתָב]</td>
<td>προσβυτὴς καὶ πλήρης [ἡμερῶν]</td>
<td>35:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>וַיִּשְׁלַח [יְתָב]</td>
<td>τὸν ἀγρόν [καὶ τὸ στήλαιον] θὸ ἐκτῆσατο Ἀβραὰμ</td>
<td>25:9; 23:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28**</td>
<td>יִתְרָך וּכְ ἐκεῖ</td>
<td>וַיֶּהָר [ט]</td>
<td>25:9; 23:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:7**</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>Γυνὴ μου [ἐστῖν]</td>
<td>12:19; 20:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>καὶ ὄρυξεν οἱ παῖδες Ισαὰκ ἐν τῇ φάραγγι [Γέραρῳ]</td>
<td>26:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>[ἀπάρας δὲ ἐκείθεν] ὄρυξεν φρέαρ ἔτερον</td>
<td>26:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27**</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>ὡς ὀσμὴ ἀγγέλου [πλῆρος] ἐν εὐλογησιν κύριος</td>
<td>27:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34**</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>καὶ εὐλογημένος ἐστώ [ἐγένετο δὲ] ἥνικα ἰχθύσεν Ἦσαο</td>
<td>28:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπόδρασι [εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν]</td>
<td>25:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>וַיְזָכְרוּ הָאֶבֶר [בּוֹדֵר]</td>
<td>διὰ τὰς δυνατέρας [τῶν υἱῶν] Χέτ</td>
<td>25:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>וַתִּטְמוּרֵךְ [בָּדָר] בְּכֵי אַשְׁר הַדָּל</td>
<td>דַּיְתָּעְלָסְתּוֹן סֶה [בֵּין הַדָּל] פָּאַשְׁיׁ סֶאָא אַל פָּאַשְׁיׁ</td>
<td>28:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:1</td>
<td>בַּיִלְּאֵל הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>אֶפְּרַעְרָה יֵלֶךְ אֵלַי הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>28:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>יִכְּעַר הַוָּא [אֲלָהָא אַשְׁרַי]</td>
<td>אָעֲתָה יָאָר אָבָאָא [תַּאֲפָרָה אֵלַי הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>29:9; 37:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>24:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>30:7, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:10</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>Ζέλαφα</td>
<td>30:4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>Ζέλαφα, η παιδίωση Λεια, και έτεκεν ιουβ [η θεία]</td>
<td>30:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>εν τοι [υπν] καιροφ αιρετει με ο άνήρ μου</td>
<td>29:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>και έγένετο αυτω κατη κολα [και βοσ] και παιδες</td>
<td>32:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:10</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>και έδω οι τραγοι [και οι κριοι, άναβαιντες ξανα</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τα αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>και ίδε (-) τους τραγους [και τους κριους] αναβαιντες</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>וַתַּעֲשֵׁהוּת הַנְּגֵר בְּנֵי דוֹד [אֵל לְבָנָן]</td>
<td>επι τα πρόβατα [και τας αγας]</td>
<td>31:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>בָּיְתָנָה יַעֲקֹב</td>
<td>ἀνά κύριον ἐμοῦ καὶ σου ἐξέπνευς δὲ αὐτῷ</td>
<td>24:54; 25:34; 26:30; 27:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>ἵππος [ἱππότης]</td>
<td>καὶ ἐφαγὸν [καὶ ἐστιν] ἐκεῖ</td>
<td>31:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>καὶ μαρτυρεῖ ἡ στήλη [ἀπο]</td>
<td></td>
<td>31:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>[ἀρα] σύνει κύριον ἡμῶν ἐστίν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>καὶ ἐφαγὸν [καὶ ἐστιν]</td>
<td>24:54; 25:34; 26:30; 27:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:1</td>
<td>[καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἶδεν παρεμβολὴν θεοῦ]</td>
<td>33:1; 32:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>καὶ ηττήτασεν [τῷ πρῶτῳ καὶ τῷ δεύτερῳ]</td>
<td>32:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20w</td>
<td>καὶ ἔριζεν [ἐβάφη] Κανά</td>
<td>32:29; 35:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>καὶ ἐποίησαν τὰς [δύο] παρισίδικας</td>
<td>33:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>τὰ ταῦτα σοὶ ἐστίν</td>
<td>33:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>καὶ ἔποιησεν ἑαυτῷ [ἐκεῖ] οἰκίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:10</td>
<td>καὶ ἦ γῆ [ἴδῳ πλατεία] ἐναντίον υἱῶν</td>
<td>34:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθησόμεθα υἱῶν [καὶ κατοικήσομεν ἐν υἱῶν]</td>
<td>34:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων υἱῶν λημψόμεθα ἡμῖν</td>
<td>34:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>λύσας τὴν ἱδρυμα [τοῦτο]</td>
<td>34:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>[αὐτῶν] ἄνατον τὸ μόνον [ἐν τούτῳ] ὁμοιωθήμεν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>34:15, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>καὶ περιστέραν [τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀνθρωποστάσιας αὐτῶν] πᾶς ἀρσεν</td>
<td>17:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>καὶ διήλθας [ὁ διὰ τὴν ἡμέραν] καὶ διὰ τῆς αὐτίκης τάς οἰκίας</td>
<td>34:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>δς ἴνα μετ' ἰματία [καὶ διήσωσεν]</td>
<td>28:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ובת אל בית אל (תהלים [192])</td>
<td>קָאָהָה הָבִלֵּם מִשְׁאֵל הַתָּלְמִיד הַגָּדוֹל</td>
<td>Deut 11:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>וַיְהַעֲמֵדָן הַמַּשֶּךָּה נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>יְהַעֲמֵדוּנָהּ נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>35:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>וַיִּשְׁלַחוּ לַאֲחֵלָהּ נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>48:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ixo</td>
<td>יְהַעֲמֵדוּנָהּ נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>12:7; 15:7, 18; 24:7; 48:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>וַיְהַעֲמֵדָן הַמַּשֶּךָּה נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>רָהָב הַמַּשֶּךָּה נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>23:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:6</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>בְּכָלָּהּ נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>10:20, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:17</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>39:12, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:4</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>29:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:16</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>41:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>1:26, 28, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>1:26, 28, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:4</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>41:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>41:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>יִשָּׁרֶת נַחֲלָהּ נַחֲלָה</td>
<td>41:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ителה הראשת</td>
<td>יתלד בתוכות</td>
<td>41:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>יאחט</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>הנה ישיב [חומר]</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>יאש</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:5, 6, 22, 23, 26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ילפנ</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 SP</td>
<td>ששת</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>אש</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 SP</td>
<td>שבט שמע ושמע [היה]</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>שנות</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>41:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:2</td>
<td>שושן</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>43:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ירה אול</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 SP</td>
<td>מע</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>יקאי</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>זא בר</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:3</td>
<td>תוכל</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:15, 20, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>אמזโตו</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>43:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>אכיש</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:15, 20, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 SP</td>
<td>ירא בר</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 SP</td>
<td>ירא בר</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>44:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:4</td>
<td>תולים ושית</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>44:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>שאין</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>44:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>��ים [1]</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>מעש</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>44:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>מו</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>42:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 SP</td>
<td>יכי</td>
<td>בזאת</td>
<td>44:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>אַ֣שׁ אֲבִיאֹ֣ו אֲדָ֔לֵךְ [ַּדְּבַ֖ר]</td>
<td>Εἶδεν μὴ ἐγένεις αὐτὸν πρὸς σὲ [καὶ στῆσῃ αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου]</td>
<td>43:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:9</td>
<td>שָׁמַ֣ר נַֽעְרֵי לְאֹתְדֹּֽו לֵ֣ל [אָרִים]</td>
<td>ἐποιήσεν μὲ ὁ θεὸς κύριον πάσης [γῆς] Αἰγύπτου passim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ἔκλαυσεν [ἐπ’ αὐτῷ]</td>
<td>45:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:20</td>
<td>καὶ τὸν Ἑφραῖμ [ἐγένοντο δὲ οὐιοι Μανασσῆ οὕς</td>
<td>εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ] Κατοικεῖτοσαν</td>
<td>47:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>οἰκεὶ οὐ καὶ ἔργον τοῦ ἔμοι παρεῖναν. [Ἡλόν δὲ εἰ Αἰγυπτον πρὸς Ἰωσήφ Ἰακώβ καὶ οἱ οὐιοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ήκουσέν</td>
<td>47:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[ἰδοὺ] ἢ γῆ Αἰγύπτου ἐναντίον σοῦ ἐστιν</td>
<td>[μὴ] ημέραι τῶν ἐτῶν [τῆς ζωῆς μου] ὡς παροικῶ</td>
<td>47:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>μὴ σὺ [ἴχι] μονηρ</td>
<td>Βουσκαρ αὐτῶν [οὐ ἠγοραζόν καὶ ἑστιομέτρει αὐτοῖς]</td>
<td>47:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>τοῦ σῖτου ὦ ἡγοραζόν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16≤sp</td>
<td>μανασσῆ ἐκ [ἱλόμ]</td>
<td>καὶ δοῦσῳ ύμῖν [ἀρτοὺς]</td>
<td>47:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>καὶ η γῆ [ἐρημωθή]</td>
<td></td>
<td>47:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>τῶν υμῶν [τὸν ἱερὸν] καὶ [τινα σπαίρωμεν] καὶ ζώμεν</td>
<td>47:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24≤sp</td>
<td>τὰ γενήματα [ἀυτῆς]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:1</td>
<td>καὶ ἀναλαβὼν τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ τὸν Μανασσῆ καὶ τὸν Ἑφραίμ [ἐξέβαλεν πρὸς Ιακώβ]</td>
<td>48:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7≤sp</td>
<td>[ἰρα]</td>
<td>ἐξ Μασσοπταμίας [τῆς Συρίας]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ἐκτεῖνας δὲ Ἰσραήλ [τὴν χείρα] τὴν δεξιὰν</td>
<td>48:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16≤sp</td>
<td>[ἰρα]</td>
<td>εὐλογήσας τὰ παιδία [ταῦτα]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>καὶ ἀποστρέψῃ υἱάς [ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ταύτης] εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν πατέρων υἱῶν</td>
<td>50:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:12</td>
<td>καθὼς ἐνετειλάτο αὐτοῖς [καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἔκει]</td>
<td>49:29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>αὐτῶς [καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί αὐτοῦ]</td>
<td>47:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minus: implied participant (17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>יאמר (לדך אחרון) λέγον (-)</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:5</td>
<td>יאמר (ל) και εἶπεν (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:3</td>
<td>יאמר (ל) και εἶπεν (-) context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:1</td>
<td>יאמר (ל) και εἶπεν (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:34</td>
<td>יאמר (ל) και εἶπεν (-) context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:1</td>
<td>יאמר (ל) λέγον (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:12</td>
<td>תמר (עקב) דרהל και ἀνήγγειλεν (-) τῇ Παχηλ context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:40</td>
<td>בנה (לבן) εν τοις ἁμοιοις (-) 30:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:11</td>
<td>ו�� תמר (אנלי) σότι και δέ εἶπητε (-) δώσομεν context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:29</td>
<td>תמר (עקב) ἵμη και ἐκλίτων (-) ἀπέθανεν context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:9</td>
<td>יאמר (ל) και εἶπεν (-) context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:11</td>
<td>ומטсос א黼 אל בוס (פרעה) και ἐξέδιψα αὐτὴν εἰς τὸ ποτήριον (-) 40:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:4</td>
<td>לאל שלח (עקב) את אדוא oὐκ ἀπέστειλεν (-) μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:10</td>
<td>יאמר (אנלי) οἱ δὲ εἶπαν (-) context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:18</td>
<td>יאמר אל統 (וקף) Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς (-) context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:1</td>
<td>התחוות (וטק) אל אתח ήνικὰ ἀνεγνωρίζετο (-) τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:19</td>
<td>יהוים (אבו) και οὐκ ἠθάλησεν (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minus: expanded participant (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21:4</td>
<td>רָמֵל אֱבֹרֶהוֹ הָאִיתֵצִית (בון) περιετέτεμεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ (-) 21:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:67</td>
<td>ירבאו תיטע הַטִּיל (שַׂרְדוּ) ἐστιθλέεν δὲ Ἰσαὰκ εἰς τὸν οἶκον (-) τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:12</td>
<td>שָׂר חַלָּה הָנה (הַמַּטְרָה) שפָחָת שֻׁרֶה ἐν ἐπικεκ Αγάρ (-) ἢ παυδική Σάρρας 16:3; 21:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:15</td>
<td>ואָרָבַנ oι παῖδες (-) τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ context</td>
<td>&amp; αρβαν oι παῖδες (-) τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:18</td>
<td>יאלפ מאליבמה (בַּת טַעַת שֻׁר) οὕτοι ἡγεμόνες Ὀλιβεμαῖς (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>שבע נשים (1)شمונת מותות שנות</td>
<td>ἐτῆ ἐπτακόσια (-) ἐπτά</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>(1)חסן (1)חס נפש</td>
<td>- )Σήμ (- )Χάμ Ιάфеθ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>(1)חסן (1)חס נפש</td>
<td>- )Σήμ (- )Χάμ Ιάфеθ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22</td>
<td>זר טוב (-)ψύχος και καύμα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22</td>
<td>(1)קינז ותרח</td>
<td>- θέρος και έαρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22</td>
<td>(1)חי ו윈ה (-)ἡμέραν και νύχτα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>(1)חסון (1)חס נפש</td>
<td>- Σήμ (- )Χάμ Ιάфеθ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>(1)אמלך נפצע (-)ἀπὸ τῶν διασπάρθησαν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>(1)liğית (1)לטיו - Χούς και Μισράιμ (-)Φωδ και Χανάν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:32</td>
<td>(1)אמלך טומדת (-)ἀπὸ τῶν διασπάρθησαν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:23</td>
<td>(1)אָד (1)אָד - λήμψομαι</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:35</td>
<td>(1)מהלך ותפירה (-)καθάλος και ὄνος</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:38</td>
<td>(1)שלל (1)אִיל יאָני (-)οὐκ ἠτεκνώθησαν (-)χροῖς τῶν προβάτων σου</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:21</td>
<td>(1)שב (1)שבת מ userAgent (-)οικεῖτος</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:24</td>
<td>(1)ライ (1)לד (-)Λεи και Ωνάν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:27</td>
<td>(1)בל כל (-)ἐποδώμεθα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:10</td>
<td>(1)יאָבָד (1)תα προβατά σου και αἱ βόες σου</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:9</td>
<td>(1)נשון (-)Ασρόν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:21</td>
<td>(1)кра (-)ἐως τῶν ἀκρων</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:25</td>
<td>(1)שָׁי (-)ὁ θεὸς (-)ὁ ἔμος</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:20</td>
<td>(1)נָב (1)אתים ושבת (-)ἔγω (-)ὑμεῖς ἑβουλεύσασθε</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minus: ֵ Caleb (12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>כל (1)הכהה חתורה (-)ἀπὸ δῆ (-)τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καβαρῶν</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>כל (1)תהמה (1)תָּם (-)ם הֵן ύποκάτω (-)τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:28</td>
<td>כל (1)פי ארימ הכבש (-)καὶ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (-)τῆς γῆς τῆς περιχώρου</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:17</td>
<td>כל (1)גב_weapon (-)ἐν (-)τοὺς ὄρεις αὐτοῦ θύκλω</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36</td>
<td>כל (1)אריש (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαὸς (-)ὁ λαaoke</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:32</td>
<td>כל (1)אָבְר (1)&gt;(() (1)אָבְר (-)παρελθόντω (-)τα πρόβατά σου σήμερον</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minus: other (46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>(בבל) בצלם אלוהים בר אבות</td>
<td>תּוּ עַּלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ</td>
<td>16, 9, 11, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>(בבל) בצלם אלוהים בר אבות</td>
<td>תּוּ עַּלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ עַל תּוּ עַלְּנוֹ</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29</td>
<td>פֶּרֶץ (ך) זָדוֹנָה</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>1:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:14</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:26</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:17</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:28</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:4</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:19&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:16</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:2</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:43</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:28</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:33&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:44</td>
<td>(שם) הגָּEObject שלישית</td>
<td>כָּרַט (-) סֵפֶר מְצֹּר</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:32</td>
<td>כל הש (נודד וונ라이 וול שט) תומ</td>
<td>πᾶν προβατον (-) φαίνω ἐν τοῖς ἀρνάσιν καὶ πᾶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:38</td>
<td>(יווחנה) (בבש ושקות) (-) ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πιεῖν</td>
<td></td>
<td>30:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:18</td>
<td>אחר רכש (מקנה גנים אשר רכש) בוס</td>
<td>ἤν περιποίησατο (-) ἐν τῇ Μесopotamία</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:20</td>
<td>(ותבוך את ולָבָּב) (תִּזְבֵּה) (-) καὶ ἀπήγαγες</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:31</td>
<td>(רָדָעָה (פָּמָר) (אָמֶרתי)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:39ס</td>
<td>(מייר (חָבָּשַׁה)</td>
<td>par' ἐμαυτοῦ (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:52</td>
<td>או אֵין אֶל אָנשׁ ברָבָּה (את גָּלָה הת)</td>
<td>εἶν τε γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ διάβω πρὸς σέ (-)</td>
<td>31:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:54</td>
<td>(ตรวจสอบת) (יָרָל) (-) καὶ ἐφαγόν</td>
<td></td>
<td>31:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:54</td>
<td>(떼) (יָרָל) καὶ ἐφαγόν (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:8</td>
<td>את בּוֹרָש (בּוֹרָש) καὶ τὰ πρόβατα (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>32:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:15</td>
<td>(אוה בּוֹרָש תלָב (ותגנב את לבבי) ותנהוג</td>
<td>(-) ἐν τοῦτῳ ὁμοιοιδιομομέθα ύμῖν</td>
<td>34:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:24</td>
<td>על בר (בל ציון תֵּיָה) πᾶς ἄρσην (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:16</td>
<td>בּוֹר (בּוֹר) כוֹד</td>
<td>ἐν (-) Ἐδώμ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:3</td>
<td>(יווח מקולת (בטוח)</td>
<td>κύριος εὐθυδί (-)</td>
<td>cf. 39:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:27</td>
<td>(חוּרַת) (חוּרַת) αἱ λεπτα (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>41:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:2</td>
<td>(תִּבְרִי) (לְבוֹנָה) καὶ πρῖνσθε ύμῖν (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:13</td>
<td>שָׁנִים עֵשֶׂר בְּדוֹד אוֹתָם אָנָנוּ (בּוֹר) איֵש</td>
<td>Δώδεκα ἔσμεν οἱ παιδὲς σου ἀδελφοί (-)</td>
<td>42:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:24</td>
<td>(יווח adviser את האנשׁים ביתה יוט) ותונ</td>
<td>(-) καὶ ἠγεύκεν</td>
<td>43:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:18</td>
<td>את בּוֹר (בּוֹר) (ער) (הָרָּפָה)</td>
<td>τῶν ἁγάθων (-) Ἀλγύπτου</td>
<td>45:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:20</td>
<td>כו בּוֹר (בּוֹר) (ער) (הָרָּפָה)</td>
<td>τά γὰρ πάντα ἁγάθα (-) Ἀλγύπτου</td>
<td>45:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:5</td>
<td>(בּוֹר) (ער) (הָרָּפָה)</td>
<td>ἐν (-) Ἀλγύπτου</td>
<td>46:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:30</td>
<td>בָּשָׂר (השֶׁר) (הָרָּפָה)</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ στήλαιῳ (-) τῷ διπλῷ</td>
<td>49:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:5</td>
<td>(לָר) (הָרָּפָה) (תּוֹפָה)</td>
<td>λέγων (-)</td>
<td>48:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:13</td>
<td>בָּשָׂר (השֶׁר) (הָרָּפָה)</td>
<td>εἰς τὸ στήλαιον (-) τῷ διπλῶν</td>
<td>23:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:14</td>
<td>בְּדִי (אוֹתָם בֶּיתוֹר כבּוֹר) (ותגנ)</td>
<td>δέψαι (-) τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference (69)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:2ס</td>
<td>בְּדִי (אוֹתָם בֶּיתוֹר כבּוֹר)</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ &lt;אְקָת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>ליאופלט</td>
<td>&lt;Aύτη&gt; [杼</td>
<td>ἡ βιβλίος] γενέσεως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6sp</td>
<td>יאופלט</td>
<td>kal ἔφαγ&lt;ου&gt; καὶ διηνο&lt;χησαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2sp</td>
<td>Αἰσχύλος</td>
<td>&lt;ἀρσεν&gt; καὶ &lt;βῆλυ&gt; 7:3, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2sp</td>
<td>Αἰσχύλος</td>
<td>&lt;ἀρσεν&gt; καὶ &lt;βῆλυ&gt; 7:3, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:4sp</td>
<td>Ρόδιος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12sp</td>
<td>תומ וטלייש (ומאה)</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐκάτων] τριάκοντα πέντε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>קיאן</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:14sp</td>
<td>שוליס [שונה ומאת]</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐκάτων] τριάκοντα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:16sp</td>
<td>אברם וטלייש (ומאה)</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐκάτων] τριάκοντα τέσσαρα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:18sp</td>
<td>שוליס [שונה ומאת]</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐκάτων] τριάκοντα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20sp</td>
<td>שוליס [שונה ומאת]</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐκάτων] τριάκοντα δύο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:22sp</td>
<td>שוליס [שונה ומאת]</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐκάτων] τριάκοντα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:24sp</td>
<td>תɲ=1 וטלייש &lt;שונ&gt;</td>
<td>ἐτῆ [ἐβδομάκοντα] ἐνέα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:31sp</td>
<td>וציציו א</td>
<td>kal καὶ ἔξηγαγεν αὐτοὺς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:3sp</td>
<td>מקולה</td>
<td>τ&lt;ούς&gt; καταρωμένους σε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:19sp</td>
<td>ביבר &lt;אבר&gt;</td>
<td>καὶ εὐλόγησεν &lt;τον Ἀβραμ&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10sp</td>
<td>אופו וא</td>
<td>τ&lt;α&gt; δὲ ὥρνε&lt;α&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:6sp</td>
<td>ביד</td>
<td>ἐν τ&lt;αις&gt; χερ&lt;σίν&gt; σου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;יאוש</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vorlage</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Harm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:29&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>נל לא השחתה.Où μη ἀπολέσω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>נל לא השחתה.Où μη ἀπολέσω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:13&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ותעט. Εἴηγαγ. με</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:13&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ארח elc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:6&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>מיה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:15&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ויאמר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:33&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>και εἴπαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>μετά τὸ γηράσαι αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:18&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>οἱ παῖδες Αβραάμ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:34&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>θυγατέρα Αιλὼν τοῦ Ἐδαίου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:8&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>πάντας τοὺς ποιμένας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:27&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>και δῶ σοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:36&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:40&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ΤΚΡΙΝ. διάλειψον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:29&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>κακοποιήσαι σε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:29&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>τοῦ πατρός σου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:11&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ἅς ἥνεκά σοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:14&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>κατὰ σχολὴν τῆς &lt;παρείπειας&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:13&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>סמך</td>
<td>ἐμῖναν&lt;αυ&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:16&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ועט עזר</td>
<td>γένος ἐν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:31&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ועש</td>
<td>χρησ&lt;ουται&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:2&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>עונת בות בטעון</td>
<td>ἀνά τοῦ &lt;υίου&gt; Σεβεγών</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:6&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:14&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>עונת בות בטעון</td>
<td>ἀνά τοῦ &lt;υίου&gt; Σεβεγών</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:4&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:21&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:25&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:4&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:43&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>יקימא</td>
<td>καὶ ἐκήρυξ&lt;εν&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:53&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:57&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:14&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:23&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:9&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:13&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:24&lt;sup&gt;sp&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;טמא&lt;ו</td>
<td>ἐμίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Vorlage</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:20sp</td>
<td>ותתך ול תתך</td>
<td>καὶ μὴ φαίνῃς τὸ &lt;οἶς&gt; ὀφθαλμὸν &lt;οἶς&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:13sp</td>
<td>נבש</td>
<td>καὶ &lt;Ἰασοῦβ&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:16sp</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>Ἅη &lt;δ&gt; ἰς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:22sp</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ο &lt;ὕς&gt; ἐτε &lt;κεν&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:3sp</td>
<td>אֱלָו אֱלָו רבי</td>
<td>τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς &lt;Ἰωσήφ&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:21sp</td>
<td>ἐκ τοῦ μων</td>
<td>&lt;κατεδουλώσατο&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:21sp</td>
<td>ἐκ τοῦ μων</td>
<td>διὰ ἑκάστων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:4sp</td>
<td>&lt;τῆς&gt; εὔξάσισαν</td>
<td>εὔξασισαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:5sp</td>
<td>&lt;δέ&gt;</td>
<td>δέ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:6sp</td>
<td>&lt;τῆς&gt; ἐρέσισα</td>
<td>ἐρέσισα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:8sp</td>
<td>&lt;τῆς&gt; ἐρέσισα</td>
<td>καὶ &lt;χεῖρат&gt; σου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:22sp</td>
<td>&lt;τῆς&gt; ἐρέσισα</td>
<td>υἱὸς &lt;μου νεώτατος&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:23sp</td>
<td>&lt;τῆς&gt; ἐρέσισα</td>
<td>&lt;ἐλεοδόρου&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:26sp</td>
<td>&lt;τῆς&gt; ἐρέσισα</td>
<td>&lt;ἀρέω&gt; μονίμων καὶ ἐπὶ εὐλογίαις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Classified Lexical Equivalences for Content Words

Note: unlike the body of this work, all of the references in Appendix II are to the versification of the Hebrew text. Differences in versification between the Hebrew and Greek texts is limited to a small number of verses (with the exception of Gen 32, where the Hebrew verse numbers are one higher than those in the Greek text).

Proper nouns

Hapaxlegomena

2  אֵבִים  "Abimekal (1/1): 10:28.
3  אֵבִים מַעֲרִים  πένθος + Αίγυπτος (1/1): 50:11.
5  אֵבִיק  "Alziχ (1/1): 10:27.
6  אֵבִים  "Ωμά (1/1): 36:23.
7  אֵבִר  "Oφίρ (1/1): 10:29.
10 אֵבִר  תֶרֶמִינוֹס + Φαράν (1/1): 14:6.
11 אֵבִים  "Ομμαίτος (1/1): 14:5.
12 אֵבִר  "Αρχάδ (1/1): 10:10.
14 אֵבִר  "Ηλάς (1/1): 36:41.
16 אֵבִר  "Ελιέζφ (1/1): 15:2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>אַרְלִי</td>
<td>אַרְלִי (1/1): 46:16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>אָרְדִיוּ</td>
<td>אָרְדִיוּ (1/1): 10:18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>אָרְוָדִי</td>
<td>אָרְוָדִי (1/1): 10:18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּה (1/1): 36:28. Cf. אָרְפֵּה used for אָרְפֵּה (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה</td>
<td>אָרְפֵּנָה (1/1): 25:3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>יובל</td>
<td>Ιουβάλ</td>
<td>4:21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>יהל</td>
<td>Αλόη</td>
<td>46:14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>יאשנה</td>
<td>Ιασώλ</td>
<td>46:24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>יותר</td>
<td>Ιετώρ</td>
<td>25:15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιαχίν</td>
<td>46:10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιεμουήλ</td>
<td>46:10. Cf. Ιεμουήλ used for בָּנֶה (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιαμίν</td>
<td>46:10. Cf. Ιαμίν used for בָּנֶה (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιαμνά</td>
<td>46:17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιαχά</td>
<td>11:29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιασαρ</td>
<td>46:24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιεσβόκ</td>
<td>25:2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιασοῦβ</td>
<td>[46:13].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιεσούά</td>
<td>46:17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιεσύ</td>
<td>46:17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιεθάν</td>
<td>36:26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιεθέρ</td>
<td>36:40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Ιασβί</td>
<td>38:5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Χαλανή</td>
<td>10:10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Χασλωνίμ</td>
<td>10:14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Καφθορίμ</td>
<td>10:14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Χαρμί</td>
<td>46:9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Χαρράν</td>
<td>36:26. Cf. Χαρράν used for מַתִּי (8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Χάσαד</td>
<td>22:32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Κίτιος</td>
<td>10:4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Λοουμείμ</td>
<td>25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Λατουσίμ</td>
<td>25:3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Λασά</td>
<td>10:19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>יהי</td>
<td>Μαζάρ</td>
<td>36:42.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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113 מִּגְּדִּיאֵל מֵּגְדִּיאֵל (1/1): 36:43.
114 מִּגְּדָל מִּגְּדָל + מִּגְּדָל (1/1): 35:21.
115 מֵֹגָוִי מֵֹגָוִי (1/1): 10:2.
116 מִדָּי מִדָּי (1/1): 10:2.
118 מִיגֶּל מִיגֶּל (1/1): 36:39.
120 מָגֵּג מָגֵּג (1/1): 10:2.
121 מָדָי מָדָי (1/1): 10:2.
123 מְהֵּׁיט בְּאֵּל מְהֵּּיט בְּאֵּל (1/1): 36:39.
124 מַרְוֵה מַרְוֵה (1/4): 12:6. Cf. מַרְוֵה used for גָּבֹה (2); מַרְוֵה (1).
125 מַרְוֵה מַרְוֵה (1/4): 22:2. Cf. מַרְוֵה used for גָּבֹה (2); מַרְוֵה (1).
126 מַרְרָה מַרְרָה (1/5): 31:49. Cf. מַרְרָה used for מַרְוֵה (2); מַרְרָה (1).
127 מַרְרָה מַרְרָה (1/5): 31:49. Cf. מַרְרָה used for מַרְרָה (2); מַרְרָה (1).
130 מַשְׂנָא מַשְׂנָא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשְׂנָא used for מַשְׂנָא (1).
131 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
133 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
137 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
139 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
140 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
141 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
142 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
143 מַשָּׂא מַשָּׂא (1/2): 10:23. Cf. מַשָּׂא used for מַשָּׂא (1).
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144 Σαβαθ (1/1): 10:7.
145 Σαβακαθ (1/1): 10:7.
146 Ἀσενναίος (1/1): 10:17.
147 εἰς + Σωφήρα (1/1): 10:30.
149 Ἀηδίς (1/1): [46:16].
150 Γεθθάμ (1/1): 36:35.
151 Γάξα (1/1): 10:19.
152 Γαβήλ (1/1): 36:23.
155 Ζαφώ (1/1): 36:43.
156 Γωλά (1/1): 36:40.
157 Γωλάν (1/1): 36:23.
159 Αμαλήθ (1/3): 14:7. Cf. Αμαλήθ used for πηγὴ (2).
162 Ιωκάμ (1/1): 36:27.
163 Εδέμ (1/1): [46:20].
164 Αρουκάιος (1/1): 10:17.
165 Ασταρᾶθ + Καρνάν (1/1): 14:5.
166 Ἀδικία (1/7): 26:20. Cf. Ἀδικία used for ἐπισκέπτη (3); μήκος (2); ὁ δαίμος (1).
168 Μεσοποταμία (1/13): 48:7. Cf. Μεσοποταμία used for ἄριστος ἐπόμαχος (11); ἀρχηγὸς (1).
171 Φινών (1/1): 36:41.
172 Φισών (1/1): 2:11.
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175 פְּנוּאֵׁל εἶδος + θεός (1/2): 32:32. Cf. εἶδος + θεός used for פְּנוּאֵׁל (1).
177 פְּנוּאֵׁל פְּנוּאֵׁל (1/1): 36:39.
179 Σαμαραϊός (1/1): 10:18.
180 Σαφών (1/1): 46:16.
181 Ψυνθυμιακή (1/1): 41:45.
182 Κέδμα (1/1): 25:15.
183 Κεδμωναὶ (1/1): 15:19.
185 Καάθ (1/1): 46:11.
186 Κεναῖος (1/1): 15:19.
188 Κενεζαῖος (1/1): 15:19.
189 πόλις (1/59): 14:5. Cf. πόλις used for רְּחֹב + עִיר (1); פִּינַּח (2); פִּינַּח (2); פִּינַּח (2); רְּחֹב + עִיר (1).
192 Ρόδιος (1/1): [10:4].
193 Ρωβώβ + πόλις (1/1): 10:11.
194 Ριφάθ (1/1): 10:3.
195 Ράσημ (1/1): 10:12.
196 Ραμεσσή (1/2): 47:11. Cf. Ραμεσσή used for פִּינַּח (1).
197 δρκος (1/12): 26:33. Cf. δρκος used for בֵּין שָׁמַיִם (9); בֵּין שָׁמַיִם (2).
Consistent

1  אֵילון (24/24): 20:2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18; 21:22, 25+, 26, 27, 29, 32; 26:1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 26.

2  אֶרֶץ (64/65): 11:26, 27, 29+, 31+; 12:1, 4+, 5, 6, 7[, 9, 10, [11][+], 14, 16, 17, 18; 13:1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 18; 14:12, 13+, 14, [19]+, 21, 22, 23; 15:1+, 2, 3, [6], 11, 12, 13, 18; 16:1, 2, 3++, 5, 6, 15+, 16+; 17:1+, 3, 5. Cf. אָבְרָם used for וַיְהִי (1).


4  אָבֶרֶךְ (3/3): 10:19, 14:2, 8.

5  אָבֶרֶךְ (7/7): [36:2], 5, 14, 18+, 25, 41.

6  אָבֶרֶךְ (2/2): [36:11], 15.

7  אָבֶרֶךְ (3/3): [41:45], 50; 46:20.

8  אָבֶרֶךְ (5/7): [38:4], 8, 9; [46:12+]. Cf. אָנָם used for וַיְהִי (2).


11  אָבֶרֶךְ (2/2): [26:34], 36:2.

12  אָבֶרֶךְ (7/7): [36:4], 10, 11, 12+, 15, 16.
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(2) Μαμβρή (2/10): 14:13, 24. Cf. Μαμβρή used for מְרֵא (8).


(10) Αἰγύπτιος (10/20): 12:12, 14; 16:1, 3; 21:9; 39:1, 2, 5; 43:32+. Cf. Αἰγύπτιος used for מְרֵא (9); שָנָב (1).

(2) Μαθουσάλ (2/2): 4:18+.

(5) Μαθουσάλα (5/5): 5:21, 22, 25, 26, 27.


(2) Νάχοβ (2/2): 36:13, 17.

(2) Νινευή (2/2): 10:11, 12.

(2) Νινδ (2/2): 10:8, 9.


(7) "Εβερ (7/7): 10:21, 24, 25; 11:14, 15, 16, 17.

(8) Αδά (8/8): 4:19, 20, 23; 36:2, 4, 10, 12, 16.

(3) "Οδόλαμψης (3/3): 38:1, 12, 20.


(3) "Αλάμ (3/3): 10:22; 14:1, 9.

(2) "Αίναν (2/2): 38:14, 21.

(2) "Γαδάδ (2/2): 4:18+.

(2) "Αχουμ (2/2): 36:38, 39.

(2) "Αμαλή (2/3): 36:12, 16. Cf. "Αμαλη used for מְרֵא (1).

(10) Γόμορρα (10/10): 10:19; 13:10; 14:2, 8, 10, 11; [18:16], 20; 19:24, 28.

(2) "Αονάν (2/7): 14:13; 24. Cf. "Αονάν used for מְר (5).


(5) "Ηρ (5/5): 38:3, 6, 7; 46:12+.

(81) "Ησαο (81/81): 25:25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34+; 26:34; 27:1, 5+, 6, 11, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38+, 41+, 42+; 28:5, 6, 8, 9; [29:1]; 32:4, 5, 6; 7, 9, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20; 33:1, 4, 9, 15, 16; 35:1, [7]; 29:36:1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8+, 9, 10++, 12+, 13, 14+, 15+, 17+, 18, 19, 40, 43.
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(3) Πετεφρῆς (3/5): 41:45, 50; 46:20. Cf. Πετεφρῆς used for פַּוִּיפֵר (2).

(2) Πετεφρῆς (2/5): 37:36; 39:1. Cf. Πετεφρῆς used for פַּוִּיפֵר (3).


(3) Σεβωίμ (3/3): 10:19; 14:2; 8.

(6) Σεβεγών (6/6): 36:2, 14, 20, 24+, 29.


(3) Σελλά (3/3): 4:19, 22, 23.

(2) Σωφάρ (2/2): 36:11, 15.


(2) Χεττούρα (2/2): 25:1, 4.

(16) Κάιν (16/16): 4:1, 2, 3, 5+, 6, 8+, 9, 13, 15+, 16, 17, 24, 25.

(12) Κανάν (12/12): 5:9, 10, 12, 13, 14; [10:22], [24:][+]; [11:12], [13:][+][+].

(3) Κενέζ (3/3): 36:11, 15, 42.


(34) Ρεβέκκα (34/34): 22:23; 24:15, 29, 30, 45, 51, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61+, 64, 67; 25:20, [21:][+], [26], 28; [26:7][+], 8, 35; 27:5, 6, 11, 15, 42, 46; 28:5; [29:1], 12; 35:8; 49:31.

(46) Ραχήλ (46/46): 29:6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18+, 20, 25, 28, 29, 30+, 31; 30:1+[+], 2, [5], 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 22, [23], 25; 31:4, 14, 19, 32, 33, 34; 33:1, 2, 7; 35:16, 19, 20, 24, 25; 46:19, 22, 25; 48:7.


(6) Ραγουήλ (6/6): [25:3]; 36:4, 10, 13, 17+[+].

(2) Ρεγμά (2/2): 10:7+[+].

(3) Σαουλ (3/3): 36:37, 38; 46:10.


(2) Σαῦ (2/2): 38:2; 12.


(12) Σουχέμ (12/16): 33:19; 34:2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 24, 26+. Cf. Σουχέμ used for שַׁבְּש (4).

(5) Σηλώμ (5/5): 38:5, 11, 14, 26; 46:12.


(2) Σομέ (2/2): 36:13, 17.


(4) Σεναάρ (4/5): 10:10; 11:2; 14:1, 9. Cf. Σεναάρ used for שִׂנְּאָב (1).

(7) Σήθ (7/7): 4:25, 26; 5:3, 4, 6, 7, 8.

(3) ἀλυκός (3/3): 14:3, 8, 10.

(2) Σαμαλά (2/2): 36:36, 37.

(37) Σάρρα (36/36): 17:15, 17, 19, 21; 18:6, 9, 10+, 11+, 12, 13, 14, 15; 20:2+, 14, 16, 18; 21:1+, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12; 23:1, 2+, 19; 24:36, [67]; 25:10, 12; 49:31.

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1:23:1).


(17) Σάρρα (17/18): 11:29, 30, 31; 12:5, 11, 17; 16:1, 2+, 3, 5, 6+, 8+; 17:15+. Cf. Σάρα used for הַרְרָא (1).

(2) Θαργάλ (2/2): 14:1, 9.

(2) Θσβέλ (2/3): 4:22+. Cf. Θσβέλ used for יִשְׁב (1).

(4) Θαμών (4/6): [25:3]; 36:11, 15, 42. Cf. Θαμών used for נָרְקָה (1); נְרָק (1).

(3) Θαμάν (3/6): 36:12, 22, 40. Cf. Θαμάν used for נָרְק (3).

(6) Θαμάρ (6/6): 38:6, 11+, 13, 24, [26].

(9) Θάρα (9/9): 11:24, 25, 26, 27+, 28, 31, 32+.

Main

(140) Αβραάμ (139/139): 17:5, 9, 15, 17, 18, [19], 22, 23+, 24, 26; 18:6, 7, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 27, 33+; 19:27, 29; 20:1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 14, [15], 17, 18, 21:2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, [30], [33], 34; 22:1+[+], 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11+, 13+, 14, 15, 19+, 20, 23; 23:2, 3, 5, 7, [8], 10, 12, 14, 16+, 18, 19, 20; 24:1+, 2, 6, 9, 12+, [14], 15, 27, 34, 42, [44], 48, 52, 59; 25:1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10+, 11, 12+, 19+; 26:1, 3, 5, 18+, 24+; 28:4+, 9, 13; 31:42, 53; 32:10; 35:12, 27; 48:15, 16; 49:30, 31; 50:13, 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>אֱדָוִם (12/13): 25:30; 32:4; 36:1, 8, 9, 17, 19, 21, 31, 32, 43+. Cf. אֱדָוִם used for יָשַׁשְׂ (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>입으므로 (1/1): 36:16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>אָדָם (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. אָדָם used for שֵׁׂעִיר (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. אֶמֹר used for אָדָם (18).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>אָדָם (2/2): 10:11, 22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. אָדָם used for אָדָם (18).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>בֵּאֵר לֶּהֶר (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּאֵר לֶּּהֶר used for שְׁאִי (69); אָדָם (25); בָּשָׂר (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>בֵּאֵר שֶבש (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּאֵר שֶבש used for בֵּאֵר שֶבש (11).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>בֵּל (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּל used for שַׁאָר (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>בֵּית־אֵל (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּית־אֵל used for בֵּית־אֵל (11).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>בִּלְע (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בִּלְע used for פְּלִׂשְּׁתִׂי (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>בֵּר (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּר used for בֵּר (2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>בֵּן (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּן used for בֵּן (10).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בֵּית־אֵל used for בֵּית־אֵל (3/3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בְּשָׂר used for בְּשָׂר (2/2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>בּוֹ (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. בּוֹ used for בּוֹ (3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Χορραίως (1/4): 34:2. Cf. Χορραίως used for ἔθνος (3).

17 ἔθνος


18 ἔθνος


19 ἔθνος

Χετταίος (1/9): 10:15. Cf. Χετταίος used for ἔθνος (8).
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 27:46).

20 ἔθνος

(167) κύριος (117/221): 2:8, 15, 16, 18, 22; 3:1, 8+, 9, 14, 21, 23; 4:3, 13; 9:26; 10:9; 11:5, 6, 8, 9; 12:1, 4, 7+, 8+, 13:4, 18; 15:1, 8, 18; 16:2, [8], 9, 10, 11+, 13; 17:1; 18:13, 17, 19+, 20, 22, 26, 33; 19:13+, 14, 16, 24+, 27, [29]; 20:18; 21:1+, 33; 22:11, 14+, 15, 16; 24:1, 3, 7, 12, 21, 26, 27+, 31, 35, 40, 42, 44, 48+, 50, 51, 52, 56; 25:21, 22, 23; 26:2, 12, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29; 27:7, 20, 27; 28:13+, 16, 21; 29:31, 32, 33, 35; 30:30; 31:3; 32:10; 38:7; 39:2, 3+, 5+, 21, 23+; 49:18. Cf. κύριος used for Θανάτος (78); ἐντολή (7); ἥρωα (2); ἔρως (1).

21 ἀνθρώπος

(162) Ἰωσὴφ (160/165): 30:24, 25; 33:2, 7; 35:24; 37:2+, 3, 5, 13, 17, 23+, 28++, 29, 31, 33; 39:1, 2, 4, 5, 6+, 7, 10, [11], 20, 21, 22; 40:3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 16, 18, 22, 23; 41:14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46+, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57; 42:3, 4, 6+, 7, 8, 9, 14, 23, [24], 25, 36; 43:15, 16, 17+, 18, 19, 25, 26, 30; [44:1], 2, 4, 14, 15, [17]; 45:1, 3+, 4+, 9, 16, 17, 21, 26, 27+, 28; 46:4, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31; 47:1, [3], 5, [6]++, 7, 11, 12, 14+, 15, 16, 17+, 20, [22], 23, 26, 29; 48:1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17[+], 18, 21; 49:22, 26; 50:1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 14, 15+, 16, 17+, 19, 22+, 23+, 24, 25, 26. Cf. Ἰωσὴφ used for ἀνθρώπος (4); ἀνθρώπος (1).
ἀνθρώπος (1/1,600): 48:15.
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:45).

22 ἀνθρώπος

(198) Ἰακὼβ (196/200): 25:26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33+, 34; 27:6, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22+, 30+, 36, 41+, 42, 46; 28:1, 5+, 6, 7, 10, 16, 18, [19], 20; 29:1+, 4, [7], 10+, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, [23], [25], 28, [32], [33]; 30:1+, 2, [3], 4, 5, 7, 9, [10]+, 12, 16, 17, 19, [23], 25, [29], 31, 36+, 37[+], 40, 41, 42; [31:1]+, 2, 3, 4, 11, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25+, 26, 29, 31, [32]+, 33, 36+, 43, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54; 32:2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, [9], 10, 19, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33; 33:1[+], 10, 17, 18; 34:1, 3, 5+, 6, 7+, 13, 19, 25, 27,
30; 35:1, 2, 4+, 6, 9, 10+, 14, 15, [16], 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29; 36:6; 37:1, 2, 34; 42:1, 29, 36; 45:25, 27; 46:2+, 5+, 6, 8+, 15, 18, 19, 22, 25, 26+, 27; 47:6, 7+, 8, 9, 10, 28+; 48:1, 2, 3, [9]; 49:1, 2, 7, 24, 33; 50:24. Cf. Ἰακώβ used for τ (2); בָּמָשִׂים (2).


“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 42:1).


αὐτός (1/1,600): 48:10.

“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 35:10, 21).

(4) Χούς (3/3): 10:6, 7, 8.


Χαναϊάδος (1/10): 36:2. Cf. Χαναϊάδος used for בָּמָשִׂים (9).


(4) Λοῦξα (2/3): [35:9]; 48:3.


εἰς + Λοῦξα (1/1): [35:6].

(3) Μωάβ (2/2): 19:37; 36:35.

Μωαβίτης (1/1): 19:37.


εἰς + Αἰγύπτιος (19/19): 12:10, 11, 14; 26:2; 37:25, 28; 39:1; 41:57; 45:4; 46:3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 26, 27; 47:6; 48:5; 50:14.

Αἰγύπτιος (9/20): 41:55, 56; 43:32; 45:2; 46:34; 47:15, 20+; 50:11. Cf. Αἰγύπτιος used for ἔρση (10); ἔρση (1).


“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 41:45, 56).
(30) נֹח (42/43): 5:29, 30, 32++; 6:8, 9++, 10, 13, 22; 7:1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13++, 15, 23; 8:1, 6, 11, [13]+, 15, 18, 20; 9:1, 8, [12], 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 28, 29; 10:1, 32. Cf. נֹח used for ו (1).
αὐτός (1/1,600): 7:9.

(31) Σόδομ (19/21): 10:19; 13:10, 12, 13; 14:2, 8, 10, 11, 12, [16], 17, 21, 22; 18:16, 20, 26; 19:1, 24, 28.

(32) סְדֹם (22) Σόδομα (19/21): 10:19; 13:10, 12, 13; 14:2, 8, 10, 11, 12, [16], 17, 21, 22; 18:16, 20, 26; 19:1, 24, 28.
eἰς + Σόδομ (1/1): 33:17.


(35) עֵדֶן (5) Ἐδεμ (3/3): 2:8, 10; 4:16.

Γέραπα (1/10): 26:8. Cf. גֶּרֶת used for ו (9).

(37) וַשָּׁעַר (11) Μεσοποταμία (2/13): 25:20; 31:18. Cf. Μεσοποταμία used for ως ἡ πόλις (1); Ἰορ (1).

(38) רְחֹבָה (97) Ραφαήλ (93/94): 12:15++, 17, 18, 20; 37:36; 39:1; 40:2, 7, 11++, 13++, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21; 41:1, 4, 7, 8++, 9, 10, 14++, 15, 16++, 17, 25++, [26], 28++, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44++, 45, 46++, 55++; 42:15, 16; 45:2, 8, 16++, 17, 21; 46:31, 33; 47:1, 2, 3++, 4, 5, [6]+, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20[+]+, 22++, 23, 24, 25, 26++; 50:4++, 6, 7.
Ἰωσήφ (1/165): 46:5. Cf. Ἰωσήφ used for Ἰωσὴφ (160); Ἰ (4).
αὐτός (1/1,600): 47:10.
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:33).

(39) דָּרֶךְ (7) Σήγωρ (5/6): 14:2, 8; 19:22, 30++.

(40) רְחֹבָה (2) Ρωμαῖοι (1/2): 36:37. Cf. 'Ρωμαῖοι used for רחובות (1).
eἵρυχωρία (1/1): 26:22.

(41) רָפָה (2) Ῥαφαὴλ (1/1): 15:20.
γίγας (1/6): 14:5. Cf. γίγας used for בנים (4); יַעֲקֹב (1).

eἰς + Ὁσἰμ (1/1): 37:14.

eἰς + Ἐσφ (2/2): 33:14, 16.

44 הָעָק (3) Θαμνά (1/6): 38:14. Cf. Θαμνά used for תִּמְּנָה (3).
eἰς + Θαμνά (2/2): 38:12, 13.

No main

1 אָרְם (4) Ἀράμ (2/3): 10:22, 23. Cf. Ἀράμ used for אָרְם (1).
Συρία (1/6): [48:7]. Cf. Συρία used for Ἀράμ (8).

2 צַהְר (3) Δαδάν (1/1): 10:7.
Δαδάν (2/2): 25:3+.

3 צַר (5) Ζάρε (2/2): 36:13, 17.


5 קַב (3) ἤρημος (1/11): 13:3. Cf. ἤρημος used for ἄφθορος (8).


7 שָׁבֵע (2) πόλις + Ἀρβάκ (1/1): 23:2.
pόλις + ὁ + πεδίον (1/1): 35:27.

8 שָׁב (3) Σαβά (2/3): 10:7; 25:3. Cf. Σαβά used for נַחְש (1).
Σαβεύ (1/1): 10:28.
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Common nouns

Hapaxlegomena

3. אֵּיָה ἄγαθος (1/6): 39:22. Cf. ἄγαθος used for ἄγαθος (2); ἄγαθος (2); ἀσέρ (2); ἀσέρ (2).
8. אָבִּיר ἱνώμα (1/1): 18:27.
9. אָבִּיר ἕνος (1/3): 35:4. Cf. τερέμνος used for Ἠ ἐν Καιν (1); τέκτον (1).
10. אָבִּיר ἕνος (1/1): 38:11.
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30 וּבֹה ἀσφαλὸς (1/1): 34:25.
31 וּבֹה τερέμυνδος (1/3): 43:11. Cf. τερέμυνδος used for פֶּרֶק (1); קְלֵל (1).
32 וּבֹה πένυος (1/7): 35:8. Cf. πένυος used for בָּבַל [מַעֲרִים (4); תִּבְנֵי (1); אֱלֹהִים (1).
33 וּבֹה κλαυμόδ (1/2): 45:2. Cf. κλαυμόδ used for בִּקְעָה (1); בָּכוּת (1); אָבֵל מִצְּר יִם (1).
34 וּבֹה πένυος (1/7): 50:4. Cf. πένυος used for בָּבַל [מַעֲרִים (4); תִּבְנֵי (1); אֱלֹהִים (1).
35 וּבֹה πορεῖον (1/1): 45:17.
37 וּבֹה דραχμή (1/1): 24:22.
38 וּבֹה πεδίον (1/19): 11:2. Cf. πεδίον used for נָשְׁר (16); שָׁם (1); קְרִית אָרֶב (1).
39 וּבֹה σίδηρος (1/1): 4:22.
40 וּבֹה παρθένος (1/7): 24:16. Cf. παρθένος used for הַנְּנָבִים (5); עֲקַלִּת (1).
41 וּבֹה αֹוֵד (1/1,600): [ז + בָּבַל + יִשְׂרָאֵל] (1): 15:10.
43 וּבֹה בְּיס (1/1): 30:11.
44 וּבֹה πειρατήριον (1/1): 49:19.
45 וּבֹה πειρατέρι (1/6): 15:9. Cf. πειρατέρι used for רָע (5).
46 וּבֹה σוֹמָה (1/5): 47:18. Cf. σωμά used for רָע (1); קְרֵי (1); שֵׁם (1).
53 וּבֹה ψόγος (1/1): 37:2.
54 וּבֹה μέλι (1/1): 43:11.
55 וּבֹה Ἰγίθος (1/3): 9:2. Cf. Ἰγίθος used for γίν (2).
57 וּבֹה καταστροφή (1/1): 19:29.
58 וּבֹה סטנָגמָו (1/1): 3:16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>σκηνή (1/17): 25:16. Cf. σκηνή used for אֹהֶל (13); סֻּכָה (2); תַּפָּר (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>δικαίωμα (1/1): 26:5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>καθήμ (1/2): 31:40. Cf. καθήμ used for ס (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>χονδρί (1/1): 40:16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>χονδρί (1/1): 45:6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>χονδρί (1/1): 45:6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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122 ר סגמה (1/1): 31:34.
125 כרל סקול (1/7): 49:11. Cf. סקול used for הֶלֶק (4); בֵּין (2).
127 כרל סטῦרάκινος (1/1): 30:37.
129 כרל קראיון (1/1): 30:37.
130 כרל λαμπάς (1/1): 15:17.
132 כרל δώρον (1/12): 24:53. Cf. δώρον used for ἐγκαθιστάναι (10); περ (1).
133 כרל ύπερασπίζω (1/1): 15:1.
136 כרל “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 45:23).
137 כרל δραμα (1/2): 15:1. Cf. δραμα used for μάρκα (1).
138 כרל ζωή (1/23): 45:5. Cf. ζωή used for φύς (20); ἄλη (1); ἥψη (1).
139 כרל επάύρην (1/1): 19:34.
140 כרל διανοομαί (1/3): 6:5.
141 כרל περισύρω (1/1): 30:37.
142 כרל θησαυρός (1/1): 43:23.
143 כרל στέγη (1/2): 8:13. Cf. στέγη used for בֶּן (1).
144 כרל ἐκ + αἰρέσις (1/1): 49:5.
145 כרל πλήθος (1/8): 48:19. Cf. πλήθος used for βρα (5); ἡμέρα (1).
146 כרל ἐφραμευθής (1/1): 42:23.
147 כרל ἀνάπαυσις (1/2): 8:9. Cf. ἀνάπαυσις used for ἱππος (1).
148 כרל ἀνάπαυσις (1/2): 49:15. Cf. ἀνάπαυσις used for θύμος (1).
149 כרל ἀνὴρ (1/51): 49:15. Cf. ἀνὴρ used for σως (48); שָׁמִי (1); בֵּן (1).
151 כרל κοπέτος (1/1): 50:10.
185 μέτρον μέτρον (1/2): 20:5. Cf. μέτρον used for δικαιοσύνη (5); ρύθμισ (3); πολιτεία (1).
187 οὐ πολιτεία (1/1): 25:34. Cf. πολιτεία used for πολιτεία (1).
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215 יֶשֶׁנ קאַטְרוּ (1/1): 15:17.
216 יְשָׁם פּלוּדָּש (1/1): 31:16.
218 רְבּוּנ סְוֹמָה (1/5): 15:11. Cf. סְוֹמָה used for בְּתֵי (1); שָׁנָּה (1); שֵׁן (1); דְּבֵית (1).
220 הֶלֶכֶּת לֶפִּּסְמוּ (1/1): 30:37.
221 אֵשֶׁת טְרָאָּמָה (1/1): 4:23.
222 רָחָּקָּה פִּלּוּסָּו (1/9): 41:36. Cf. פִּלּוּסָּו used for בָּשָׁר (8).
223 דֶּקְרַּס תֹּסַּרְוֶּחֶץ (1/1): 41:34.
225 אָרַּס אֲרֹּוָּקָו (1/2): 16:12.
226 נְפִי פְּרָאָּגָמָּס (1/1): 38:29.
228 יָפֶּפֶר "Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 18:5).
229 יָחַּר פָּלָּגָּו (1/1): 6:16.
231 הָלַּעֲקַּגֶּרְוֶּס גָּלֶּוֶּס (1/1): 216.
233 יָאָּרַּס אָנָטָּלָּלָּו (1/4): 19:25. Cf. אָנָטָּלָּלָּו used for רָח (2); חָדָּש (1).
234 יָנְבָּה "Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:23).
235 נְטָּרָּטוּ נֶטֶרָּט (1/3): 43:33. Cf. נֶטֶרָּט used for נְטָּרָּט (1); יִּשְׁעָ (1).
236 יָנְבָּה דְּרֵנֶו (1/6): [15:10]. Cf. דְּרֵנֶו used for שֵׁנ (4); שָׁנ (1).
239 יָנְבָּה כּוּפָּלָּס (1/1): 6:15.
242 יָנְבָּה בָּרָּס (1/1): 8:22.
244 יָנְבָּה דְּרַגָּמָּו (1/5): 41:47. Cf. דְּרַגָּמָּו used for הָר (4).

ψώχος (1/1): 8:22.

παγετός (1/1): 31:40.


 Cf. ἀμνός used for כֶשֶׂב (1);

 Cf. צֹאן (1);

 Cf. מֹנֶה (1).


 κλοιός (1/1): 41:42.

 Cf. ἁρμα used for מֶרְכָבָה (2).

 Cf. αἰσχρός used for מְרִׂיבָה (1).

 Cf. μάχη used for מְרִיבָה (1).

 Cf. מָרֵך (4).


πράσινος (1/1): 2:12.

Σαυή (1/2): 14:5. Cf. Σαυή used for יָש (1).

ἀναστρέφω (1/9): 49:22. Cf. ἀναστρέφω used for בוש (7); נב (1).

μουσική (1/1): 31:27.

τροφή (1/1): 49:27.

τρίτος + γενεά (1/1): 50:23.

δομα (1/112): 29:13. Cf. δομα used for שיש (110); כָּב (1).

ὀδούς (1/1): 49:12.

κριθή (1/1): 26:12.


κάρυον (1/1): 43:11.

βύσσινος (1/1): 41:42.

 Cf. φέρω used for בו (8); לַע (1); נש (1); יד (1); נט (1); יב (1).

 Cf. וְשַׁת used for בו (1).

 Cf. וֶּשָּׁת used for בו (1).

 Cf. וְשַׁת used for בו (1).
276 שָׂעִיר (1/6): 37:31. Cf. שָׂעִיר used for וַיְהַע (5).
278 σφαιρωτή (1/1): 14:23.
279 πῦρ (1/5): 11:3. Cf. πῦρ used for פֶּשֶׁת (4).
280 ἐλιξ (1/1): 49:11.
283 ἀρατος (1/1): 1:2.
285 νόμιμος (1/1): 26:5.
287 φαρέτρα (1/1): 27:3.
288 κλίβανος (1/1): 15:17.
290 τύμπανον (1/1): 31:27.

Consistent

1 בֵּן (4) πένθος (4/7): 27:41; 50:10, 11+. Cf. πένθος used for וַכָּה (1); בֵּן (1); אָבִּיל (1).
3 אָרוֹן (43) γῆ (43/360): 1:25; 2:5, 6, 7, 9, 19; 3:17, 19, 23; 4:2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 14; 5:29; 6:1, 7, 20; 7:4, 8, 23; 8:8, 13, 21; 9:2, 20; 12:3; 19:25; 28:14, 15; 47:18, 19++, 20, 22+, 23+, 26+. Cf. γῆ used for פָּדַר (307); קָפֵר (5); הָעָר (4); נַחֲלָה (1).
4 אָרוֹר (6) φῶς (6/6): 1:3+, 4+, 5, 18.
6 אָחי (2) ἄχι (2/2): 41:12, 18.
8 אָרוֹן (2) νήσος (2/2): 10:5, [32].
10 אָרוֹן (19) θεὸς (18/281): 14:18, 19, 20; 16:13; 17:1; 21:33; 28:3; 31:13; 35:1, 3, 11; 43:14; 48:3; 49:25++; [αἰών + θεός] (2); 33:20; 46:3++; [αἰών + θεός] (1): 14:22. Cf. θεὸς used for פָּדַר (211); פָּדַר (10); בָּשָׁל (2); פָּדוֹ (1); פָּדוֹ (1).
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 35:7).


(2) βάλλωνα (2/2): 35:8+.


(2) χρήστα (2/2): 38:14, 19.


(16) μάρτσιππος (16/17): 42:27, 28; 43:12, 18, 21+, 22, 23; 44:1+, 2, 8, 11+, 12, [13]. Cf. μάρτσιππος used for γνωστ (1).

(2) καταρράκτης (2/2): 7:11; 8:2.


(23) φρέαρ (23/32): 14:10++; 16:14; 21:19, 25, 30; 24:11, 20; 26:15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25; 32; 29:2++, 3+, 8, 10. Cf. φρέαρ used for γνωστ (11); πῦρ ἀνήλικον (1).


(5) στόχος (4/13): 41:35, 49; 42:3, 25. Cf. στόχος used for γνωστ (5); νῆσος (2); γῆ (2).

(16) "Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 45:31).


(8) κόφτο (6/7): 44:2, [4], [9], 12, 16, 17. “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 44:2, [4]).

(2) κύριος (2/221): 27:29, 37. Cf. κύριος used for γνωστ (133); κύριος (78); κύριος (7); κυρί (1).

(3) κυρίλλα (3/3): 16:4, 8, 9.


(2) νεῦρον (2/3): 32:33++. Cf. νεῦρον used for γνωστ (1).

(6) βουνός (6/9): 31:46++; 48, 51, 52++. Cf. βουνός used for γνωστ (2); βουνός (1).
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(14) παράδεισος (14/14): 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16; 3:1, 2, 3, 8+, 10, 23, 24; 13:10.
(3) ἄμπελος (3/3): 40:9, 10; 49:11.
(2) υπέρτος (2/3): 7:12; 8:2. Cf. υπέρτος used for μεσα (1).
(2) ἤχος (2/3): 1:26, 28. Cf. ἤχος used for δῆ (1).
(2) σῖτος (2/13): 27:28, 37. Cf. σῖτος used for ἐβρ (5); ἔλθε (2).
(8) γενεά (8/12): 6:9; 7:1; 9:12; 15:16; 17:7, 9, [10], 12. Cf. γενεὰ used for ἡμῖν (2); ἡμῶν (1); μῖς (1).
(3) θύρα (3/9): 19:6, 9, 10. Cf. θύρα used for ἁπάντα (6).
(2) βοτάνη (2/2): 1:11, 12.
(2) νεῦμα (2/4): 31:54; 46:1. Cf. νεῦμα used for ἀθράφ (2).
(2) πέργη (2/5): 34:31; 38:15. Cf. πέργη used for ἀπὸ (3).
(4) γῆρας (4/10): 21:2, 7; 37:3; 44:20. Cf. γῆρας used for ἐκβολή (5); ζώον (1).
Cf. θηρίον used for χι (1); τρώγ (1).
(2) γάλα (2/2): 18:8; 49:12.
(2) θυρίς (2/2): 8:6; 26:8.
(3) μερίς (3/7): 14:24+; 31:14. Cf. μερίς used for ἐπαύγει (3); ἕλεμος (1).
(2) πενθήμορος (2/2): 38:13, 25.
(2) ἀσφαλτος (2/3): 11:3; 14:10. Cf. ἀσφαλτος used for πᾶ (1).
(2) ἐξηγηθήκει (2/2): 41:8, 24.
(4) ἀγαθός (4/8): 24:10; 45:18, 20, 23. Cf. ἀγαθός used for τιμὴ (2); σοῦ (1); σῶ (1).
(3) ξηρός (3/4): 19+[+], 10. Cf. ξηρός used for ἑξαρά (1).
(5) περιστερά (5/6): 8:8, 9, 10, 11, 12. Cf. περιστερά used for ὑπό (1).
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(2) ἀγαθός (2/8): 47:6, 11. Cf. ἀγαθός used for שות (4); שובי (1); שובי (1).


(18) γένος (18/27): [1:11]+, 12+, 21+, 24++, 6:20++; 7:14+++. Cf. γένος used for ש (6);
מֶחֶל (1); וָיִּים (1).


(4) ἐργον (4/11): 2:2+, 3; 39:11. Cf. ἐργον used for מֶשֶׁת (5); בָּב (2).

(2) καταλου (2/2): 42:27; 43:21. Cf. καταλού used for מ (4); מָל (1).


(2) πόλεμος (2/2): 14:2, 8.

(2) βασιλεια (2/3): 10:10; 20:9. Cf. βασιλεια used for ש (1).

(2) κυριακ (2) 1:16+. Cf. κυριακ used for מֶשֶׁת (4); תַּחְּלָה (3); מֵשֶׁת (1); מִשֶּׁפֶחַ (1).


(2) ἀρχιμή (2/2): 34:30; 41:49.

(2) πην (2/2): 7:11; 8:2. Cf. πην used for מֶשֶׁת (9); רֵא (1); מֶשֶׁת (1).


(2) μικρός (2/2): 19:20+. Cf. μικρός used for מֶשֶׁת (8); מֶשֶׁת (2).

(7) ράβδος (7/11): 30:37+, 38, 39, 41++; 32:11. Cf. ράβδος used for מֶשֶׁת (2); מִשֶּׁפֶחַ (1); מֶשֶׁת (1).


(2) ἀρμα (2/3): 41:43; 46:29. Cf. ἀρμα used for מִשֶּׁפ (1).


(3) μερίς (3/7): 43:34++. Cf. μερίς used for מֶשֶׁת (3); מֶשֶׁת (1).


149 עין (2/2): 2:21, 22.
150 צְּפִּים (3/3): 24:22, 30, 47.
161 תְּחִלָה (3): ἀρχή (3/16): 1:1; 10:10; 49:3. Cf. ἀρχή used for "ἀρχή (4); ἑλλήνικα (3); ἡμικυκλικά (2); νομικά (1);" μετάφραση (1); νομικά (1); νομικά (1).
164 לֵיל (2): πρόβατον (2/59): 31:38; 32:15. Cf. πρόβατον used for ἡπιστεύειν (54); ἡπί (3).
169 לְקִי (9): στέρεωμα (9/9): 1:6, 7++, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20.
171 לְשׁו (2): ἐβδομάς (2/8): 29:27, 28. Cf. ἐβδομάς used for "ἐβδομάς (3); "ἐβδομάς (3).
172 לְשׁו (2): δρκος (2/12): 24:8; 26:3. Cf. δρκος used for "ἔβδομος (9); "ἔβδομος (1).
173 לְשׁו (10): στάχυς (10/10): 41:5, 6, 7++, 22, 23, 24++, 26, 27.
Main
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15+, 18+ [+], 24; 27:6, 9, 10 [+], 12, 14, 18+, 19, 22, 26, 30, 31++, 32, 34+, [36] [+], 38++, 39, 41+; [28]:2, [4], 7, 8, 13, 21; [29]:[+, 12++; 31:1++, 3, 5+, 6, 7, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, [29], 30, 35, 42, 53; [32]:10++; [33]:19; [34]:4, 6, 11, 13, 19; [35]:18, 22, 27; [36]:9, 24, 43; [37]:1, 2+, 4, 10+, 11, 12, 22, 32, 35; [38]:11++; [41]:51; [42]:13, 29, 32+, 35, 36, 37; [43]:2, 7, 8, 11, [23], 27, 28; [44]:17, 19, 20+, 22+, [24], 25, 27, 30, 31, 32+, 34++; [45]:3, 8, 9, 13+, 18, 19, 23+, 25, 27; [46]:1, 3, 5, 29, 31, 34; [47]:1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12+, 30; [48]:1, 9, 15, 16, 17+, 18+, 21; [49]:2, 4, 8, 25, 26, 28, 29; [50]:1, 2, 5+, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, [24]. Cf. πατήρ used for γ (1); ἰμ (1); ἔα (1).

πατρικές (1/1): [50]:8.


“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: [31]:53; [46]:31).

2 ἡμ (15) λίθος (13/13): 2:12; 11:3; 28:11, 18, 22; 29:2, 3+, 8, 10; 31:45, 46+.

λίθος (1/1): [35]:14.


3 ιν (82) κύριος (78/221): 18:3, 12, 27, 30, 31, 32; 19:2, 18; 20:4; 23:6, 11, 15; 24:9, 10+, 12+, 14, 18, 27++, 35, 36+, 37, 39, 42, [44], 48+, 49, 51, 54, 56, 65; 31:35; 32:5, 6, 19; 33:8, 13, 14+, 15; 39:2, 3, [4], 7, 8+, 16, 19, 20; 40:1, 7; 42:10, 30, 33; 43:20; 44:5, 7, 8, 9, 16+, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 33; 45:8, 9; 47:18+, 25. Cf. κύριος used for τῶν (133); ἤλθον (2); ὑπὲρ (1).


σύ (1/750): [44]:18.


5 ΕΝ (183) ἀδέλφως (178/179): 4:2, 8+, 9+, 10, 11, 21; 9:5, 22, 25; 10:21, 25; 12:5; 13:8, 11; 14:12, 13+, 14, 16; 16:12; 19:7; 20:5, 13, 16; 22:20, 21, 23; 24:15, 27, 29, 29, 48, 53, 55, 25:18, 26; 27:6, 11, 23, 29, 30, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45; 28:2, 5; 29:1, 4, 10++, 12, 15; 31:23, 25, 32, 37+, 46, 54; 32:4, 7, 12, 14, 18; [33]:1, 3, 9; 34:11, [14], 25; 35:1, 7; 36:6, 37:2, 4, 5, 8, 10+, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26+, 27+, 30; 38:1, 8+, 9+, 11, 9, 29, 30; 42:3, 4+, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21+, 28, 32, 33, 34+, 38; 43:3, 4, [5]+, 6, 7+, 13, 14, [16], 29+, 30; 44:14, 19, 20, 23, 26+, 33; 45:3, 4, 3+, 4+, 12, 14, 15+, 16, 17, 24; [46]:20, 31+; 47:1, 2, [3], 5, 6, 11, 12; 48:6, 19, 22; 49:5, 8, 26, 50:8, 14, 15, [22], 24. Cf. ἀδέλφως used for ὃ (1).


“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: [37]:9; [50]:18).
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13 זח (2) אֵל (1/1): 49:17.

§§ 1.8 (2: 31:42, 53).

Theos used for יהו (133); ציון (78); בר (2); וב (1).

"Omitted" (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 31:42, 53).

Theos used for יהו (133); ציון (78); בר (2); וב (1).

"Omitted" (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 31:42, 53).

Theos used for יהו (133); ציון (78); בר (2); וב (1).

"Omitted" (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 31:42, 53).
18
(23) κτήνος (21/45): 1:25, 26, [28]; 2:20; 3:14; 6:7, [19], 20; 7:2+, 8+, 14, 21, 23; 8:1, 17, 20; 9:10; 36:6; 47:18. Cf. κτήνος used for ἄγαλμα (16); ἄμα (7); σκύλος (1).


19
(9) λάβκος (7/8): 37:20, 22, 24, 28, 29+; 40:15.


20
(109) ὅκος (55/70): 7:1; 12:1, 5, 17; 17:23, 27; 18:19; 19:2, [10], 11; 20:13, 18; 24:7, 27, 28, 38, 40; 27:15; 28:17, 21, 22; 29:13; 30:30; 31:14, 30, 37; 34:19, 26, 30; 35:2; 36:6; 38:11+; 39:2, 4, 5++, [8], 16; 41:10, 40; 42:33; 43:18, 19+; 44:8; 45:2, 8, 16; 46:27, 31; 47:12, 24; 50:7. Cf. ὅκος used for ἀλόγο (9); ὄνος (1).

οἰκία (16/22): [17:12], 13; 19:3, 4; 24:2, 31; 31:41; 33:17; 34:29; 39:9, 11, 14; 43:16; 44:1, 4; 50:8. Cf. οἰκία used for ἄλογο (1); ἁ. (1).


πανοικία (2/2): 50:8, 22.


πρός (1/253): 44:14.


ὑπάρχω (1/17): 45:18. Cf. ὑπάρχω used for ἡμείς (5); ὑπάρχει (4); ἡ (2); θύμοι (1); κύριον (1); στὶς (1).

ὑός (1/341): 45:11. Cf. ὑός used for ἡμι (327); ὑός (4); διήλ (1); δεύτερον (1); τῷ (1); στὶς (1).


δ (1/4,832): 41:51.


“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 46:31).

21

προσβείον (1/1): 43:33.
€ + μοσχάριν (1/1): [רֶם + א + א] (1): 188.

24 בֵׁן (19) פַּרְו (18/19): 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23,
פַּרְו (1/1): 49:27.

25 תְּרִיב (27) דִּיאָב (26/26): 6:18; 9:9; 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17; 15:18; 17:2, 4, 7+, 9, 10, 11, 13+, 14, 19+, 21; 21:27; 32; 26:28; 31:44.

אָעָלָה (1/7): 12:2. Cf. אָעָלָה used for אָר (6).

אָדוּרָפַט (1/96): 6:13. Cf. אָדוּרָפַט used for אָדוּר (69); אָדוּר (25); אָדוּר (1).

28 בַּע (109) מְיָאָו (102/102): 5:4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 30; 61:1, 2, 4; 11:11, [13]+, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29; 19:8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 30+, 36; 24:3, 13, 23, 24, 37, [43], 47+, 48; 25:20; 26:34++; 27:46++; 28:1, 2, 6, 8, 9; 29:6, [9], 10, 16, 18, 23, 24, 28, 29; 30:21; 31:26, 28, 31, 41, 43++, 50+; 32:1; 34:1+, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9+, 16+, 17, 19, 21++; 36:2++, 3, 6, 14, 25, 39; 37:35; 38:2; 41:45, 50; 46:7+, 15+, 18, 20, 25.
עָיָס (1/341): 36:39. Cf. עָיָס used for צ (327); דַּל (4); דַּל (1); דַּל (1); דַּל (1);
“Omitted” (3): see §3.1.8 (2: 27:46; 38:12); §3.1.6 (1: 17:17).

פָּו (2/27): 11:11; 15:4. Cf. פָּו used for בְּרָמ (23); נְסָף (1); נְסָף (1).
לָגוֹ (2/622): 45:27; [בְּרָמ + יִשָּׁב] (1): 44:10. Cf. לָגו used for נָשָׁן (604); נָשָׁן (10); נָשָׁן (1); נָשָׁן (1).


\[\mu\delta\epsilon\iota + \alpha\delta\upsilon\upsilon\varsigma (1/1): 19:8.\]

\[\text{πρόσταγμα (1/3): 24:50. Cf. πρόσταγμα used for γραφέω (1); πρόσταγμα (1).}\]

\[\text{oùς (1/32): [\tau\nu + \iota + \nu + \nu + \nu] (1): 39:19. Cf. oùς used for τὸ (24); γὰρ (6); ἢ (1).}\]

\[\text{ἐπερώτησις (1/1): 43:7.}\]


“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 20:10; 37:14).

\[30\text{ סנאי (5) μανδραγόρας (4/5): 30:14, 15+, 16.}\]

\[\text{μήλων + μανδραγόρας (1/1): 30:14.}\]

\[31\text{ רוע (2) γνώσκω (1/38): 2:17. Cf. γνώσκω used for ὠρών (36); ἀναρ (1).}\]

\[\text{oία + γνωστός (1/1): 2:9.}\]

\[32\text{ דד (34) ἐδός (29/30): 3:24; 6:12; 16:7; [18:5], 19; 19:2; 24:21, 40, 42, 48, 56; [28:15],}\]

\[20; 30:36; 31:23; 32:2; 33:16; 35:3, 19; 38:16, 21; 42:25, 38; [44:29]; 45:21, 23, 24; 48:7; 49:17.}\n
\[\text{ἐὐδόκω (1/9): [ἦν + δό + ὑ] (1): 24:27. Cf. εὐδόκω used for ἐλεύθερον (6); ἡμέρα (1).}\]

\[\text{πάρενθες (1/1): 38:14.}\]

\[\text{καθά (1/1): 19:31.}\]

\[\text{κατά + έκαστός (1/1): 31:35.}\]

\[\text{ἐπίπλορος (1/2): 48:7. Cf. ἐπιπλορος used for τεῶρ (1).}\]

\[33\text{ ומכ (2) πολός (1/19): 17:5. Cf. πολός used for ἐπὶ (9); ἐπὶ (3); ἐπὶ (2); ἐπὶ (1); ἐπὶ (1); ἐπὶ (1).}\]

\[\text{πλήθος (1/8): 17:4. Cf. πλήθος used for ἐπὶ (5); ἄνθρωπος (1).}\]

\[34\text{ אֵל (22) ὑπάρχει (18/21): 7:19, 20; 8:4, 5; 10:30, 14:6; 19:30; 22:2, 14; 31:21, 23, 25+, 54+; 36:8, 9;}\]

\[49:26.]\n
\[\text{εἰς + ὑπάρχεις (3/3): 12:8; 19:17, 19.}\]

\[\text{εἰς + ὑπάρχει (1/1): 14:10.}\]

\[35\text{ בֵּן (9) χρυσόν (5/5): 2:11, 12; 13:2; 24:35; 44:8.}\]

\[\text{χρυσός (4/4): 24:22+, 53; 41:42. Cf. χρυσός used for σάρκα (2).}\]

\[36\text{ כֵּך (18) ὀρθή (13/13): 1:27; 5:2; 6:19, [20]; [7:2][+], 3[+], 9, 16; 17:14, 23; 34:24.}\]

\[\text{ἀρθρώμενος (5/5): 17:10, 12; 34:15, 22, 25.}\]


\[\text{used for ᾿σσύ (1); πόλη (1).}\]

\[\text{στέρμα (1/2): 1:29.}\]

\[38\text{ שֵׁר (11) μή (10/12): 7:11++; 8:4+, 5+, 13, 14++; 29:14.}\]

\[\text{τρίκυκλος (1/1): [שֵׁר + שֶׁר] (1): 38:24.}\]

40 חֵׁש (4) ἀμαρτία (2/6): 18:20; 50:17. Cf. ἀμαρτία used for ןש (1); חֵׁש (1); שׁש (1).
ἀμαρτάνω (1/7): 4:7. Cf. ἀμαρτάνω used for נטש (6).
ἀμάρτημα (1/1): 31:36.

ζω (2/74): 9:3; 27:46. Cf. ζῶ used for הרת (52); ית (20).
"Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 23:1).

42 חֵלֶק (34) ἐνόπτων (23/24): 37:5, 6, 8, 9+, 10, 20; 40:5++, 8, 9, 16; 41:7, 8, 11+, 15+, 25, 26, 32; 42:9. Cf. ἐνόπτων used for לֶח (1).
ἐνόπτως (8/10): 20:3, 6; 31:10, 11, 24; 40:9; 41:17, 22. Cf. ἐνόπτως used for רָק (2).
"Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (2: 41:12+).

ὑπολόγιον (1/1): 36:24.
χάλκος (1/41): 49:14. Cf. χάλκος used for בֶּש (32); בֶּש (6); הָרֹד (1); שֹוֶק (1).

44 סָק (4) ἀδικία (3/7): 6:11, 13; 49:5. Cf. ἀδικία used for שַׁפ (2); שׁפ (1); ית (1).
ἀδικέω (1/4): [* + σκότος] (1): 16:5. Cf. ἀδικέω used for רָש (1); שׁפ (1); נטש (1).


46 בָּרֶך (6) μάχαυρα (5/7): 27:40; 31:26; 34:25, 26; 48:22. Cf. μάχαυρα used for חֲנָם (2).


μετά (3/247); [τ, + τ] (3): 24:10; 43:12, 22.
πλατύς (2/3); [τ, + βραχίον] (2): [34:10], 21. Cf. πλατύς used for βραχίον (1).
φέρω (1/16); [τ, + τ] + μεσημβρία (1): 32:14. Cf. φέρω used for μεσημβρία (8); τοκή (1); ασήμ (1); δίμ (1); τάν (1); βασιλέα (1); τάση (1).
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2): 32:12; 48:17.

χρόνος (2/2): 26:1, 15.
βασιλεία (1/3): 14:1. Cf. βασιλεία used for κύριος (2).
“Omitted” (3): see §3.1.6 (3): 7:11; 8:4, 14.

50 παιδίον (12/32): 21:8, 14, 15, 16; 30:26; 32:23; 33:1, 2, 5++, 13; 44:20. Cf. παιδίον used for κύριος (1); νύξ (7); νύξ (1).
téchnon (2/21): 33:6; 7. Cf. τέχνη used for νύξ (18); τάση (1).
υἱός (1/341): 33:2. Cf. υἱός used for κύριος (327); τίλι (4); νύξ (1); τάση (1); τάση (1); τάση (1).


52 ἐν (2) ἐνάστημα (1/1): 7:23.
άμνος (1/4): 30:40. Cf. άμνος used for άνοι (1); χοιρί (1).


60 לֶחֶם (14) διάνοια (7/7): 8:21; 17:17; [24:15], 45; 27:41; 34:3; 45:26.


64 מָגוּר (4) βρῶσις (2/8): 2:9; 3:6. Cf. βρῶσις used for ἀίδι (3); ἄνω (1); κεφαλή (1).


66 מָגוּר (9) γενέσεις (2/15): 31:13; 32:10. Cf. γενέσεις used for γενεά (12); ζήλος (1).


68 בֵּית (7) ἀποστρήσκω (4/69): 25:11; 26:18; 27:7, 10. Cf. ἀποστρήσκω used for μεθί (63); μον (1); κράτος (1).
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69 מִשְׁפָחָה (44/45): 14:1++, 2+++++, 5, 8+++++, 9+++++, 10[+], 17++, 18, 21, 22; 17:6, 16; 20:2; 26:11, 8; 35:11; 36:31++; 39:20; 40:1+, 5, [17]; 41:46; [45:21]; [47:6]. Cf. הָשָּׁא (1).

67 מַשֶּׁה (1/1): 27:2.

teleutâ (1/6): 50:16. Cf. teleutâ used for_health (4); utens (1).

69 רָבָּה (45): מִשְׁפָחָה (44/45): 14:1++, 2+++++, 5, 8+++++, 9+++++, 10[+], 17++, 18, 21, 22; 17:6, 16; 20:2; 26:11, 8; 35:11; 36:31++; 39:20; 40:1+, 5, [17]; 41:46; [45:21]; [47:6]. Cf. הָשָּׁא (1).

68 בָּשָׂת (1/1): 27:2.

teleutâ (1/6): 50:16. Cf. teleutâ used for_health (4); utens (1).

69 מִשְׁפָחָה (44/45): 14:1++, 2+++++, 5, 8+++++, 9+++++, 10[+], 17++, 18, 21, 22; 17:6, 16; 20:2; 26:11, 8; 35:11; 36:31++; 39:20; 40:1+, 5, [17]; 41:46; [45:21]; [47:6]. Cf. הָשָּׁא (1).
78  נֵּכָר

79  הָרָה
(2) κλέφος (1/2): 48:6. Cf. κλέφος used for פָּשַׂן (1).

80  כְּנֶגֶד
(4) ἀλλότριος (3/4): 17:12; 35:2; 4. Cf. ἀλλότριος used for יָבִין (1).

81  יָבִין
(12); β (7); ש (1).
παις (4/95): 18:7; 22:3, 5, 19. Cf. παις used for בֶּן (85); דנְגֵד (3); שֵׂם (1);
נֵּכָר (1).

82  יַדְּרֶךְ
(9) παρθένος (5/7): 24:14, 16, 55; 34:3+. Cf. παρθένος used for דִּבְּרָה (1).
παις (3/95): 24:28, 57; 34:12. Cf. παις used for בֶּן (85); דנְגֵד (4); נֵּכָר (1);
נֵּכָר (1).

83  יָבִין
(43) ψυχή (41/42): 1:20, 21, 24, 30; 2:7, 19; 9:4, 5+, 10, 12, 15, 16; 12:5, 13; 17:14; 19:17, 19,
20; 23:8; 27:4, 19, 25, 31; 32:31; 34:3, 8; 35:21; 42:21; 44:30+; 46:15, 18, 22, 25,
26+, 27+; 49:6. Cf. ψυχή used for שָׁר (1).
ανήπ (1/51): 14:21. Cf. ανήπ used for שֵׂם (48); שֶׁם (1); ש (1).
σῶμα (1/5): 36:6. Cf. σῶμα used for רב (1); שְׁלֹשָׁה (1); ש (1); הַנְּתָן (1).

84  יָבִין

85  יָבִין

86  יָבִין
(93) παις (85/95): 9:25, 26, 27; 12:16; 14:15; 18:3, 5, [17]; 19:2, 19; 20:8, 14; 21:25; 24:2, 5,
9, 10, 14, 17, 34, 35, 52, 53, 59, 61, 65+, 66; 26:15, [18], 19, 25, 32; 30:43; 32:5, 6+,
11, 17+, 19, 21; 33:5, [8], 14; 39:17, 19; 40:20+; 41:10, 12, 37, 38; 42:10, 11, 13; 43:18,
18; 44:7, 9+, 10, 16, 17, 18+, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31+, 32, 33; 46:34; 47:3, 4+, 19,
21, 25; 50:2, 7. Cf. παις used for בֶּן (4); νυμμα (3); נֵּכָר (1); שֵׂם (1);
נֵּכָר (1).
πατὴρ (1/214): 26:24. Cf. πατὴρ used for בָּשָׁם (209); ש (1); בָּש (1).
θεραπεία (1/1): 45:16.
θεράπων (1/2): 50:17.
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(4) μάρτυς (1/2): 31:50. Cf. μάρτυς used for דַּבְּרַת (1).
μαρτυρεω (2/4): 31:48, 52. Cf. μαρτυρεω used for דַּבְּרַת (1); דַּבְּרַת (1).
μαρτύριον (1/2): 31:44. Cf. μαρτύριον used for דַּבְּרַת (1).

(2) μαρτύριον (1/2): 21:30. Cf. μαρτύριον used for דַּבְּרַת (1).
μαρτυρεω (1/4): 31:52. Cf. μαρτυρεω used for דַּבְּרַת (2); דַּבְּרַת (1).

(9) ποιμνιον (6/7): 29:2+, 3; 30:40; 32:17, 20. Cf. ποιμνιον used for נַשְׁ (1).
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 32:17).


(24) πετενδος (20/21): 1:20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 30; 2:19, 20; 6:7; 7:3[+], 8, 14, 21, 23; [8:1], 17, 19, 20; 40:17.

δρέον (4/6): 6:20; 9:2, 10; 40:19. Cf. δρέον used for רָעַם (1); רָע (1).

(2) δέρμα (1/1): 27:16.


“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 27:16).


παγη (7/13): 16:7+; 24:13, 29, 30, 42, 43. Cf. παγη used for παγ (2); παγ (1); μπροστάς (1).


πρόσωπον (1/65): 20:16. Cf. πρόσωπον used for πρά (58); πρά (6).


“Omitted” (7): see §3.1.1 (4: 45:5, 16+; 48:17); §3.1.8 (3: [32:2]; 33:1, 5).

(48) πόλις (47/59): 4:17+; 10:12; 11:4, 5, 8; 13:12; 18:24, 26, 28; 19:4, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 25+, 29+, [20:2]; 23:10, 18; 24:10, 11, 13, [43]; 26:33; 28:19; 33:18+; 34:20+, 24, 25, 27, 28, [29]; 35:5; 36:32, 35, 39; 41:35, 48+; 44:4. Cf. πόλις used for πα (3); ἀρά (2);
Omitted (1): see ξίφος (1).


λέγω (1/622): [45/21]. Cf. λέγω used for προσωπον (604); δείκνυ (1); άπειραν (1); κατὰ ρήμα (1).


πρό (5/16): [ἡμὺν + ὁ] (5): 13;10; 27;7; 10; 36;31; 50;16.


ἐπί (2/266): [ἡμὺν + ὁ] (2): 6;1; 7;3.


Cf. ἔνωτιον used for ἄρα ῥῆμα (1).


διά (2/44): [ἡμὺν + ὁ] (2): 2;7; 27;46.


παρά (1/52): [ἡμὺν + ἐν + ὁ] (1): 43;34.


“Omitted” (5): see §3.1.1 (4: 18;8; 24;33; 32;21; 46;28); §3.1.8 (1: 45;3).

106 ἐκφεύγω (3/7): 50;17+. Cf. ἐκφεύγω used for ἐκπήκω (3); ὁπέστρεφον (1); ὅστις (1).

ἐκφεύγω (1/1): 31;36.


ἐπὶ + ἔφη (2/2): 18;1; 19;11.

πρὸς + ἔφη (1/1): 18;10.

πρὸς + πρᾶσινου (1/1): 19;6.

διαιρέω (1/4): [ἡμὺν + ὁ] (1): 4;7. Cf. διαιρέω used for ὑπὸ (2); ἔφημον (1).

πύλη (1/5): 38;14. Cf. πύλη used for ἔφεσον (4).

ἐν + πυλοῦ (1/1): 43;19.

108 ὁμοίως (65) πρᾶσινου (54/59): 42;2; 4; 12;16; 13;5; 20;14; 21;27; 28; [29]; 24;35; 26;14; 27;9; 29;2; 3, 6, 7, 8, 9+[1], 10+[1]; 30;31; 32; 36, 38, 39+[1], 40+, 41+, 42; 31;8+, 10+, 12, 19, 38, 41; 32;6, 8; 33;13; 34;28; 37;2, 12, 14; 38;12, 13, 17; 45;10; 46;34; 47;3, 17; 50;8. Cf. πρᾶσινος used for ὑπὸ (3); ἔφημον (2).

κτήνος (7/45): 30;43; 31;43+; 33;13; 46;32; 47;1, 4. Cf. κτήνος used for ἐκπήκω (21); ἔπη (16); ἔπε (1).
רָבָּדָס (1/11): 30:38. Cf. רָבָּדָס used for בֵּין (7); בֵּית (2); בֵּית (1).
אֵמָנָו (1/4): 30:40. Cf. אֵמָנָו used for בֵּית (1); בֵּית (1); בֵּית (1).
פְּלִימוּנ (1/7): 31:4. Cf. פְּלִימוּנ used for רָע (6).

כּוֹסָא (1/1): 2:1.

(8) תֶּרֶךְ (7/7): 27:16, 40; 33:4; 41:42; 45:14++; 46:29.


(9) אָּנָּטָּל (8/11): 2:8; 10:30; 11:2; 12:8+; 13:11; 25:6; 29:1. Cf. אָּנָּטָּל used for הָר (2); בֵּית (1).

(4) סְעָנָגְו (3/5): 28:3; 35:11; 48:4. Cf. סְעָנָגְו used for מַקְּה (1); מַק (1).

כּוֹרָה (1/13): 6:13. Cf. כּוֹרָה used for רָּע (4); בֵּית (3); בֵּית (2); בֵּית (1).

(9) חֵוָל (2/6): 41:21++. Cf. חֵוָל used for רָע (2); בֵּית (1).

אִרֶךְ (4/16): 2:10; 40:13, 20+. Cf. אִרֶך used for הָר (3); הָר (3); הָר (2); קֶפֶּל (1); קֶפֶּל (1); בֵּית (1).

(5) פָּלָּבְּס (4/8): 16:10; 27:28; 30:30; 32:13. Cf. פָּלָּבְּס used for מַק (1); מַק (1).
פָּלָּבְּס + פָּלָּבְּס (1/1): 48:16.

מְנַמְּאָת (1/11): 49:10. Cf. מְנַמְּאָת used for מַק (9); מַק (1).
"Omitted" (2): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:4); §3.1.1 (1: 33:14).
“Omitted” (47): see §3.1.6 (46: 5:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31; 7:11; 9:28, 29; [11:13][+]+, [14], 15, 17, [18], 19, 21, [22], 25, 32; 12:4; 16:16; 17:1; 23:1+; 25:7+, 17+; 35:28; 47:28); §3.1.8 (1: 23:1).


129 דָּבָר (7) εὐθυγραμμία (6/6): 41:29, 33, 34, 47, [48], 53.

130 נַפְשָׁה (8) χείλος (6/6): 11:1, 6, 9; 22:17; 41:3, 17.


133 גֶּנֶסֶס (13) γένεσις (12/15): 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1, 32; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1, 9; 37:2. Cf. γένεσις used for מָלָל (2); דָּבָר (1).

134 בֶּלֶת (4) ἀρχή (3/16): 41:21; 43:18, 20. Cf. ἀρχή used for הבאת (4); תִּשְׁאָר (3); מְקַשֶּׁה (2); מַשְׁפֶּה (1); מַשְׁפֶּה (1); מַשְׁפֶּה (1).


No main

1 שָׂרָה (44) ἀνθρώπος (25/96): 1:26, 27; 2:5, 7, 8, 15, 18, 6:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7*; 7:21, 23; 8:21+; 9:5, 6+; 11:15; 16:12. Cf. ἀνθρώπος used for ζωή (69); ἐν (1); ἐν (1).

2 אַלְכָּה (23) σκηνῇ (12/17): 4:20; 12:8; 13:3, 5; 18:1, 2, 9, 10; 26:25; 31:25; 33:19; 35:21. Cf. σκηνῇ used for ἄνεμον (2); ὦν (1); ἄνεμον (1).


ἀνθρώπος (67/96): 2:24; 41:1; 6:4; 9:5; 11:3; 13:8; 13; 20:7, 8; 24:21, 22, 26, 29, 30+, 32, 43, 58, 61, 65; 25:27+; 26:11, 13, 31; 30:43; 32:25, 29; 34:14, 21, 22; 37:15+, 17, 28; 38:2, 22, 25; 41:33, 38, [39]; 42:11, 30, 33; 43:3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16+, 17+, 18, 19, [28], 33; 44:1, 3, 4, 15, 17, 26; 49:6. Cf. ἀνθρώπος used for ἀνθρώπος (25); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1).

ἀνθρώπος + γεωργός (1/1): 9; 20.

ἀνθρώπος + τίς (1/1): 38:1.


ἐκάτερος (1/1): 40:5.


ἐτέρος (1/17): 31:49. Cf. ἐτέρος used for ἀνα (13); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1).

παῖς (1/95): 39:14. Cf. παῖς used for ἄνθρωπος (85); ἀνα (4); ἀνα (1).


πᾶς (1/354): [ὁ + ἀνα] (1): 45:1. Cf. πᾶς used for ἄνθρωπος (349); νῦν (1); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1).

“Omitted” (7): see §3.1.8 (7: 39:11, 14; 40:5; 41:12; 43:17; 45:22; 47:20).

(4) βρῶσις (3/8): 1:29, 30; 9:3. Cf. βρῶσις used for ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1).


ἐξάω (1/24): [ὁ + οὐ + ἀνα] (1): 7:22. Cf. ἐξάω used for ἀνα (3); ἀνα (2); ἀνα (2); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1); ἀνα (1).

αὐτός (1/1,000): [ὁ + ἀνα + ἀνα] (1): 24:47.
θυμώ (1/4): [ץ + הד] (1): 30:2. Cf. θυμός used for רוח (2); משא (1).
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 44:18).

8 חותם (4) ἡμιόνος (2/2): 12:16; 45:23.

9 북 (4) γαστήρ (2/10): 25:23; 38:27. Cf. γαστήρ used for היה (4); קש (3); חספ (1).
χολία (2/6): 25:24; 30:2. Cf. χολία used for בכר (2); משא (1).

ἀνήρ (1/51): 20:3. Cf. ἀνήρ used for שְׁא (48); שיש (1); ש (1).
χύριος (1/221): 49:23. Cf. χύριος used for רוח (133); אַח (78); אָכָל (7); נבי (2).

11 בֶּל (3) γόν (2/2): 30:3; 48:12.
μηρός (1/11): 50:23. Cf. μηρός used for דיח (9); הים (1).

εἰσόδος (1/1): 30:27.

ἴδεα (1/1): 5:3.


15 חותם (2) σῶμα (1/5): 34:29. Cf. σῶμα used for פָּרֵך (1); יָשִׁי (1); ח (1); נִים (1).
ὕνταγος (1/3): 47:6. Cf. ὑνταγος used for ἐνέμ (1); בֵּל (1).

16 חותם (2) στέαρ (1/1): 4:4.
μυλός (1/1): 45:18.

17 חלתפ (2) δισσός (1/2): 45:22. Cf. δισσός used for משא (1).
ἐξαλλάσσω (1/1): 45:22.

18 חותם (2) καῦμα (1/2): 8:22. Cf. καῦμα used for בָּרָך (1).

19 חותם (12) δικαιοσύνη (5/10): 19:19; 20:13; 21:23; 24:27; 32:11. Cf. δικαιοσύνη used for נְדֵך (3); נְדֵך (1); מָנ (1).
ἔλεησσον (1/1): 47:29.

20 חותם (3) דֹּמָה (1/2): 47:22. Cf. דֹּמָה used for נְחָת (1).
δόσις (1/2): 47:22.
πρόσταγμα (1/3): 47:26. Cf. πρόσταγμα used for ἱκερ (1); ἱσχυρόν (1).

21 Μήθη (2): καλός (1/41): 44:4. Cf. καλός used for ἱππός (32); ἱππότης (6); θέμορος (1).

22 Να (7): ἀποσκευή (3/6): 34:29; 43:8; 46:5. Cf. ἀποσκευή used for ἱστός (3).

23 Γνώμη (2): λύπη (1/6): 42:38. Cf. λύπη used for ὁσμή (3); σἀββυν (1); κήρυκα (1).


25 Δέκτης (2): χλωρός (1/4): 1:30. Cf. χλωρός used for τὸ ἱππότης (1); λόθ (1).


29 Μεθοδεύσε (3): ράβδος (1/11): 47:31. Cf. ράβδος used for ἄλλης (7); σῶμα (2); ἄνοι (1).

30 Μικρότατος (2): ὑπάρχου (1/17): 24:59. Cf. ὑπάρχου used for μικρά (5); ἀρχισυνοχία (4); ἰδική (2); κτής (1); ψαλτήριον (1).

31 Μέγας (2): συναγωγή (1/5): [1:9]. Cf. συναγωγή used for ἄλλης (3); κύριος (1).


33 Μερήσας (11): ἰδεὸς (1/5): 29:29. Cf. ἰδεὸς used for ἱστός (2); μικρά (1); ἄλλης (1).
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(3) δεύτερος (1/18): 41:43. Cf. δεύτερος used for שָׁנָה (13); שלֹחָן (2); עם (1); שָׁר (1).

δισὺς (1/2): 43:12. Cf. δισύς used for שָׁנָה (1).

דיפלוס (1/7): 43:15. Cf. דיפלוס used for מַלְכָּה (6).

(3) χρίσις (2/4): 18:19, 25. Cf. χρίσις used for מַשֶּׁה (1).

ἀρχή (1/16): 40:13. Cf. ἀρχή used for אָסִיר (4); רָשָׁה (3); מַשֶּׁה (3); רַאשִׁית (2); שָׁנָה (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); מַשֶּׁה (1).

(3) ὁλοκ (2/2): 24:22+.


γάμος (1/1): 29:22.


(3) φάραγγ (2/3): 26:17, 19. Cf. φάραγγ used for מֶלֶך (1).


(2) νεότης (1/3): 8:21. Cf. νεότης used for לַעֲבָד (1); דָע (1).

παῖς (1/95): 46:34. Cf. παῖς used for בֶן (85); גָּז (4); שֶׁבֶם (3); אֵשׁ (1).

(4) θύσ (1/37): 17:20. Cf. θύσ used for יָרָה (25); בָּש (5); צֹּב (2); יָסַק (1); בָּש (1).


ἐρχόμεν (2/11): 25:16; 34:2. Cf. ἐρχόμεν used for שִׁלַּח (2); מַש (2); שֶׁב (1); שֶׁל (1); בָּש (1); דָּם (1).

(2) ἐργασία (1/1): 29:27.


ἀμαρτία (1/6): 15:16. Cf. ἀμαρτία used for מַש (2); מַש (1); מַש (1);

ἀνοίγε (1/1): 19:15.

ἀνακλά (1/7): 44:16. Cf. ἀνακλά used for מַש (3); מַש (2); מַש (1).

(9) χεῖρ (1/1): 2:7.
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κεφάλαιο (5/360): 3:14, 19+; 18:27; 26:15. Cf. γεγονός (307); ρέθη (43); χειμώνας (4); κοιμήθηκε (1).


46 קס (10) πρός (2/253): 8:11; 24:11.

καιρός (3/13): 18:10; 21:32; 38:1. Cf. καιρός used for μέρα (4); μέση (2); μέση (2); κλάση (1); κλάση (1).


47 קס (2) סף (1/8): 32:9. Cf. סף used for מים (4); מים (1); קס (1).


48 סף (10) וו (3/48): 2:23; 29:35; 46:30. Cf. וו used for קס (37); קס (1); קס (1); קס (1).

άπαξ (1/1): 18:32.

δευτερος (1/18): 27:36. Cf. δευτερος used for χρόνος (13); χρόνος (2); χρόνος (1); χρόνος (1).


καιρός (2/13): 29:34; 30:20. Cf. καιρός used for μέρα (4); μέρα (3); μέση (2); κλάση (1); κλάση (1).


49 חסר (5) δραστ (1/5): 40:5. Cf. δραστ used for μάρτυς (2); μάρτυς (1); μάρτυς (1).

διασφάσος + αύτός (1/1): 40:8.

σύγκρισις (2/2): 40:12, 18.

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:11).

50 חסר (3) בורה (1/9): 27:3. Cf. בורה used for דוע (8).


φωνή (1/27): 27:34. Cf. φωνή used for קול (23); קול (2); קול (1).

52 חסר (3) μνημείον (2/8): 35:20+. Cf. μνημείον used for קול (6).


53 חסר (2) φλάξ (1/2): 19:28. Cf. φλάξ used for קס (1).


54 חסר (2) ύπαρχει (1/17): 34:23. Cf. ύπαρχει used for קס (5); קס (2); קס (1); קס (1); קס (1).

κτάσμα (1/14): 36:6. Cf. κτάσμα used for קס (10); קס (2); קס (1).


59 מִּשְׁפָּחָה (2/3): 11:3. Cf. πλησίων used for ἄγαν (1).

60 קָחָה (10) κακός (2/2): 6:5; 31:52.


64 פָּרָה (15) εἰρήνη (2/2): 15:15; 26:29.

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 37:14).

(48) γῆ (4/360): 3:11, 14; 47:20, 24. Cf. γῆ used for ἑί (307); πέφ (5); εἰ (1).

πεδίον (16/19): [4:8]+; 24:63, 65; 25:29; 27:3; 5:29; 31:4; 34:5. 7, 28; 36:35; 37:7, 15; 41:48. Cf. πεδίον used for ἄμα (1); πέφ (1); γῆ (1).

ἀρχιν (1/11): 14:7. Cf. ἁρχιν used for ὅς (2); ἑί (2); γῆς (1); γῆς (1); πέφ (1);

(49) χώρα (1/9): 32:4. Cf. χώρα used for ᾿η (5); ᾿η (3).


(2) χιλιάρος (1/4): 2:5. Cf. χιλιάρος used for ᾿η (1); ᾿η (1).


στολή (4/7): 35:2; 41:14; 45:22+. Cf. στολή used for ἀγρ (2); ᾿η (1).

(25) ἁρχιστότολος (2/11): 12:15; 47:6. Cf. ἁρχιστότολος used for ἀν (2); ᾿η (2); ᾿η (1); ᾿η (1);


(4) ἀβυσσός (3/3): 1:2; 7:11; 8:2.

γῆ (1/360): 49:25. Cf. γῆ used for ἀη (307); ἀη (43); πέφ (5); ᾿η (4).

Adjectives

Hapaxlegomena

1 ἁπλόν (1/4): 37:35. Cf. ἁπλόν used for ἁρμ (2); ᾿η (1).

5 אָשֵׁׁם הַסֹּרוּ הָלַּע (1/25): 41:22. Cf. הַסֹּרוּ used for רָע (15); רָע (15); נָשָׁה (1); וָו (1).
7 אָשֵׁׁם χαροποι (1/1): 49:12.
8 אָשֵׁׁם πραμμάτα (1/1): 34:27.
9 אָשֵׁׁם λαίος (1/1): 27:11.
10 אָשֵׁׁם κάρφος (1/1): 8:11.
12 חָלָל χαροποι (1/1): 49:12.
13 חָלָל τραυματίας (1/1): 34:27.
14 חָלָל λεῖος (1/1): 27:11.
15 חָלָל κάρφος (1/1): 8:11.
16 חָלָל πικρός (1/1): 27:34.
17 חָלָל πικρός (1/1): 27:34.
18 חָלָל ἀλλότριος (1/4): 31:15. Cf. ἀλλότριος used for νέρ (3).
20 חָלָל πολύς (1/19): 18:18. Cf. πολύς used for ἔρ (9); ἐρ (9); ἐρ (9); ἐρ (9).
21 חָלָל γυμνός (1/5): 2:25. Cf. γυμνός used for ἐρ (3); ἐρ (1).
23 חָלָל ἀπεικόνισ (1/1): 15:2.
24 חָלָל ἀπερείματος (1/1): 17:14.
25 חָלָל ἀρχων (1/11): 40:26. Cf. ἀρχων used for ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2); ἔρ (2);
27 חָלָל κατάγκαυς (1/1): 6:16.

Consistent

1 בָכִׂיר πρέσβεις (5/20): 19:31, 33, 34, 37, 29:26. Cf. πρέσβεις used for ἐν (8); ἐν (4); ἐν (3).
2 בָרֹד σποδοειδής (2/3): 31:10, 12. Cf. σποδοειδής used for ἐν (1).
3 בָרֹד ἐκλεκτός (6/7): 41:2, 4, 5, 7, 18, 20. Cf. ἐκλεκτός used for Μεθύρ (1).
5 בָרֹד γίγας (4/6): 64:10, 8, 9. Cf. γίγας used for ἐν (1); ἐν (1).
6 בָרֹד λεπτός (6/10): 41:3, 4, 6, 7, 23, 24. Cf. λεπτός used for ἐν (3); ἐν (1).
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8 שׂ ר + ה (8) *καβαρός* (8/12): 7:2+, [3][+], 8+; 8:20+. Cf. *καβαρός* used for מֵת (2); נָקִי (1); נְפָנֵס (1).
9 רָחֹב [3] [4]: 22:2, 12, 16.
11 כ ב (5/7): 42:11, 19, 31, 33, 34. Cf. *εἰρηνικός* used for μὲν (1); ψάλτης (1).
13 קָד (2/17): 25:29, 30. Cf. *ἐκλείπω* used for ΝΣ (4); ἕβρος (2); ἅτε (2); ἄφες (2); ἄκηλεν (1); ἄχαρτος (1); ἀνάρχης (1).
14 גָד (3) [3/3]: 3:7, 10, 11. Cf. γαμνός used for πρόειρος (1); ηλιόπνοος (1).
19 פְּנֵי (2/7): 42:7, 30. Cf. *σκληρός* used for πρόειρος (2); τιτηρος (2); ἀτραχνής (1).
22 בֵנ (3) [3/10]: 41:19, 20, 27. Cf. *λεπτός* used for בֵנ (6); בֵנ (1).
23 מִשֶּׁר (4) [3/20]: 18:23[+], 25+.

Main

1 רָח (15) [17/17]: 4:25; 8:10, 12; 17:21; 26:21, 22; 29:19, 27, 30; 30:24; 37:9; 41:19; 43:22. Cf. *ἐτερος* used for χιλία (1); ὁ ἄρχων (1); ἡ φυσική (1).
    ἐλλάς (2/3): 41:3, [23].
2 מִנָּה (8) [1/1]: 40:17.
3 מַעַי (34) [25/35]: 1:16+; 21; 4:13; 10:12, 21; 12:2, 17; 15:12, 18; 17:20; 18:18; 19:11; 20:9; 21:8, [13], 18; 27:33, 34; 29:2, 16; 39:14; 45:7; 46:3; 50:10. Cf. *μέγας* used for μέγας (5); βάθος (2); νάρκη (2); κτέριον (1).
    πρόσβασις (4/20): 27:11, 15, 42; 44:12. Cf. *πρόσβασις* used for צָרֵא (8); κέκριτα (5); קְרָב (3).
    πολύς (3/19): 15:14; 29:7; 41:29. Cf. *πολύς* used for πολύς (9); μέγας (2); εἰρήνη (1); ἀνάρχης (1); μετά (1).
οὐ + ὑπερέχει (1/1); [חיים + ו + י] (1): 39:9.

πουνὴ (1/25): 39:9. Cf. πουνὴ used for ἃν (15); ἢ (3); ὅταν (1); ἢ (1).

4 חות (9) πρέσβις (8/20): 18:11; 19:4; 24:2; 35:29; 43:27; 44:20; 50:7+. Cf. πρέσβις used for ἄθετον (5); ἢ (4); ἢ (3).

5 חות (4) φαιάδος (3/3): 30:32, 33, 35.

πουκόλος (1/10): 30:40. Cf. πουκόλο used for ἄθετον (5); ἢ (3).


7 חות (41) καλός (32/41): 14; [8], 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31; 29+, 12, 17, 18; 35, 6, 22; 62; 15:15; 18:7; 24:16, 50; 25:8; 27:9; 30:20; 41:5, [20], 22, 24, 26+, 35; 49:15. Cf. καλός used for θῆκ (6); ἄθομος (1); ἢ (1).

καλός (1/2): 26:29. Cf. καλός used for θῆκ (1).


ὦραίος (1/5): 26:7. Cf. ὦραίος used for ἄθορμο (2); ἢ (2).

ἀγαθός (1/8): 29:19. Cf. ἀγαθός used for ἄθομο (4); ἢ (2); ἢ (1).


"Omitted" (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 31:24, 29).

8 חות (9) καλός (6/41): 12:14; 29:17; 39:6; 41:2, 4, 18. Cf. καλός used for ἄθομο (32); ἄθροισ (1); ἢ (1); ἢ (1).

ὦραίος (2/5): 29:17; 39:6. Cf. ὦραίος used for ἄθρομο (2); ἢ (1).


9 חות (9) ἐνισχύω (4/7): 12:10; 43:1; 47:4, 13. Cf. ἐνισχύω used for ἄθροισ (1); ἀθροισ (1).


μέγας (2/35): 50:9. Cf. μεγας used for ἄθροισ (25); ἑκάστη (1); ἤ (2); ἢ (1).


11 חות (11) μικρός (8/12): 24:17, 43; 26:10; 30:30; [42:2]; 43:2; 44:25; 47:9. Cf. μικρός used for ἄθροισ (2); ἢ (2).
(5) ὑπαρκός (4/4): 14:18, 19, 20, 22.


(8) μικρός (2/12): 19:11; 42:32. Cf. μικρός used for μικρός (8); μικρός (2).

(9) νέος (8/28): 19:31, 34, 35, 38; 29:26; 43:33; 48:14; [49:22]. Cf. νέος used for μικρός (13); μικρός (6); μικρός (1).

(10) ἐλαχίς (1/3): 25:23. Cf. ἐλαχίς used for μικρός (1); μικρός (1).


(12) πολύς (9/19): 13:6; 21:34; 24:25; 26:14; 30:43; 33:9; 36:7; 37:34; 50:20. Cf. πολύς used for πολύ (3); ἄρχον (2); ἄρχον (1); ἄρχον (1); ἄρχον (1); ἄρχον (1). πληθύνω (1/28): 6:5. Cf. πληθύνω used for πληθύνω (25); πληθύνω (1); πληθύνω (1).

(13) μέγας (1/35): 25:3. Cf. μέγας used for μεγάλος (25); μεγάλος (5); μεγάλος (2); μεγάλος (1).

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 7:11).

(14) παράσιως (15/25): 2:9, 17; 35, 22; 65:5; 8:21; 13:13; 28:8; 31:24; 29; 37:2, 20, 33; 38:7; 47:9. Cf. παράσιως used for παράσιον (3); παράσιον (3); παράσιον (1); παράσιον (1).


No main

(2) ἐσχήμα (1/3): 25:30. Cf. ἐσχήμα used for διάκοπτον (2).
Verbs

Hapaxlegomena

1 ἀπόλλυμι (1/10): [35:4]. Cf. ἀπόλλυμι used for פָּתַת (7); פֶּה (1); נֶשׁ (1).
2 πενθέω (1/4): 37:34. Cf. πενθέω used for לו (2); לֹא (1).
3 ἐπιστουδάζω (1/1): 19:15.
4 ημερίζομαι (1/1): 4:23.
5 δεσμεύω (1/2): 37:7. Cf. δεσμεύω used for מָסָר (1).
7 πέτσσω (1/1): 19:3.
8 ὑπολείπω (1/7): 27:36. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for מָתָא (3); מָשָׁה (1); שֶׁב (1).
10 μακαρίζω (1/1): 30:13.
11 ἐμπνέω + εἰμί (1/1): 34:30.
12. תָּרָאָסְו (1/6): 45:3. Cf. תָּרָאָסְו used for: whom (1); hedge (1); horse (1).
17. ἐκλείπω (1/17): 11:6. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for: gate (4); hedge (2); fence (2); through (2); and (1); succeed (1); to succeed (1).
18. בֶּרֶךְ (1/1): 24:11.
22. פֹּרְטִיוּ (1/20): 24:17. Cf. פֹּרְטִיוּ used for: she (18); speak (1).
24. בְּרָב (1/28): 48:16. Cf. בְּרָב used for: Bib (1); Bib (1).
25. וְזֵד (1/1): 6:3.
26. קְטָאָרַדָּה (1/5): 31:36. Cf. קְתָאָרַדָּה used for: screen (3); freight (1).
27. קְטָאָרַדָּה (1/5): 33:13. Cf. קְתָאָרַדָּה used for: screen (3); all (1).
29. גִּנְוַּא (1/20): 27:29. Cf. גִּנְוַּא used for: home (155); day (18); have (2); set (2); stand (1); stand (1); this (1); set (1); this (1); stay (1); stay (1); stay (1); stay (1).
30. בָּלַע (1/1): 12:15.
32. אֶפְָּרַדָּה (1/1): 30:20.
34. מַמָּס (1/1): 11:6. Cf. מַמָּס used for: time (6); hour (1); hour (1); hour (1); hour (1).
35. וְזִנָּת (1/1): 38:24.
36. תָּרָאָסְו (1/6): 40:6. Cf. תָּרָאָסְו used for: whom (1); fence (1); man (1); horse (1); herd (1).
37. אִנָּא (1/4): 32:32. Cf. אִנָּא used for: men (2); man (1).
38. מְלָכָה (1/1): 14:3.
40. פֶּלְָדָא (1/5): 45:20. Cf. פֶּלְָדָא used for: blessed (3); succeed (1).

42 שות ἀποπεμπτόω (1/2): 41:34. Cf. ἀποπεμπτόω used for שַׁחְת (1).

43 שתי ἔγκειμαι (1/2): 34:19. Cf. ἔγκειμαι used for רצח (1).

44 שתי ἥγεομαι (1/2): 49:10. Cf. ἥγεομαι used for רִזר (1).

45 שרח χαλκεύω (1/1): 4:22.

46 שרש προαιρέω (1/1): 34:8.

47 שרח ἐπιγαμβρεύω (1/1): 34:9.


50 שבל קบירה (1/1): 35:2.

51 שבל בολή (1/1): 21:16.


53 ש '"גיμίω (1/1): 45:17.

54 ש '"גμμβρεύω (1/1): 38:8.


57 ש '"יסחיμ (1/36): 31:51. Cf. ἱστημι used for θεῦτο (12); κόμ (7); ἱστ (7); ἱστ (3); κόμ (2); θεῦτ (2); θεῦτ (1).

58 ש '"ירκάω (1/3): 46:28. Cf. ναρκάω used for נַשֵׁה (1); מנו (1).

59 ש '"יסחיμ (1/5): 24:33. Cf. ναρκάω used for הָע (2); קות (1); יָצְר (1).

60 ש '"נ + πόνος (1/1): 34:25.

61 ש '"נ (1/1): 49:11.


63 ש '"נ (1/7): 47:18. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for תחכ (3); שֵׁם (1); נָצר (1); רָע (1).

64 ש '"נ (1/1): 18:15.

65 ש '"נ (1/1): 43:30.


68 ש '"נ (1/1): 11:3.

69 ש '"נ (1/7): 47:13. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for τα (4); נָצַר (2); וֹכֶה (2); נָצַר (2); וֹכֶה (2); וֹכֶה (1); נָצַר (1); ναρκάω (1).
ψηλαφοποίησε (1/4): 13:45. Cf. στερέωσα used for (1).
89  διαστείρισα (1/7): 9:19. Cf. διαστείρισα used for (5);
90  διαστέλλω (1/4): 30:28. Cf. διαστέλλω used for (2);
91  ἑπιλαμβάνομαι + ποιέω (1/1): 41:51.
92  συγκαθάσθηται (1/1): 15:11.
93  ἑστία (1/1): 23:12.
95  πονέω (1/1): 49:15.
97  ἑπικαλόπτω (1/3): 8:2. Cf. ἑπικαλόπτω used for (2).
98  στηρίζω (1/2): 27:37. Cf. στηρίζω used for (1).
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99 ἐσθίω (1/52): [ב מ + ב ו + מ ו] (1): 18:5. Cf. ἐσθίω used for ἰαμάλ (49); מַכְר (1); מַקְר (1).
100 לֵׁב (1/1): 33:13.
103 τίκτω (1/81): 30:42. Cf. τίκτω used for דָּל (80).
104 μισητός + ποιέω (1/1): 34:30.
106 ἐπιτίθημι (1/11): [44:13]. Cf. ἐπιτίθημι used for מ (6); מ (1); ר (1); נ (1); נ (1).
108 δυνάτος + γίνομαι (1/1): 26:16.
113 πλούτω (1/1): 14:23.
114 ἀδικέω (1/4): 26:20. Cf. ἀδικέω used for שָׁכ (1); שָׂכ (1).
115 ἐξίστημι (1/4): 45:26. Cf. ἐξίστημι used for דר (1); ש (1); ש (1).
117 ἐξοβρίζω (1/1): [49:4].
120 ταράσσω (1/6): 41:8. Cf. ταράσσω used for מָז (1); מ (1); מ (1); מ (1); מ (1).
121 χαίνω (1/1): 4:11.
122 ἐκλύω (1/1): 40:10.
123 ἐκλύω (1/2): 27:40. Cf. ἐκλύω used for מ (1).
125 ἐκδύω (1/1): 37:23.
126 πλατύνω (1/1): 9:27. Cf. πλατύνω used for ב (1); ב (1).
127 συναναστρέφω (1/1): 30:8.
128 ἐπισκάζω (1/1): 32:32.
129 ἐπιδιδομι (1/2): 31:49. Cf. ἐπιδιδομι used for נ (1).
131 ἄγιαξ (1/1): 2:3.
133 κόσμος προσοχθίζω (1/1): 27:46.
134 ἦττα ἴμανον + ἐγώ (1/1): 32:11.
136 ἐργίζω (1/4): 45:24. Cf. ἐργίζω used for ἄνθυμον (2); ἀρχή (1).
137 ἐπέβαλλε καθαρά (1/4): 27:40. Cf. καθαρέω used for ὕδρις (3).
138 ἔτρωπον πλατύνω (1/3): 26:12. Cf. πλατύνω used for θάνατος (1); μέτριον (1).
139 ἔπιφέρω ἐπίθετo (1/3): 1:2. Cf. ἐπιφέρω used for ἄριστον (1); ἀνάλυμα (1).
140 ἐπέβαλλε παραλογίζομαι (1/2): 29:25. Cf. παραλογίζομαι used for πάθος (1).
141 ἔβρα πεινάω (1/1): 41:55.
143 ἐβραίς σκιρτάω (1/1): 25:22.
146 ἔβραν κοπάζω (1/4): 8:1. Cf. κοπάζω used for καλλί (3).
147 ἔβραν ἀνταποδιδόμει (1/2): 44:4. Cf. ἀνταποδίδομει used for ἐπιστήμη (1).
148 ἔβραν ἐκτρίβω (1/7): 34:30. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for ἐπιστήμη (3); ἐπαίνει (1); ἔριμον (1).
149 ἔβραν δευτερόπ (1/1): 41:32.
152 ἐκκόπω (1/4): 21:23. Cf. ἐκκόπω used for λέον (1); ἀνάθεμα (1).
154 ἐκκόπω ἐκθεῖν (1/1): 40:11.
158 ἔκπρω (1/7): 32:29. Cf. ἐκπρῶ used for ἐπαύγει (4); ἔκπρω (1); ἔσκυξε (1).
159 ἔκπρω παρακρούω (1/1): 31:7.
160 ἔκπρω ἐξίστημι (1/4): 43:33. Cf. ἐξίστημι used for ἔρως (1); ἐπιστήμη (1); ἔπος (1).
Consistent

2. תח (3) ὀμοίω (3/3): 34:15, 22, 23.
4. אספס (2) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 47:15, 16. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for γού (4); κτείν (2); τὰς (2); τὰς (1); διέλθε (1); πέντε (1).
5. בקיל (5) διαχωρίζω (5/10): 1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for מָגר (3); מִס (1); יה (1).
7. בחר (2) ἐκλέγω (2/2): 6:2; 13:11.
8. בץ (2) φρόνιμος (2/3): 41:33, 39. Cf. φρόνιμος used for מַע (1).
11. בְּשֶׁ (4) ζητέω (4/5): 37:15, 16; 43:9, 30. Cf. ζητέω used for מָSnackBar (1).
12. בַּר (9) ἀποδιδράσκω (9/10): 16:6, 8; 27:43; 31:20, 21, 22, 27; 35:1, 7. Cf. ἀποδιδράσκω used for πִּל (1).
17. בַּר (2) ἀφαίρεω (2/7): 21:25; 31:31. Cf. ἀφαίρεω used for πάλ (2); ἔξω ἀστί (1); סו (1).
20. בַּר (2) ἥκω (2/2): 31:54; 46:1.
23. בַּר (2) ὠραίος (2/5): 29:6. Cf. ὠραίος used for מַע (2); סב (1).
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(8) ὄρύσσω (8/10): 21:30; 26:15, 18+, 19, 21, 22, 32. Cf. ὄρυσσω used for רָעָה (2).
(3) ἐρευνάω (3/5): [31:33], 35; 44:12. Cf. ἐρευνάω used for שׁחפ (2).
(2) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 8:13+. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for γινώ (4); κατ' ὅ (2); ἅμα (2); θύλ (1); δήλοι (1); καὶ (1); τὸς (1).
(2) παρασιωπάω (2/2): 24:21; 34:5.
(3) μιαίνω (3/4): 34:5, [13], 27. Cf. μιαίνω used for דְּחַל (1).
(2) κατακυριεύω (2/2): 1:28; [9:1].
(2) ὄρύσσω (2/10): 26:25; 50:5. Cf. ὄρυσσω used for רָעָה (8).
(2) ἀπάγω (2/6): 31:18, 26. Cf. ἀπάγω used for ἀσέρ (2); ἄσις (1); αὐτό (1).
(2) τρέμω (2/2): 4:12, 14.
(2) στένω (2/2): 4:12, 14.
(2) κόμπω (2/2): 23:2; 50:10.
(2) ἐμφράσσω (2/2): 26:15, 18.
(3) συγκλείω (3/3): 16:2; 20:18+.
(2) ἐκδέχομαι (2/2): 43:9; 44:32.
(5) διαστείρω (5/7): 10:18; 11:4, 8, 9; 49:7. Cf. διαστείρω used for μετά (1); πρὸς (1).
(2) λεπτίζω (2/3): 30:37, 38.
(2) συνάγω (2/15): 41:35, 49. Cf. συνάγω used for ἀσάς (7); κατοικία (2); κατά (2); κόσμος (1); λήστη (1).
(2) δικαιώ (2/2): 38:26; 44:16.
54 (3) θηρεύω (3/3): 27:3, 5, 33.
55 (2) συνάγω (2/15): 19+[+]. Cf. συνάγω used for אסף (7); קיבצ (2); כּבֶּר (2); כּוֹם (1); לָקֵט (1).
56 (3) γιλέω (3/3): 26:14; 30:1; 37:11.
57 (2) ὄργιζω (2/4): 40:2; 41:10. Cf. ὄργιζω used for ἀρχαίος (1); ὄργανον (1).
59 (2) ἀρχο (2/13): 1:26, 28. Cf. ἀρχο used for ἔπηλον (6); μετὰ (3); ἀλα (1); ἀλλά (1).
60 (2) ὀφραῖοναι (2/2): 8:21; 27:27.
   “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 24:32).
62 (3) καταπάυω (3/4): 2:2; 3; 8:22. Cf. καταπάυω used for הָלָל (1).
64 (2) θανάτω (2/2): 3:15+.
68 (2) μεθύσκω (2/2): 9:21; 43:34.
72 (20) πίνω (20/21): 9:21; 24:14+[+], 18, 19, 22, 44, 46+, 54; 25:34; 26:30; 27:25; 30:38++; [31:46], [54]; 43:34; 44:5. Cf. πίνω used for ἐκπερσθ (1).
73 (3) κρεμάννυμι (3/3): 40:19, 22; 41:13.

Main

2 (2) σκοραφάω (1/1): 13:12.
3 (3) χρονίζω (2/2): 32:5; 34:19.
   κατέχω (1/4): 24:56. Cf. κατέχω used for κατὼ (2); ἐν (1).
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(64) ἰσθίω (49/52): 2:16, 17++; 3:1, 2, 3, 5, 6[+], 11++, 12, 13, 14, 17++, 18, 19, 22; 6:21; 9:4; 14:24; 18:8; 19:3; 24:33++, 54; 25:34; 26:30; 27:4, 7, 10, 19, 25+, 31, 33; 28:20; 31:46, 54; 32:33; 37:25; 39:6; 40:19; 43:16; 45:18; 47:22; 49:27. Cf. ἵσθιο used for הָלַךְ (1); בָּלַךְ (1).


συνεσθίω (1/1): 43:32.

βρώσις (1/8): 2:16. Cf. βρώσις used for הָלַךְ (3); בָּלַךְ (2); בָּלַךְ (1).

κατάβρωσις (1/1): 31:15.

συγκαταβρωσις (1/1): 31:40.

μέλλω + ἀφιστάω (1/1): 43:25.

συνδειπνέω (1/1): 43:32.

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 47:24).

(617) λέγω (604/622): 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 2:16, 18, 23; 3:1++, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13++, 14, 16, 17, 22; 4:2, 6, 8, 9++, 10, 13, 15, 23, [25]; 5:29; 6:3, 7, 13; 7:1; 8:15, 21; 9:1, 8++, 12, 17, 25, 26; 10:9; 11:3, 4, 6; 12:1, 7, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19; 13:8, 14; 14:19, 21, 22, 23; 15:1; 2, 3, 4, 5++, 7, 8, 9, 13, 18; 16:2, 5, 6, 8++, 9, 10, 11, 13; 17:1, 3, 9, 15, 17++, 18, 19; 18:3, 5, 6, 9+, 10, 12, 13++, 15+, 17, 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29+, 30++, 31+, 32++; 19:2++, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 31, 34; 20:2[+], 3, 4, 5++, 6, 9, 10, 11++, 13++, 15, 16; 21:1, 6, 7, 10, 12++, 16, 17, 22++, 24, 26, 29, 30; 22:1++, 2++, 3, 5, 7++; 8, 9, 11++, 12, 14, 16, 20; 23:3, 5, 8, 10++; 14; 24:2, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14++, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33[+], 34, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58++, 60, 65++; 25:22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 33; 26:2++, 7+, 9++; 10, 11, 16, 22, 24, 27, 28+, 32; 27:1++, 2, 6++, 11, 13++, 18, 19, 20++, 21, 22, 24++, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32++, 33, 34, 35, 36++, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 46; 28:1, 6, 13, 16, 17, 20; 29:4++, 5++, 6++, 7, 8, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35; 30:1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15++, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31++, 34; 31:1, 3, 5, 8++, 11++, 12, 14, 16, 24, 26, 29++, 31++, [32], 35, 36, 43, 46, 48, 49, 51; 32:3, 5++, 7, 9, 10++, 13, 17, 18++, 19, 20, 21+, 27++, 29+, 30++, 31++, 5++, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13++, 15++; 34:+, 8, 11++, 12, 14, 20, 30, 31; 35:1, 2, 10, 11, 17; 37:6, 8, 9, 10, 13++; 14, 15, 16, 17++; 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 30, 32, 33, 35; 38:8, 11++, 13, 16++, 17++, 18, 21, 22++, 23, 24++, 25++, 26, 28, 29; 39:7, 8, 12, 14++, 17++, 19; 40:7, 8++, 9, 12, 16, 18; 41:9, 15++, 16, [17], 24, 25, 38, 39, 41, 44, 54, 55++; 42:1, 4, 7++, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16++, 18, 21++, 28++, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37++, 38; 43:2, 3++, 5[+], 6, 7++, 8, 11, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 27++, 28[+], 29++, 31; 44:1, 4+, 7, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32; 45:3, 4+, 9++, 16, 17++, 24, 26, 28; 46:2++, 3, 30, 31++, 33, 34; 47:1, 3++, 4++, 5+, [6], 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31; 48:2, 3, 4, 8, 9++, 11, 15, 18, 19, 20++, 21; 49:1, 29; 50:4++, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16++, 17, 18, 19, 24[+], 25. Cf. λέγω used for רָאָה (10); נָשָׁה (1); נָשָׁה (1); נָשָׁה (1).


φησί (1/1): 24:47.

φάσκω (1/1): 26:20.

λαλέω (1/64): 42:22. Cf. λαλέω used for רָבָר (62); עָבָר (1).
ἀναγγέλλω (1/17): 48:1. Cf. ἀναγγέλλω used for רְבָע (14); לְאִלָּחַ (1); בּוּשָׁה (1).


ἀπέρχομαι (3/27): 15:15; 31:18; 45:17. Cf. ἀπέρχομαι used for דָלָן (21); בּוּשָׁה (2).


ἀγω (10/13): 2:19, 22; 42:20, 34, 37; 43:9; 44:32; 46:7, 32; 47:17. Cf. ἄγω used for נְשׁוּ (1); דָּי (1).

ἐπάγω (5/7): 6:17; 18:19; 20:9; 26:10; 27:12. Cf. ἐπάγω used for מָסָר (1); עָבָר (1).

ἀπάγω (1/6): 42:19. Cf. ἀπάγω used for מָסָר (2); אָסִיר (2).

κατάγω (1/10): 37:28. Cf. κατάγω used for דָּי (9).

φέρω (9/16): 43:4, 4; 27:4, 7, 14; 30:14; 33:11; 43:2+; [ד + מִיר + בְּ + נְשׁוּ + גל] (1): 32:14. Cf. φέρω used for לְלָא (1); נְשׁוּ (1); דָּי (1); וְרִים (1); נְשׁוּ (1).


καταφέρω (1/1): 37:2.


ηγοῦ (8/10): 6:13; 42:7, 9; 45:16, 18; 46:31; 47:4, 5. Cf. ηγοῦ used for בּוּשָׁה (1); קִימ (1).


πορεύομαι (2/65): 24:62; 37:30. Cf. πορεύομαι used for לְלָא (61); נְשׁוּ (1); דָּי (1).

ὕστρια (2/2): 15:12, 17.

δῶ (1/1): 28:11.


κρύπτω (1/6): 31:20. Cf. κρύπτω used for אֹבָּה (2); סתר (2).


לֶגוֹ (10/622): 8:15; 18:5; 23:3, 13; 41:28; 42:14, 24; 44:2, 6; 45:27. Cf. λέγω used for מָרָא (604); מָשָׁה (1); מֶשֶׁכֶת (1); רָב (1).

אִנִּיתֶגָּוָּו (1/2): 24:50. Cf. אִנִּיתֶגָּו used for מָרָא (1).


18 תָּהָלְקִית (125) προερομαι (61/65): 2:14; 3:14; 8:3; 5:9; 23:11; 12:1; 12:4, 5, 9, 13, 16, 18; 21:19; 22:2, 3, 6, 8, 13, 19; 24:4, 5, 8, 10, 38, 39, 42, 58+, 61, 65; 25:22, 32; 26:1, 26; 27:5, 9, 13, 14; 28:5, 7, 9, 10, 15, 20; 29:1; 30:14; 31:30; 32:18; 33:12; 35:3, 22; 36:6; 37:12, 14, 17+; 25; 41:55; 42:38; 43:8; 45:24, 28. Cf. προερομαι used for ναό (2); ἠφο (1); ἔδρα (1).


πορεύομαι (1/1): [33:14].

ἀπέρχομαι (21/27): 14:11; 18:33; 19:2; 21:14, 16; [24:54], 55, 56, 61; 26:16, 17; 29:7; 30:25, 26; 32:1, 2; 34:17; 38:11, 19; 42:26, 33. Cf. ἀπέρχομαι used for ναό (3); ἀνά (2).


ἐξέρχομαι (1/54): 12:1. Cf. ἐξέρχομαι used for ναό (51); τῇμ (1).

εὐαστεῖο (6/7): 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15. Cf. εὐαστεῖο used for ῥήμα (1).


δεῦτε (2/3): 37:20, 27. Cf. δεῦτε used for ῥήμα (3).

περικατεῖο (2/2): 3:8, [10].


ἀπολύω (1/1): 15:2.


προβαίνω (1/3): 26:13. Cf. προβαίνω used for ναό (2).

ἀποδιδάσκαω (1/10): 28:2. Cf. ἀποδιδάσκαω used for ῥήμα (9).

ἐπιφέρω (1/3): 7:18. Cf. ἐπιφέρω used for ῥήμα (1); ἀνά (1).


“Omitted” (5): see §3.1.8 (4: 24:10; 26:13; 33:12; 45:17); §3.1.7.4 (1: 31:30).


29) חָלָה
(14) ἐνυψώτατος (6/6): 28:12; 37:5, 6, 9, 10; 41:5.

30) חָלָה

31) חָלָה

32) חָלָה
(3) ἐλαττονέω (2/2): 8:3, 5.

33) חָלָה
(2) διαφέω (1/4): 32:8. Cf. διαφέω used for βάρη (2).

34) חָלָה

35) חָלָה
(5) διάλευκος (4/8): 30:32, 33, 35+. Cf. διάλευκος used for δόξα (4).

36) חָלָה
(2) ἔρχω (1/13): 18:27. Cf. ἔρχω used for περί (6); μετά (3); θεῖο (2); αὐτό (1).

37) חָלָה

38) חָלָה
(22) δύναμαι (21/22): 13:6, 16; 15:5; 19:19, 22; 24:50; 29:8; 30:8; 31:35; 32:26; 34:14; 36:7; 37:4; 43:32; 44:1, 22, 26+; 45:1, 3; 48:10. Cf. δύναμαι used for ὑπήρξε (1).

דיע ServiceException (1/3): 32:29. Cf. דיע服务体系 used for ἔσοδον (1); ἔσοδον (1).
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41 ἵνα (5) ἐγείρω (2/3): 41:4, 7. Cf. ἐγείρω used for ὕπνος (1).


44 ἔφαγε (1/3): 13:7. Cf. ἔφαγε used for ἁμαρτεῖν (10); ἔφαγε (1).
אָנָפְלָרוֹ (1/3): 29:28. Cf. אָנָפְלָרוֹ used for נָר (1); שם (1).
אֶפִּיפִּלָמוּ (1/1): 42:25.
סוּטְטֶלָו (1/11): 29:27. Cf. סוּטְטֶלָו used for נַל (8); רֶע (1).
קאַטָּרָלוֹּו (1/1): 50:3.
(5) סְפָּרָיו (4/8): 19:17+, 20, 22. Cf. סְפָּרָיו used for נְפָלָת (1); דֶּת (1); הי (1).
אִֽֽו (1/24): 19:15. Cf. אָוּו used for דָּרָה (3); תַּח (2); רוּחַ (2); אֶל (1); יִשׁ (1); לָלִים (1); הָל (1); רָבָּה (1); נָרָה (1).
(12) אַנוֹבָּלֶטָה (1/13): 15:5. Cf. אַנוֹבָּלֶטָה used for נַשַּׁר (12).
דֵּינָמוֹ (1/5): 41:25. Cf. דֵּינָמוֹ used for נָרָה (3); לָרְדִּי (1).
אָתָּלָו (1/12): 12:17.
בּוֹדְלִיסְטוֹמָא (1/1): 26:29.
אָפָקָנוֹמָא (1/3): 28:12. Cf. אָפָקָנוֹמָא used for נַשַּׁר (1); נָשׁ (1).
אָפּוּסּוֹמָא (1/6): 19:9. Cf. אָפּוּסּוֹמָא used for נַשַּׁר (1); מְדִי (1); שֶׁמָּר (1); נְדָב (1); שֶׁמָּיִנָא (1).
(7) פּוּזְגָּו (6/6): 14:10+; 39:12, 13, 15, 18.
οἰωνισμός (2/2): 44:5, 15.
ἐξαιρέω (1/4): 35:5. Cf. ἐξαιρέω used for ἀνα (1); χωρ (1).
κυνέω (2/8): 11:2; 20:1. Cf. κυνέω used for ἐμπροσθίνω (5); προφήτη (1).
"Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 35:21).
σμιπίπτω (2/2): 4:5, 6.
ἐμπίπτω (1/1): 14:10.
ἐπιβάλλω (1/6): 2:21. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for τρίφυλλον (3); τό πολεμικὸν (1); ἄρση (1).
καταπήδω (1/1): 24:64.
κατοικέω (1/42): 25:18. Cf. κατοικέω used for τιμίον (33); ἄρτος (7); τὸ (1).
ἐπιστήμη (1/11): 43:18. Cf. ἐπιστήμη used for τὸ δεμένον (6); τῶν (1); οὕτως (1); τῷ (1).
"Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 50:18).
(12) ἵστημι (7/36): 18:2; 21:28, 29; 24:13; 33:20; 35:14, 20. Cf. ἵστημι used for ὑπέρ (12); κακό (7);
καταπήδω (1/1): 37:7.
ἀφαίρεω (2/7): 31:9, 16. Cf. ἀφαίρεω used for ἐκέρας (2); καταφερεῖ (1); ἀρετὴ (1).
σφίξω (1/8): 32:31. Cf. σφίξω used for μεῖσθαι (4); προσερχόμενος (1); ἐκεί (1).
(2) ἐκδικέω (1/2): 4:24.
ἐκδίκεω + παραλῦο (1/1): 4:15.
ὑπάκουο (1/6): 41:40. Cf. ὑπάκουο used for ἀκεφαλήσθη (5).
53+: 255, 6, 34; 263, 4; 27:17, 28; 28:4+, 13, 20, 22; 29:19+, 24, 26, [27], 28, 29; 30:4, 6, 9, 14, 18+, 28, 31+, 35; 31:7, 9; 32:17; 34:8, 9, 11, 12+, 14, 16, 21; 35:4, 12++; 38:9, 14, 16, 17, 18+, 26; 39:4, 8, 21, 22; 40:11, 13, 21; 41:45; 42:25, 27, 37; 43:14, 23, 24; 45:18, 21+, 22++; 46:18, 25; 47:11, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24; 48:4, 9, 22; 49:20. Cf. δίδωμι used for ἔχω (2).

ἀποδίδωμι (2/18): 30:26; 42:34. Cf. ἀποδίδωμι used for παρά (9); συν (6); ἔχω (1).

προσδίδωμι (1/1): 29:33.


τίθημι (12/27): 1:17; 9:13; 15:10; 17:2, 5, 6; 30:40; 40:3; 41:10, 48++; 42:30. Cf. τίθημι used for συν (12); ἔθησα (1); τίθημι (1); θημι (1).

παρατίθημι (1/5): 18:8. Cf. παρατίθημι used for συν (2); ἔθησα (1); ἔθησα (1).

περιτίθημι (1/4): 41:42. Cf. περιτίθημι used for συν (2); ἔθησα (1).

ἀφίημι (2/7): 20:6; 45:2. Cf. ἀφίημι used for συν (3); ἔθησα (1); ἔθησα (1).

ποιεώ (2/165): 27:37; 48:4. Cf. ποιεώ used for συν (138); συν (11); συν (9); συν (2); βαπτίζω (1); σύν (1); σύν (1).

καθίστημι (2/7): 41:41, 43. Cf. καθίστημι used for συν (3); σύν (1); σύν (1).

προεκφέρω (1/1): 38:28.

φέρω (1/16): 43:24. Cf. φέρω used for συν (8); ἔθησα (1); ἔθησα (1); ἔθησα (1); ἔθησα (1).

ἐμβάλλω (1/7): 39:20. Cf. ἐμβάλλω used for συν (5); σύν (1).

“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 23:11, 13).

75 סרח
(5) ἐμπορεύομαι (3/3): 34:10, 21; 42:34.


76 ספח
(4) ἀπόλλυμι (1/10): 18:24. Cf. ἀπόλλυμι used for τίθημι (7); τίθημι (1); συν (1).


77 ספח
(13) διναγώμαι (7/7): 24:66; 29:13; 37:9; 40:8, 9; 41:8, 12.


ἐξαριθμέω (1/3): 15:5. Cf. ἐξαριθμέω used for συν (2).

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 37:10).

78 עבד

καταδουλώ (1/1): [47:21].


γεωργός (1/2): 49:15. Cf. γεωργός used for συν (1).

79 עזר
(2) διαμαρτυρέω (1/1): 43:3.

diamaarturio (1/1): 43:3.

80 ערז
(11) καταλείπω (7/11): 2:24; 39:12, 13, 15, 18; 44:22+. Cf. καταλείπω used for συν (3); ἔχω (1).


ὀπολείπω (17/7): 50:8. Cf. ὀπολείπω used for τίθημι (3); συν (1); συν (1); συν (1).
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81 הָעָלָה (51) ἀναβάσαν (37/37): 2:6; 13:1; 17:22; 19:28, 30; 24:16; 26:23; 28:12; 31:10, 12; 32:27; 35:1, 3, 13; 38:12, 13; 41:2, 3, 5, 18, 19, 22, 27; 44:17, 24, 33, 34; 45:9, 25; 46:29, 31; 49:4+,
9: 50:5, 6, 7.

82 עָה (16) ἱστημι (12/36): 18:22; 19:17, 27; 24:30, 31; 29:35; 30:9; 41:1, 17, 46; 43:15; 47:7. Cf. ἱστημι used for ἐκ (7); ἔμμεν (7); ἐν (3); ὑψύχον (2); θύμησεν (1); ἡμέρα (1).

83 עָנָה (20) ἀποκαρμέναι (18/18): [18:9], 27; 23:5, 10, 14, 24:50; 27:37, 39; 31:14, 31, 36,
43; 34:13; 40:18; 41:16+; 42:22; 45:3.

84 עָנוּ (5) ταπεινῶ (3/4): 16:9; 31:50; 34:2. Cf. ταπεινῶ used for ἄνευ (1).

85 עָנָה (153) ποιῶ (138/165): 1:7, 11, 12, 16, 25, 26, 31; 2:2+, 3, 4, 18; 3:1, 7, 13, 14, 21; 4:10; 5:1; 6:6, 7, 14+, 15, 16+, 22+; 7:4, 5; 8:6, [13], 21:9; 26; 11:4, 6+; 12:2, 18; 13:4; 14:2; 18:5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 19, 25+; 19:3, 8, 19, 22; 20:5; 6, 9++, 10, 13; 21:1, 6, 8, 22, 23+, 26; 22:12, 16; 24:12, 14, [44], 49, 66; 26:10, 29, 30; 27:4, 7, 9, 14, 17, 19, 31, 37, 45; 28:15; 29:22, 25, 28; 30:30, 31; 31:1, 12, 16, 26, 43, 46; 32:11; 33:17; 34:7, 14, 19; 35:1, 3; 37:3; 38:10; 39:3, 9, 11, 19, 22, 23; 40:14, 15, 20; 41:25, 28, 32, 34, 47, 55; 42:18, 20, 28; 43:11, 17; 44:5, 7, 15, 17; 45:17, 21; 47:29, 30; 50:10, 12. Cf. ποιῶ used for ἵππος (11); ἄρα (9); ἄνω (2); ῶ (2); ὅ (2); ὁ (2); ὁ (1); ἄρα (1); οὖ (1); ἕστη (1).


γίνομαι (3/201): 42:25; 44:2; 50:20. Cf. γίνομαι used for ἱερὸς (155); δύναμις (18); ἔστω (2);
δύναται (2); ἐστὶν (1); ἔστω (1); τὸ πρῶτον (1); ἐστὶ (1); ἔστω (1); ἐστιν (1); ἐστιν (1).
(2) ἀποδεκατώ (1/1): 28:22.

86 וְשָׁר (2)

87 מָגְנָה (3)

88 מָנָה (2)

89 נָלָל (3)

90 פְּצָר (3)

91 פָּקָה (3)

92 פְּרָד (15)

93 פְּתָח (9)

94 פֶּרָח (9)

95 פּוּז (27)
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 49:29).

96 קָרָא (7) εὐφορία (6/9): 24:21, 40, 42, 56; 39:3, 23. Cf. εὐφορία used for רָע (1); נָתַן (1).

97 בָּאָמָר (28) βάπτισμο (26/27): 15:15; 23:4, 6+, 8, 11, 13, 15, 19; 25:9, 10; 35:19, 29; 47:29, 30; 49:29, 31++; 50:5+, 8, 7, [12], 13, 14. Cf. βάπτισμο used for נָשָׁה (1).


99 סָפַר (12) κτάομαι (10/14): 4:1; 25:10; 33:19; 39:1; 47:19, 20, 22, 23; 49:30; 50:13. Cf. κτάομαι used for רָע (2); נָשָׁה (1); קָרָא (1).


ἀπαντάω (1/3): 49:1. Cf. ἀπαντάω used for ἀπαντάω (1); ἀπαντάω (1).
συμβαίνω (2/5): 42:4, 38. Cf. συμβαίνω used for συμβαίνω (2); συμβαίνω (1).
ἀντιπρόσωπος (1/1): 15:10.


(103) ὁ ὑπεροράω (149) ὑπεροράω (130/144): 14, [8], [9], 9, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31, 2:19; 3:6; 6:2, 5, 12; 7:1; 8:5; [7], 8, 13; 9:14, 16, 22, 23; 11:5; 12:7, 12, 14, 15; 13:10, 14, 15; 16:4, 5, 13; 17:1; 18:1, 2,+,
21; 19:1, 28; 21:9, 16, 19; 22:4, 8, 13, 14+; 24:30, 63, 64; 26:2, 8, 24, 28+; 27:1; 28:6,
8; 29:2, 10, 31, 32; 30:1, 9; 31:2, 5, 10, 12+, [13], 42, 43, [50]+; [32:2], 3, 21, 26, 31, 33:1,
5, 10+; 34:2; 35:1, 9; 37:4, 14, 20, 25; 38:2, 14, 15; 39:13, 14; 40:6, 16[+]; 41:19, 22; 42:1,
7, 12, 27, 35; 43:3, 5, 16, 29; 44:23, 26, 28, 31, 34; 45:13, 27, 28; 46:29, 30; 48:3, 8,
17; 49:15; 50:11, 15, 25. Cf. ὑπεροράω used for ὑπεροράω (2); ὑπεροράω (1); ὑπεροράω (1).

ἰδοὺ (3/5): 12:1; 41:28; 48:11. Cf. ἰδοὺ used for ἰδοὺ (1); ἰδοὺ (1).
καταμανθάω (1/2): 34:1. Cf. καταμανθάω used for καταμανθάω (1).
οἶδα (1/17): 39:3. Cf. οἶδα used for οἶδα (15); οἶδα (1).
γινώσκω (1/38): 39:23. Cf. γινώσκω used for γινώσκω (36); γινώσκω (1).
σκέπτομαι (1/1): 41:33.
ραθμέω (1/1): 42:1.

(105) ἐπιλήθου (1/28): 18:20. Cf. ἐπιλήθου used for ἐπιλήθου (1); ἐπιλήθου (1).
πολεύς + γίνομαι (1/1): 6:1.

(106) κατάσκοπεύω (1/1): 42:30.
κατάσκοπεύω (6/6): 42:9, 11, 14, 16, 31, 34.

(107) καταδιώκω (3/5): 14:14; 31:23; 35:5. Cf. καταδιώκω used for καταδιώκω (1); καταδιώκω (1).
ἐκδιώκω (1/1): 14:15.
ἐπιδιώκω (1/1): 44:4.
ἐξέγω (1/17): 41:14. Cf. ἐξέγω used for ἦς (13); ἴστε (2); ἀνά (1).

(2) μακρόθεν (1/3): 21:16.
ἀπέχω + μακράν (1/1) 44:4.

(8) ύδρευ (6/6): 24:11, 19, 20, [43], 44, 45.


(5) καταλείπω (3/11): 7:23, 14:10; 42:38. Cf. καταλείπω used for ἔτη (7); ἐτή (1).
ὑπολείπω (1/7): 47:18. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for ῥάπτη (3); ἄνωθεν (1); ἄθιο (1);
προτείνω (1/9): 32:9. Cf. διεύθυντο used for ἔτη (13); ἑτή (2); ἀνέκδοτα (1).

(3) ἀκαμαλωτέοι (2/2): 14:14; 34:29.
ἀκαμαλωτίς (1/1) 31:26.

ἐξορκίζω (1/1): 24:3.

(67) ἀποστρέψω (23/25): 3:19; 14:16+; 15:16; 16:9; 18:33; 22:19; 24:5, 6, 8; 27:45; 28:15,
21; 31:3; 32:1; 33:16; 38:22; 43:12+, 18, 21; 44:8; 48:21. Cf. ἀποστρέψω used for ἐπ᾽ (1);
ῥέω (1).
ἀναστρέψω (7/9): 14:7, 17; 18:14; 22:5; 32:7; 37:29, 30. Cf. ἀναστρέψω used for ἀνέκδοτα (1);
ῥάπτη (1).
ὑποστρέψω (2/3): 8:9; 43:10.
οὔ + ὑποστρέψω (1/1) [ἀπετέλεσον + ἔτη] (1) 8:7.
ἐπαναστρέψω (1/1): 18:10.
ἀποδίδωμι (6/18): 20:7+, 14; 37:22; 42:25, 28. Cf. ἀποδίδωμι used for μερί (9); ἐτθέν (2); ὅρω (1).
ἐνδίδωμι (2/2): 8:3+.
ἀνταπόδωμο (1/1) 50:15.
ἀνταποδίδωμι (1/2) 50:15. Cf. ἀνταποδίδωμι used for ἐντεταγμένος (1).
ἀποκαθίστημι (4/5) 29:3; 40:13, 21; 41:13. Cf. ἀποκαθίστημι used for ἐπέστρεψε (1).
πάλιν (2/9): 26:18; 30:31. Cf. πάλιν used for ἀνέκδοτα (2); ἐτθέν (1).
βαδίζω + πάλιν (1/1) 44:25.
πάλιν + πορεύομαι (1/1) 43:2.
πάλιν + προσέρχομαι (1/1) 42:24.
ἀπέρχομαι (2/27): 3:19; 31:13. Cf. ἀπέρχομαι used for עשת (21); ינש (3).
ἐπανέρχομαι (1/1): 50:5.
ἀνάγω (1/2): 42:37. Cf. ἀνάγω used for שלח (1).
ἐπισυνάγω (1/2): 38:29. Cf. ἐπισυνάγω used for קרא (1).
καταβάζω (1/25): 43:13. Cf. καταβάζω used for דרי (23); שים (1).
ἀναγγέλλω (1/17): 37:14. Cf. ἀναγγέλλω used for נבג (14); פנוי (1).
ἐκοιμήθη (1/10): 18:10. Cf. ἐκοιμήθη used for חב (8); קיס (1).
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.7.4 (1: 24:5).

116 נשב (22) κοιμᾶω (20/27): 19:4, 32, 33+, 34+, 35+; 26:10; 28:11; 30:15, 16; 34:2, 7; 35:22; 39:7, 12, 14, [17]; 47:30. Cf. κοιμᾶω used for שלי (5); שים (1); רוח (1).

117 נשב (8) κατοικίζω (7/42): 9:27; 14:13; 16:12; 25:18; 26:2; 35:22; 49:13. Cf. κατοικίζω used for נשא (33); נס (1); נשא (1).

πέμπω (1/1): 27:42.
ἐπιβάλλω (1/6): 22:12. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for נש (3); ינש (1); נשא (1).
ἐπιφέρω (1/3): 37:22. Cf. ἐπιφέρω used for קפר (1); דלי (1).

ἐμβάλλω (1/7): 37:22. Cf. ἐμβάλλω used for נש (5); ינש (1).

120 שמש (64) ἀκοῦω (45/47): 3:8, 10, 17; 4:23; 11:7; 14:14; 18:10; 21:6, 12, 26; 23:6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16; 24:30, 52; 27:5, 6, 8, 34, 43; 28:7; 29:13, 33; 31:1; 34:5, 7; 35:22; 37:6, [17], 21, 27; 39:15, [18], 19; 41:15; 42:3, 23; 43:25; 45:2; [47:6]; 49:2.+
ἀκοῦω + σύ (1/1): 41:15.
ἀκουστὸς + γίνεμαι (1/1): 45:2.
diaβον (1/1): 45:16.


diaπερή (3/3): 17:9, 10; 37:11.

προσέχω (1/3): 24:6. Cf. προσέχω used for הוא (1); פרד (1).

diaπερή (1/2): [35:3]. Cf. diaπερή used for מִלּו (1).

122 ω (5/8): 16:5; 18:25; 19:9; 31:53. Cf. χρίνω used for דִּין (3); רְבִי (1).

χρίσ (1/4): 19:9. Cf. χρίσ used for מְשַׁע (2); מְשׁוּפ (1).

123 ω (19) ποτίζω (18/20): 26, 10; 19:32, 33, 34, 35; 21:19; 24:14, 18, 43, 45, 46+; 29:2, 3, 7, 8, 10. Cf. ποτίζω used for תָּקִשׁ (1); מְנַמ (1).


124 ω (2) μαθόω (1/1): 30:16.

σήμερον (1/23): 30:16. Cf. σήμερον used for מִשְׁמַע (18); מַה (2).


ὑπεναντίος (1/2): 24:60. Cf. ὑπεναντίος used for אֲב (1).

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 37:5).

126 ω (3) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 47:15, 18. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for מִשְׁמַע (4); חָרְב (2); κτίς (2); πάσα (2); בָּשׁ (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); בַּל (1); מָשַׁע (1).

ἐξέφρασα (1/54): 47:18. Cf. ἐξέφρασα used for אָפ (51); מִשְׁפ (1).


ἐξάγω (1/17): [20:13]. Cf. ἐξάγω used for מִשְׁפ (13); מְדִיר (2); מְד (1).

128 ω (2) ἐπιστάω (1/1): 39:12.


No main

1 ἀρ (2) ψολόω (1/1): 24:5.

θέλω (1/4): 24:8. Cf. θέλω used for מָא (3).

2 ἀρ (4) φαινέω (1/2): [1:14]. Cf. φαινεω used for רָצִיר (1).

διαφανέσκω (1/1): 44:3.

φαίνω (2/8): 1:15, 17. Cf. φαίνω used for מָש (3); מְרַח (1); מִשְׁכ (1).

3 ἀρ (4) κατέχω (1/4): 22:13. Cf. κατέχω used for מְשַׁר (2); מְר (1).


ἐγκτάσαι (1/1): 34:10.

χληρονομέω (1/10): 47:27. Cf. χληρονομεω used for מִש (9).
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4 אִסָּק (15) συνάγω (7/15): 6:21; 29:3, 7, 8, 22; 34:30; 49:1. Cf. συνάγω used for καθ (2); βορ (2); סומ (1); טֹל (1).

5 אָסָר (9) δεσμοῦτης (1/1): 39:20.

6 אָסָק (2) ἐγκρατείωμαι (1/1): 43:31.

7 בֶּקֶר (2) φήναμ (1/1): 7:11.

8 נָבָר (5) ἐπικρατέω (2/4): 7:18, 19. Cf. ἐπικρατέω used for μάχ (2).


10 תָּלֹם (2) γυμνόμαι (1/1): 9:21.


12 רְבָך (4) προσκαλέω (1/1): 2:24.


προσέχω (1/3): 34:3. Cf. προσέχω used for παρέχ (1).
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19 רז damning (2) ἐξίζωσι ἀπὸ (1/4): 27:33. Cf. ἐξίζωσι used for ἀντὶ (1); ἔμμεθ (1); פון (1).

20 רזים (12) λυπέω (1/2): 4:5. Cf. λυπέω used for קיים (1).


22 שרש (5) θηρίων (1/19): 37:33. Cf. θηρίων used for ἕτη (17); ὦ (1).

23 דידים (2) ἐξομηλογεόμαι (1/1): 29:35.

24 ביב (8) δεῦτε (3/5): 11:3, 4, 7. Cf. δεῦτε used for כְּלָה (2).


26 ביב (6) ἀλληλεύω (1/2): 20:16.
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(179) τίκτω (80/81): 3:16; 4:1, 2, 17, 20, 22, 25; 16:1, 2, 11, 15+, 16; 17:17, 19, 21; 18:13; 19:37, 38; 20:17; 21:2, 3, 7; 22:20, 23, 24; 24:15, 24, 36, 47; 25:2, 12, 24, 26; 29:32, 33, 34+, 35+; 30:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 39; 31:8+, 43; 34:1; 35:16, 17; 36:4+, 5, 12, 14; 38:3, 4, 5+, 27, 28; 41:50; 44:27; 46:15, 18, 20[+], [22], 25; 50:23. Cf. τίκτω used for ἐπικοινωνία (1).

tοκετός (1/1): 35:16.

gίνομαι (14/201): 4:18, 26; 6:1; 10:1, 21, 25; 21:3, 5, 9; 35:26; 36:5; 41:50; 46:27; 48:5. Cf. gίνομαι used for ἐπικοινωνία (155); ἰδέα (4); ἰδέα (3); ἰδέα (2); ἰδέα (1); ἰδέα (1); ἰδέα (1); ἰδέα (1); ἰδέα (1); ἰδέα (1).

gεννάω (77/77): 4:18++; 5:3, 4+, 6, 7+, 9, 10+, 12, 13+, 15, 16+, 18, 19+, 21, 22+, 25, 26+, 28, 30+, 32; 6:4, 10; 10:8, 13, 15, 24[+]+, 26; 11:10, 11+, 12, 13[+][+][+], 14, 15+, 16, 17+, 18, 19+, 20, 21+, 22, 23+, 24, 25+, 26, 27++; 17:20; 22:23; 25:3, 19; [46:20], [21]; 48:6. Cf. gίνομαι + νίκος (4/4): 17:17; 46:20[+], [21].

gένεσις (1/15): 40:20. Cf. γένεσις used for οὐκ ὄνομάν τι (12); μὴ μᾶλλον (2).


(5) παρατίθημι (1/5): 30:38. Cf. παρατίθημι used for ἐπικοινωνία (2); ὑπέταξα (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1).

καταλείπω (1/11): 33:15. Cf. καταλείπω used for ἐπικοινωνία (7); ἕρωτα (3).

ἔστημι (3/36): 43:9; [44:32]; 47:2. Cf. ἔστημι used for ἐπικοινωνία (12); ἐπικοινωνία (7); ἐπικοινωνία (2); ἐπικοινωνία (2); ἐπικοινωνία (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1).

(3) ὑπνών (1/1): 2:21.

κοιμᾶω (1/27): [41:21]. Cf. κοιμᾶω used for ἐπικοινωνία (20); ἐπικοινωνία (5); ἐπικοινωνία (1).

“Omitted” (1) see §3.1.8 (1: 41:5).

(3) μέγας (1/35): 18:20. Cf. μέγας used for ἐπικοινωνία (25); ἐνίοθεν (5); ἐπικοινωνία (2).

εἰμὶ + ἐνδοξος (1/1): 34:19.


(4) ἐκτρέφω (1/3): 45:11. Cf. ἐκτρέφω used for ἐπικοινωνία (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1).


στομοτρέφω (2/2): 47:12, [14].

(2) συνέχω (1/1): 8:2.


(19) συντελέω (8/11): 2:1, 2; 6:16; 17:22; 24:15, 45; 43:2; [49:5]. Cf. συντελέω used for ἐπικοινωνία (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1).


ἐκλείπω (1/17): 21:15. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for ἐπικοινωνία (4); ἐπικοινωνία (2); ἐπικοινωνία (2); ἐπικοινωνία (2); ἐπικοινωνία (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1).

πᾶς (1/354): 24:19. Cf. πᾶς used for ἐπικοινωνία (349); ἐπικοινωνία (1); ἐπικοινωνία (1).

ἀναλίστηκα (1/1): 41:30.
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(8) ἐπικαλύπτω (2/3): 7:19, 20. Cf. ἐπικαλύπτω used for σκότωσα (1).

συγκαλύπτω (1/1): 9:23.
kατακαλύπτω (1/1): 38:15.
κρύπτω (2/6): 18:17; 37:26. Cf. κρύπτω used for ἔκβαινον (2); σκότωσα (1).


(2) ἀσφαλτόω (1/1): 6:14.


(9) καταλύω (4/7): 19:22; 24:23, 25. Cf. καταλύω used for κόλπος (2); σκότωσα (1).

κοιμάω (5/27): 24:54; 28:11; 31:54; 32:14, 22. Cf. κοιμάω used for σκότωσα (20); ψω (1); ῥημ (1).

(2) συλλέγω (1/2): 31:46. Cf. συλλέγω used for λόγος (1).

συνάγω (1/15): 47:14. Cf. συνάγω used for ἀσέμνος (7); θύρα (2); κάμηλος (2); κόκος (2).


ἀρχων (2/11): 24:2; 45:8. Cf. ἀρχων used for δρόμος (2); ἀνθρώπος (1); σέληνος (1); θάλαττα (1).


(4) ψηλαφάω (2/3): 27:12, 22. Cf. ψηλαφάω used for μορφή (1).

ἐρευνάω (2/5): 31:34, 37. Cf. ἐρευνάω used for φύσις (3).

(2) ἐνισχύω (1/7): 33:14. Cf. ἐνισχύω used for κόπα (4); χωρίς (1).

ἐκτρέφω (1/3): 47:17. Cf. ἐκτρέφω used for ἀνήρ (1);

(4) τίθημι (1/27): 2:15. Cf. τίθημι used for τοιχώμενος (12); χώρα (12); σκέψις (1).


ἀφίημι (1/7): 42:33. Cf. ἀφίημι used for νήσος (3); κότος (2); ἀνήρ (1).

(9) διαναπαύομαι (1/1): 5:29.


ἀπειλέω (1/1): 27:42.

(9) ἱστημι (2/36): 12:8; 33:19. Cf. ἱστημι used for ἐπάθος (12); κόμος (7); ἴσα (3); ἴσα (2);

τέκμη (1); ἰσόν (1); ἱδρύμα (1).


ἐκκλίνω (1/4): 38:16. Cf. ἐκκλίνω used for σῶμα (2); ἄρθρο (1).
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ἀφικνέομαι (1/3): 38:1. Cf. ἀφικνέομαι used for ἐν (1); ἔσχη (1).

(12) ἀναίρεω (1/1): 4:15.
κοπή (1/1): 14:17.
ἐκκόπτω (2/2): 32:9; 36:35.
συγκόπτω (1/1): 34:30.

(2) καθαρὸς + εἰμί (1/1): 24:8.
ἀθρος + εἰμί (1/1): 24:41.

(48) προσφέρω (1/4): 4:7. Cf. προσφέρω used for ἀναβά (2); ἁγνύ (1).
φέρω (1/16): 36:7. Cf. φέρω used for ἀναβά (8); ἔφη (1); ἔσχη (1); ἔμειν (1); ἐποίηκεν (1).
ἀφήμι (3/7): 4:13; 18:26; 50:17. Cf. ἀφήμι used for ἔσχη (2); ἀναπά (1); ἔσχη (1).
ἐξαιρώ (1/4): 29:1. Cf. ἐξαιρώ used for ἐστὶ (1); ἔσχη (1).
βάω (1/5): 29:11. Cf. βάω used for ἐστὶ (3); ἐστὶ (1).
λαμβάνω (3/131): 21:18; 27:3; 31:17. Cf. λαμβάνω used for ἔφη (124); ἔρχεται (2); ἔσχη (1); ἐστὶ (1).
γέμω (1/1): 37:25.
ἐπιβάλλω (1/6): 39:7. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for ἐστὶ (3); ἔσχη (1).
ἀφαιρέω (1/7): 40:19. Cf. ἀφαιρέω used for ἔστη (2); ἔσχη (1); ἔστη (1).
ἐπιτίθημι (1/11): 42:26. Cf. ἐπιτίθημι used for ἐστὶ (6); ἔστη (1); ἔστη (1); ἐστὶ (1); ἐστὶ (1).
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 31:10).

εὐφράσκο (1/56): 44:6. Cf. εὐφράσκο used for ἐστὶ (54).
ἀφικνέομαι (1/3): 47:9. Cf. ἀφικνέομαι used for ἔννεπ (1); ἐν (1).


(4) ἀναπληρῶ (1/3): 2:21. Cf. ἀναπληρῶ used for ἔστη (1); ἐμφασίζω (1).


(2) παρατάσσω (1/1): 14:8.

(3) ἀφιστήμι (1/6): 12:8. Cf. ἀφιστήμι used for ἐμφασίζω (1); ἐν (1); ἔπη (1); ὥρ (1).

57 זכר
ἐπαχοῦ (1/9): 25:21. Cf. ἐπαχοῦ used for שמע (6); הער (2).

58 נבנש
(4) ἀποστρέφω (1/25): 18:22. Cf. ἀποστρέφω used for שוב (23); מָכַב (1).
ἐποιμάζω (1/5): 24:31. Cf. ἐποιμάζω used for יnbsp; (2); מַנ (2).

59 דכר
καβίστημι (3/7): 39:4, 5; 41:34. Cf. καβίστημι used for וnbsp; (2); שִׁית (1); שִׁמ (1).

60 וֹדֶר
(8) ἀφορίζω (2/2): 2:10; 10:5.
διαστείρω (1/7): 10:32. Cf. διαστείρω used for μַי (5); תֶּן (1).
διαχωρίζω (3/10): 13:9, 11, 14. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for בָּרִל (5); בָּר (1); שִׁית (1).
διαστέλλω (2/4): 25:23; 30:40. Cf. διαστέλλω used for נִב (1); סְר (1).

61 טרש
(4) πλατύνω (1/3): 28:14. Cf. πλατύνω used for גַּס (1);
αὐξάνω (1/19): 30:30. Cf. αὐξάνω used for חָר (15);
πλούτω (1/1): 30:43.
διακόπτω (1/1): 38:29.

62 צTk

63 נ Kg
(5) ἀνατέλλω (2/4): 2:5; 3:18. Cf. ἀνατέλλω used for וnbsp; (1);
ῥῆ (1).
ἀνφώ (2/2): 41:6, 23.

64 צק
(3) βοᾶω (1/5): 4:10. Cf. βοᾶω used for מָר (3); אש (1).
 rápב (1/3): 27:34. Cf. rápב used for אש (2).
ἐρᾶ (1/1): 41:55.

65 כבש
(3) συνάγω (2/15): 41:35, 48. Cf. συνάγω used for עֲסַף (7);
חָו (2); צבִּר (2); קָט (1); לָכֶה (1).

66 כדר
(3) εὐθόκεω (2/3): 24:26, 48. Cf. εὐθόκεω used for רצה (1).

67 כלק
(7) κοπάζω (3/4): [8:7], 8, 11. Cf. κοπάζω used for שְׁך (1).
καταράομαι (2/5): 8:31; [12:3]. Cf. καταράομαι used for מָר (3).
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68 ῥασ (4) εὐοδῶ (1/9): 24:12. Cf. εὐοδῶ used for ἔλεος (6); ῥάθη (1).

69 ὁστοκέω (1/1): 35:16.

70 ῥασ (4) ἐν + γαστήρ + λαμβάνω (1/2): 30:41.

71 ἱλασ (5) ἀσυνάξω (1/1): 4:7.

72 ῥομ (6) ψύχω (3/9): 7:17; 39:15, 18. Cf. ψύχω used for διά νή (4); νέμα (2).

73 ῥίμ (5) μαχημα (3/3): 26:20, 22; 31:36.

74 ἱκ (2) ἀριθμεύω (1/5): 14:14. Cf. ἀριθμεύω used for σφέρ (4).

75 ῥιβ (3) ἐπιβαίνω (1/1): 24:61.

76 ῥιβ (4) κτάομαι (2/14): 12:5; 46:6. Cf. κτάομαι used for κηνή (10); υψός (1); κῦκ (1).

77 ῥιμ (11) ἔρπετον (2/18): 1:31; 7:8. Cf. ἔρπετον used for σφέρ (14); σφέρ (2).
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βήσκω (5/5): 29:7, 9; 37:12, 16; 41:2.


τρέφω (1/3): 48:15. Cf. τρέφω used for מים (2).


(11) ταπεινώ (1/4): [15:13]. Cf. ταπεινώ used for רע (3).


πονηρός + συντελέω (1/1): 44:5.


σκληρός + εἰμί (1/1): 21:12.


(3) ιάσομαι (1/1): 20:17.

ἐνταφιασθῆς (2/2): 50:2+.


προμαχι (5/5): 42:2, 3, 10; 43:2, 20.

(19) φθείρω (1/1): 6:11.


ἐξαλέφ (1/4): 9:15. Cf. ἐξαλέφ used for רע (3).


ἀπόλλυμι (7/10): 18:28+, [29], [30], 31, 32; 19:13. Cf. ἀπόλλυμι used for שָׁמָּה (1); רֹע (1); רע (1).

ἐκτίβω (3/7): 19:13, 14, 29. Cf. ἐκτίβω used for שָׁמָּה (1); רֹע (1); רע (1).


(8) τίθημι (1/27): 31:15. Cf. τίθημι used for גָּאָה (12); שָׁמָּה (12); פִּדָּה (1); אָסַף (1).

ἐξανίστημι (1/5): 4:25. Cf. ἐξανίστημι used for קום (2); מִדָּה (2).

καθίστημι (1/7): 41:33. Cf. καθίστημι used for פֶּסֶד (3); גָּאָה (2); שָׁמָּה (1).

διαχωρίζω (1/10): 30:40. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for בְּבִיל (5); פִּדָּה (3); נָשָּׁה (1).

μήγιστο (1/1): 30:40.

ἐπιβάλλω (3/6): 46:4; 48:14, 17. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for נָפָל (1); נָשָּׁה (1); נָשָּׁה (1).


(2) ἐφορᾶ (1/2): 4:4. Cf. ἐφορᾶ used for ἔρχομαι (1).

προσέχω (1/3): 45. Cf. προσέχω used for שָׁמָּה (1); רע (1).
86 (3) καταβλέπω (1/1): 18:16.
παρακάμπτω (1/1): 26:8.

87 (4) ἐξάγω (2/17): 1:20, 21. Cf. ἐξάγω used for ἐκατέρ (13); ἔρχομαι (1).
κινέω (1/8): 7:21. Cf. κινέω used for ἐρχόμενος (5); ἔστη (2).

88 (2) εὐαρέστετο (1/7): 39:4. Cf. εὐαρέστετο used for ἔυλος (6).
παρίστημι (1/4): 40:4. Cf. παρίστημι used for ἑμείς (2); ἔμμε (1).

89 (3) ἐγκύτω (1/1): 27:41.
μνησκυκλώ (1/1): 50:15.

90 (48) τίθημι (12/27): 2:8; 4:15; 24:2; 9; 28:11; 30:41; 42; 31:37; 32:26; 47:26; 48:20; 50:26. Cf. τίθημι used for ἐστάς (12); ἔστη (1); ἑβαρέ (1).
περιτίθημι (2/4): 24:47; 41:42. Cf. περιτίθημι used for ἢλθεῖν (1); ἔστη (1).
παραπεριτίθημι (2/5): 43:31; 32. Cf. παραπεριτίθημι used for ἐστάσας (1); ἔστη (1); ἐφεξής (1).
τάσσω (1/1): [3:24].
ποιέω (11/165): 6:16; 13:16; 21:13, 18; 27:37; 32:17; 33:2; 45:8; 9; 46:3; 48:20. Cf. ποιέω used for ἔστησα (138); ἔστησε (9); ἔστησα (2); ἔστησέν (2); ὅτι ἐστάται (1); ἔστη (1).
ἴστημι (2/36): 28:18, 22. Cf. ἴστημι used for ἑστήκε (12); ἔστη (7); ἔστη (3); ἔστη (2); ἐστάσας (1); ἔστη (1).
ἀφίστημι (1/6): 30:36. Cf. ἀφίστημι used for ἔστη (1); ἔστη (1); ἐστή (1); ἐστῆ (1).
καθίστημι (1/7): 47:6. Cf. καθίστημι used for σταθήκε (3); ἔστη (2); ἔστη (1).
ἐμβάλλω (5/7): 31:34; 40:15; 43:22; 44:1, 2. Cf. ἐμβάλλω used for ἔστησε (1); ἔστη (1).
ὑπολείπω (1/7): 45:7. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for ἔστη (3); ἔστησε (1); ἔστησε (1).
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