

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE POETICS OF TRANSLATION IN GREEK GENESIS AND THE VIRTUOUS  
PLOT

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
JAMES ROBERT COVINGTON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MARCH 2019

For Allison

# Table of Contents

|                                                |           |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Acknowledgements .....                         | xii       |
| List of Tables.....                            | xiv       |
| Abstract .....                                 | xv        |
| <br>                                           |           |
| <b>1 Introduction.....</b>                     | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Context .....                              | 1         |
| 1.2 Thesis .....                               | 4         |
| 1.3 Argument.....                              | 8         |
| 1.4 Method .....                               | 11        |
| 1.5 Caveats .....                              | 15        |
| <br>                                           |           |
| <b>Part I .....</b>                            | <b>18</b> |
| <br>                                           |           |
| <b>2 Textual Issues .....</b>                  | <b>19</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction to Part I.....                | 19        |
| 2.2 Critical Texts: G and his Vorlage (V)..... | 28        |
| 2.2.1 Quantitative Variants.....               | 35        |

|          |                                                            |           |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.2.2    | Qualitative Variants (69).....                             | 40        |
| 2.3      | Digital Texts: Data Sources Used in This Dissertation..... | 41        |
| 2.3.1    | The Digital Text of G.....                                 | 42        |
| 2.3.2    | The Digital Text of V.....                                 | 43        |
| 2.3.3    | Textual Alignment of G and V .....                         | 44        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Quantitative Equivalence .....</b>                      | <b>48</b> |
| 3.1      | Omitted Hebrew tokens (3,010) .....                        | 51        |
| 3.1.1    | Prepositions (1,541).....                                  | 51        |
| 3.1.2    | Conjunctions (483).....                                    | 58        |
| 3.1.3    | Pronominal suffixes (247) .....                            | 64        |
| 3.1.4    | Definite article (235).....                                | 68        |
| 3.1.5    | Particles (118).....                                       | 71        |
| 3.1.6    | Nouns in date and age formulae (58).....                   | 74        |
| 3.1.7    | Other commonly omitted elements (101) .....                | 75        |
| 3.1.8    | Residual cases (229).....                                  | 78        |
| 3.2      | Added Greek tokens (2,989).....                            | 78        |
| 3.2.1    | Definite article (2,233) .....                             | 79        |
| 3.2.2    | Copulas in verbless clauses (180) .....                    | 88        |
| 3.2.3    | Conjunctions (179).....                                    | 92        |

|          |                                                    |            |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 3.2.4    | Prepositions (108).....                            | 95         |
| 3.2.5    | Personal pronouns (79).....                        | 97         |
| 3.2.6    | The particle <i>אֲנִי/אֲנִי</i> (38).....          | 100        |
| 3.2.7    | Double translations (41) .....                     | 101        |
| 3.2.8    | Residual cases (131).....                          | 103        |
| 3.3      | Synthetic Translation (646 groups) .....           | 105        |
| 3.3.1    | Hebrew compounding (373 groups) .....              | 105        |
| 3.3.2    | Greek Compounding (110 groups) .....               | 112        |
| 3.3.3    | Periphrastic Translations (163 groups) .....       | 114        |
| 3.4      | Expansive Translation (394 groups) .....           | 118        |
| 3.4.1    | Inadequate granularity of tokenization (142) ..... | 118        |
| 3.4.2    | Likely textual variants (26).....                  | 120        |
| 3.4.3    | Multiple function words (100).....                 | 120        |
| 3.4.4    | Verbal periphrastic constructions (44).....        | 122        |
| 3.4.5    | Residual cases (82) .....                          | 123        |
| 3.5      | Conclusion .....                                   | 124        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Serial Equivalence .....</b>                    | <b>125</b> |
| 4.1      | Displacement of a Hebrew Morpheme (1,054) .....    | 128        |
| 4.1.1    | The conjunction <i>ו</i> (758).....                | 129        |

|          |                                                            |            |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 4.1.2    | Pronominal Suffixes (194).....                             | 149        |
| 4.1.3    | Directional ה (102).....                                   | 157        |
| 4.2      | Displacement of a Hebrew Word or Phrase (474 groups) ..... | 159        |
| 4.2.1    | Nominal modifiers (209).....                               | 159        |
| 4.2.2    | Verbal arguments and modifiers (126).....                  | 165        |
| 4.2.3    | The conjunction וְ (84).....                               | 167        |
| 4.2.4    | Other cases (55).....                                      | 169        |
| 4.3      | Major Displacement (20 groups) .....                       | 171        |
| 4.4      | Conclusion .....                                           | 172        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Lexical Equivalence .....</b>                           | <b>174</b> |
| 5.1      | Part-of-speech Equivalence .....                           | 176        |
| 5.1.1    | Content words.....                                         | 178        |
| 5.1.2    | Function words .....                                       | 184        |
| 5.2      | Lexical Equivalence.....                                   | 193        |
| 5.2.1    | Consistency .....                                          | 193        |
| 5.2.2    | Adequacy.....                                              | 206        |
| 5.3      | Conclusion .....                                           | 234        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Grammatical Equivalence.....</b>                        | <b>236</b> |
| 6.1      | Verbal Morphology.....                                     | 238        |

|                |                                                             |            |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 6.1.1          | Tense-Aspect-Mood.....                                      | 239        |
| 6.1.2          | Person, Number and Voice.....                               | 289        |
| 6.2            | Nominal Morphology.....                                     | 301        |
| 6.2.1          | Person.....                                                 | 301        |
| 6.2.2          | Number.....                                                 | 303        |
| 6.2.3          | Gender.....                                                 | 310        |
| 6.3            | Conclusion.....                                             | 310        |
| 6.4            | Conclusion to Part I.....                                   | 311        |
| <b>Part II</b> | .....                                                       | <b>316</b> |
| <b>7</b>       | <b>The Consistent and Concise Plot (Noah: Gen 6–9).....</b> | <b>317</b> |
| 7.1            | Introduction to Part II.....                                | 317        |
| 7.2            | Introduction.....                                           | 320        |
| 7.3            | Refutation.....                                             | 329        |
| 7.3.1          | Crime and punishment.....                                   | 330        |
| 7.3.2          | Warnings, instructions, and preparations.....               | 333        |
| 7.3.3          | Noah enters the ark.....                                    | 336        |
| 7.3.4          | Floodwaters rise.....                                       | 338        |

|          |                                                                        |            |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 7.3.5    | Raven and dove .....                                                   | 341        |
| 7.4      | Confirmation.....                                                      | 341        |
| 7.4.1    | Crime and punishment .....                                             | 343        |
| 7.4.2    | Warnings, instructions, and preparations .....                         | 359        |
| 7.4.3    | Noah enters the ark .....                                              | 362        |
| 7.4.4    | Floodwaters rise and fall .....                                        | 365        |
| 7.4.5    | Raven and dove .....                                                   | 371        |
| 7.5      | Conclusion .....                                                       | 375        |
| <b>8</b> | <b>The Sequential and Unified Plot (Abraham: Gen 11:27–25:11).....</b> | <b>378</b> |
| 8.1      | Introduction .....                                                     | 378        |
| 8.2      | Critique: an episodic and character-driven plot.....                   | 384        |
| 8.3      | Elucidating plot structure.....                                        | 395        |
| 8.3.1    | Beginning and complication (Gen 11:27–16:16).....                      | 396        |
| 8.3.2    | Middle and transformation (Gen 17–21).....                             | 424        |
| 8.3.3    | End and final resolution (Gen 22:1–25:11) .....                        | 455        |
| 8.4      | Conclusion .....                                                       | 465        |
| <b>9</b> | <b>The Tragic Plot (Joseph: Gen 37–50).....</b>                        | <b>469</b> |
| 9.1      | Introduction .....                                                     | 469        |
| 9.2      | The tragic in Joseph .....                                             | 475        |



|           |                                                                 |            |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 9.2.1     | Reversal.....                                                   | 477        |
| 9.2.2     | Revenge .....                                                   | 478        |
| 9.2.3     | Recognition .....                                               | 479        |
| 9.2.4     | Lamentation .....                                               | 480        |
| 9.2.5     | Emotions.....                                                   | 481        |
| 9.2.6     | The supernatural .....                                          | 482        |
| 9.2.7     | Irony .....                                                     | 484        |
| 9.3       | Translating in the tragic mode .....                            | 485        |
| 9.3.1     | Revenge, emotion, and lamentation (Gen 37) .....                | 486        |
| 9.3.2     | A tragic digression: Judah and Tamar (Gen 38) .....             | 505        |
| 9.3.3     | Reversal and the supernatural (Gen 39–41) .....                 | 515        |
| 9.3.4     | Recognition and irony (Gen 42–45).....                          | 545        |
| 9.4       | Conclusion .....                                                | 563        |
| <b>10</b> | <b>Conclusion .....</b>                                         | <b>568</b> |
|           | <b>Appendix I: Textual Reconstructions in G's Vorlage .....</b> | <b>585</b> |
|           | Plus: implied participant (106) .....                           | 585        |

|                                                                                 |            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Plus: expanded participant (36) .....                                           | 588        |
| Plus: ם (45) .....                                                              | 590        |
| Plus: ך (35) .....                                                              | 591        |
| Plus: speech formula (7) .....                                                  | 592        |
| Plus: other (255) .....                                                         | 593        |
| Minus: implied participant (17) .....                                           | 604        |
| Minus: expanded participant (5) .....                                           | 604        |
| Minus: ם (21) .....                                                             | 605        |
| Minus: ך (12) .....                                                             | 605        |
| Minus: other (46) .....                                                         | 606        |
| Difference (69) .....                                                           | 607        |
| <br><b>Appendix II: Classified Lexical Equivalences for Content Words .....</b> | <b>612</b> |
| <b>Proper nouns .....</b>                                                       | <b>612</b> |
| Hapaxlegomena .....                                                             | 612        |
| Consistent .....                                                                | 619        |
| Main .....                                                                      | 625        |
| No main .....                                                                   | 630        |

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| <b>Common nouns</b> ..... | 631 |
| Hapaxlegomena.....        | 631 |
| Consistent.....           | 640 |
| Main .....                | 647 |
| No main.....              | 666 |
| <b>Adjectives</b> .....   | 673 |
| Hapaxlegomena.....        | 673 |
| Consistent.....           | 674 |
| Main .....                | 675 |
| No main.....              | 677 |
| <b>Verbs</b> .....        | 678 |
| Hapaxlegomena.....        | 678 |
| Consistent.....           | 684 |
| Main .....                | 686 |
| No main.....              | 705 |
| <b>Bibliography</b> ..... | 717 |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would never have come to fulfillment without the assistance, guidance, and support of dozens of entities and individuals, only a portion of whom are named here. While the University of Chicago Divinity School provided key financial assistance throughout my graduate studies, funding from the Martin Marty Junior Fellowship for the 2017–2018 academic year enabled me to dedicate my time to the completion and revision of this work. Yet, I will not forget that my graduate career would never have even begun without the support of my late grandparents, Jess and Dorothy Covington, who always held firm to their belief in the value of education.

Inexpressible thanks are also due to all of my teachers, but especially to the three members of my dissertation committee: Prof. Margaret Mitchell, Prof. Jeffrey Stackert, and Prof. James Aitken (Cambridge). Together they have guided, encouraged, critiqued, and sharpened this work by their careful reading of it, their probing questions, and the productive and stimulating conversations we have had together. In particular, I would like to thank my advisor Prof. Mitchell for her enthusiastic support of this project from its earliest stages and her timely, copious, and precise written feedback on my work throughout the two years of writing. Furthermore, she is to be commended for the excellent way in which she models this *ἀκρίβεια* not only as a scholarly but also as a personal virtue.

I would also like to thank other individuals and groups that have read and listened to my ideas throughout the course of their development and have offered their generous feedback: Prof. Sofia Torallas Tovar; Prof. Ralph Klein (Lutheran School of Theology at

Chicago); Prof. Simeon Chavel; Dr. Jeff Jay; Dr. Spencer Allen (University of Arkansas); the Hebrew Bible and Early Christian Studies Workshops; and the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Special thanks are also due to my friend and colleague, Dr. Drayton Benner, for his persistent support and encouragement, and also for his provision of the text-alignment tools needed to begin my research. In addition, I would like to express my appreciation for my newfound colleagues and friends—and students!—at Thaden School, as they have cheered me to the finish line these past few months.

The most essential and enthusiastic supporters of this work are, of course, those who have had to live with it alongside me. My parents, David and Ann Covington, and my parents-in-law, Mark and Jennifer Kidd, have not flagged in their steady encouragement of me in this work. My four dear children, Jesse, Max, Charles, and Miriam, have too often been turned away from my office because “Daddy has to work on his dissertation.” Yet, they have provided more support than they know by enticing me to play, asking their endless and curious questions, and constantly reminding me of what really matters.

But it is my wife Allison who deserves real credit for my accomplishment, because without her—without her love and help, her conversation and kindness, her patience and encouragement, her friendship and sense of humor—this would have died long ago. Allison, I thank you for enduring my tireless schedule and never letting me abandon my dreams. We did it!

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                        |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 1. Quantitative Variants reconstructed in V by category .....                                    | 35  |
| Table 2: Types of Alignment Relationships Illustrated.....                                             | 45  |
| Table 3: Simplex Preposition Omitted, Object Inflected By Greek Case .....                             | 52  |
| Table 4. Simplex Preposition Omitted, Object Translated Verbally .....                                 | 56  |
| Table 5. Omission of the Article with Nouns modified by $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ (Lexically Classified) 70 |     |
| Table 6. Common Hebrew compound prepositions translated synthetically .....                            | 107 |
| Table 7. Common Hebrew compound conjunctions translated synthetically .....                            | 110 |
| Table 8. Hebrew compound adverbials with $\text{וְ}$ and $\text{כִּי}$ .....                           | 111 |
| Table 9. Hebrew compound question words translated synthetically (5+) .....                            | 112 |
| Table 10. Main translation equivalents for clausal- $\text{וְ}$ .....                                  | 132 |
| Table 11. Primary Hebrew Parts of Speech and Main Greek Equivalents.....                               | 177 |
| Table 12. Count of Types in Consistency Groups by Part of Speech .....                                 | 196 |
| Table 13. Count of Tokens in Consistency Groups by Part of Speech .....                                | 196 |
| Table 14. Counts of doubly consistent lemmas by part of speech.....                                    | 199 |
| Table 15. Counts of nearly consistent lemmas by part of speech.....                                    | 201 |
| Table 16. Counts of consistent lemmas by part of speech $\pm$ close cases. ....                        | 205 |
| Table 17. Hebrew Conjugations in Narration and Speech in Genesis (V) .....                             | 239 |
| Table 18. Hebrew singular dual and plural nouns regularly translated as singular .                     | 307 |
| Table 19. Hebrew singular nouns regularly translated as plural .....                                   | 309 |
| Table 20. Comparison of Gen 38 (Judah and Tamar) and Gen 37, 39–50 (Joseph).507                        |     |

## 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 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE, by some group of multilingual individuals who were either Jewish or intimately familiar with Jewish beliefs and practices.<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> and the translators’ level of education can only be approximated.<sup>3</sup> We do not know why the

---

<sup>1</sup> For a sample of arguments making use of various types of linguistic evidence, see: Lee, *Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, SCS 14 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 145–149; T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 263–264; Jan Joosten, “On Aramaising Renderings in the Septuagint,” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Martinus Baasten and Willem van Persen, OLA 118 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 587–600; Stefan Pfeiffer, “Ägyptische Elemente im Griechischen der LXX,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016), 231–245.

<sup>2</sup> The most comprehensive treatment of this subject is Hayeon Kim, “Multiple Authorship of the Pentateuch” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 2006).

<sup>3</sup> 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 *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 awkwardly 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,<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>5</sup> (ii) broader

---

<sup>4</sup> John William Wevers, ed., *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 1974; *Text History of the Greek Genesis*, MSU 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 1974.

<sup>5</sup> 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;<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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

---

Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia B.132.1 (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian, 1965); Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*, AASF Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemian, 1982); Anssi Voitila, *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le pentateuque grec: une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction*, Publications de la Société d'Exégèse de Finlande 79 (Helsinki: Société d'Exégèse de Finlande, 2001); Anwar Tjen, *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*, LHBOTS 515 (New York: T&T Clark, 2010). Cf. also §2.1 note 5.

<sup>6</sup> Emblematic of this approach are: Lee, *Lexical Study*; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*; Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (Leuven: Peeters), 2016. Muraoka's grammar is hereafter cited as *SSG* (by section number).

<sup>7</sup> The lengthiest examples are commentaries, often accompanied by translations: Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse*, La Bible d'Alexandrie 1 (Paris: CERF, 1986); John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, SCS 35 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*, BZAW 223 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994); Susan Brayford, *Genesis*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2007). Cf. also §2.1 note 6.

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,<sup>8</sup> 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.

---

<sup>8</sup> For exposition and application of the neo-documentary approach, see: Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*, FAT 52 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Joel Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, FAT 68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, ABRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).

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.<sup>9</sup> So, I argue in this chapter that G strove to capture and embellish the aspects of this plot that a Greek audience would identify

---

<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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

---

<sup>10</sup> The problem of discovering the translator's intentions has received much attention by Septuagint scholars. For a point of entry into this discussion, see: Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, CBET 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 56–59; Theo van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 (Leuven: Peters, 2007), 57–92; "Did the Septuagint Translators Really Intend the Greek Text as it Is?," 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), 449–466; Albert Pietersma, "Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as a Case in Point)," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Glenn Wooden, SCS 53 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006), 33–45; Hiebert, Robert J. V., ed. *"Translation is Required:" The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, SCS 56 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010); Larry Perkins, "The Order of Pronominal Clitics and other Pronouns in Greek Exodus — An Indicator of the Translator's Intentionality," JSCS 45 (2012): 46–76.

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.<sup>11</sup>

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 | ותאמר שרי אל אברם                            | εἶπεν δὲ Σάρα πρὸς Ἀβράμ                              |
|      | הנה נא עֲצֹרְנִי יְהוָה                      | Ἴδοὺ <u>συνέκλεισέν</u> με κύριος                     |
|      | מלדת                                         | τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν·                                       |
|      | בא נא אל שפחתי                               | εἴσελθε <u>οὗν</u> πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην μου,            |
|      | אולי אבנה ממנה                               | ἵνα <u>τεκνοποιήσης</u> ἐξ αὐτῆς.                     |
|      | וישמע אברם לקול שרי                          | <u>ὑπήκουσεν</u> δὲ Ἀβράμ τῆς φωνῆς Σάρας.            |
|      | And Sarai said to Abram,                     | Then Sara said to Abram,                              |
|      | “Behold! The Lord has <u>prevented</u> me    | “Behold! The Lord has <u>closed</u> me <u>up</u>      |
|      | <u>from</u> bearing children.                | <u>so that</u> I cannot bear children.                |
|      | Go in to my maidservant.                     | <u>So</u> , go in to my maidservant,                  |
|      | <u>Perhaps I will be built up</u> from her.” | <u>in order that you may produce a child</u> by her.” |
|      | And Abram <u>listened to</u> Sara's voice.   | And Abram <u>obeyed</u> Sara's voice.                 |

<sup>11</sup> 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 Septuaginta-forschung,” 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 of אולי אבנה (“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” (אולי) => “in order that” (ἵνα); “I” (אבנה) => “you” (τεκνοποιήσῃς); “be built up” (בנה) => “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 אולי in every other occurrence in a way that conveys contingency (11/12),<sup>12</sup> 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 εἰ πως (“if perhaps”) and τεκνοποιήσῃς to either οἰκοδομηθήσομαι (“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

---

<sup>12</sup> G translates אולי (12) elsewhere as εἰν (“if”) (6: 18:24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32), μήποτε (“perhaps”) (4: 24:5, 39; 27:12; 43:12), or ἴσως (“perhaps”) (32:20).

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.<sup>13</sup> 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

---

<sup>13</sup> Didymus, *In Gen* 235.16–20: Καὶ ἡ Σάρα οὖν, σοφὴ καὶ ἀγία οὖσα, πολλῶ χρόνῳ εἰδυῖα ὅτι συνευναζομένη οὐκ ἔλαβεν κατὰ γαστρός, ἀπέσχετο τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας καί, ἐπειδὴ ἐγίγνωσκεν ἀκόλουθον εἶναι ἔχειν ἐκεῖνον τέκνα, τὴν παιδίσκην ἑαυτῆς ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα παλλακίδα. Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 1.10.4 §§186–187; Jub **14**:21.

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"<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Gentry, *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 (*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,” *Text* 12 [1985]: 149–187; cf. *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,<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> Scholars then use these two types of cross-sectional analysis—or rely on prior research and personal familiarity with particular books<sup>6</sup>—to generalize about a given translator and his approach to translation, sometimes

---

<sup>4</sup> This general approach was not entirely invented but rigorously developed by the Finnish school and has been adopted by many, but the following works may be taken as paradigmatic examples: Henry St. John Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX,” *JTS* 9 (1908): 597–601; Albert Wifstrand, “Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta,” *K: Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1949-1950*, II (1950): 44–70; Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*; Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, AASF Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1979); Aejmelaesus, *Parataxis*; Jan Joosten, “Elaborate Similes — Hebrew and Greek: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique,” *Bib* 77 (1996): 227–236; Voitiola, *Présent et imparfait*; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*; Tjen, *Conditionals*.

<sup>5</sup> For studies that illustrate this approach to varying degrees (chiefly in regard to Greek Genesis), see John William Wevers, “An Apologia for Septuagint Studies,” *BIOCS* 18 (1985): 28–38; Johann Cook, “The Translator of the Greek Genesis,” in *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea: V Congreso de la IOSCS*, ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos, Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34 (Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano” C.S.I.C., 1985), 169–182; “The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis,” in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Claude Cox, SCS 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 91–125; Rösel, *Übersetzung*; Robert J. V. Hiebert, “The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Glenn Wooden, SCS 53 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006), 85–103; Theo van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 (Leuven: Peters, 2007), 93–154; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*, BTS 8 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011); Mark Scarlata, *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4:1-16*, LHBOTS 573 (New York: T&T Clark, 2012); cf. J. Ross Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*, FAT 88 (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013). Among these studies, Scarlata’s work on Cain and Abel in the versions (i.e., Septuagint, later Greek translations/revisions, Vulgate, Peshitta, and Targums) stands out for its competent adaption of the commentary format for literary readings.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., Harl, *La Genèse*, 29–82; Robert J. V. Hiebert, “Genesis: To the Reader,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1–6; Peter Prestel and Stefan Schorch, “Genesis: Das erste Buch Moses,” in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen*

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.<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> so that this translator

---

*und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 1.145–152; Mark Scarlata, “Genesis,” in *T&T Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. James Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 13–28; Martina Kepper, “Genesis / Das erste Buch Mose,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H = Handbook of the Septuagint*, ed. Martin Karrer, et al. (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlaghaus, 2016), 107–119; Martin Rösel, “2.4.1.1 Genesis,” in *Textual History of the Bible*, ed. Armin Lange, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2016), doi:10.1163/2452-4107\_thb\_COM\_0002040101.

<sup>7</sup> 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).

<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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,<sup>10</sup> but recombining some of their parts in new ways:

| James Barr                            | Wright-Tov                                 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| (i) segmentation and word order       | (i) consistency                            |
| (ii) quantity                         | (ii) segmentation                          |
| (iii) consistency                     | (iii) word order                           |
| (iv) semantic accuracy (and level)    | (iv) quantity                              |
| (v) formal (“etymological”) imitation | (v) linguistic adequacy of lexical choices |
| (vi) level of text/analysis           |                                            |

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

---

<sup>10</sup> James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, MSU 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 275–325; Emanuel Tov and Benjamin Wright, “Computer-Assisted Study,” Benjamin Wright, *No Small Difference*; cf. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, “The Classification of Literalism in Ancient Hebrew-Greek Translation,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016), 139–160.

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.<sup>11</sup> 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—

---

<sup>11</sup> Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 186–213.



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.<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> but also as evidence in larger arguments,<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> I have intentionally written Part I like a

---

<sup>12</sup> E.g., Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 7–8, 270–280.

<sup>13</sup> This is especially the case with the precise philological work of the Finnish school (see note 4).

<sup>14</sup> 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*).

<sup>15</sup> Charles Fritsch, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch*, Princeton Oriental Texts 10 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943); Martin Rösel, "Die Übersetzung der Gottesbezeichnungen in der Genesis-Septuaginta," in *Ernten, was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. D.

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.

---

R. Daniels, et al. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991), 357–378; Susan Brayford, “The Taming and Shaming of Sarah in the Septuagint of Genesis” (PhD diss., The University of Denver, 1998); John Alan Beck, *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique*, StBibLit 25 (New York: Peter Lang, 2000); Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines*. See also §10 note 4.

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,<sup>16</sup> 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.

---

<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> This approach is certainly not irrational, for at

---

<sup>17</sup> 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; “Translator,” 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),<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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., explication), often on the basis of expressions found elsewhere (i.e.,

---

*Required:” the Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, SCS 56 [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010], 130).

<sup>18</sup> Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 45.

<sup>19</sup> 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),<sup>20</sup> is attested not only by G but also by L and SP vis-à-vis the others.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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.

---

<sup>20</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> 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.

<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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

---

<sup>23</sup> 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).

<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup>

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."<sup>26</sup> Yet, the explicitation of

---

<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>26</sup> Wevers, "Apologia," 36–37.



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.<sup>27</sup> 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

---

<sup>27</sup> 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.

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**

|                                                                   | + in V     |                           | - in V     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| (i) to add a reference to an implied participant                  | 106        | [8 <sup>SP</sup> ]        | 17         |                          |
| (ii) to expand the reference to a stated participant              | 36         | [7 <sup>SP</sup> ]        | 5          |                          |
| (iii) to add the conjunction ו                                    | 45         | [45 <sup>SP</sup> ]       | 21         | [21 <sup>SP</sup> ]      |
| (iv) to add the word כל                                           | 35         | [2 <sup>SP</sup> ]        | 12         |                          |
| (v) to add a speech formula (e.g. ויאמר or לאמר)                  | 7          |                           |            |                          |
| (vi) to introduce other pluses, typically involving harmonization | 255        | [57 <sup>SP</sup> ]       | 46         | [3 <sup>SP</sup> ]       |
| <b>Total</b>                                                      | <b>484</b> | <b>[119<sup>SP</sup>]</b> | <b>101</b> | <b>[24<sup>SP</sup>]</b> |

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.

| V                         | G                                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 16:8 [לה מלאך יהוה] ויאמר | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου] |
| 9 ויאמר לה מלאך יהוה      | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου    |
| 29:32 [לעקב] ותלד בן      | καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν [τῷ Ἰακώβ].       |

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 (לו) ויאמר καὶ εἶπεν (-)

The presence of this phenomenon across the textual tradition confirms its scribal nature.<sup>28</sup>

**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

<sup>28</sup> SP also contains unique pluses and minuses of implicit participants: SP > L G (5: 18:19, 29; 21:7; 47:1, 2); SP < L G (4: 5:32; 28:9; 34:4; 44:7), cf. Kim, "Studies in the Relationship," 58–63.

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 (יצחק) (21:8<sup>L</sup>), a noun phrase (בני) (24:3<sup>L</sup>), or a long form combining the two (יצחק בנו) (21:5).

|                    | V                               | G                                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 21:8 <sup>SP</sup> | ביום הגמל את יצחק [בנו]         | ἡ ἡμέρα ἀπεγαλακτίσθη Ἰσαὰκ [ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ]. |
| 24:3               | ... אשר לא תקח אשה לבני [ליצחק] | ἵνα μὴ λάβῃς γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου [Ἰσαὰκ] ... |
| 21:5               | בהולד לו את יצחק בנו            | ἡνίκα ἐγένετο αὐτῷ Ἰσαὰκ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ.      |

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

|      | V                            | G                                      |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 21:4 | ... וימל אברהם את יצחק (בנו) | περιέτεμεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ (-) ... |

**2.2.1.3 The Conjunction ו (+45, -21)** It is very common for a scribe to add or omit the conjunction ו, especially given that the character ו is very common in word-initial and word-final positions and it is often hard to distinguish from the character י, which also occurs in these positions. Although G usually translates the conjunction ו, 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, ו 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

<sup>29</sup> SP also contains unique expanded references to participants: SP > L G (4: 11:31+; 23:8; 24:27); SP < L G (2: 34:4; 36:39), cf. Kim, “Studies in the Relationship,” 58–63.

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:

| V                                                                                                 | G |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 1:26 <sup>SP</sup> בצלמנו [ו]כדמותו κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν [ <u>καὶ</u> ] καθ' ὁμοίωσιν,            |   |
| 6:19 <sup>SP</sup> ומכל החי [ו]מכל בשר καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων [ <u>καὶ</u> ] ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκός, |   |

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

On occasion ו 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.

| V                                                                | G |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 37:27 <sup>SP</sup> ... לכו (ו)נמכרו ... δεῦτε (-) ἀποδώμεθα ... |   |

**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.<sup>30</sup> This phenomenon may be illustrated by the following set of examples.

| V                                                                                | G |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 6:20 מ[כל] העוף למיניהו ἀπὸ [ <u>πάντων</u> ] τῶν ὀρνέων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος |   |
| 8:20 ומכל העוף הטהר καὶ ἀπὸ <u>πάντων</u> τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν καθαρῶν,              |   |
| 41:30 ב[כל] ארץ מצרים ἐν [ <u>ᾧ</u> ] Αἰγύπτῳ,                                   |   |
| 41:29 בכל ארץ מצרים ἐν <u>πᾶσι</u> γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ.                                   |   |

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.

<sup>30</sup> SP also testifies to the addition of כל: SP > L G (2: 14:2; 42:21); SP < L G (2: 34:29; 41:51), cf. Kim, “Studies in the Relationship,” 58–63.

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

|       | V                                  | G                                        |
|-------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 17:17 | <b>לאמר</b> בלבו ויאמר <b>לאמר</b> | καὶ εἶπεν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ [ <b>λέγων</b> ] |
| 18:9  | ויאמר <b>ויען</b>                  | ὁ [ <b>δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς</b> ] εἶπεν         |

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:

|                     | V                                             | G                                                        |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 21:13 <sup>SP</sup> | לגוי <b>גדול</b> אשימנו                       | εἰς ἔθνος [ <b>μέγα</b> ] ποιήσω αὐτόν,                  |
| 18                  | כי לגוי <b>גדול</b> אשימנו                    | εἰς γὰρ ἔθνος <b>μέγα</b> ποιήσω αὐτόν.                  |
| 27:6                | אל יעקב בנה <b>הקטן</b>                       | πρὸς Ἰακώβ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς [ <b>τὸν ἐλάσσῳ</b> ]          |
| 15                  | את יעקב בנה <b>הקטן</b>                       | Ἰακώβ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς <b>τὸν νεώτερον</b> ,               |
| 35:1                | קום עלה <b>מקום</b> בית אל                    | Ἀναστὰς ἀνάβηθι [ <b>εἰς τὸν τόπον</b> ] <b>Βαιθήλ</b> , |
| 7                   | אל <b>בית אל</b> <b>מקום</b> אל <b>בית אל</b> | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα <b>τοῦ τόπου Βαιθήλ</b> .          |

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:<sup>31</sup>

<sup>31</sup> This plus is based upon the genealogical information given in Num 26:29–37 // 1 Chr 7:14–27.

## V

## G

|       |                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 20:2  | ויאמר אברהם אל שרה אשתו אחתי הוא<br>[כי ירא לאמר אשתי היא]<br>פן יהרגו אנשי העיר עליה]                                                  | εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ περὶ Σάρρας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ<br>ὅτι Ἀδελφὴ μου ἐστίν· [ἐφοβήθη γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι Γυνή μου ἐστίν,<br>μήποτε ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως δι' αὐτήν.]                                    |
| 26:7  | אחתי הוא כי ירא לאמר אשתי [היא]<br>פן יהרגני אנשי המקום על רבקה                                                                         | καὶ εἶπεν Ἀδελφὴ μου ἐστίν· ἐφοβήθη γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι Γυνή μου ἐστίν,<br>μήποτε ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου περὶ Ῥεβέκκας,                                                                               |
| 46:20 | ואת אפרים [וילד למנשה]<br>אשר ילדה לו הפילגש הארמית את מכיר<br>ומכיר הוליד את גלעד<br>ובני אפרים אחי מנשה שותלח ותחן<br>ובני שותלח ערן] | καὶ τὸν Ἐφραίμ· [ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Μανασσὴ,<br>οὓς ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ ἡ παλλακὴ ἡ Σύρα, τὸν Μαχίρ·<br>Μαχίρ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Γαλαάδ.<br>υἱοὶ δὲ Ἐφραίμ ἀδελφοῦ Μανασσὴ· Σουθάλααμ καὶ Τάαμ.<br>υἱοὶ δὲ Σουθάλααμ· Ἐδέμ.] |

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).

## V

## G

|                     |                          |                                         |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 15 21 <sup>sp</sup> | ואת [החוי ואת] הגרגשי    | καὶ τοὺς [Εὐαίους καὶ τοὺς] Γεργεσαίους |
| 9:5                 | ומיד (האדם מיד) איש אחיו | καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς (-) ἀνθρώπου ἀδελφοῦ      |

### 2.2.2 Qualitative Variants (69)

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.

|       |       |                                              |
|-------|-------|----------------------------------------------|
| 2:4   | SP MT | <אלה> [-] תולדות                             |
|       | V     | <זה> [ספר] תולדות <Aὐτῆς [ἡ βίβλος] γενέσεως |
| 11:12 | SP MT | <שלח>                                        |
|       | V     | <קין> <Καινάν>                               |

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).

|                      |      |                                                     |
|----------------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------|
|                      | MT   | ו<ד>דנים                                            |
| 10: 4 <sup>SP</sup>  | SP V | ו<ד>דנים <P>όδοι                                    |
|                      | MT   | לא <אעשה>                                           |
| 18: 29 <sup>SP</sup> | SP V | לא <אשחית> Οὐ μὴ <ἀπολέσω>                          |
|                      | MT   | והפתיל<ם>                                           |
| 38: 25 <sup>SP</sup> | SP V | והפתיל<ז> καὶ <ῶ> ὁρμίσκ<ος>                        |
|                      | MT   | <ז>ומת                                              |
| 44: 9 <sup>SP</sup>  | SP V | <ז>ומת ἀποθνήσκ<έτω>                                |
|                      | MT   | ועינ<ז>כס אל תחס                                    |
| 45: 20 <sup>SP</sup> | SP V | ועינ<ז>כס אל תחס καὶ μὴ φείσησθε τ<οῖς> ὀφθαλμ<οῖς> |

### 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,<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup>

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

---

<sup>32</sup> 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," *SJOT* 10 [1996]: 159).

<sup>33</sup> Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax," in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo, Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian toimituksia, Sarja B 237 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 51–52.

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 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of Genesis.<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> I also checked the lemma and morphology codes of every word manually.<sup>36</sup> 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.<sup>37</sup> An

---

<sup>34</sup> This digital text has been made publicly available by CATSS at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/catss.html>.

<sup>35</sup> 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 (διαλευκους in 30:35; ἐπτακις 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; υἱοὶ in 10:23; γῆ in 26:12; σου in 27:20; λαβάν in 29:23; τῇ in 31:6; δὲ in 43:21; γῆς in 50:24) or the transposition of words (καὶ Ὁρεχ' Ἀρχὰδ in 10:10; μεθ' ὧν ἐν ἐγὼ οἰκῶ αὐτοῖς in 24:3; and ὥστε πονηρόν με εἶναι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν γῆν, ἔν τε πᾶσιν τοῖς Χαναναίοις in 34:30).

<sup>36</sup> 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 ἐξέχεεν in 38:9, which has been kept as imperfect indicative (instead of aorist).

<sup>37</sup> 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,<sup>38</sup> 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 quantitatively in the other text, however, four types of links are possible depending on whether the link involves single tokens or groups of tokens

---

<sup>38</sup> 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 2: TYPES OF ALIGNMENT RELATIONSHIPS ILLUSTRATED**

| Ungrouped tokens                           |                                                                                   |                                                                                            | Grouped tokens                                                  |                                                                                                      |                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Unlinked tokens                            |                                                                                   | Linked tokens                                                                              |                                                                 |                                                                                                      |                                                                            |
| 0 : 1                                      | 1 : 0                                                                             | 1 : 1                                                                                      | m : 1                                                           | 1 : n                                                                                                | m : n                                                                      |
| <p>ὁ</p> <p>ו — δὲ</p> <p>יאמר — εἶπεν</p> | <p>אחר — μετὰ</p> <p>ה — τὰ</p> <p>דברים — ῥήματα</p> <p>ה</p> <p>אלה — ταῦτα</p> | <p>ו — Καὶ</p> <p>יאמר — εἶπεν</p> <p>יהוה — κύριος</p> <p>אל — τῷ</p> <p>אברם — Ἀβράμ</p> | <p>על — ἐπάνω</p> <p>פני</p> <p>ה — τοῦ</p> <p>מים — ὕδατος</p> | <p>לֹא — Οὐ</p> <p>μή</p> <p>תאכלו — φάγητε</p> <p>מן — ἀπὸ</p> <p>כל — παντὸς</p> <p>רע — ξύλου</p> | <p>טוב — καθά</p> <p>ב — ἄν</p> <p>עֵינַי — ἀρέσκει</p> <p>כֶּם — ὑμῖν</p> |
| Gen 12:1                                   | Gen 22:1                                                                          | Gen 18:13                                                                                  | Gen 1:2                                                         | Gen 3:1                                                                                              | Gen 19:8                                                                   |

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 ὁ in Gen 12:1 should not be unlinked, since it functions together with εἶπεν to translate the Hebrew verb's gender; the unlinked ה in Gen 22:1 could have been grouped with אלה; or, one might argue that only Οὐ in Gen 3:1 serves to translate לֹא, and so G's μή 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:<sup>39</sup>

**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 (ἡ), while the caveat of Principle 2 accounts for the decision in Gen 3:1, where it was felt necessary to group οὐ μὴ, because either form could translate אֲלֹ alone. In addition, the initial alignment was produced using Miklal Software Solution’s Text Alignment Tool,<sup>40</sup> which was engineered to produce high-quality

---

<sup>39</sup> 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>.

<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> 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.

---

<sup>41</sup> 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  $1 : n$ ).<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> This point will be discussed in this chapter, especially in §§3.3.1–2; 3.4.1.

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  $\text{אמר ל}$ , which G nearly always translates as a participle of  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ , usually  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  (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  $\text{אמר}$  should be linked to  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  in each case, but  $\text{ל}$  could either (i) be grouped with  $\text{אמר}$  ( $m : 1$ ) or (ii) left unlinked ( $1 : 0$ ), resulting in a  $1 : 1$  match of  $\text{אמר}$  and  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ . 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  $\text{אמר ל}$  and  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  are linked, but that all cases of  $\text{אמר ל}$  translated by  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  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 inequivalence. 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 ל and את (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.<sup>3</sup> 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 3: SIMPLEX PREPOSITION OMITTED, OBJECT INFLECTED BY GREEK CASE**

| LEMMA            | DAT      | ACC      | GEN     | NOM | VOC | TOTAL/LEMMA FREQUENCY |              |
|------------------|----------|----------|---------|-----|-----|-----------------------|--------------|
| ל / לָמוּ (2)    | 386 [23] | 56 [2]   | 47 [3]  | 18  | 2   | 511 [28] / 1,396      | <b>36.6%</b> |
| אֶת (DDOM)       | 34 [2]   | 425 [9]  | 10 [2]  | 4   |     | 473 [13] / 1,033      | <b>45.8%</b> |
| אֶל              | 123 [27] | 4        | 10      |     |     | 137 [27] / 514        | <b>26.7%</b> |
| ב                | 23       | 12       | 23 [2]  | 3   |     | 61 [2] / 842          | <b>7.2%</b>  |
| עַל              | 8        | 5        | 4 [1]   | 1   |     | 18 [1] / 310          | <b>5.8%</b>  |
| אֶת (PREP)       | 11       | 5        |         |     |     | 16 / 141              | <b>11.3%</b> |
| בֵּין            |          |          | 15      |     |     | 15 / 75               | <b>20.0%</b> |
| עִם / עִמָּד (2) | 7        | 5 [1]    | 1       |     |     | 13 [1] / 104          | <b>12.5%</b> |
| מִן              |          | 1        | 7       | 1   |     | 9 / 443               | <b>2.0%</b>  |
| כ / כִּמוּ (1)   |          | 2        | 2       | 1   |     | 5 / 151               | <b>3.3%</b>  |
| עַד              |          | 2        |         |     |     | 2 / 67                | <b>3.0%</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>     | 592 [52] | 518 [12] | 121 [8] | 28  | 2   | 1,260 [72] / 5,077    | <b>24.8%</b> |

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

<sup>3</sup> 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 ל, אל, על, and את (PREP); the accusative for את (DDOM); and the genitive for בין and מן.<sup>4</sup> Combined, these two facts suggest that G omits את (DDOM), ל, and אל so often, because he found the Greek accusative to be a good match for את (DDOM),<sup>5</sup> and the Greek dative apt for ל and אל.<sup>6</sup> Third, G more often omits prepositions bound in a multi-token word,<sup>7</sup> which implies that G's aim to maintain quantitative equivalence often required only a word-level analysis of the Hebrew.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Though infrequent (3/18), G uses the bare genitive for מן in 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 מן in the Greek Pentateuch," *BIOSCS* 12 [1979]: 29–33, 41–42).

<sup>5</sup> It is no surprise, then, that את (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).

<sup>6</sup> Similarly, it is no accident that אל (*IBHS* §11.2.2) and ל (*IBHS* §11.2.10d; cf. Joüon §133d) are said to have "dative" 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., את (DDOM) in the accusative (479/525) (91.2%), and ל and אל in the dative (ל: 190/286 [66.4%]; אל: 70/79 [88.6%]). Similarly, when G translates מן with the Greek definite article, it is usually in the genitive (17/19) (89.5%).

<sup>7</sup> This is supported by several points: (i) G more often omits the inseparable preposition ל (41 : 20) than אל (85 : 104) after the verb אמר (189 with אל; 61 with ל)—note, these counts exclude three anomalous cases ( אל לבו [= δὲ ἀνσθηθεὶς] in 8:21; לו [= οὗ] in 26:32; and לו [= Λεῖα] in 30:15); (ii) G more often omits אל after אמר when it is suffixed (75 : 11) than when it is a separate word (10 : 93); (iii) G only omits מן in its inseparable form (מן); and (iv) G tends to omit בין when it is suffixed (but 17:2, 7; 26:28) and to retain מן 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). With ובין ... בין, G only omits non-initial occurrences of בין (15: 9:12, 13, 15; 13:8+; 16:5; 17:10, 11; 23:15; 31:44, 45, 46, 48, 49; 32:16).

<sup>8</sup> 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 אָת (DDOM) unless Greek has the article where Hebrew does not, such as when אָת (DDOM) governs a proper noun (22:1), a suffixed noun (22:2), or a noun in a construct chain (22:6).<sup>9</sup>

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:<sup>10</sup>

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 לָּ after אָמַר.)

<sup>9</sup> 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).

G typically translates the inseparable preposition ב, but not with certain verbs (e.g., מִשַּׁל [6/8] and רָדָה [5/10])<sup>11</sup> or in certain uses (e.g., temporal [4]<sup>12</sup> and instrumental [4]<sup>13</sup>).

Though less often, but for similar types of reasons, G may omit compound or complex prepositions, such as לִפְנֵי and בְּעֵינַי.<sup>14</sup> Finally, G's use of the nominative case to translate an omitted preposition's object (28)<sup>15</sup> requires comment. This may involve a Greek predicate nominative (17:4), but it often results from some syntactic transformation (31:36; 43:28).

|       |                           |                                              |
|-------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 17:4  | והיית לאב המון גוים       | καὶ ἔσῃ πατὴρ πλῆθους ἐθνῶν                  |
| 31:36 | ויהר ליעקב                | ὠργίσθη δὲ Ἰακώβ                             |
| 43:28 | ויהאמרו שלום לעבדך לאבינו | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ὑγιαίνει ὁ παῖς σου ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν |

<sup>11</sup> G translates ב after מִשַּׁל and 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 מִשַּׁל, G uses the bare genitive (6: 3:16; 4:7; 24:2; 37:8; 45:8, 26) more often than the genitive article τῆς (2: 1:18+); with רָדָה, G uses the bare genitive (5: 1:26+, 28[++]) as often as the genitive article τῶν (5: 1:26++, 28+). Yet, like אֶת (DDOM), the difference simply depends upon the presence or absence of the Hebrew article.

<sup>12</sup> 7:11; 8:4, 13, 14. For a study of temporal ב-expressions with יוֹם, חֹדֶשׁ, and שָׁנָה 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).

<sup>13</sup> 19:11, 38:14; 39:14; 48:22. For a study of instrumental ב in the Greek Pentateuch, see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Wiedergaben des ב instrumenti im griechischen Pentateuch," in *Glaube und Gerechtigkeit: in memoriam Rafael Gyllenberg*, ed. Jarmo Kiilunen, et al. (Helsinki: Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft, 1983), 31–46. The Pentateuchal translators generally used ἐν for instrumental ב, or the instrumental dative, but the data is skewed by frequently recurring expressions, "ב instrumenti," 45.

<sup>14</sup> Omission of compound/complex prepositions occurs 10 times, involving 20 tokens: לִפְנֵי (8: 18:8; 24:33; 32:20; 46:28); בְּעֵינַי (8: 45:5, 16+; 48:17); לְרֹגֶל (2: 33:14); and מֵאֵת (2: 47:22). G contains a high percentage of the total cases involving the bare dative (3/22) or genitive (1/12) for לִפְנֵי in the entire Septuagint, and the translation of בְּעֵינַי 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.

<sup>15</sup> 2:23; 4:18; 7:21; 17:4, 7, 8; 18:10, 25; 20:7; 21:5, 8; 24:67; 29:23; 30:32, 33; 31:36, 43; 33:9; 40:5; 41:36; 43:28+; 44:9; 49:10, 15, 20, 25; 50:18.

**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),<sup>16</sup> a participle (95),<sup>17</sup> or even a finite verb (12).<sup>18</sup> These data are tabulated below in Table 4, classified lexically by the Hebrew preposition omitted and grammatically by the Greek verb's form.

**TABLE 4. SIMPLEX PREPOSITION OMITTED, OBJECT TRANSLATED VERBALLY**

| LEMMA        | INF     | PART   | FIN    | TOTAL/LEMMA FREQUENCY |       |
|--------------|---------|--------|--------|-----------------------|-------|
| ל            | 133 [3] | 91 [5] | 9 [1]  | 233 [9] / 1,396       | 17.0% |
| ב            | 3       | 3      | 1      | 7 / 841               | 0.8%  |
| מן           | 3       |        | 1      | 4 / 443               | 0.9%  |
| אל           |         |        | 1      | 1 / 514               | 0.2%  |
| כ            |         | 1      |        | 1 / 146               | 0.7%  |
| <b>Total</b> | 139 [3] | 95 [5] | 12 [1] | 246 [9] / 3,340       | 7.4%  |

All but four cases involve an infinitive construct (cf. §6.1.1.7),<sup>19</sup> and most involve ל (esp. in לאמר [84]).<sup>20</sup> But excluding לאמר, G typically uses the Greek infinitive (137/162) (84.6%),

<sup>16</sup> 1:18+; 2:3, 5, 10, 15+, 19; 3:23, 24; 4:2, 11, 26; 6:1, 17, 20, 21; 7:3; 8:8, 21; 10:8; 11:5, 6+, 31; 12:5, 10, 11; 13:6+, 16; 15:5, 7; 17:7; 18:11, 19, 27, 29, 31; 19:9+, 13, 19, 22, 30, 33, 35; [20:2], 6; 22:10; 23:2+; 24:5, 8, 13, [14], 20, 23, 25, 33, [43], 48, 63; 25:22, 32; 26:7; 27:5; 28:4, 6, 20+; 29:26; 30:38; 31:7, 18, 19, 28, 29, 35; 32:5; 34:1, 6, 14+, 19; 35:16, 17; 36:7; 37:10, 12, 25+, 35+; 38:13, 20; 39:10, 11, 14, 17; 41:15, 49, 54, 57; 42:3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 25+, 27; 43:2, 18, 20, 22, 30, 32; 44:7, 17, 22, 23, 26+; 45:1, 3, 7+; 46:3, 5, 28; 47:4, 26; 48:10, 17; 50:2, 7, 14.

<sup>17</sup> 1:22; 2:16; [4:25]; 5:29; 8:15; 9:8; 11:8; 15:1, 4, 18; 17:3, [17], 22; 18:12, 13, 15, 16, 33; 19:11, 15; 21:22; 22:20; 23:3, 5, 8, 10, 14; 24:7, 15, 19, 22, 30, 37, 45; 26:11, 20; 27:5, 6, 30; 28:6, 20; 30:24, 38; 31:1, 29; 32:4, 6, 17+, 19; 34:4, 7, 8, 20; 37:15; 38:13, 24, 25, 28; 39:12, 14, 17, 19; 40:7, 10; 41:9, 15, [17]; 42:14, 22, 28, 29, 37; 43:3+, [5], 6, 7; 44:1, 19, 32; 45:16, 26; 47:5, 15; 48:20+; 49:33; 50:4+, 5, 16, 17, [24], 25.

<sup>18</sup> 18:25; 24:4, 18; 27:20; 30:15; 31:26; 39:14, [17]; 41:16; 42:15, 22; 50:16.

<sup>19</sup> 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).

<sup>20</sup> G typically translates לאמר as λέγω 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 ל in translating לאמר for at least

unarticulated (2:10),<sup>21</sup> 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).

|       |                             |                                                         |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:10  | ונהר יצא מעדן להשקות את הגן | ποταμός δὲ ἐκπορεύεται ἐξ Ἑδεμ ποτίζειν τὸν παράδεισον. |
| 11:8  | ויחדלו לבנות העיר           | καὶ ἐπαύσαντο οἰκοδομοῦντες τὴν πόλιν                   |
| 43:6  | למה הרעתם לי להגיד לאיש     | τί ἐκακοποιήσατέ με ἀναγγέλλαντες τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ            |
| 50:17 | ויבך יוסף בדברם אליו        | καὶ ἔκλαυσεν Ἰωσήφ λαλούντων αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτόν           |
| 30:15 | ולקחת גם את דודאי בני       | μή καὶ τοὺς μανδραγόρας τοῦ υἱοῦ μου λήμψῃ              |

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.<sup>22</sup>

**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).<sup>23</sup> This phenomenon is restricted to a few

---

two reasons: (i) לאמר is a frozen form having basically lost its epexegetical sense (*IBHS* §36.2.3e; Joüon §1420); and (ii) Greek does not usually introduce direct speech with a preposition and an articular infinitive (KG II §592.1; Smyth §§2589–2590; *SSG* §79). For the treatment of לאמר in the entire Septuagint, see Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 68–75. On this use of λέγων, see *SSG* §31da.

<sup>21</sup> Bracketing לאמר, Soisalon-Soininen claims that G translates the Hebrew construction [ל + infinitive construct] far more often with a bare infinitive (124) than with the Greek [ὥστε/τοῦ + infinitive] (22), and, based on G's preference for the bare infinitive to render final cases of [ל + 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).

<sup>22</sup> KG II §§485–486; §§Smyth 2070–2075; *SSG* §31h. In the Septuagint, the genitive absolute is usually temporal, and Soisalon-Soininen calls it “eine freie Übersetzung, die von feinem Sprachgefühl zeugt,” (“Der Gebrauch des *genetivus absolutus* in der Septuaginta,” in *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, ed. Avigdor Shinan [Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972], 132).

<sup>23</sup> Greek adverbs need no preposition, since they replace a prepositional phrase (KG II §497; Smyth §1095).



expressions: with ב, in במאד מאד (3) (17:2), בבקר (3) (29:25),<sup>24</sup> and בעוד (3) (40:19); with כ, in כיום (2) (25:31); and with עד, in עד מאד (2) (27:33).

|       |                             |                                            |                    |
|-------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 17:2  | וארבה אותך במאד מאד         | καὶ πληθυνῶ σε σφόδρα                      | (also 17:6, 20)    |
| 29:25 | ויהי בבקר והנה הוא לאה      | ἐγένετο δὲ πρωί, καὶ ἶδον ἡν Λεία.         | (also 24:54; 41:8) |
| 40:19 | בעוד שלשת ימים              | ἔτι τριῶν ἡμερῶν                           | (also 25:6; 40:13) |
| 25:31 | מכרה כיום את בכרתך לי       | Ἀπόδου μοι σήμερον τὰ πρωτοτόκιά σου ἐμοί. | (also 25:33)       |
| 27:33 | ויחרד יצחק חרדה גדלה עד מאד | ἐξέστη δὲ Ἰσαὰκ ἔκστασιν μεγάλην σφόδρα    | (also 27:34)       |

### 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.<sup>25</sup> 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 ו (but כי in 20:10;

<sup>24</sup> Similarly, G very often translates ב with the definite article when it modifies a noun functioning as a temporal adverb: in the accusative (19: 13:3, 4; 19:27, [33]; 20:8; 21:14; 22:3; 26:31; 28:18; 30:16; 31:55; 32:13, 22, 23; 40:6; 43:16, 18; 43:20; 49:27); in the dative (6: 7:11; 8:5; [17:14]; 22:4; 31:22; 42:18); and in the genitive (5: 7:11; 8:13; 31:40+; 41:34). Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, “Zeitangaben,” 138–146.

<sup>25</sup> 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 ו. 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<sup>26</sup> for a prior verb (190/208).<sup>27</sup> 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   | וַתִּהְיֶה וַתִּלְדִּי      | καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν             |
| 25:34 | וַיִּקְרָא וַיִּלֶּךְ       | καὶ ἀναστὰς ὤχετο·                |
| 40:18 | וַיֹּסֶף וַיֹּאמֶר          | ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωσήφ εἶπεν         |
| 43:29 | וַיִּשָּׂא עֵינָיו וַיֹּרֶא | ἀναβλέψας δὲ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδεν |

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).

<sup>26</sup> KG §§485–486; Smyth §§2054–2069; *SSG* §31d.

<sup>27</sup> 3:6; 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 וַיֹּאמֶר translated as לֵאמֹר (12: 1:28; 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).

|       |                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 48:13 | ויקח יוסף את שניהם<br>את אפרים בימינו משמאל ישראל<br>ואת מנשה בשמאלו מימין ישראל<br>ויגש [אתם] אליו | λαβὼν δὲ Ἰωσήφ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ,<br>τόν τε Ἐφραίμ ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν δὲ Ἰσραήλ,<br>τὸν δὲ Μανασσὴ ἐν τῇ ἀριστερᾷ ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ Ἰσραήλ,<br>ἤγγισεν αὐτοὺς αὐτῷ. |
| 45:27 | וירא את העגלות<br>אשר שלח יוסף לשאת אתו<br>ותחי רוח יעקב אביהם                                      | ἰδὼν δὲ τὰς ἀμάξας,<br>ὅς ἀπέστειλεν Ἰωσήφ ὥστε ἀναλαβεῖν αὐτόν,<br>ἀνεζωπύρησεν τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰακώβ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.                                                      |
| 16:3  | ותקח שרי אברם<br>את הגר המצרית שפחתה<br>מקץ עשר שנים לשבת אברם בארץ כנען<br>ותתן אתה לאברם          | καὶ λαβοῦσα Σάρα ἡ γυνὴ Ἀβράμ<br>Ἀγάρ τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν τὴν ἑαυτῆς παιδίσκην,<br>μετὰ δέκα ἔτη τοῦ οἰκῆσαι Ἀβράμ ἐν γῇ Χανάαν,<br>καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν Ἀβράμ.                   |

Yet, G rarely makes this mistake,<sup>28</sup> and his normal omission of *ו*, even in such challenging cases, betrays his care as a translator to follow Greek syntactic conventions.

Though less often, G also omits apodotic-*ו* in complex sentences (59),<sup>29</sup> usually taking the first clause as a conditional (13:9; 34:17) or temporal (3:5; 22:1) protasis.

|       |                                                  |                                                                                           |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13:9  | אם השמאל ואימנה                                  | εἰ σὺ εἰς ἀριστερά, ἐγὼ εἰς δεξιὰ.                                                        |
| 34:17 | ואם לא תשמעו אלינו להמו<br>ולקחנו את בתנו והלכנו | ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εἰσακούσητε ἡμῶν τοῦ περιτέμεσθαι,<br>λαβόντες τὰς θυγατέρας ἡμῶν ἀπελευσόμεθα. |
| 3:5   | ביום אכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם                    | ἐν ᾗ ἂν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, διανοιχθήσονται ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί                          |
| 22:1  | ויהי אחר הדברים האלה והאלהים נסה את              | Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἐπείραζεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ.                             |

<sup>28</sup> The Pentateuchal translators tend to omit *ו* after circumstantial participles. Aejemelaesus counts seven retentions in Genesis, but the rate of retention is higher in other constructions (*Parataxis*, 104). Cf. *SSG* §81.

<sup>29</sup> 3:5; 4:3; 8:6; 9:14; 11:2; 12:11, 12, 14; 13:9+; 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; 41:1; 43:9, 10; 44:22, 24, 26, 31, 32; 46:34; 47:6, 24; 50:4. The cases in 31:42 and 43:10 involve *כי* instead of *ו*. Here, *כי* could have been matched with *ἂν*, but this analysis has been rejected given (i) the rarity of this lexical equivalence and (ii) the necessary change in word order. Still, postpositive *ἂν* 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-ו in complex sentences about half the time.<sup>30</sup> Finally, G's use of other hypotactic structures also results in the omission of a conjunction, especially relative clauses (6)<sup>31</sup> (38:26), infinitives (5)<sup>32</sup> (22:10; 42:25), and genitives absolute (5)<sup>33</sup> (18:1), but other structures (7),<sup>34</sup> too.

|       |                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 38:26 | ויכר יהודה ויאמר צדקה [תמר] ממני<br>כי על כן לא נתתיה לשלה בני                | ἐπέγνω δὲ Ἰούδας καὶ εἶπεν Δεδικαίωται Θαμάρ ἢ ἐγώ,<br>οὐ εἵνεκεν οὐκ ἔδωκα αὐτήν Σηλὼμ τῷ υἱῷ μου.                                                          |
| 22:10 | וישלח אברהם את ידו<br>ויקח את המאכלת לשחט את בנו                              | καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Ἀβραάμ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ<br>λαβεῖν τὴν μάχαιραν σφάξαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.                                                                           |
| 42:25 | ויצו יוסף וימלאו את כליהם בר<br>ולהשיב כספיהם איש אל שקו<br>ולתת להם צדה לדרך | ἐνετείλατο δὲ Ἰωσήφ ἐμπλῆσαι τὰ ἀγγεῖα αὐτῶν σίτου,<br>καὶ ἀποδοῦναι τὸ ἀργύριον ἐκάστῳ εἰς τὸν σάκκον αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς ἐπισιτισμὸν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. |
| 18:1  | וירא אליו יהוה באלני ממרא<br>והוא ישב פתח האהל כחם היום                       | ᾿Ωφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τῇ δρυὶ τῇ Μαμβρή,<br>καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ μεσημβρίας.                                                   |

While G's use of the infinitive subtly shifts the meaning by forging a causal connection between the clauses merely juxtaposed in Hebrew (22:10; 42:25),<sup>35</sup> his use of the genitive absolute aptly conveys the subordination implied by the Hebrew disjunctive syntax (18:1).<sup>36</sup>

**3.1.2.2 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,<sup>37</sup> Greek makes

<sup>30</sup> Aejmelaeus counts 56/101 (*Parataxis*, 140).

<sup>31</sup> 3:19; 18:5; 19:8; 22:16; 33:10; 38:26 (always כ).

<sup>32</sup> 12:20; 22:10; 42:25; 43:18, 24 (always ו).

<sup>33</sup> 18:1; 24:30; 44:14, 26, 34 (always כ).

<sup>34</sup> 26:18; 30:39; 31:10; 37:9, 18; 44:31; 49:23.

<sup>35</sup> The use of the infinitive in 22:10 and 42:25 was likely influenced by the following Hebrew infinitives.

<sup>36</sup> For a discussion of disjunctive syntax and G's translation of it, see §4.1.1.1.

<sup>37</sup> *IBHS* §19.6; Joüon §177.

greater use of asyndeton for rhetorical effect.<sup>38</sup> G employs clausal asyndeton (32)<sup>39</sup> deliberately, especially in speech, in order to evoke a certain mood or to reduce the causal relationship between two clauses to subtle implicature.

|       |                                                                             |                                                                               |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4:7   | רבץ ונאליך תשוקתו                                                           | ἡσυχασον· πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφή αὐτοῦ                                           |
| 29:32 | ראה יהוה בעניי<br>בִּי עתה יאהבני אישי                                      | εἶδέν μου κύριος τὴν ταπείνωσιν·<br>νῦν με ἀγαπήσει ὁ ἀνὴρ μου.               |
| 41:44 | אני פרעה ובלעדיך לא ירים איש את ידו ואת רגלו <sup>40</sup><br>בכל ארץ מצרים | Ἐγὼ Φαραώ· ἄνευ σοῦ οὐκ ἐξαρεῖ οὐθὲς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ<br>ἐπὶ πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου. |

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,<sup>41</sup> such as the omission of ו joining the parts of a compound number (74)<sup>42</sup> (11:17),<sup>43</sup> two noun phrases (26)<sup>44</sup> (35:23), or two prepositional phrases (8)<sup>45</sup> (19:11).

<sup>38</sup> KG II §546; Smyth §§2165–2167; *SGS* §82.

<sup>39</sup> 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.

<sup>40</sup> For G's decision not to represent ואת רגל, which also involves ו, see §3.1.8.

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

<sup>42</sup> 4:24; 5:3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17+, 18+, 20+, 21, 23+, 25+, 26+, 27+, 28+, 30+, 31+; 6:3; 7:24; 9:28, 29; 11:12[+], [13][+], [14], 15, 16[+], 17, [18], 19, 20[+], 21, [22], 24, 25, 32; 12:4; 16:16; 17:1, 24; 18:28; 23:1+; 25:7+, 17+; 35:28; 46:15, 26; 47:9, 28+; 50:22, 26.

<sup>43</sup> This fits normal Greek usage (see §4.2.1.3 note 121).

<sup>44</sup> 6:1, 10; 7:13; 9:18+; 10:1, 4, 10, 19; 12:16+; 14:24; 32:14+, 15; 35:23++++; 36:11, 13, 20++.

<sup>45</sup> 6:7; 8:17; 13:3; 14:23; 19:4, 11; 31:33; 46:34.

11:17 <sup>46</sup> שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה ἔτη τριακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα

35:23 בני לאה בכור יעקב ראובן υἱοὶ Λείας· πρωτότοκος Ἰακώβ Ῥουβήν,  
 ושמעון ולוי יהודה ויששכר וזבולן Συμεών, Λεὺί, Ἰούδας, Ἰσσαχάρ, Ζαβουλών.

19:11 מקטן ועד גדול ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου

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 ἕως.

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

3:22 פן ישלח ידו ולקח גם מעץ החיים μήποτε ἐκτείνῃ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ λάβῃ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς  
 ואכל וחי לעלם καὶ φάγῃ καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

38:11 פן ימות גם הוא כאחי Μήποτε ἀποθάνῃ καὶ οὗτος<sup>48</sup> ὥσπερ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ.

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

<sup>46</sup> For G's regular omission of nouns like שנה that are repeated in time phrases, see §3.1.6.

<sup>47</sup> 3:22; 6:4; 13:5; 14:7, 16+; 15:14; 17:16; 18:24; 20:6; 21:26+; 24:14, 44, 46+; 29:30+; 30:6; 31:15; 32:6, 18, 20; 33:7; 37:7; 38:22, 24; 40:15; 42:22, 28; 48:19. In three cases גם is also omitted with a following pronoun (2:5; 47:19; 50:18). Since they involve multiple words, they are not counted here (cf. §3.1.7.3 and note 117).

<sup>48</sup> On adverbial καί, which at times functions much like גם, see KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891; SSG §7bm.

<sup>49</sup> 8:3, 5; 20:16; 24:40, 63; 26:8+; 32:9, 29; 37:15; 39:20.

<sup>50</sup> 4:7; 9:9; 14:23; 18:20+, 24; 33:11; 37:7; 40:9; 45:26; 48:19.

37:15 וימצא־הוּ אִישׁ וְהָנָה תַּעֲהָ בַשָּׂדֶה καὶ εὗρεν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπος πλανώμενον ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ·

4:20 אָבִי יֵשֶׁב אֹהֶל וּמִקְנָה ὁ πατήρ οἰκούντων ἐν σαχναῖς κτηνοτρόφῳ

In 4:20, G (or V) read אֹהֶל וּמִקְנָה for אָבִי יֵשֶׁב, <sup>51</sup> an example that should serve as a reminder of the tenuous existence of the letters ו and י, 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)<sup>52</sup> (27:8).

27:8 וְעַתָּה בֶּן־שֹׁמֶעַ בְּקֹלִי νῦν σὺν, υἱέ, ἄκουσόν μου

27:1 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו בֶּן־וַיֹּאמֶר הִנְנִי καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Υἱέ μου· καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἐγώ.

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

<sup>51</sup> Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 9–10.

<sup>52</sup> 15:8; 18:3, 30, 32; 19:2, 7, 18; 20:4; 22:7+, 8; 23:6, 11, 15; 24:18; 27:8, 13, 18+, 21, 25, 26, 34, [36], 37, 38+, 43; 29:4; 31:35; 33:8, 9, 15; 42:10; 43:20, 29; 44:16, 18, 19, 20; 48:18, 19. The vocative is rarely modified by a genitive pronoun in the Septuagint (Martin Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta* [Kirchhain N.-L.: Max Schmiersow, 1910], 7–8). Cf. *SSG* §22ye.

head noun is translated in a prepositional phrase (39)<sup>53</sup> (20:5), but this count is inflated by G's translation of forms like למינהו (16)<sup>54</sup> (6:20). If these are excluded, a similar number occur outside of prepositional phrases (21)<sup>55</sup> (19:12).

|       |                               |                                                          |
|-------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 20:5  | בתם לבבן ובנקין כפן עשיתי זאת | ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ χειρῶν ἐποίησα τοῦτο. |
| 6:20  | מ[כל] העוף למינהו             | ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ὀρνέων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος            |
| 19:12 | עד מי לך פה חתן ובנין ובנתיב  | Ἔστιν τίς σοι ὧδε, γαμβροὶ ἢ υἱοὶ ἢ θυγατέρες;           |

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 את שני נעריי as δύο παῖδας demotes these נערים to props, thus distinguishing them from Isaac.<sup>56</sup>

22:3 ויקח את שני נעריי אתו ואת יצחק בנו παρέλαβεν δὲ μεθ' ἐαυτοῦ δύο παῖδας καὶ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ

**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

<sup>53</sup> [1:11]+, 12+, 21, 24+, 25+, 26; 6:16, 20+; 7:14+++; 8:21; 9:4+, 5; 10:5; 17:17; 20:5+, 6, 12+; 22:6; 25:13; 33:12, 14; 35:3; 43:21; 46:34; 48:12, 15, 22; 49:26.

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

<sup>55</sup> 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 (י) may easily have been doubled (dittography), skipped (haplography), or confused with a following conjunction, e.g., perhaps with בכרו before ואת (10:15; 22:21), as is suggested by the fact that G regularly translates this form's suffix. Still, י-variants have only been reconstructed based on SP (see §2.2.1.3).

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion of G's interpretation of this verse in its narrative context, see §8.3.3.



supplied from context (47).<sup>57</sup> This is very common with nouns denoting (i) family relations (27)<sup>58</sup> (28:7), (ii) personal belongings (9)<sup>59</sup> (46:6), and (iii) body parts (6)<sup>60</sup> (22:4).

28:7 וישמע יעקב אל אביו ואל אמו    και ἤκουσεν Ἰακώβ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ<sup>61</sup>

46:6 ויקחו ... ואת [כל] רכושם    και ἀναλαμβάνοντες ... και πᾶσαν τὴν κτῆσιν

22:4 וישא אברהם את עיניו    και ἀναβλέψας Ἀβραάμ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς

**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),<sup>62</sup> because he translates it as a verb, most often a finite verb (30) (19:17; 36:6), but at times an infinitive (4)<sup>63</sup> (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).

<sup>57</sup> 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).

<sup>58</sup> 2:24; 11:3; 14:14; 19:15; 22:2, 12, 16; 24:53; 26:31; 27:14, 19, 31; 28:7; 30:26; 31:28; 32:18, 22+; 36:6+; 44:22++, 33; 45:19; 47:11, 12.

<sup>59</sup> 36:6; 37:23; 39:12; 41:42; 42:27; 46:5, 6; 47:17, 22.

<sup>60</sup> 19:10; 22:4, 13; 24:64; 48:14+. For cases of other types of nouns (5), see 25:33; 30:26; 41:8; 42:26; 49:18.

<sup>61</sup> Sometimes, G omits one suffix in a series of suffixed forms, as here. For a treatment of the omission of repeated possessives, see Raija Sollamo, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint*, SCS 40 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); "The Koinē Background for the Repetition and Non-Repetition of the Possessive Pronoun in Co-Ordinate Items," in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*, ed. Detlaf Fraenkel, et al., MSU 20 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 52–63.

<sup>62</sup> On infinitives construct (29), see 2:4, 17; 3:5; 11:6; 12:4; 17:24, 25; 19:17; 24:4, 30; 25:20; 33:18; 34:7, 25; 35:9; 36:6, 24; 37:24; 38:5, 27; 39:10, 13, 18; 41:46; 42:21; 44:19, 30; 46:30; 48:7; on other verbal forms (2), see 15:6; 31:40; on nonverbal forms (4), see 24:4; 36:6; 37:24; 44:19.

<sup>63</sup> 19:21, 33, 35; 28:4.

|       |                             |                                                 |
|-------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 19:17 | ... ויהי כהוציאם אתם החוצה  | καὶ ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἐξήγαγον αὐτοὺς ἔξω, ...      |
| 36:6  | ויקח עשו ... ואת כל קנינו   | ἔλαβεν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ... καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐκτήσατο       |
| 19:21 | לבלתי הפכי את העיר אשר דברת | τοῦ μὴ καταστρέψαι τὴν πόλιν, περὶ ἧς ἐλάλησας. |
| 31:40 | הייתי ביום אכלנו חרב        | ἐγινόμην τῆς ἡμέρας συγκαιόμενος τῷ καύματι     |

**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,<sup>64</sup> G omits pronominal suffixes on resumptive pronouns in relative clauses (20),<sup>65</sup> but not always.<sup>66</sup>

|      |                        |                                                |
|------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 4:25 | תחת הבל כי הרגו קין    | ἀντὶ Ἀβελ, ὃν ἀπέκτεινεν Κάιν.                 |
| 6:17 | כל בשר אשר בן רוח חיים | πᾶσαν σάρκα, ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶν πνεῦμα ζωῆς            |
| 16:1 | שפחה מצרית ושמה הגר    | παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία, ᾗ ὄνομα Ἀγάρ. <sup>67</sup> |

<sup>64</sup> 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).

<sup>65</sup> 4:25; 5:29; 6:17; 7:15; 16:1; 22:24; 24:29; 25:1; 27:27; 30:26; 34:14; 38:1, 2, 6; 44:5, 9, 10, 16, 17; 49:23.

<sup>66</sup> G only omits resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in about half of the cases. The count of 20 here differs from that of Soisalon-Soininen (18/40) and Sollamo (22/48), because both scholars only consider וְאֵשׁ-clauses, and Sollamo includes resumptive שֶׁ(מ) (see §§3.1.7.1; 4.2.4.1) (Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* [Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1973], 401–406; Raija Sollamo, “The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch,” in *VII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Claude Cox, SCS 31 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991], 75–85; “The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy,” in *VIII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, SCS 41 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995], 43–62). Cf. Takamitsu Muraoka, “Septuagint Greek: A Syntactical Perspective,” 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), 470; *SSG* §86c.

<sup>67</sup> G's translation of [י + suffixed שֶׁ] with [ἡ/ὃ ὄνομα] 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., כל (7)<sup>68</sup> (42:11), הנה (4)<sup>69</sup> (9:9), עוד (4)<sup>70</sup> (43:27), and איש (5)<sup>71</sup> (43:4)—or when a verbal object is contextually superfluous (16)<sup>72</sup> (2:15; 27:34).<sup>73</sup>

|       |                                      |                                                                 |
|-------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 42:11 | כלנו בני איש אחד נחנו                | πάντες ἐσμεν υἱοὶ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου.                                |
| 9:9   | ואני הנני מקים את בריתי              | Ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἀνίστημι τὴν διαθήκην μου                              |
| 43:27 | השלום אביכם הזקן אשר אמרתם העודנו חי | Εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ πρεσβύτερος, ὃν εἶπατε; ἔτι ζῇ;      |
| 43:4  | אם ישלח את אחינו ...                 | εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀποστέλλεις τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, ...                    |
| 2:15  | וינחהו בגן לעבדה ולשמרה              | καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ φυλάσσειν. |
| 27:34 | ברכני גם אני אבי                     | Εὐλόγησον δὴ καμέ, πάτερ.                                       |

### 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 πᾶς.                                             | 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

<sup>68</sup> [11:1], 6; 13:10; 25:25; 42:11; 43:34; 45:22. G only translates the suffix on כל in 42:36 [= ταῦτα].

<sup>69</sup> 6:17; 9:9; 22:7; 40:6.

<sup>70</sup> 18:22; 43:27, 28; 44:14.

<sup>71</sup> On ין (3), see 7:8; 20:7; 43:5; on יש (2), see 24:49; 43:4.

<sup>72</sup> 2:15; 9:16; 15:7; 23:2, 11+; 27:34, 38; 31:39; 33:4; 38:22, 23; 40:13; 42:7; [49:23]; 50:20.

<sup>73</sup> 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)<sup>74</sup> (7:13),<sup>75</sup> but also when G preposes an attributive adjective (8:5; also 7:11)<sup>76</sup> 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 היום (14) (30:32), החוצה (7) (39:12), and הפעם (3) (2:23).<sup>77</sup>

|       |                               |                                    |                                                                                      |
|-------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7:13  | בַּעֲצַם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה       | ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ                  |                                                                                      |
| 8:5   | עַד הַחֹדֶשׁ הָעֲשִׂירִי      | ἕως τοῦ δεκάτου μηνός              |                                                                                      |
| 30:32 | אֶעֱבֹר בַּצֹּאֲנֵךְ הַיּוֹם  | παρελθᾶτω τὰ πρόβατά σου σήμερον   | (also 4:14; 21:26; 22:14; 24:12, 42; 26:33; 31:43, 48; 40:7; 41:9; 42:13, 32; 47:23) |
| 39:12 | וַיֵּנֶס וַיֵּצֵא חֹצָה       | ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω.            | (also 15:5; 19:17; 24:29; 39:13, 15, 18)                                             |
| 2:23  | זֹאת הַפֶּעַם עֲצַם מַעֲצָמִי | Τοῦτο νῦν ὁστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὁστέων 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.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>74</sup> 2:12; 6:4; 7:1, 11, 13; 10:11; 12:7; 15:1, 7, 17, 18+; 17:14, 21, 23, 26; [18:14], 25; 19:8, [12], 13, 14, 20, 21, 25, 35; 20:8, 10, 11; 21:10+, 22, 26, 29, [30]+, 31; 22:1, 14, 16, 20; 24:5, 7, [8], 9, 28, 58; 25:30; 26:3+, 4, 11, 12+, 24, 32; 28:11, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22; 29:2, [12], 13; 30:31, 35; 31:1, 13, 46, 48+[+], 52; 32:2, 10, 13, 19, 21, [30], 32; 33:8, 16, [17]; 34:4, 14, [19], 21; [35:4], [12], 21; 37:6, 10, 22; 38:1, 23, 25; 39:7, 9+, 11, 17; 40:1, 14; 41:35; 42:21; 43:7, 15, [28]; 44:6, 7+, 15, [17]; 47:17, 18, 26; 48:1, 4, 15, [16], 20, [21]; 50:24.

<sup>75</sup> 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).

<sup>76</sup> KG II §463.3A; Smyth §1156; *SSG* §37bba.

<sup>77</sup> 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).

<sup>78</sup> The count is of omitted articles. Note that several may be omitted from one construct chain (e.g., 7:14).

TABLE 5. OMISSION OF THE ARTICLE WITH NOUNS MODIFIED BY  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  (LEXICALLY CLASSIFIED)

| ANIMALS |                           | PLANTS |                | OTHER   |       |
|---------|---------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|-------|
| נֶפֶשׁ  | 5: 1:21+; 12:5; 46:26, 27 | עֵץ    | 2: 1:29; 23:17 | מָקוֹם  | 20:13 |
| רֶמֶשׂ  | 4: 7:14+, 8:17+           | שִׁיחַ | 2:5            | אֶמְתָּ | 32:10 |
| שָׂרֵץ  | 2: 7:21+                  | עֵשֶׂב | 2:5            | חֶסֶד   | 32:10 |
| עוֹף    | 2: 7:14; 8:19             |        |                |         |       |
| בְּשָׂר | 2: 7:15, 21               |        |                |         |       |
| אָדָם   | 7:21                      |        |                |         |       |

Grammatically, G's omission of the article may reflect his desire to convey a distributive sense (e.g.,  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  πετεινόν as “every bird” in 8:19), since the construction [ $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  + arthrous singular noun] would likely be understood collectively.<sup>79</sup> This fact explains why G does not omit the article with  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  for plural nouns (e.g., πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν as “all the birds” in 8:20),<sup>80</sup> as well as the interpretive distinction he makes between πάντα τόπον (“every place”) in 20:13 and πάντα τὸν τόπον (“the whole place”) in 18:26 (cf. 18:24).

|       |                                                       |                                                                                          |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:19  | וכל העוף                                              | καὶ πᾶν πετεινόν                                                                         |
| 8:20  | ומכל העוף הטהר                                        | καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν καθαρῶν                                                  |
| 20:13 | זה חסדך אשר תעשי עמדי<br>אל כל המקום אשר נבוא שמה ... | Ταύτην τὴν δικαιοσύνην ποιήσεις ἐπ’ ἐμέ·<br>εἰς πάντα τόπον, οὗ ἐὰν εἰσέλθωμεν ἐκεῖ, ... |
| 18:26 | ונשאתי לכל המקום בעבורם                               | ἀφήσω πάντα τὸν τόπον δι’ αὐτούς.                                                        |

<sup>79</sup> KG II §465.6; Smyth §1174; *SSG* §38b(i).

<sup>80</sup> For other cases involving עוֹף 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)<sup>81</sup> (2:11). With Ἀδάμ, however, G only (but not always) omits the article in the nominative or when the name itself is meant (6)<sup>82</sup> (2:20).<sup>83</sup>

2:11 הוא הסבב את כל ארץ בחוילה οὗτος ὁ κυκλῶν πᾶσαν τὴν<sup>84</sup> γῆν Εὐιλάτ

2:20 ויקרא האדם שמות לכל הבהמה Καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ ὀνόματα πᾶσιν τοῖς κτήνεσιν

**3.1.4.4 Residual cases.** The remaining cases (47)<sup>85</sup> 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 Ἰακώβ ἐξ ἀγροῦ<sup>86</sup> ἐσπέρας

42:6 ויוסף הוא השליט על הארץ Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἦν ἄρχων τῆς γῆς<sup>87</sup>

### 3.1.5 Particles (118)

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

<sup>81</sup> G omits the article on Χορρί (2: 36:29, 30), Εὐιλά(τ) (2:11), Θαιμάν (36:34), and Χανάαν (50:11).

<sup>82</sup> See 2:19, 20, 23; 3:20, 22; 4:1. But G translates the article on האדם (3) in 3:1, 8, 12.

<sup>83</sup> 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).

<sup>84</sup> Here, τὴν has been matched with את, since it is more proximate.

<sup>85</sup> 1:31; 2:4+; 8:21; 9:6, 20; 10:30; 11:3; 13:9+; 14:5, 7, 17; 15:11, 12; 19:9, 15, 28; 21:15, 28; 22:8; 29:2, 7; 30:16, 41; 31:10, 12; 32:8+; 35:16; 39:1; 40:15; 41:4, 20+, 42; 42:6, 27, 33; 45:6; 47:6, 11, 12; 48:19, 22; 49:17, 21.

<sup>86</sup> The article is often omitted after prepositions (KG II §462f; Smyth §1128; *SSG* §3a). Muraoka specifies that this is especially common when the preposition's object is a single lemma.

<sup>87</sup> Here, G does not translate the article on ἄρχων 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 **אֵן**. 60 / 118 50.8%

§3.1.5.2 The particle **הֵן**. 25 / 118 21.2%

§3.1.5.3 Other particles. 33 / 118 28.0%

**3.1.5.1 The particle **אֵן**.** G generally leaves the particle **אֵן** untranslated (60/74), regardless of its use,<sup>88</sup> i.e. after a volitive (40/50)<sup>89</sup> (31:12), in the collocation **אֵן אֵל** before a real or implied volitive (7/9)<sup>90</sup> (13:8), or in a variety of non-volitional uses (13/15)<sup>91</sup> (30:27).

|       |                                                   |                                     |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 31:12 | שָׁא <b>אֵן</b> עֵינֶיךָ                          | Ἀνάβλεψον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου        |
| 13:8  | <b>אֵל אֵן</b> תְּהִי מְרִיבָה בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶיךָ | Μὴ ἔστω μάχη ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ |
| 30:27 | אִם <b>אֵן</b> מִצָּאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ ...      | Εἰ εὕρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, ...    |

The quantitative equivalents G uses for **אֵן** (**אֵל**) vary widely (**μοι, οὖν, δὴ, μηδαμῶς, δέομαι, ἄρα**), having been carefully selected for a particular rhetorical effect in each context.<sup>92</sup>

**3.1.5.2 The particle **הֵן**.** Omission is also G's most common way of handling the Hebrew question particle **הֵן** (25/58),<sup>93</sup> but his decision to omit it reflects his interpretation of its meaning, as G (i) always uses **εἰ** for indirect questions (14)<sup>94</sup> (8:8)<sup>95</sup> and (ii) omits **הֵן** when

<sup>88</sup> *IBHS* §§34.3, 7; 40.2.5c; Joüon §§105c; 114b.

<sup>89</sup> 13:9, 14; 15:5; 19:2, 8, 20; 22:2; 24:2, 12, 17, 23, 43, 45; 25:30; 26:28; 27:3, 9, 19; 30:14; 31:12; 32:11; 33:11, 14, 15; 34:8; 37:6, 14, 16; 37:32; 38:25; 40:14; 44:18, 33; 45:4; 47:4, 29; 50:4, 5, 17+. When G represents **אֵן** after a volitive, he uses **μοι** (5: 24:14; 27:21, 26; 32:29; 38:16), **οὖν** (4: 12:13; 16:2; 18:21; 40:8), or **δὴ** (18:4).

<sup>90</sup> 13:8; 18:3, 30, 32; 33:10; 47:29; 48:9. G renders **אֵן אֵל** synthetically twice: **μηδαμῶς** (19:7); **δέομαι** (19:18).

<sup>91</sup> 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.

<sup>92</sup> For a discussion of G's translation of **אֵן** 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.

<sup>93</sup> The particle **הֵן** is used for polar (i.e., yes/no) questions in Hebrew (*IBHS* §40.3; Joüon §161).

<sup>94</sup> [8:7], 8; 18:21; 24:21, 23; 37:32; 43:6, 7+; 44:19.

<sup>95</sup> KG II §589.14; Smyth §2671; *SSG* §68.

he translates הלא as οὐ (13)<sup>96</sup> (13:9), thus expecting an affirmative response.<sup>97</sup> Furthermore, he typically uses (iii) μή for questions that anticipate a negative response (10)<sup>98</sup> (4:9)<sup>99</sup> and (iv) no translation for questions that anticipate a positive response (12)<sup>100</sup> (29:5).

|      |                                    |                                                           |
|------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:8  | לראות בקלו המים מעל פני האדמה      | ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς.          |
| 13:9 | הלא הנה כל הארץ לפניך              | οὐκ ἰδοὺ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον σου ἐστίν;                    |
| 4:9  | השמר אחי אנכי                      | μή φύλαξ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου εἰμι ἐγώ;                        |
| 29:5 | הידעתם את לבן בן נחור ויאמרו ידענו | Γινώσκετε Λαβάν τὸν υἱὸν Ναχώρα; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Γινώσκουμεν. |

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

|       |                                     |                                                        |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 30:2  | ויהר אף יעקב ברחל ויאמר             | ἐθυμώθη δὲ Ἰακώβ τῇ Ραχὴλ καὶ εἶπεν                    |
|       | התחת אלהים אנכי אשר מנע ממך פרי בטן | Μὴ ἀντὶ θεοῦ ἐγώ εἰμι, ὃς ἐστέρησέν σε καρπὸν κοιλίας; |
| 50:19 | ויאמר אלהם יוסף                     | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰωσήφ                                 |
|       | אל תיראו כי התחת אלהים אני          | Μὴ φοβεῖσθε· τοῦ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰμι ἐγώ.                    |

<sup>96</sup> 4:7; 13:9; 19:20; 20:5; 27:36; 29:25; 31:15; 34:23; 37:13; 40:8; 42:22; 44:5, 15. In 43:7+ and 44:19, G retains a pleonastic λέγων before εἰ with an indirect question. On occasion, G uses εἰ for ה introducing a direct question (4: 17:17; 27:21; 42:16; 43:27), where omission would have better conformed to Greek grammatical convention (cf. *SSG* §§29dc(iii); 88).

<sup>97</sup> Like הלא, questions introduced by οὐ anticipate a positive response (*IBHS* §40.3 note 48; Joüon §161c; *KG II* §589.3; Smyth §2651a; *SSG* §83ga).

<sup>98</sup> 4:9; 18:14, 17, 23; 27:38; 30:2; 31:14; 37:8; 41:38; 43:7.

<sup>99</sup> *KG II* §589.4; Smyth §2651b; *SSG* §83gb.

<sup>100</sup> 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.

<sup>101</sup> Also, compare a similar alternation in 18:23–24, where G first translates ה 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 (התחת אלהים אני/אנכי),<sup>102</sup> 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 ה ("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)<sup>103</sup> (28:12–13) and אשר (13/421),<sup>104</sup> but also several others (5).<sup>105</sup>

|           |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 28: 12–13 | ויחלם והנה סלם מצב ארצה<br>וראשו מגיע השמימה<br>והנה מלאכי אלהים עלים וירדים בו<br>והנה יהוה נצב עליו | καὶ ἐνυπνιάσθη, καὶ ἰδοὺ κλίμαξ ἐστηριγμένη ἐν τῇ γῇ,<br>ἥς ἡ κεφαλὴ ἀφικνεῖτο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,<br>καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνέβαινον καὶ κατέβαινον ἐπ' αὐτῆς.<br>ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐπεστήρικτο ἐπ' αὐτῇ |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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.<sup>106</sup>

### 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)<sup>107</sup> and יום (3)<sup>108</sup> in date

<sup>102</sup> Of course, כי in 50:19 inflects the rhetorical question as the reason why Joseph's brothers should be at ease.

<sup>103</sup> 8:13; 12:11; 15:3; 24:30, 63; 26:8; 27:36; 28:12, 13; 31:51; 37:7+, 15; 41:3, 23.

<sup>104</sup> 6:15; 9:10; 13:16; 20:13; 24:7; 25:6; 29:9[+]; 31:19; 38:18; 47:4; 49:28+.

<sup>105</sup> הן (2: 29:7; 30:34), לו (30:34), אל (33:10), and אנה (50:17).

<sup>106</sup> Though it obviously results from Hebrew הנה, the particle ἰδοὺ is especially common in Septuagint with the imperfect and in nominal clauses (SSG §§28c(i); 94dbc; cf. IBHS §§16.3.5b; 37.6a, d; Joüon §§146h; 154c).

<sup>107</sup> 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.

<sup>108</sup> 8:14; 7:11; 9:4.

formulae and בן/בת (9)<sup>109</sup> in age formulae, as Greek does not have the same usage.

Repeating ἔτη would be pleonastic (5:5), and יום (8:14) and בן (26:34) need no translation.<sup>110</sup>

|       |                        |                              |
|-------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| 5:5   | תשע מאות שנה ושליש שנה | ἔτη ἑννακόσια τριάκοντα      |
| 8:14  | בשבעה ועשרים יום לחדש  | ἑβδόμη καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός  |
| 26:34 | ויהי עשו בן ארבעים שנה | Ἦν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἑτῶν τεσσαράκοντα |

### 3.1.7 Other commonly omitted elements (101)

G omits a few other Hebrew structures on occasion. Though infrequent, shared contexts warrant their brief consideration apart from other residual cases:

|          |                                                          |          |       |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|
| §3.1.7.1 | Resumptive elements.                                     | 19 / 101 | 18.8% |
| §3.1.7.2 | Certain uses of לך/לם.                                   | 14 / 101 | 13.9% |
| §3.1.7.3 | Redundant pronominal subjects and prepositional phrases. | 42 / 101 | 41.6% |
| §3.1.7.4 | Infinitives absolute with cognate finite form.           | 6 / 101  | 5.9%  |
| §3.1.7.5 | Speech formulae.                                         | 14 / 101 | 13.9% |
| §3.1.7.6 | היה in temporal frames.                                  | 6 / 101  | 5.9%  |

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

<sup>109</sup> 6:1; 17:1, 17+, 25; 25:20; 26:34; 37:2; 50:26. All omissions involve בן except one in 17:17 (בת).

<sup>110</sup> Most often, G translates age formulae with the pattern [ἑτῶν + number] (11) or [number + ἑτῶν] (4), the only exceptions to this rule being in 17:17 (ἑκατονταετής) and 11:10 (υἱὸς ἑκατὸν ἑτῶν) (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: 7:6; 12:4; 16:16; 17:24; 21:5; 25:26; 41:46).

<sup>111</sup> Cf. §3.1.3.4 note 66.

<sup>112</sup> 24:14, 43; 26:18; 38:25; 42:9, 38; 45:4. Each case involves two tokens, i.e., preposition and object.

<sup>113</sup> 3:23; 13:3, 14; 19:27; 35:27.

24:14 ... הנער אשר אמר אליה *ἡ παρθένος, ἥ ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω ...*

35:27 שם אשר גר שם אברהם ויצחק ... *οὗ παρώκησεν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ*

**3.1.7.2 Certain uses of לך/לכם.** G sometimes omits לך and לכם (14)<sup>114</sup> (12:17), especially with the so-called “ethical dative” used with verbs of motion (8) (12:1).<sup>115</sup>

21:17 מה לך הגר *τί ἐστίν,<sup>116</sup> Ἀγάρ;*

12:1 לך מֵאֶרֶץ *Ἐξέλθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου*

**3.1.7.3 Redundant pronominal subjects and prepositional phrases.** Occasionally G omits pronominal subjects (26)<sup>117</sup> (33:6) and prepositional phrases (16)<sup>118</sup> (37:24) that may be gapped or would be either pleonastic or unduly emphatic.

33:6 ותגשן השפחות הנה וילדיהן *καὶ προσήγγισαν αἱ παιδίσκαι καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν*

37:24 וישלכו אתו הברה *καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸν λάκκον.<sup>120</sup>*

<sup>114</sup> With verbs of motion (8), see 12:1; 22:2, 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).

<sup>115</sup> *IBHS* §11.2.10d; Joüon §133d.

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

<sup>117</sup> 2:23; 7:14; 18:13; 19:38; 20:5 (with גם); 21:22; 24:27; 25:29, 30; 29:33; 31:20; 32:18; 33:6; 37:16+; 37:30; 38:25; 39:3; 41:9, 28; 42:27; 47:14, 19 (with גם); 49:8. Since Hebrew and Greek both use subject pronouns for emphasis, G and the other Pentateuchal translators usually retain them (Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Personalpronomens als Subjekt im griechischen Pentateuch,” in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox [Mississauga: Benben, 1984], 115, 117).

<sup>118</sup> 9:10; 29:13; 30:20; 37:18, 23, 24; 39:20; 43:13. Each case involves two tokens, preposition and object.

<sup>119</sup> It is possible that the suffix וְהוּ was missed by haplography or parablepsis and G moved אֹתוֹ back a clause.

<sup>120</sup> 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),<sup>121</sup> considering it superfluous.

20:7 ואם אינך משיב דע כי מות תמות *εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀποδίδως, γνῶθι ὅτι ἀποθανῇ*

**3.1.7.5 Speech formulae.** G sometimes omits **לֵאמֹר** (8) (3:17) or **וַיֹּאמֶר** (6)<sup>122</sup> (19:9).

3:17 אשר צויתך **לֵאמֹר** לא תאכל ממנו *οὗ ἐνετειλάμην σοι τούτου μόνου μὴ φαγεῖν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ*

19:9 **וַיֹּאמֶר** גֵּשׁ הָלֹאֵה **וַיֹּאמֶר** הָאֶחָד ... *εἶπαν δὲ Ἀπόστα ἐκεῖ. εἷς ...*

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).<sup>123</sup>

**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).<sup>124</sup>

12:11 **וַיְהִי** כַּאֲשֶׁר הִקְרִיב [אֲבִרָם] לְבֹאֵ מִצְרִימָה ... *ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἤγγισεν Ἀβράμ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ...*

38:29 **וַיְהִי** כַּמְשִׁיב יָדוֹ ... *ὥς δὲ ἐπισυνήγαγεν τὴν χεῖρα, ...*

<sup>121</sup> 20:7; 24:5; 27:30; 31:30; 43:7, 20. On G's handling of the infinitive absolute, see §6.1.1.8.

<sup>122</sup> For **לֵאמֹר**, see 3:17; 23:13; 27:6; 38:21; for **וַיֹּאמֶר**, 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 ו. For Genesis, Soisalon-Soininen counts 4 omissions of **לֵאמֹר** compared to 75 translated forms (*Infinitive*, 74).

<sup>123</sup> “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).

<sup>124</sup> For omissions of **היה/יהי**, see 15:12; 38:29; 39:10, 15, 18; 46:33 (והיה). G typically renders the verb as ἐγένετο (59) (Hiebert, “Hermeneutics of Translation,” 87–88; H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint* (New York: Georg Olms, 1987), 50–52. Cf. *SSG* §72j; 90d.

Even if G's regular imitation of this temporal construction produces a foreign-sounding translation, his increased use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  in translating temporal frames reflects a contextual understanding of the boundary-marking nature of this formula.<sup>125</sup>

### 3.1.8 Residual cases (229)

Some residual cases (229)<sup>126</sup> 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.

---

<sup>125</sup> For the statistically higher use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  to translate  $\text{וְיָהִי}$ , see Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 40–41. See also the discussion of G's contextual use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  as a boundary-marker in §4.1.1.

<sup>126</sup> For all residual cases (counted by number of tokens, not groups), see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

|        |                              |               |       |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------|-------|
| §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 <i>šv/šdv</i> . | 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,<sup>127</sup> and

---

<sup>127</sup> *IBHS* §13.4; Joüon §§139–140. A few cases involve indefinite Hebrew substantives (9: 7:11; 8:2; 31:35; 39:19; 20:16; 27:25; 47:15; 49:12+).

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).<sup>128</sup>

|       |                                   |                                                 |
|-------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 2:7   | וּפַח בְּאַפִּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים | καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς |
| 30:16 | בְּדוּדָאֵי בְנֵי                 | ἀντὶ τῶν μανδραγορῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου               |
| 50:7  | כָּל עֲבָדֵי פַרְעֹה              | πάντες οἱ παῖδες 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)<sup>129</sup> (2:12);<sup>130</sup> (ii) demonstrative pronouns (36)<sup>131</sup> (15:18);<sup>132</sup> (iii) relative clauses (25)<sup>133</sup> (29:27);<sup>134</sup> (iv) possessive adjectives (5)<sup>135</sup> (33:10);<sup>136</sup> and (v) ordinal numbers (4)<sup>137</sup> (14:5).<sup>138</sup>

<sup>128</sup> KG II §§454.3; 464.3–4; Smyth §§1161; 1184–1185; *SSG* §§3b; 6.

<sup>129</sup> 2:2+, 12; 6:4; 8:4, 14; 12:6; 13:13, 18; 14:1, 8, 10, 13, 17; 17:21; 18:1; 21:21; 22:2, 17; 24:52, 62; 25:9; 26:1; 30:33; 31:23; 32:20; 34:25; 37:28; 38:22; 40:17, 20; 41:26, 43; 43:17; 44:12; 47:18; 49:25, 30; 50:8, 13.

<sup>130</sup> KG II §463.3A; Smyth §1154; *SSG* §37bb. Though the anarthrous pattern *ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός* is permitted, this construction is increasingly uncommon in Hellenistic Greek.

<sup>131</sup> 6:3, 4; 7:1; 15:18; 17:21; 18:10, 14, 25; 19:8, 21, 33, 35; 20:11; 21:22; 24:28; 26:3, 12+, 24, 32; 28:11, 16, 20; 29:12; 30:35; 32:19; 33:16; 35:21; 38:1; 39:9, 17; 40:15; 44:7+; 47:17; 48:20.

<sup>132</sup> KG II §465.4; Smyth §§1176–1178; *SSG* §34a.

<sup>133</sup> 6:21; 21:2, 17+, 23; 23:17+; 24:7; 26:2, 18; 28:12, 15; 29:27; 35:3, 13, 14; 37:1; 39:20; 40:3, 17; 41:48; 42:38; 44:8; 46:5; 50:25.

<sup>134</sup> Smyth §1120d.

<sup>135</sup> 24:41; 33:10; 37:7; 47:5; 49:29.

<sup>136</sup> KG II §454.3; Smyth §1196a; *SSG* §36a.

<sup>137</sup> 7:11; 8:13; 14:4, 5.

<sup>138</sup> KG II §465.14; Smyth §1125; *SSG* §39b.

|       |                                |                                    |
|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2:12  | ואבן השהם                      | ὁ λίθος ὁ πράσινος                 |
| 15:18 | ביום ההוא                      | ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ                 |
| 29:27 | בעבדה אשר תעבד                 | ἀντὶ τῆς ἐργασίας, ἧς ἐργᾷ         |
| 33:10 | ולקחת מנחת <sup>139</sup> מידי | δέξαι τὰ δῶρα διὰ τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν. |
| 14:5  | ובארבע עשרה שנה                | ἐν δὲ τῷ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ ἔτει    |

When the Hebrew noun is prefixed by an inseparable preposition (i.e., ב, כ, or ל), it cannot bear the article as a consonant (57),<sup>140</sup> though the Massoretic vocalization may indicate its presence (17:21).<sup>141</sup>

17:21 בשנה האחרת ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ ἑτέρῳ

**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)<sup>142</sup> and proper

<sup>139</sup> For G's translation of pronominal suffixes with the Greek definite article, see §4.1.2.1.

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

<sup>141</sup> 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.

<sup>142</sup> For common nouns other than θεός (207), see γῆ (41: 1:22, 24; 2:4, 5; 4:2, 12, 14; 6:4, 5, 6, 17; 10:8, 32; 11:28; 12:6, 10+; 14:19, 22; 18:2; 19:1, 31; 24:52; 26:1, 22; 33:3; 34:21; 37:10; 38:9; 41:31; 42:6; 43:1, 26; 44:11, 14; 45:7; 47:4, 6, 11; 48:7, 12); ὄρκος (8: 21:14, 33; 22:19+; 26:23; 28:10; 46:1, 5); πεδῖον (8: 4:8; 14:17; 24:63, 65; 29:2; 34:5, 28; 37:15); εἶδος (6: 29:17; 39:6; 41:2, 3, 18, 19); πόλις (6: 14:5; 19:12; 34:28, 29; 41:35, 48); ἔρημος (6: 13:3; 16:7; 21:20; 24:62; 36:24; 37:22); ἀργύριον (6: 42:28; 43:12, 15, 21; 44:1; 47:16); σάξ (4: 41:2, 3, 18, 19); ὄψις (4: 24:16; 26:7; 29:17; 39:6); γυνή (4: 20:7; 30:13; 31:35; 46:26); ὁδός (4: 42:25; 44:29; 45:21, 24); οὐρανός (4: 2:4; 11:4; 14:19, 22); ὄρος (4: 19:30; 22:14; 31:54+); οἶκος (3: 27:15; 39:2, 5); αἰών (3: 3:22; 6:3; 13:15); παράδεισος (3: 2:15; 3:8, 10); ἄρνός (3: 30:32, 33, 35); νεφέλη (3: 9:13, 14, 16); ἄβυσσος (3: 1:2; 7:11; 8:2); other lemmas (84: 1:22; 2:4; 3:23, 24; 4:20; 5:1; 6:16; 7:22, 23; 8:1, 5, 20; 9:5; 14:7, 9, 10, 15; 16:10, 12; 17:12, 27+; 18:9, 23, 25; 19:1, 2, 21, 30; 21:32; 23:2; 24:62; 25:11, 32; 27:16, 45; 30:14, 32, 33, 40, 41+; 31:7, 10, 40; 32:12, 21; 34:12, 25, 29; 37:29; 38:25, 28; 39:5; 40:4, 7, 10, 11; 41:2, 18, 21, 35, 36, 48; 43:34; 44:12+; 46:15; 47:17+, 18+, 24; 48:7+, 10; 49:15, 21, 27; 50:10, 11, 17, 21, 26).



(52).<sup>143</sup> Lexically, G more frequently adds the article for certain Greek nouns, e.g., θεός (163) (35:13); γῆ (39) (2:4); πεδῖον (9) (4:8); ὄρκος (8) (21:33);<sup>144</sup> Μεσοποταμία (9) (28:2); Συρία (4) (35:9); and Φυλιστιείμ (5) (21:32).

|       |                                |                                                          |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 35:13 | ויעל מעליו אלהים               | ἀνέβη δὲ ὁ θεός <sup>145</sup> ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ                 |
| 2:4   | ביום עשות יהוה אלהים ארץ ושמם  | ἡ ἡμέρα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν          |
| 4:8   | ... ויהי בהיותם בַּשָּׂדֶה ... | καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ, ...          |
| 21:33 | בבאר שבֵּע                     | ἐπὶ τῷ φρέατι τοῦ ὄρκου                                  |
| 28:2  | קום לך פדנה ארם                | ἀναστὰς ἀπόδραθι εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν                    |
| 35:9  | בבאו מִפְּדֵן ארם              | ὅτε παρεγένετο ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας τῆς Συρίας <sup>146</sup> |
| 21:32 | וישבו אל ארץ פלשתים            | καὶ ἐπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Φυλιστιείμ.               |

<sup>143</sup> Μεσοποταμία (9: 24:10; 25:20; 27:43; 28:2, 5, 6, 7; 31:18; 33:18); Φυλιστιείμ (5: 21:32, 34; 26:14, 15, 18); Συρία (4: 35:9, 26; 46:15; 48:7); Αἰγύπτιος (4: 45:2; 47:15, 20+); κύριος [= יהוה] (3: 4:13; 18:17; 28:13); Ἰωσήφ (3: 37:29, 31, 33); Νῶε (2: 7:11; 8:13); Σὴμ (2: 9:26, 27); Χαλδαῖος (2: 11:28, 31); Ἀβράμ (2: 13:7; 14:13); Λώτ (2: 13:7, 14); Ἀβιμέλεχ (2: 20:18; 21:25); Χαναναῖος (2: 34:30; 36:2); Χεβρών (37:14); Βεώρ (36:32); Ὠνᾶς (36:24); Σάαρ (23:8); Ἰαβόκ (32:22); Ἰσαάκ (26:8); Ἀδὰμ (5:1); Σοδομίτης (19:4); Φαράν (14:6); Μανασσή (48:20).

<sup>144</sup> Although γῆ is often unarticulated, ἄβυσσος (0/3), πεδῖον (1/19: 11:2), and ὄρκος (2/12: 26:33+) are not.

<sup>145</sup> G rarely leaves θεός unarticulated (25/281: 1:2, 27; 3:5; 5:1; 9:6; 15:4; 17:7, 8; 21:33; 23:6; 28:17, 19, 21, 22; 30:2; 31:13; 32:1, 2, 28, 30+; 33:10; 35:5; 41:38; 49:24). While θεός in reference to “the God of Israel” is “normally articular” in the Septuagint, Muraoka notes certain anarthrous patterns (*SSG* §5aa).

<sup>146</sup> 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 Συρίας (2: 28:6; 33:18). G leaves Φυλιστιείμ 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)<sup>147</sup> (41:2),<sup>148</sup> and an added article before proper nouns is often in the genitive case (28/52)<sup>149</sup> (9:26).<sup>150</sup>

|      |                                |                                                   |
|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 41:2 | שבע פרות יפות ומראה ובריאת בשר | ἑπτὰ βόες καλαὶ τῷ εἶδει καὶ ἐκλεκταὶ ταῖς σαρκίν |
| 9:26 | ברוך יהוה אלהי שם              | Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Σήμ                   |

As above, the Massoretic vocalization may indicate the presence of the article (90) (4:8).<sup>151</sup>

**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

<sup>147</sup> 24:16; 26:7; 29:17+; 39:6+; 41:2+, 3+, 18+, 19+.

<sup>148</sup> 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+.

<sup>149</sup> 7:11; 8:13; 9:26, 27; 11:28, 31; 13:7+; 14:6, 13; 20:18; 21:25, 32, 34; 23:8; 25:20; 32:22; 33:18; 35:9, 26; 36:2, 32; 37:14, 31; 46:15; 47:20; 48:7, 20.

<sup>150</sup> 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).

<sup>151</sup> 1:22+; 2:5; 3:8, 10; 4:8, 12, 14; 6:4, 5, 6, 17; 7:22, 23; 8:1, 5, 20; 9:13, 14, 16; 10:8, 32; 11:4, 28; 12:6, 10+; 16:7; 18:9, 23, 25; 19:2, 12, 30+, 31; 21:20; 24:62, 63, 65; 26:1, 22; 27:15; 29:2; 30:14, 32+, 33+, 35, 41+; 31:54+; 32:21; 34:5, 21, 28+, 29+; 36:24; 37:15, 22, 29; 39:5+; 40:10; 41:2, 18, 21, 31, 35, 36, 48; 42:25; 43:1; 44:12+, 29; 45:7, 21, 24; 47:4, 17+; 48:7; 49:27; 50:26. For the implications of this, see note 141 in §3.2.1.2.

[preposition + articular infinitive] (80),<sup>152</sup> mainly for the Hebrew constructions [preposition + infinitive construct]<sup>153</sup> (58)<sup>154</sup> (9:14) and [טרם (ב) + yiqtol/qatal]<sup>155</sup> (9)<sup>156</sup> (37:18).

9:14 בענני ענן על הארץ ἐν τῷ συννεφεῖν με νεφέλας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν  
 37:18 ובטרם יקרב אליהם πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσαι αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτούς

But G also adds an article in the Greek construction [preposition + articular infinitive] used to translate a variety of other Hebrew formulations (8).<sup>157</sup>

42:16 ויבחנו דבריכם ἕως τοῦ φανερὰ γενέσθαι τὰ ῥήματα ὑμῶν  
 42:35 הם מריקים שקיהם ἐν τῷ κατακενοῦν αὐτοὺς τοὺς σάκκους αὐτῶν

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)<sup>158</sup> (16:2).<sup>159</sup>

16:2 הנה נא עצרני יהוה מלדת Ἴδου συνέλκυσέν με κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίττειν.

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”).<sup>160</sup>

<sup>152</sup> KG II §478.4; Smyth §§2032g; 2033b; 2034b; *SSG* §§6h; 30aba.

<sup>153</sup> *IBHS* §§36.2.2–3; Joüon §124k–l.

<sup>154</sup> With אחרי (23), see 5:4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 30; 11:11, 13+, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25; 13:14; 14:17; 24:36; 25:11; 26:18; with ב (16), see 4:8; 9:14; 11:2; 19:16, 29+, 33, 35; 29:20; 32:19, 25; 34:22; 35:1, 7, 18; 38:28; with עד (8), see 3:19; 8:7; 19:22; 27:45; 34:5; 38:17; 43:25; 48:5; with לפני (5), see 13:10; 27:7, 10; 36:31; 50:16; with ל (3): 30:38; 34:15; 49:15; with כ (2), see 39:15; 44:31; with על (1), see 41:32. The count of אחרי is inflated by אחרי הולידו in the genealogies of Gen 5 (9) and Gen 11 (9).

<sup>155</sup> *IBHS* §38.7; Joüon §113j. In Genesis, טרם (ב) is followed by yiqtol except in 24:15 (qatal).

<sup>156</sup> 2:5+; 19:4; 24:15, 45; 27:33; 37:18; 41:50; 45:28. Once G uses [πρίν + infinitive] (27:4).

<sup>157</sup> 11:4; 27:1, 30; 28:15; 32:8; 39:5; 42:16, 35.

<sup>158</sup> 8:12; 16:2; 19:22; 20:6; 47:29.

<sup>159</sup> KG II §478.4c; Smyth §§1408; 2032e; *SSG* §30ab.

<sup>160</sup> 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),<sup>161</sup> usually when the Hebrew equivalent is definite by being suffixed (4:15) or in construct (22)<sup>162</sup> (9:10), but also to substantivize adjectives (12)<sup>163</sup> (25:23),<sup>164</sup> adverbs (5)<sup>165</sup> (15:16),<sup>166</sup> and once a prepositional phrase (39:6).<sup>167</sup>

|       |                         |                                                  |
|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 4:15  | לבילתי הכות אתו כל מצאו | τοῦ μὴ ἀνελεῖν αὐτὸν πάντα τὸν εὐρίσκοντα αὐτόν. |
| 9:10  | מכל יצאי התבה           | ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐξεληθόντων ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ        |
| 25:23 | ורב יעבד צעיר           | καὶ ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι.              |
| 15:16 | עד הנה                  | ἕως τοῦ νῦν <sup>168</sup>                       |
| 39:6  | ולא ידע אתו מאומה ...   | καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ...            |

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)<sup>169</sup> (14:18; 42:39), where Greek grammar requires the

<sup>161</sup> KG II §§461.4–5; Smyth §§1124; 1153b; 2049–2053; *SSG* §31bb.

<sup>162</sup> 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).

<sup>163</sup> 6:5; 8:21; 18:28; 25:23+; 31:8+, 15, 32; 45:23; 48:16; 49:14.

<sup>164</sup> KG II §§403; 461.4; Smyth §§1021–1029; 1153a; *SSG* §23f.

<sup>165</sup> 15:16; 18:12; 32:4; 41:5; 46:34.

<sup>166</sup> KG II §461.6; Smyth §1153e; *SSG* §§6a(ii), e; 24a.

<sup>167</sup> KG II §§403d; 461.6; Smyth §1153c; *SSG* §§6a(i); 26l.

<sup>168</sup> G always articulates νῦν after ἕως (4: 15:16; 18:12; 32:4; 46:34).

<sup>169</sup> 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.

article,<sup>170</sup> but also before prepositional phrases (17)<sup>171</sup> (14:5) and proper nouns (13)<sup>172</sup> (26:1), where G's addition of the article ensures an adnominal interpretation, which is especially significant when the modifier could otherwise be taken adverbially (14:5).<sup>173</sup>

|       |                                                                                               |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 14:18 | והוא כהן לאל עליון ἤν δὲ ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου. <sup>174</sup>                          |
| 43:29 | בנימין אחיו בן אמו Βενιαμὴν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁμομήτριον                                  |
| 14:5  | ויכו את רפאים בעשתרת קרנים καὶ κατέκοψαν τοὺς γίγαντας τοὺς ἐν Ἀσταρῶθ Καρνάν                 |
| 26:1  | ... אשר היה בימי אברהם וילך יצחק ... ὅς ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· ἐπορεύθη δὲ Ἰσαὰκ ... |

The attributive article in 14:5 disambiguates Ἀσταρῶθ Καρνάν 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 Ἀβραάμ 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.<sup>175</sup>

<sup>170</sup> 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.

<sup>171</sup> 1:9+; 2:16; 3:1+; 7:8; 13:13; 14:5+, 6; 17:23; 22:7; 34:19; 38:21, 22; 41:32; 45:13.

<sup>172</sup> 8:4; 13:18; 14:1, 11, 13, 17; 18:1; 21:21; 24:52, 59; 26:1; 43:17; 44:12.

<sup>173</sup> “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).

<sup>174</sup> Several cases involve אל עליון ([ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὑψίστος] 4: 14:18, 19, 20, 22); cf. שדי [אל] ([ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐμός] 49:25).

<sup>175</sup> John Lee claims that G's translation of השמים מתחת השמים in 1:9 as τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ may “avert an ambiguity,” but he remains tentative, as the Hebrew may have read השמים אֲשֶׁר מתחת השמים. 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,<sup>176</sup> since Hebrew has no equivalent structure.<sup>177</sup> G uses *ὁ δέ*, *ἡ δέ*, or *οἱ δέ* almost exclusively to mark a change in speaker (46).<sup>178</sup>

|          |                                   |                                                                  |
|----------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 38:16–18 | ... ויאמר [אליה] הבה נא אבוא אליך | <i>καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἐασόν με εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς σέ. ...</i>            |
|          | ותאמר מה תתן לי כי תבוא אלי       | <i>ἡ δὲ εἶπεν Τί μοι δώσει,ς ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃς πρὸς με;</i>           |
|          | ויאמר אנכי אשלח גדי עזים מן הצאן  | <i>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἐγὼ σοι ἀποστελῶ ἔριφον αἰγῶν ἐκ τῶν προβάτων.</i> |
|          | ותאמר אם תתן ערבון עד שלחך        | <i>ἡ δὲ εἶπεν Ἐὰν δῶς ἀρραβῶνα ἕως τοῦ ἀποστεῖλαί σε.</i>        |
|          | ויאמר מה הערבון אשר אתן לך        | <i>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τίνα τὸν ἀρραβῶνά σοι δώσω;</i>                    |
|          | ותאמר חתמדך                       | <i>ἡ δὲ εἶπεν Τὸν δακτύλιόν σου ...</i>                          |

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.<sup>179</sup>

<sup>176</sup> KG §§456; 459; Smyth §§1099; 1106–1112; *SSG* §1a.

<sup>177</sup> In theory, G could have used the article in this way to translate cases of Hebrew disjunctive syntax that involve contrastive subjects, such as *והוא* (= *καὶ αὐτός*) in 3:16 (*והוא ימשל בך*), 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.

<sup>178</sup> 4:9; 16:8; 18:9; 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 δέ* with a verb other than a verb of speaking (24:65; 39:8), but in both cases adjacent to dialogue.

<sup>179</sup> 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,<sup>180</sup> G often supplies a copula, usually εἰμί.<sup>181</sup> 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% |

---

<sup>180</sup> 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 ἐστὶ-clauses, whereas Hebrew verbless clauses are not equivalent to clauses with הִיּה, 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).

<sup>181</sup> 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)<sup>182</sup> (15:7; 23:15), but also in clauses with existential (13)<sup>183</sup> (29:2), adverbial (13)<sup>184</sup> (4:9), or adjectival (7)<sup>185</sup> (15:1) predicates, or in clauses with periphrastic tense constructions (5)<sup>186</sup> (44:32).<sup>187</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> When G supplies a copula with a nominal predicate, the subject—or rarely the predicate—is a pronoun: with demonstrative pronouns (19), see 6:4; 9:19; 14:2, 7, 8, 17; 23:2, 19; 24:65; 25:4; 35:19, 20, 27; 36:24; 42:14; 44:5; 48:7, 14; 50:11; with personal pronouns (17), see 4:9; 15:7; 17:1; 18:27; 23:6; 24:24, 34, 47; 26:24; 27:32; 30:2; 31:13; 36:1, 8; 45:3, 4; 46:3; with interrogative pronouns (9), see 23:15; 24:65; 27:18, 32; 29:15; 32:27; 33:5, 8; 46:33. Yet, in main clauses with nominal predicates, G permits a verbless clause with personal (3: 28:13; 35:11; 41:44) and interrogative pronouns (6: 31:36+; 37:10, 26; 44:15; 47:3) far less often than with demonstrative pronouns (74: 2:4, 11, 13, 14+, 19, 23; 5:1; 6:9; 9:12, 17; 10:1, 20, 29, 31, 32; 11:10, 27; 14:3; 15:2; 17:10; 19:37, 38; 22:23; 25:7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19; 27:20; 28:17; 32:2; 35:26; 36:1, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16+, 17+, 18+, 19+, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 30, 40, 43+; 37:2; 40:12, 18; 43:29; 46:8, 18, 22, 25; 49:28; 50:18). Also, G commonly uses no copula with expressions like *ὄνομα τῷ ἐνὶ Φισῶν* (15: 2:11, 13; 4:19+, 21; 10:25+; 11:29+; 29:16+; 36:32, 35, 39+) and with other nominal subjects (23: 2:14; 4:22; 6:9; 11:10; 14:10; 16:13; 25:27; 27:11, 19, 22+, 33; 31:43++; 35:10; 46:27; 47:3; 49:9, 10, 21, 22, 27).

<sup>183</sup> 16:1; 18:14; 24:29; 25:23; 29:2, 7, 16; 31:14, 32, 44, 50; 40:20; 41:12. G uses no copula in main clauses with existential predicates more often, especially those with *ἰδοῦ* followed by a noun (7: 22:7, 13; 27:27; 28:12; 29:2; 30:3; 33:1) or pronoun (6: 22:1, 11; 24:25; 27:1, 18; 37:13). For other cases (5), see 11:6; 15:17; 40:10, 17; 45:6.

<sup>184</sup> 2:12; 4:9; 13:9; 15:4; 19:5; 22:7; 23:4; 29:4, 14; 31:38, 41; 38:21; 40:8. G uses no copula in main clauses with adverbial predicates more often (26: 1:2; 3:16; 4:7; 12:19; 13:9+; 16:6, 12+; 17:4; 18:9+; 21:22; 24:51; 25:22, 32; 27:13, 46; 28:15; 40:11; 42:13, 28, 32; 49:8, 13, 24).

<sup>185</sup> 15:1; 24:1, 16; 29:31; 34:7, 30; 45:28. G uses no copula in main clauses with adjectival predicates far more often, especially when blessing (8: 9:26; 14:19, 20; 24:27, 31; 26:29; 27:29; 43:28) or cursing (6: 3:14, 17; 4:11; 9:25; 27:29; 49:7) is involved. For other cases (37), see 1:31; 2:12, 18; 4:13; 6:15++; 9:23; 13:13; 18:11, 20; 19:20, 31; 25:26; 28:17; 29:17+, 19; 30:13, 15; 32:17; 33:15; 34:10, 21; 37:24; 38:25; 40:10+; 41:21; 43:23; 46:26, 27; 47:9; 48:8; 49:12+, 20.

<sup>186</sup> 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. הִיהַ or הָנָה). For a comprehensive treatment of this topic in relation to the Pentateuch, see Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 220–257 (cf. §3.4.4).

<sup>187</sup> For remaining unclassified cases (7), see 17:25; 21:17; 24:16; 28:19; 35:12; 38:25; 46:32.



|       |                                 |                                                        |
|-------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 5:7   | אני יהוה אשר הוצאתיך מאור כשדים | Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐξαγαγών σε ἐκ χώρας Χαλδαίων        |
| 23:15 | מה הוא                          | τί ἂν εἴη τοῦτο;                                       |
| 29:2  | והאבן גדלה על פי הבאר           | λίθος δὲ ἤν μέγας ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι τοῦ φρέατος           |
| 4:9   | אי הבל אחיך                     | Ποῦ ἐστὶν Ἄβελ ὁ ἀδελφός σου;                          |
| 15:1  | שכרך הרבה מאד                   | ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα.                       |
| 44:32 | ... וחטאתי לאבי כל הימים        | ... ἡμαρτηκὼς ἔσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας. |

By adding a copula, G explicates the clause's structure, but since Greek also uses verbless clauses,<sup>188</sup> 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 מה הוא ("What (is) this") in 23:15 by putting it in the optative as τί ἂν εἴη τοῦτο ("What might this be?"), and in 15:1 he takes a future-tense interpretation of שכרך הרבה מאד ("Your payment (is) very great") by translating it as ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα ("Your payment will be very great").<sup>189</sup>

**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)<sup>190</sup> (35:6a), but also possessive (6)<sup>191</sup> (24:36), existential (4)<sup>192</sup> (34:28), adjectival (30:35+), and nominal (35:6b) predicates.<sup>193</sup>

<sup>188</sup> *IBHS* §8; Joüon §154; KG II §354; Smyth §§944–948; *SGS* §94d. Greek often omits the copula (typically ἐστὶν or εἶσιν), 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.

<sup>189</sup> For the significance of this translation choice in relation to the plot of Abraham's story, see §8.3.1.

<sup>190</sup> 1:7, 29+, 30; 2:11; 3:3; 6:17+; 7:15, 19, 22, 23; 8:1, 17; 9:12, 15, 16, 17; 11:4; 13:14, 18; 14:6, 15; 18:24; 23:2, 17++++, 19, 20; 25:9, 18; 27:15; 32:32; 33:18; 35:4, 6+; 38:14, 30; 40:7; 41:38; 43:26; 46:31; 49:29; 50:10, 11.

<sup>191</sup> 12:20; 23:9; 24:36; 39:6; 40:5; 45:10.

<sup>192</sup> 34:28+, 29+.

<sup>193</sup> G almost entirely avoids verbless relative clauses, only permitting the formulation [ἡ/ὃ ὄνομα + nominative] (7: 16:1; 22:24; 24:29; 25:1; 38:1, 2, 6) (cf. §3.2.2.1 note 182)—always a nominal predicate—and a few cases involving adverbial predicates after οὗ (3: 1:11, 12; 31:4).

|       |                               |                                                     |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 35:6  | לוחה אשר בארץ כנען הוא בית אל | Λοῦζα, ἣ ἐστὶν ἐν γῇ Χανάαν, ἣ ἐστὶν Βαιθήλ         |
| 24:36 | ויתן לו את אשר לו             | καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤν αὐτῷ.                        |
| 34:28 | אשר בעיר ואת אשר בשדה         | ὅσα τε ἤν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ὅσα ἤν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ        |
| 30:35 | כל אשר לבן בו וכל חום         | καὶ πᾶν, ὃ ἤν λευκὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πᾶν, ὃ ἤν φαιόν |

**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).<sup>194</sup> Often, the Greek subordinate clause is introduced by ὅτι (7)<sup>195</sup> (41:32) or γάρ (7)<sup>196</sup> (39:23a), but G also adds verbs in other subordinate constructions (14)<sup>197</sup> (19:11; 39:23b; 43:3).

|        |                            |                                                    |
|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 41:32  | כי נכון הדבר מעם האלהים    | ὅτι ἀληθὲς ἔσται τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ          |
| 39:23a | כל מאומה בידו              | πάντα γὰρ ἤν διὰ χειρὸς Ἰωσήφ                      |
| 19:11  | ואת האנשים אשר פתח הבית    | τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τοῦ οἴκου  |
| 39:23b | באשר יהוה אתו              | διὰ τὸ κύριον μετ' αὐτοῦ εἶναι                     |
| 43:3   | ... בלתי אחיכם [הקטן] אתכם | ..., ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν ὁ νεώτερος μεθ' ὑμῶν ᾤ. |

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.

<sup>194</sup> 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.

<sup>195</sup> 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 ὁράω X ὅτι καλόν (10: 1:4, 8, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25; 3:6+; 49:15). For other cases (7), see 3:20; 12:12; 25:28; 39:3; 40:7; 45:12; 49:15.

<sup>196</sup> 30:30; 35:17; 39:23; 41:49; 42:23; 46:34; 50:19. Twice G omits the copula in a γάρ-clause (2: 45:6, 11).

<sup>197</sup> 17:15, 17; 19:11; 23:9; 24:54; 26:20; 38:15; 39:9, 14, 23; 43:3, 5; 44:1; 49:32. Twice G uses a verbless clause in a conditional protasis (2: 13:9+).

### 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 <i>καί</i> .            | 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),<sup>198</sup> *δέ* (27),<sup>199</sup> *ὅτι* (17),<sup>200</sup> *οὖν* (9),<sup>201</sup> and *γάρ* (8)<sup>202</sup>— to join two clauses in a way that is appropriate to each word.<sup>203</sup> While G may introduce the most neutral Greek conjunction *καί* just to avoid asyndeton (11:30),<sup>204</sup> he frequently adds *δέ* to mark a textual

---

<sup>198</sup> 2:12; 4:12, 22; 9:3; 11:10, 30; 12:9; 17:10; 18:6; 19:14, 32; 21:14; 23:11; 26:3, 29; 27:2, 9, 29+; 30:8, 31, 32; 31:13, 29; 32:32; 34:23; 39:9; 40:13; 42:34; 45:9, 22; 46:4; 47:18; 48:10; 49:17, 31.

<sup>199</sup> 6:9; 7:2; 8:5; 13:12; 15:1; 18:11, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32; 19:8; 23:6; 26:2; 31:6, 28; 34:7; 36:2; 37:2, 25; 38:25; 41:28; 43:9, 23; 44:4; 46:26; 50:4.

<sup>200</sup> 12:12, 13, 19; 14:23; 17:14; 18:28; 20:2+, 13; 21:7; 26:7; 30:15; 33:15; 40:7; 42:14; 44:4; 45:26.

<sup>201</sup> 6:14; 19:9, 22; 23:4; 24:50; 29:27; 31:13; 43:4; 45:9.

<sup>202</sup> 21:6; 23:6, 15; 31:52; 32:20; 39:23; 42:18, 21.

<sup>203</sup> For less common conjunctions (14), see *τε* (3: 27:36; 31:52; 41:13); *μέν* (3: 27:22; 43:4; 44:8); *εἰ* (2: 42:20; 45:28); *ἵνα* (2: 18:21; 30:38); *ἀλλά* (42:34); *ἐάν* (33:13); *ἐπεὶ* (15:17); and *ὥσπερ* (41:2).

<sup>204</sup> 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 *ι* must always be considered, especially in the presence of an identifiable trigger, such as in 49:32, where G or V may have doubled a *ι* by reading *שמתו ושמח* as *שמתו ושמח* (= *τὴν γυναικα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκεῖ*).

boundary, such as a paragraph break (6:9),<sup>205</sup> or in a clearly adversative sense (18:28), and he typically adds *ὅτι* to signal the onset of speech (13/17)<sup>206</sup> (42:14).

|       |                                        |                                                       |
|-------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 11:30 | ותהי שרי עקרה אין לה ולד               | καὶ ἦν Σάρα στεῖρα καὶ οὐκ ἔτεκνοποίει.               |
| 6:9   | אלה תולדת נח                           | Αὗται δὲ αἱ γενέσεις Νῶε·                             |
| 18:28 | ... אולי יחסרון חמשים הצדיקים חמשה ... | ἐὰν δὲ ἐλαττονωθῶσιν οἱ πεντήκοντα δίκαιοι πέντε, ... |
| 42:14 | לאמר מרגלים אתם                        | λέγων <i>ὅτι</i> Κατάσκοποι ἐστε·                     |

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.

|       |                                   |                                                                       |
|-------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6:14  | עשה לך תבת עצי גפר                | ποιήσον <i>οὖν</i> <sup>207</sup> σεαυτῷ κιβωτὸν ἐκ ξύλων τετραγώνων· |
| 42:18 | זאת עשו וחיו<br>את האלהים אני ירא | Τοῦτο ποιήσατε καὶ ζήσεσθε·<br>τὸν θεὸν <i>γὰρ</i> ἐγὼ φοβοῦμαι.      |

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

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

<sup>206</sup> G also adds *ὅτι* as a complementizer (3: 33:15; 40:17; 44:4) and in a causal sense (17:14).

<sup>207</sup> G always adds *οὖν* in speech and often after imperatives (6/9: 6:14; 19:22; 23:4; 29:27; 31:13; 45:9).

phrases (12) with *καί* (40),<sup>208</sup> *δέ* (8),<sup>209</sup> or *τε* (6).<sup>210</sup> G's addition of *καί* may improve the style of the translation,<sup>211</sup> but it usually does not significantly alter its meaning.

25:15 *חַדַּד וְתִימָא יִטּוֹר נְפִישׁ וּקְדָמָה* *καὶ* *Χοδδὰδ καὶ Θαιμὰν καὶ* *Ἰετοῦρ καὶ* *Ναφῆς καὶ* *Κέδμα*  
 10:5 *לְמַשְׁפַּחְתָּם בְּגוֹיָם* *ἐν ταῖς φυλααῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν αὐτῶν*

In contrast, G adds *δέ* to clarify complex appositional structures (44:31; 48:13)<sup>212</sup> and *τε* to bind natural pairs as a unit, such as husband and wife (3:1) or quiver and bow (27:3).<sup>213</sup>

44:31 *אֶת שִׁבְתָּ עַבְדְּךָ אֲבִינוּ* *τὸ γῆρας τοῦ παιδὸς σου πατὴρ δὲ ἡμῶν*  
 48:13 *בִּימִינוּ מִשְׁמַל יִשְׂרָאֵל* *ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν δὲ Ἰσραήλ*  
 3:1 *הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ* *ὁ τε Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνή αὐτοῦ*  
 27:3 *תֵּלֶךְ וְקֶשֶׁת* *τὴν τε φερέτραν καὶ τὸ τόξον*

**3.2.3.3 G supplies a conjunction to join adjectives.** Occasionally, G adds *καί* to coordinate two attributive adjectives (8),<sup>214</sup> often joined by a conjunction in Greek.<sup>215</sup>

27:9 *שְׁנֵי גִדֵּי עֲזִים טָבִים* *δύο ἐρίφους ἀπαλούς καὶ* *καλούς*  
 41:7 *[שְׁדָפוֹת הַקִּדִּים] [שְׁבַע] הַשְּׁבִלִים הַדְּקוֹת* *οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ στάχυες οἱ λεπτοὶ καὶ* *ἀνεμόφθοροι*

<sup>208</sup> With noun phrases (31), see 6:17; 7:22; 8:19+; 13:2; 14:1; 17:23, 27; 23:10; 25:15++; 26:5+; 30:35; 31:2, 5; 32:5, 11; 36:6, 10; 43:11; 45:23; 46:16, 21+; 47:18; 48:4; 49:25; 50:7, 24; with prepositional phrases (9), see 5:29; 6:7; 7:8; 10:5, 20, 31; 13:10; 36:40; 49:26.

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

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

<sup>211</sup> KG II §521.2; Smyth §2878; *SSG* §78f.

<sup>212</sup> 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.

<sup>213</sup> KG II §522; Smyth §§2967–2983; *SSG* §§26m; 78c, k.

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

<sup>215</sup> KG II §405.4; Smyth §1033; *SSG* §37a.

### 3.2.3.4 G supplies adverbial *καί*. Rarely, G adds adverbial *καί* (6)<sup>216</sup> for emphasis.<sup>217</sup>

14:12 ... ויקחו את לוט *ἔλαβον δὲ καὶ τὸν Λώτ ...*

41:13 ויהי כאשר פתר לנו כן היה *ἐγενήθη δὲ καθὼς συνέκρινεν ἡμῖν, οὕτως καὶ συνέβη*

By adding *καί* (“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 *καί* (“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),<sup>218</sup> since Greek often uses *οὗτο* to express an adverbial or adnominal

<sup>216</sup> 14:12; 31:33; 34:15, 22; 41:13; 49:16.

<sup>217</sup> KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891.

<sup>218</sup> For adverbial uses (54), see allative (27: 4:8; 9:19; 12:15; 13:9+, 10; 24:27; 26:23; 27:3, 5; 31:4, 21; 32:3; 33:18; 35:1, 3, 16, 27+; 42:6; 43:15, 18, 26; 45:2, 16, 25; 49:4); locative (22: 4:20; 6:5; 9:2; 19:25, 29; 21:14; 24:37; 28:11, 13, 18; 31:13; 33:2; 34:10, 27; 35:15; 38:11+, 30; 39:2, 20; 41:10; 49:16); ablative (5: 9:10; 19:25;

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

|       |                        |                                        |
|-------|------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 9:2   | בכל אשר תרמש האדמה [ו] | καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς |
| 36:37 | מרחבות הנהר            | ἐκ Ῥωβῶθ τῆς παρὰ ποταμόν              |
| 9:19  | נפצה כל הארץ           | διεσπάρησαν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν          |
| 27:3  | וצא השדה               | ἔξελθε εἰς τὸ πεδῖον                   |
| 46:26 | יצאי ירכו              | οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ       |

Even where such additions are obligatory, G's choice of preposition involves interpretation.

For example, יצא constellates with both source (46:26) and goal (27:3), and, while G's interpretation is likely correct, השדה 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),<sup>221</sup> though not often, no doubt since Greek expresses these relationships with case alone.<sup>222</sup> In light of this, it is likely significant that the Hebrew expressions are often idioms.

|       |                            |                                                |
|-------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 15:17 | ... ויהי השמש באה          | ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγίνετο ὁ ἥλιος πρὸς δυσμαῖς, ...      |
| 27:45 | למה אשכל גם שניכם יום אחד  | μήποτε ἀτεκνωθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο υἱῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ. |
| 39:10 | ויהי כדברה אל יוסף יום יום | ἡνίκα δὲ ἐλάλει τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἡμέραν ἕξ ἡμέρας, ... |
| 46:30 | אמותה הפעם                 | Ἀποθανοῦμαι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν                        |

29:14+; 46:26). For adnominal uses (13), see locative (9: 2:16; 3:1+; 13:13; 17:23; 34:19; 36:37; 39:11, 14); allative (2: 24:62; 38:22); ablative (2: 23:6; 38:21).

<sup>219</sup> KG II §§428.1–4; Smyth §§1636–1637; *SSG* §26a.

<sup>220</sup> *IBHS* §§9.5.2f; 10.2.2b; Joüon §§126h; 129f.

<sup>221</sup> 4:24+; 15:17; 27:45; 29:34; 30:20; 39:10; 41:48; 42:35; 45:6; 46:30.

<sup>222</sup> 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)<sup>223</sup> for the sake of clarity and stylistic evenness.<sup>224</sup>

1:14 לאתת ולמועדים ולימים ושנים εἰς σημεῖα καὶ εἰς καιροὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτούς  
 39:20 ... אל בית הסהר מקום אשר εἰς τὸ ὀχύρωμα, εἰς τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ ...

**3.2.4.4 G supplies a preposition to express the agent.** In a few cases G adds ὑπό 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 אתה עתה ברוך יהוה καὶ νῦν σὺ εὐλογητὸς ὑπὸ κυρίου.  
 45:21 על פי פרעה [המלך] κατὰ τὰ εἰρημμένα ὑπὸ Φαραώ τοῦ βασιλέως  
 45:27 את כל דברי יוסף πάντα τὰ ῥηθέντα ὑπὸ Ἰωσήφ

**3.2.4.5 Residual cases.** The other added prepositions (23)<sup>225</sup> do not follow any clear patterns and express a variety of grammatical relationships.

19:21 לבלתי הפכי את העיר אשר דברת τοῦ μὴ καταστρέψαι τὴν πόλιν, περὶ ἧς ἐλάλησας.  
 22:3 ... ויבקע עצי עלה καὶ σχίσας ξύλα εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν, ...

### 3.2.5 Personal pronouns (79)

G supplies personal pronouns in a variety of contexts,<sup>226</sup> which have been grouped by the syntactic function of the added pronoun:

<sup>223</sup> 1:14; 24:10; 39:20; 40:3.

<sup>224</sup> KG II §451; Smyth §§1667–1674; SSG §78g.

<sup>225</sup> 6:5, 14; 8:21; 14:8; 15:6; 19:21; 20:16; 22:3; 24:3, 22; 34:30; 37:21; 40:14; 48:4, 19; 49:19, 21, 23, 26, 32; 50:20, 23, 25.

<sup>226</sup> 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)<sup>227</sup> for emphasis.<sup>228</sup>

|       |                            |                                                    |
|-------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 21:30 | לעדה כי חפרתי את הבאר הזאת | εἰς μαρτύριον ὅτι <u>ἐγὼ</u> ὥρυξα τὸ φρέαρ τοῦτο. |
| 24:46 | שתה וגם גמליך אשקה         | Πίε <u>σύ</u> , καὶ τὰς καμήλους σου ποτιῶ.        |
| 38:23 | הנה שלחתי הגדי הזה         | <u>ἐγὼ</u> μὲν ἀπέσταλκα τὸν ἔριφον τοῦτον,        |
|       | ואתה לא מצאתה              | σύ δὲ οὐχ εὔρηκας.                                 |

With ἐγὼ in 21:30, G underscores the disputed claim over the well; with σύ in 24:46, he emphasizes Rebecca's generous offer to both Abraham's servant and his camels; and he uses ἐγὼ and μὲν ... δέ in 38:23 to contrast Tamar and Judah in this rhetorically charged dialogue. Also, G introduces accusative pronominal subjects of infinitives (11),<sup>229</sup> 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)<sup>230</sup> (24:33; 37:18).

|       |                         |                                                     |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 24:33 | לא אכל עד אם דברתי דברי | Οὐ μὴ φάγω ἕως τοῦ λαλήσαι <u>με</u> τὰ ῥήματά μου. |
| 37:18 | ובטרם יקרב אליהם        | πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσει <u>αὐτὸν</u> πρὸς αὐτούς            |
| 4:13  | גדול עוני מנשא          | Μεῖζων ἢ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι <u>με</u> .         |

<sup>227</sup> 12:11; 13:9+; 21:23, 30; 23:15; 24:14, 30, 40, 43, 46; 26:29; 27:4, 6; 31:11; 34:15; 38:5, 23; 41:40; 42:9; 44:19, 23, 26; 46:1.

<sup>228</sup> KG II §454.1; Smyth §§1190–1191; *SSG* §7.

<sup>229</sup> KG II §§475–476; Smyth §§1972–1981; *SSG* §69A.

<sup>230</sup> 24:33; 27:4, 33; 28:15; 33:14; 37:18; 45:28. For the other cases (4), see 4:13; 19:20; 20:6; 35:18.

**3.2.5.2 G supplies a pronoun that is a verbal object.** G also occasionally supplies object pronouns in the accusative/genitive (15)<sup>231</sup> or dative (10).<sup>232</sup> 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).

|       |                              |                                                              |
|-------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 45:28 | רב עוד יוסף בני חי           | Μέγα <u>μοί</u> ἐστίν, εἰ ἔτι ὁ υἱός μου Ἰωσήφ ζῇ.           |
| 11:3  | הבה נלבנה לבנים ונשרפה לשרפה | Δεῦτε πλινθεύσωμεν πλίνθους καὶ ὀπτήσωμεν <u>αὐτὰς</u> πυρί. |
| 42:22 | ולא שמעתם                    | καὶ οὐκ εἰσηκούσατέ <u>μου</u> .                             |

**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)<sup>233</sup> (21:16; 47:31), but not always (6)<sup>234</sup> (27:25).

|       |                          |                                                                |
|-------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 21:16 | אל אראה במות הילד        | Οὐ μὲν ἴδω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ παιδίου <u>μου</u> .                |
| 47:31 | וישתחו ישראל על ראש המטה | καὶ προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου <u>αὐτοῦ</u> . |
| 27:25 | הגשה לי ואכלה מציד בני   | Προσάγαγέ μοι, καὶ φάγομαι ἀπὸ τῆς θήρας <u>σου</u> , τέκνον   |

**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 בעיני אדני (“in the eyes of my lord”) in 33:8, 15 as ἐναντίον σου κύριε (“before you, lord”) and אל אדני (“to my lord”) in 47:18 as πρὸς σὲ τὸν κύριον (“to you, (the) lord”).

<sup>231</sup> 2:19; 3:24; 11:3; 18:24; 28:21; 31:9, 10, 42; 38:14; 41:14; 42:21, 22; 49:19; 50:10, 26.

<sup>232</sup> 25:31; 28:22; 31:13; 34:3; 35:12; 38:17; 41:45; 45:28; 47:18, 24.

<sup>233</sup> 18:1, 2; 21:16, 17; 24:46; 26:3, 10; 40:13; 47:31; 48:13.

<sup>234</sup> 3:19; 20:16; 27:25; 47:15; 49:12+.

|       |                           |                                                           |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 33:8  | למצא [עבדך] חן בעיני אדני | ἵνα εὕρῃ ὁ παῖς σου χάριν ἐναντίον σου, κύριε.            |
| 33:15 | למה זה אמצא חן בעיני אדני | ἵνα τί τοῦτο; ἵκανόν ὅτι εὕρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, κύριε. |
| 47:18 | אל אדני                   | πρὸς <u>σε</u> τὸν κύριον                                 |

### 3.2.6 The particle *אֲנִי/עָאֵן* (38)

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

|       |                                    |                                                                          |
|-------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:17  | כי ביום אכלך ממנו מות תמות         | ἢ δ' <u>ἂν</u> ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε.               |
| 21:22 | אלהים עמך בכל אשר אתה עשה          | Ὁ θεὸς μετὰ σοῦ ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς <u>ἂν</u> ποιῇς.                           |
| 2:19  | וכל אשר יקרא לו האדם נפש חיה       | καὶ πᾶν, ὃ <u>ἔα</u> ν ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸ Ἀδὰμ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν,<br>הוא שמו        |
| 33:10 | כי על כן ראיתי פניך בראת פני אלהים | ἐνεκεν τούτου εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, ὥς <u>ἂν</u> τις ἴδοι πρόσωπον θεοῦ |

<sup>235</sup> KG II §§392–399; Smyth §§1761–1849; *SSG* §29c, db(ii); 89l.

<sup>236</sup> 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.

<sup>237</sup> With aorist subjunctive (2), see 12:12; 30:38; with indicative (2), see 6:4 [imperfect]; 30:42 [aorist].

<sup>238</sup> With aorist subjunctive (3), see 12:13; 18:19; 50:20.

<sup>239</sup> With aorist indicative (4), see 30:27; 31:27, 42; 43:10; with optative (2), see 44:8 [aorist]; 23:15 [present].

<sup>240</sup> KG II §559.1; Smyth §§2555; 2567; *SSG* §29c(i).

<sup>241</sup> KG II §392.4; Smyth §1790; *SSG* §29c(iii); 89l.

<sup>242</sup> KG II §§582–583; Smyth §2477; *SSG* §29dc(i); Joosten, “Elaborate Similes,” 227–236; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 190–197.

In main clauses, G supplies ἄν/ἐάν with the indicative in a contrafactual apodosis (4)

(43:10)<sup>243</sup> or with the potential optative (2) (23:15).<sup>244</sup>

43:10 כי לולא התמהמהנו כי עתה שבנו זה פעמים εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐβραδύναμεν, ἤδη ἂν ὑπεστρέψαμεν δῖς.

23:15 מה הוא τί ἂν εἴη τοῦτο;

### 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.<sup>245</sup> 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).<sup>246</sup> 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.

---

<sup>243</sup> KG II §574; Smyth §§2302–2312; *SSG* §89b.

<sup>244</sup> KG II §396.2; Smyth §§1824–1834; *SSG* §29db(ii); Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 188–190.

<sup>245</sup> 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).

<sup>246</sup> 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.<sup>247</sup>

19:17 המלט על נפשך | Σώζων | σῶζε<sup>248</sup> τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν.

In contrast, where the two renderings serve as exegetical alternatives (19:37, 38; 30:18),<sup>249</sup> it more likely originated in Greek, but it still remains uncertain who is responsible for it.<sup>250</sup>

19:37 ותקרא שמו מואב | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Μωάβ· | ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου·

19:38 ותקרא שמו בן עמי | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἀμμάν· | υἱὸς τοῦ γένους μου·

30:18 ותקרא שמו ישכר | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσσαχάρ, | ὃ ἐστὶν Μισθός.

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

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

<sup>248</sup> 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.

<sup>249</sup> 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.

<sup>250</sup> 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).

|       |                    |                                                 |                        |
|-------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1:12  | למינהו             | κατὰ γένος   καὶ καθ' ὁμοίότητα                 | (also in [1:11])       |
| 1:29  | את כל עשב זרע זרע  | πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον   σπεῖρον σπέρμα            |                        |
| 3:14  | על גחנך            | ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει σου   καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ               |                        |
| 6:20  | מ[כל] העוף         | ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ὀρνέων   τῶν πετεινῶν            |                        |
| 12:17 | נגעים גדלים        | ἐτασμοῖς μεγάλοις   καὶ πονηροῖς                |                        |
| 15:11 | על הפגרים          | ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα,   τὰ διχοτομήματα αὐτῶν          |                        |
| 18:10 | כעת חיה            | κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον   εἰς ὥρας               |                        |
| 24:5  | ללכת אחרי          | πορευθῆναι μετ' ἐμοῦ   ὀπίσω                    |                        |
| 27:45 | אף אחיך            | τὸν θυμὸν   καὶ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου       |                        |
| 31:10 | עקדים נקדים וברדים | διάλευκοι καὶ ποικίλοι καὶ σποδοειδεῖς   ῥαντοί | (also in 30:39; 31:12) |
| 35:2  | בתככם              | μεθ' ὑμῶν   ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν                       |                        |
| 36:27 | ועקן               | καὶ Ἰωυκάμ   καὶ Οὐκάν                          |                        |

### 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)<sup>251</sup> (6:3; 19:34) and relative pronouns (12)<sup>252</sup> (14:19).<sup>253</sup> These small words may clarify or alter the meaning.

|       |                         |                                                                |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6:3   | לא ידון רוחי באדם       | Οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις <u>τούτοις</u> |
| 19:34 | נשקנו יין גם הלילה      | ποτίσωμεν αὐτὸν οἶνον καὶ τὴν νύκτα <u>ταύτην</u>              |
| 14:19 | לאל עליון קנה שמים וארץ | τῷ θεῷ τῷ ὑψίστῳ, <u>ὃς</u> ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν    |

<sup>251</sup> 6:3; 19:33, 34; 24:50; 25:24; 27:46; 30:15; 32:19; 34:12; 36:19; 37:27; 38:10, 27, 30; 40:15.

<sup>252</sup> 3:5; 14:19, 22; 23:2, 19; 27:20; 30:35; 36:6; 37:1; 41:19; 49:4; 50:25.

<sup>253</sup> For the other cases (104), see 2:9; 3:6, 11+, 17+; 8:5, 13; 9:22; 13:14; 14:13; 19:7, 9; 20:4; 21:16+; 23:17; 24:31, 33, 36, 42; 25:22++, 25+; 27:36, 38++; 28:18; 29:35+; 30:12, 37++++; 31:29, 30, 44++; 32:13+, 17+; 33:4, 10, 14++, 15; 35:5+, 16+; 36:7+, 19; 37:4, 30, 35+; 38:15++++, 28+; 39:6, 14, 22+; 40:16; 41:22, 34++, 41; 42:16+, 33; 43:16, 29, 34++; 44:10+, 23; 45:1; 47:22+++; 48:13; 50:20+, 21+.

For example, *τούτοις* in 6:3 carries a pejorative sense,<sup>254</sup> while G's addition of *ὅς* in 14:19 is needed to clarify the sentence structure, since he uses a finite verb for the participle קנה.

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).<sup>255</sup>

|       |                             |                                                               |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 25:22 | אם כן                       | <i>Ei οὕτως μοι μέλλει γίνεσθαι, ...</i>                      |
| 2:9   | ויצמח יהוה אלהים מן האדמה   | <i>καὶ ἐξανέτειλεν ὁ θεὸς ἔτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς</i>                  |
| 20:4  | אדני הגוי גם צדיק תהרג      | <i>Κύριε, ἔθνος ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολείς;</i>              |
| 39:6  | ויהי יוסף יפה תאר ויפה מראה | <i>Καὶ ἦν Ἰωσήφ καλὸς τῷ εἶδει καὶ ὥραϊος τῇ ὥψει σφόδρα.</i> |

In 2:9, *ἔτι* (“again”) mediates the redundancy of God creating plants in the two creation accounts,<sup>256</sup> and G adds *ἀγνοοῦν* (“unwitting”) in 20:4 to protect Abimelech’s character.<sup>257</sup>

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 | הכי קרא שמו יעקב<br>ויעקבני זה פעמים<br>את בכרתי לקח<br>והנה עתה לקח ברכתי | <i>Δικαίως ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ·<br/>ἐπτέρνικεν γάρ με ἥδη δεύτερον τοῦτο·<br/>τά τε πρωτοτόκιά μου εἴληφεν,<br/>καὶ νῦν εἴληφεν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου.</i> |
| 27:38 | וישא עשו קלו ויבך                                                          | <i>κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ἰσαὰκ ἀνεβόησεν φωνὴν Ἡσαὺ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν.</i>                                                                                              |
| 33:4  | וישקוהו ויבכו                                                              | <i>καὶ ἔκλαυσαν ἀμφότεροι.</i>                                                                                                                                |

<sup>254</sup> The article may be omitted with this emotive (“mit Affekt”) or “contemptuous” use of *οὗτος* (KG II §465.4d; Smyth §1178e).

<sup>255</sup> 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 יָפָה in order to enhance Joseph’s physical attractiveness.

<sup>256</sup> 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.

<sup>257</sup> 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.<sup>258</sup> 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.<sup>259</sup>

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:

---

<sup>258</sup> Such granular translation is Barr’s “narrow segmentation,” *Typology of Literalism*, 294–303.

<sup>259</sup> 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).<sup>260</sup> 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.<sup>261</sup> Common forms are presented with their Greek equivalents in Table 6 below.

---

<sup>260</sup> 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.”

<sup>261</sup> For example, the “complex” preposition מִלְפָּנֵי likely formed from a prior compound preposition לְפָנֵי, which had already become lexicalized as a preposition regardless of its historical formation.

**TABLE 6. COMMON HEBREW COMPOUND PREPOSITIONS TRANSLATED SYNTHETICALLY<sup>262</sup>**

|                       |                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <sup>263</sup> לפני   | <b>53:</b> ἐναντίον (33); <sup>264</sup> ἔμπροσθεν (11); <sup>265</sup> πρό (5); <sup>266</sup> ἐνώπιον (2); <sup>267</sup> πρὶν ἢ (29:26); πρὸς (50:18) |
| מעל                   | <b>31:</b> ἀπό (29); <sup>268</sup> ἐπάνω (1:7); ὁ (18:3)                                                                                                |
| בעיני                 | <b>29:</b> ἐναντίον (29) <sup>269</sup>                                                                                                                  |
| מאת                   | <b>14:</b> ἀπό (6); <sup>270</sup> παρὰ (6); <sup>271</sup> ἐκ (17:27); ὀπίσω (8:8)                                                                      |
| <sup>272</sup> על פני | <b>12:</b> ἐπάνω (4); <sup>273</sup> ἀπέναντι (3); <sup>274</sup> ἐπὶ (2); <sup>275</sup> κατὰ (1:20); ἐνώπιον (11:28); κατέναντι (50:13)                |

<sup>262</sup> The only prepositions G translates analytically with any regularity involve פנה (על פני, מפני, מלפני, מעל פני, מלפני, מעל פני, מאת פני, מעם פני, and מיד (ביד and מיד), i.e., according to normal Greek usage (ἀπὸ προσώπου in the sense “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.

<sup>263</sup> G only translates לפני analytically in 23:17 (κατὰ πρόσωπον). This is the only case in Genesis of local לפני with an inanimate object, which Septuagint translators typically treat differently (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 72–73).

<sup>264</sup> 6:11, 13; 7:1; 10:9+; [12:19]; 13:9; 17:1, 18; 18:22; 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.

<sup>265</sup> 24:7; 32:3, 16, 17; 33:3, 14; 41:43; 45:5, 7; 46:28; 48:20.

<sup>266</sup> 13:10; 27:7, 10; 36:31; 50:16.

<sup>267</sup> 24:51; 30:33.

<sup>268</sup> 4:14; 6:7; 7:4, 17; 8:3, 7, 8, 11, 13+; 13:9, 11; 17:22; 24:46, 64; 25:6; 27:40; 29:3, 8, 10; 35:13; 38:14, 19; 40:19+; 41:42; 42:24; 45:1; 48:17

<sup>269</sup> 6:8; 16:4, 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+; 47:25, 29; 50:4. Ἐναντίον is a favorite equivalent for בעיני 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 παρὰ + dative) (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 123–125).

<sup>270</sup> 26:27, 31; 27:30; 38:1; 42:24; 44:28.

<sup>271</sup> 19:24; 23:20; 25:10; 49:30, 32; 50:13.

<sup>272</sup> G renders על פני 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 προσώπου (2: 7:23; 11:4); ἐπὶ προσώπῳ (8:9). Genesis contains relatively many “Hebraistic” cases of ἐπὶ + πρόσωπον meaning “on the surface of” (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 113).

<sup>273</sup> 1:2+, 29; 7:18.

<sup>274</sup> 23:19; 25:9; 49:30.

<sup>275</sup> 6:1; 7:3.

|           |                                                                                                     |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 276 בעבור | 12: διὰ (4); <sup>277</sup> ἕνεκα (3: 18:29, 31, 32); ὅπως (3: 27:4, 19, 31); ἵνα (2: 21:30; 46:34) |
| מעם       | 8: ἀπό (5: 13:14; 24:27; 26:16; 31:31; 48:12); παρὰ (2: 41:32; 44:32); ἐκ (44:29)                   |
| 278 בתוך  | 8: ἐν (6: 9:21; 18:24, 26; 23:6, 9; 41:48); μετὰ (2: 35:2; 42:5)                                    |
| 279 מפני  | 7: ἀπό (4: 6:13; 36:7; 41:31; 47:13); διὰ (2: 7:7; 27:46); ἐνώπιον (31:35)                          |
| 280 בקרב  | 7: ἐν (5: 18:12, [13], 24; 24:3; 25:22); ἐπί (2: 45:6; 48:16)                                       |
| 281 ביד   | 6: μετὰ (3: 24:10; 43:12, 22); παρὰ (2: 44:16, 17); ὑποχείριος (14:20)                              |
| לעיני     | 5: ἐναντίον (5: 23:11, 18; 30:41; 42:24; 47:19)                                                     |

(Synthetic translations of less common compound prepositions are given in the notes.)<sup>282</sup>

<sup>276</sup> In 3:17 and 8:21 G translates בעבור analytically as ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου (3:17) and διὰ τὰ ἔργα (8:21), but in these cases עבור was or was read as עבוד.

<sup>277</sup> 12:13, 16; 18:26; 26:24.

<sup>278</sup> Just as often, G translates בתוך analytically as ἐν μέσῳ (7: 1:6; 2:9; 3:3, 8; 23:10; 37:7; 40:20), but he only uses this where it is good Koine Greek, i.e., when ἐν μέσῳ means “among, in the midst of” in relation to animate beings or “in the middle of” in relation to places or objects (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 251–252, 263–266).

<sup>279</sup> Just as often, G translates מפני analytically as ἀπὸ προσώπου (7: 3:8; 4:14; 16:6, 8; 35:1, 7; 36:6), but only where it reflects acceptable Koine usage, i.e., not in a causal context (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 92–94).

<sup>280</sup> It is noteworthy that, although they are commonly matched elsewhere in the Septuagint, G never translates בקרב as ἐν μέσῳ, but selects more linguistically appropriate equivalents, ἐπί being an especially rare translation of בקרב that is well-suited to contexts where it means “within, in(to)” (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 235–236, 244–248).

<sup>281</sup> G usually translates ביד analytically (25), rendering the noun יד as χεῖρ but the preposition ב 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); ὁ (3: 19:16++); ὑπό (9:2); μετὰ (22:6). The uses of ביד in Genesis, however, are almost exclusively local, and so G’s analytic translations are “good Greek equivalents” (Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 178–190).

<sup>282</sup> בפי (4) [ἐν (3: 43:12, 21; 44:8); εἰς (44:2)]; מיד (4) [παρὰ (4: 21:30; 31:39; 33:19; 38:20)]; מתחת (4) [ὑποκάτω (4: 1:7, 9+; 6:17)]; על דבר (4) [ἕνεκα (2: 20:11, 18); περί (12:17); διὰ (43:18)]; מקץ (4) [μετὰ (4: 4:3; 8:6; 16:3; 41:1)]; מקצה (3) [ἄμα (19:4); ἀπό (47:2); μετὰ (8:3)]; על אדות (3) [περί (3: 21:11, 25; 26:32)]; מל (3) [ἀπό (2: 4:16; 23:8); ἐκ (41:46)]; לבר (3) [κατά (3: 30:40; 43:32+)]; את פני (2) [ἐναντίον (2: 19:13, 27)]; כנגד (2) [κατά (2: 18); ὁμοίως (2:20)]; מנגד (2) [ἀπέναντι (2: 21:16+)]; בעבר (2) [πέραν (2: 50:10, 11)]; באזן (2) [ἀκούω (23:10); ἐναντίον (44:18)]; מלפני (2) [ἀπό (2: 23:4; 47:10)]; בגלל (2) [ἕνεκα (12:13); διὰ (39:5)]; לנכח (2) [περί (25:21); ἐνώπιον (30:38)]; מלבד (2) [χωρίς (2: 26:1; 46:26)]; כמן (1) [μετὰ: 38:24]; מאת פני (1) [παρὰ: 43:34]; על פי (1) [κατά: 43:7]; לפי (1) [κατά: 47:12]; מבין (1) [ἐκ: 49:10]; ממעל (1) [ἐπάνω: 22:9]; מעל פני (1) [ἀπό: 23:3]; מבוא (1)

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, ἔμ-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, ἔμπροσθεν, 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).<sup>283</sup>

|      |                      |                                                 |
|------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 40:9 | והנה גפן לפני        | ἤν ἄμπελος ἐναντίον μου.                        |
| 24:7 | הוא ישלח מלאכו לפניך | αὐτὸς ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθέν σου |
| 27:7 | לפני מותי            | πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν με                            |

**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.

[κατά: 24:62]; ממעה (1) [ἐκ: 15:4]; מקדם (1) [ἀπέναντι: 3:24]; לה מהלאה (1) [ἐπέκεινα: 35:16]; לה מתחת (1) [κατώ: 35:8].

<sup>283</sup> 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**

|                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <sup>284</sup> כִּאֲשֶׁר   | <b>39:</b> καθά (17); <sup>285</sup> ἡνίκα (7); <sup>286</sup> ὡς (5); <sup>287</sup> καθὼς (3: 8:21; 41:13; 50:12); καθότι (2: 26:29; 34:12); καθάπερ (2: 12:4; 50:6); ὃν τρόπον (26:29); μετά (27:30); ὅταν (40:14) |
| <sup>288</sup> כִּי אִם    | <b>6:</b> ἀλλά (4: 15:4; 32:28; 35:10; 40:14); πλὴν (2: 39:6, 9)                                                                                                                                                      |
| <sup>289</sup> בְּטֶרֶם    | <b>5:</b> πρό (4: 27:33; 37:18; 41:50; 45:28); πρὶν (27:4)                                                                                                                                                            |
| <sup>290</sup> כֹּל אֲשֶׁר | <b>5:</b> ὅσος (5: 31:12, 16; 34:29; 45:10, 13)                                                                                                                                                                       |

(Synthetic translations of less common compound conjunctions are given in the notes.)<sup>291</sup>

Many common equivalents for כִּאֲשֶׁר are composed of κατά (= כ) and a relative (ἄ[περ], ὥς, ὅτι). 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 מִן or כ (41), as well. These are listed below in Table 8.

<sup>284</sup> On כִּאֲשֶׁר, see *IBHS* §§38.5a, 7a; Joüon §§166n; 174a. In three cases G translates כִּאֲשֶׁר analytically as ἐν τῷ (24:52), ἡνίκα ἐάν (27:40), or ὅσα ἐάν (44:1).

<sup>285</sup> 7:9, 16; 17:23; 18:5; 21:1+, 4; 24:51; 27:14, 19; 34:22; 40:22; 41:21, 54; 43:14, 17; 47:11.

<sup>286</sup> 12:11; 20:13; 24:22; 32:2, 31; 37:23; 43:2.

<sup>287</sup> 18:33; 27:4, 9; 29:10; 30:25.

<sup>288</sup> On כִּי אִם, see *IBHS* §39.3.5d; Joüon §§164c; 172c; 173b. About as often G translates כִּי אִם analytically (4) as ἐάν μὴ (2: 32:26; 42:15), εἰ γάρ (47:18), or ἀλλ' ἢ (28:17).

<sup>289</sup> On בְּטֶרֶם (כ), see *IBHS* §38.7; Joüon §113j.

<sup>290</sup> Far more often, G translates the antecedent of the relative particle (כֹּל) with a form of πᾶς (39): 1:31; 2:19; 6:2, 17, 22; 7:5, 8, 22+; 9:2; 11:6; 12:20; 13:1; 14:23; 20:7, 16; 21:12, 22; 24:2; 25:5; 28:15, 22; 30:33, 35; 31:1, 21, 43; 35:2; 39:3, 5+, 6, 8, 22; 41:56; 45:11; 46:1, 32; 47:1.

<sup>291</sup> See בעת (2) [ἡνίκα (2: 31:10; 38:27)]; אִם לֹא (1) [ἀλλ' ἢ (24:38)]; לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר (1) [ὅτι (18:19)]; אִךְ אִם (1) [ἐπειδὴ (23:13)]; לַעַת (1) [ἡνίκα (24:11)]; בַּעֲבוּר אֲשֶׁר (1) [ὅπως (27:10)]; לֹא אֲשֶׁר (1) [καθά (27:8)]; עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם (1) [ἕως (28:15)]; לְבִלְתִּי (1) [μὴ (3:11)]; מֵאִז (1) [μετά (39:5)]; עַד כִּי (1) [ἕως (41:49)].

**TABLE 8. HEBREW COMPOUND ADVERBIALS WITH מן AND ב**

|                     |                                                         |                                          |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| מזה                 | 3: ἐντεῦθεν (3: 37:17; 42:15; 50:25) <sup>292</sup> בזה | 3: ἐνταῦθα (2: 38:21; 48:9); ὧδε (38:22) |
| מחוץ                | 2: ἔξωθεν (6:14); ἔξω (24:11)                           | 2: ἔξω (2: 9:22; 24:31)                  |
| <sup>293</sup> מבית | 1: ἔσωθεν (6:14)                                        | בבית 1: ἔσω (39:11)                      |
| משם                 | 23: ἐκεῖθεν (23) <sup>294</sup>                         |                                          |
| מלמעל               | 2: ἄνωθεν (6:16); ἐπάνω (7:20)                          |                                          |
| מעל                 | 2: ἄνωθεν (2: 27:39; 49:25)                             |                                          |
| מרחוק               | 2: μακρόθεν (2: 22:4; 37:18)                            |                                          |

For the cases involving מן—predominately in משם (23)—G almost always selects a Greek word suffixed by -θεν, which conveys the same locative sense as the Hebrew preposition.<sup>295</sup>

**3.3.1.4 Compound question words.** In a few cases, G translates compound Hebrew question words synthetically (11),<sup>296</sup> presented in Table 9 below.

<sup>292</sup> The phrase בזאת, however, is never locative and always translated ἐν τούτῳ (4: 34:15, 22; 42:15, 33).

<sup>293</sup> Apart from 6:14 (מבית) and 39:11 (בבית), G gives analytic translations for the adverbials מבית (6: 12:1; 20:13; 24:7, 40; 34:26; 44:8) and בבית (9: 31:14, 41; 39:2, 5, 20, 22; 40:5; 42:19; 47:24).

<sup>294</sup> 2:10; 10:14; 11:8, 9; 12:8; 18:16, 22; 20:1; [24:4], 5, 7, [38]; 26:17, [21], 22, 23; 27:9, 45; 28:2, 6; 30:32; 42:26; 49:24.

<sup>295</sup> KG I §135.3; Smyth §342.

<sup>296</sup> IBHS §18; Joüon §§144; 161.

**TABLE 9. HEBREW COMPOUND QUESTION WORDS TRANSLATED SYNTHETICALLY (5+)**

|                    |                                                                         |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <sup>297</sup> למה | (5) τί (2: 43:6; 44:4); ὅτι (12:18); μήποτε (27:45); ἵνα οὖν μή (47:19) |
| למי                | (3) τίνος (3: 32:17+; 38:25)                                            |
| מאין               | (2) πόθεν (2: 29:4; 42:7)                                               |
| אי מזה             | (1) πόθεν (16:8)                                                        |

As with the compound adverbials, the suffix -θεν could be matched to the preposition מן 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 καὶ γὰρ formed by crasis. | 5 / 110  | 4.5%  |
| §3.3.2.3 | Other Greek compounds.                   | 55 / 110 | 50.0% |

---

<sup>297</sup> G usually translates למה analytically as ἵνα 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 τί ὅτι (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: ἵνα 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,<sup>298</sup> and so G often translates numbers synthetically (50).<sup>299</sup> Parts of the Greek compound numbers have obvious correspondences to each of the Hebrew number words (e.g., in 14:5 τεσσαρες- goes with ארבע and -δεκάτω with עשרה).

14:5    ובארבע עשרה שנה    ἐν δὲ τῷ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ ἔτει

15:13    ארבע מאות שנה    τετρακόσια ἔτη

**3.3.2.2 Greek compound καὶ ἐγώ formed by crasis.** When G uses the form καὶ ἐγώ,<sup>300</sup> formed by crasis from καί and ἐγώ,<sup>301</sup> the two constituents translate different Hebrew words (5): גם (3: 20:6; also 30:3, 30), ואני (42:37), or אני (40:16).

20:6    גם אנכי ידעתי כי בתם לבבך עשית זאת    Καὶ ἐγὼ ἔγνων ὅτι ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ ἐποίησας τοῦτο

42:37    ואני אשיבנו אליך    καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνάξω αὐτὸν πρὸς σέ.

40:16    אני [ראיתי] בחלומי    Καὶ ἐγὼ εἶδον ἐνύπνιον

**3.3.2.3 Other Greek compounds.** G also translates synthetically when using compound nouns formed with ἀρχι- (20)<sup>302</sup> for Hebrew construct phrases with שר as the nomen regens, or in using the negated compound pronouns οὐδέ/μηδέ/οὐδείς (9)<sup>303</sup> (19:17).<sup>304</sup>

<sup>298</sup> IBHS §15; Joüon §142; KG I §181; Smyth §347.

<sup>299</sup> 5:4, 5, 7, 8+, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26+, 27, 30, 31; 6:1, 15; 7:6, 11; 8:13; 9:28, 29; 11:11, [13]+, 15, 17; 14:4+, 5, 14; 15:13; 17:20; 23:15, 16; 25:16; 32:6, 22; 33:1; 35:22; 37:9; 42:13, 32; 45:22; 49:28.

<sup>300</sup> G does not always use contracted forms of καὶ ἐγώ: see 17:4; 43:8; 44:9, 16; 46:4+, 34; 47:3. Also, G uses the related form καὶ ἐγώ twice (27:34, 38) in translating גם אני as δὴ καὶ ἐγώ.

<sup>301</sup> KG I §51.5b; Smyth §68c.

<sup>302</sup> Lee, *Lexical Study*, 48–49, 96.

<sup>303</sup> G translates ואל as μηδέ (3: 19:17; 22:12; 45:5), ולא as οὐδέ (4: 21:26+; 39:9; 45:6) or μηδέ (31:52 [ואם לא]), and אין איש as οὐδείς (2: 31:44, 50). See also 19:31, where G translates אין איש synthetically as οὐδείς ἐστίν.

<sup>304</sup> KG I §186; Smyth §349b; SSG §83e.



|       |                                     |                                                             |                               |
|-------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 37:36 | שר הטבחים                           | ἀρχι-μαγείρω                                                | (also 39:1; 40:3; 41:10, 12)  |
| 39:21 | שר בית הסהר                         | τοῦ ἀρχι-δεσμοφύλακος                                       | (also 39:22, 23)              |
| 40:2  | שר המשקים                           | τῷ ἀρχι-οινοχόῳ                                             | (also 40:9, 20, 21, 23; 41:9) |
| 40:4  | שר הטבחים                           | ὁ ἀρχι-δεσμώτης                                             |                               |
| 40:2  | שר האופים                           | τῷ ἀρχι-σιτοποιῷ                                            | (also 40:16, 20, 22; 41:10)   |
| 19:17 | אל תביט אחרריך<br>ואל תעמד בכל הככר | μὴ περιβλέψῃς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω<br>μηδὲ στῇς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ |                               |

G's synthetic translations also involve other compounds:<sup>305</sup> adjectives (19)<sup>306</sup> (41:6; 17:12), verbs (3)<sup>307</sup> (31:29), nouns (20:11; also 14:13), and adverbs (33:3; also 43:34).<sup>308</sup> As with other types of Greek compounds, the parts correspond to distinct Hebrew elements.

|       |              |                |                         |
|-------|--------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| 41:6  | שדופת קדים   | ἀνεμό-φθοροί   | (also 41:7, 23, 24, 27) |
| 17:12 | מקנת כסף     | ὁ ἀργυρ-ώνητος | (also 17:13, 23, 27)    |
| 31:29 | לעשות ... רע | κακο-ποιῆσαί   |                         |
| 20:11 | יראת אלהים   | θεο-σέβεια     |                         |
| 33:3  | שבע פעמים    | ἐπτ-άκις       |                         |

### 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:

<sup>305</sup> Smyth §§869–899.

<sup>306</sup> 12:11; 14:14; 15:3; 17:12, 13, 17, 23+, 27+; 26:8; 38:24; 41:6, [7], 23, [24], 27; 43:29; 49:13.

<sup>307</sup> 18:21; 24:27; 31:29.

<sup>308</sup> The other compounds are: οἰκο-γενής (4) [יליד בית (3: 14:14; 17:23, 27); 15:3]; παρ-άλιος (1) [לחוף יפת 49:13]; συν-ωμόται (1) [בעלי ברית 14:13]; πολυ-χρόνιος (1) [ארכו לו שם הימים 26:8]; εὐ-πρόσωπος (1) [יפת מראה 12:11]; συν-τελοῦνται (1) [עשו כלה 18:21]; ἑκατοντ-αετεί (1) [מאה שנה 17:17]; πεντα-πλασίως (1) [חמש 43:34]; ὁμο-μήτριον (1) [בן אמו 43:29]; εὐ-όδωκεν (1) [בדרך נחני 24:27]; τρί-μηνον (1) [שלוש חדשים 38:24].

|          |                                                 |           |       |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| §3.3.3.1 | Certain Hebrew idioms with pronominal suffixes. | 29 / 163  | 17.8% |
| §3.3.3.2 | Divine names.                                   | 12 / 163  | 7.4%  |
| §3.3.3.3 | Apparent cases.                                 | 5 / 163   | 3.1%  |
| §3.3.3.4 | Residual cases.                                 | 117 / 163 | 71.8% |

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: אינו (12)<sup>309</sup> (31:2), לבד (9)<sup>310</sup> (2:18), באכה (5)<sup>311</sup> (10:19), and בי (43:20; also 44:18).

31:2    והנה אינו עמו כתמול שלשום    και ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἔν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς ἐχθρὸς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν.

2:18    לא טוב היות האדם לבדו    Οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον.

10:19    מצידן באכה גררה עד עזה    ἀπὸ Σιδῶνος ἕως ἐλθεῖν εἰς Γέραρα καὶ Γάζαν

43:20    בי אדני    Δεόμεθα, κύριε.

**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 יהוה אדני synthetically as Δέσποτα (15:2).<sup>312</sup>

<sup>309</sup> Synthetic translations of אינו use οὐ/μή and a verb: εἰμί (9: 30:33; 31:2, 5; 37:30; 42:36+; 44:26, 30, 34), ὑπάρχω (2: 42:13, 32), or εὐρίσκω (5:24). Cf. the similar rendering of גדלו אינו as οὐχ ὑπερέχει in 39:9.

<sup>310</sup> G usually translates suffixed forms of לבד as μόνος (8: 2:18; 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).

<sup>311</sup> 10:19+, 30; 13:10; 25:18. Only in 19:22 does G translate the suffix on באכה (ἕως τοῦ σε εἰσελθεῖν).

<sup>312</sup> For the significance of this synthetic translation within its narrative context, see §8.3.1.

|       |               |                      |                                    |
|-------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 33:20 | אל אלהי ישראל | τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ      | (also 46:3)                        |
| 14:22 | יהוה אל עליון | τὸν θεόν τὸν ὑψιστον |                                    |
| 2:4   | יהוה אלהים    | ὁ θεός               | (also 2:5, 7, 9, 19, 21; 3:13, 22) |
| 15:2  | אדני יהוה     | Δέσποτα              |                                    |

As G usually uses κύριος ὁ θεός for יהוה אלהים (21),<sup>313</sup> the equivalence between יהוה אלהים and ὁ θεός, as in 2:4, likely reflects a variant in V.<sup>314</sup>

**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 | אין לה ולד     | καὶ οὐκ ἐτεκνοποιεῖ.          |
| 26:32 | לֹו מצאנו מים  | Οὐχ εὗρομεν ὕδωρ.             |
| 27:5  | לצוד ציד להביא | θηρεῦσαι θήραν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ |
| 28:19 | ואולם לזו      | καὶ Οὐλαμλούζ                 |
| 30:15 | ותאמר לה       | εἶπεν δὲ Λεία                 |

Such differences may be graphic, such as the confusion of ו and י (11:30), or acoustic, such as the exchange of לו and לא (26:32) or ה and א (27:5).<sup>315</sup>

**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,

<sup>313</sup> 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.

<sup>314</sup> 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.

<sup>315</sup> Abraham Tal, ed., *Genesis (Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato)*; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015), 145.

idiom, interpretation, etc. (117).<sup>316</sup> 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).

|       |                                  |                                                        |
|-------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 19:8  | <sup>317</sup> כטוב בעיניכם      | καθὰ ἂν ἀρέσκη ὑμῖν                                    |
| 31:35 | <sup>318</sup> אל יחר בעיני אדני | Μὴ βαρέως φέρε, κύριε·                                 |
| 37:19 | בעל החלמות                       | ὁ ἐνυπνιαστῆς                                          |
| 6:6   | ויתעצב אל לבו                    | καὶ διενσήθη.                                          |
| 8:7   | ויצא יצוא ושוב עד יבשת המים      | καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν ἕως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὕδωρ. |
| 18:12 | אחרי בלתי היתה לי                | Οὐπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν                       |
| 16:5  | חמסי עליך                        | Ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ·                                      |
| 43:23 | כספכם בא אלי                     | τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν εὐδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχῃ. <sup>319</sup>   |
| 43:27 | וישאל להם לשלום                  | ἠρώτησεν δὲ αὐτούς Πῶς ἔχετε;                          |

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 οὐπω 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

<sup>316</sup> 3:8; 4:6, 7, 17, 21; 6:3, 6; 7:22+; 8:7, 9, 21; 11:28; 12:8; 13:3+; 15:10+, 13; 16:5, 6, 13; 17:8, 23, 27; 18:1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 23, 27; 19:4, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 31, 38; 20:15; 21:6, 10, 27, 31; 22:8; 24:7, 44, 47, 49; 25:27, 28; 26:9, 35; 27:36; 30:2; 31:11, 21, 29, 35; 32:7, 13, 24; 34:9, 12, 21; 35:17; 37:19; 38:23; 39:9, 11+, 19, 20+, 22; 40:3, 5+; 41:4, 16, 17, 19+, 38, 56; 42:16, 19+, 28; 43:23, 27; 44:10, 15, 18, 19, 21, 28+; 45:1, 10; 46:2, 29, 32; 47:9, 9+; 48:7; 49:13, 22, 24; 50:17, 20.

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

<sup>318</sup> For other impersonal constructions translated synthetically, see 4:6; 30:2; 32:7.

<sup>319</sup> 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.<sup>320</sup>

### 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):

---

<sup>320</sup> The interpretive significance of several of these examples is discussed in Part II of this dissertation. For διενόγη in 6:6, see §7.4.1; for οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν in 8:7, see §7.4.5; for οὕτω μὲν in 18:12, see §8.3.2; and for ἀδικοῦμαι in 16:5, see §8.3.1.

|          |                        |           |       |
|----------|------------------------|-----------|-------|
| §3.4.1.1 | Directional-ה.         | 100 / 142 | 70.4% |
| §3.4.1.2 | Compound proper nouns. | 30 / 142  | 21.1% |
| §3.4.1.3 | Analytic translation.  | 12 / 142  | 8.5%  |

**3.4.1.1 Directional-ה.** Though not a token in WHM, G usually translates the Hebrew directional suffix (ה-) <sup>321</sup> with a Greek preposition, <sup>322</sup> which entails an expansive translation (100). <sup>323</sup> Since it always changes the word order, this group will be treated in §4.1.3.

12:5 כנען ויבאו ארצה כנען ויצאו ללכת ארצה καὶ ἐξήλθοσαν 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). <sup>324</sup>

14:5 בעשתרת קרנים ἐν Ἀσταρώθ Καρνάν  
21:32 באר שבע Φρέαρ ὀρκισμοῦ  
10:11 ואת רחבת עיר καὶ τῆν Ῥωβώθ 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.

<sup>321</sup> IBHS §10.5; Joüon §§93c–k.

<sup>322</sup> For G's addition of spatial prepositions, see §3.2.4.1.

<sup>323</sup> 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 (καθ' Ἡρώων πόλιν = גִּשְׁנָה) counted under §3.4.1.2.

<sup>324</sup> 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+.

|           |                  |                                       |
|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 16:13     | אל ראי           | ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιδῶν με                    |
| 23:13     | אך אם אתה לו ... | Ἐπειδὴ πρὸς ἐμοῦ εἶ, ...              |
| 26:22     | ופרינו           | καὶ ἠϋξήσεν ἡμᾶς                      |
| 30:8      | נפתולי אלהים     | Συνελάβετό μοι ὁ θεός                 |
| 31:47, 48 | גלעד             | Βουνὸς μάρτυς/μαρτυρεῖ <sup>325</sup> |
| 32:30, 31 | פניאל            | Εἶδος (τοῦ) θεοῦ                      |
| 40:8      | פתרנים           | ἡ διασάφησις αὐτῶν                    |
| 49:5      | מכרתיהם          | ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν                     |
| 49:10     | עד כי יבא שילה   | ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῶν       |
| 49:22     | עלי שור          | πρὸς με ἀνάστρεψον.                   |

### 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)<sup>326</sup> or אלהים (5)<sup>327</sup> 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).<sup>328</sup>

### 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

<sup>325</sup> Concerning G's recognition of the denotational significance of proper nouns in aetiologies, see §5.2.2.1.

<sup>326</sup> 4:6, 15+, 26; 5:29; 6:3, 5, 8; 7:1, 5, 16; 8:21+; 10:9; 11:9; 16:7.

<sup>327</sup> 6:12, 22; 8:15; 9:12; 28:20.

<sup>328</sup> 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 *בין* (59)<sup>329</sup> (26:28), although the particle combination *οὐ μή* (emphatic denial with the subjunctive)<sup>330</sup> is also common (14)<sup>331</sup> (28:15).

26:28 תהי נא אלה בינותינו ובינך Γενέσθω ἀρὰ ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ  
28:15 לֹא אֶעֱזֹבךָ οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω

G's deliberate choice of *οὐ μή* 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., *לִוְלִי* (31:42) and *מִדְּדוּעַ* (26:27)).

3:3 ... פֶּן תִּמְתּוֹן ... ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνῃτε.  
19:9 עַתָּה נֵרַע לְךָ מֵהֶם νῦν οὖν σὲ κακώσομεν μᾶλλον ἢ<sup>332</sup> ἐκείνους.  
18:1 וְהוּא יֵשֵׁב פֶּתַח<sup>333</sup> הָאֵהָל καθήμενος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ  
38:1 וַיֵּט עַד אִישׁ עַדְלָמִי καὶ ἀφίκετο ἕως πρὸς ἄνθρωπὸν τινα Ὁδολλαμίτην  
31:42 לִוְלִי אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִרָהָם הִיא לִי. εἰ μὴ<sup>334</sup> ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου Ἀβραάμ ἦν μοι ...  
26:27 מִדְּדוּעַ בָּאתָם אֵלַי ἵνα τί ἦλθετε πρὸς με;

<sup>329</sup> 1:4+, 6, 7+, 14+, 18+; 3:15+++; 9:12+, 13, 15+, 16+, 17+; 10:12+; 13:3+, 7+, 8+; 15:17; 16:5, 14+; 17:2+, 7++, 10+, 11; 20:1+; 23:15; 26:28+; 30:36+; 31:37, 44+, 46, 48, 49, 53; 32:16; 42:23; 49:14.

<sup>330</sup> KG II §§514.8–9; Smyth §1804.

<sup>331</sup> 3:1; 6:3; 18:28, 29, 30, 31, 32; 21:16; 23:6; 24:33; 28:15; 32:26, 32; 42:15.

<sup>332</sup> For other cases with conjunctions (10), see 21:26; 24:41; 29:30; 37:10; 41:10; 43:14; 44:22, 26, 29; 45:8.

<sup>333</sup> The noun *פֶּתַח* often functions like a preposition in Hebrew, and G translates it again with a prepositional phrase (3) in 18:10; 19:11; 43:19. These examples should also be considered in relation to G's tendency to introduce prepositions for adverbial modifiers that are spatial (see §3.2.4.1).

<sup>334</sup> For other particle combinations with *μή* (8), see 3:11; 19:15; 38:23; 43:3, 5, 10; 44:34; 45:11.



### 3.4.4 Verbal periphrastic constructions (44)

With content words, G most often translates Hebrew (esp. stative) verbs expansively by using a periphrastic structure.<sup>335</sup> Typically, G uses γίνομαι (9)<sup>336</sup> (26:16),

εἰμί (8)<sup>337</sup> (34:30), or (κατα)φαίνω (5)<sup>338</sup> (21:11) together with a predicate adjective.<sup>339</sup>

|       |                             |                                                                      |
|-------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 26:16 | כי עצמת ממנו מאד            | ὅτι δυνατώτερος ἡμῶν ἐγένου σφόδρα                                   |
| 34:30 | עכרתם אתי להבאישני ב[כל]... | Μισητόν με πεποιήκατε ὥστε πονηρόν με εἶναι <sup>340</sup> πᾶσιν ... |
| 21:11 | וירע הדבר מאד בעיני אברהם   | σκληρόν δὲ ἐφάνη τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐναντίον Ἀβραάμ                      |

Similarly, G may translate the Hebrew verb with a verb plus an adverb (9)<sup>341</sup> (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).

|       |                                       |                                                                             |
|-------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 32:12 | היטב איטיב עמד                        | Καλῶς εὖ σε ποιήσω                                                          |
| 43:2  | שבן שברו לנו מעט אכל                  | Πάλιν πορευθέντες πρίασθε ἡμῖν μικρά βρώματα.                               |
| 44:5  | הרעתם אשר עשיתם                       | πονηρὰ συντετέλεσθε, ἃ πεποιήκατε.                                          |
| 13:9  | אם השמאל ואימנה<br>ואם הימין ואשמאילה | εἰ σὺ εἰς ἀριστερά, ἐγὼ εἰς δεξιὰ.<br>εἰ δὲ σὺ εἰς δεξιὰ, ἐγὼ εἰς ἀριστερά. |

<sup>335</sup> On periphrastic tense, see KG II §353.4; Smyth §§599–601; SSG §31f; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 220–257.

<sup>336</sup> 6:1; 26:13+, 16; 38:11, 14; 41:21; 42:16; 45:2.

<sup>337</sup> 13:2; 21:12; 24:8, 41; 26:11; 34:19, 30; 48:19.

<sup>338</sup> 21:11; 35:21; 38:10; 45:5; 48:17.

<sup>339</sup> For similar cases involving predicate nouns (5), see 4:22; 17:17; 46:20+, 21. On such periphrastic constructions in the Septuagint as strategies for representing the causative idea conveyed by the Hebrew *hiphil*, see Emanuel Tov, “The Representation of the Causative Aspects of the Hiph’il in the LXX: A Study in Translation Technique,” *Bib* 63 (1982): 421–423.

<sup>340</sup> 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 (עכרתם = Μισητόν ... πεποιήκατε).

<sup>341</sup> 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.

|       |                        |                                                               |
|-------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:5   | ואדם אין לעבד את האדמה | καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔν <sup>342</sup> ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν γῆν         |
| 16:4  | ותרא כי הרטה           | καὶ εἶδεν ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει                                  |
| 42:16 | כי פרעה כי מרגלים אתם  | νὴ τὴν ὑγίειαν Φαραώ, ἥ μὴν κατὰσκοποὶ ἐστε. <sup>343</sup>   |
| 41:45 | אן                     | Ἡλίου πόλεως <sup>344</sup>                                   |
| 37:35 | וימאן להתנחם           | καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν <sup>345</sup> παρακαλεῖσθαι                   |
| 2:9   | ועץ הדעת טוב ורע       | τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν <sup>346</sup> καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ |

For example, G often uses the Greek idiom ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν/λαμβάνειν to translate הרה (8), and he regularly distinguishes between a stative sense (“be pregnant”) and an ingressive sense (“get pregnant”) by using ἔχω and λαμβάνω, respectively.<sup>347</sup> This selection of a Greek idiom, then, also involves choosing an appropriate form in each narrative context.<sup>348</sup>

<sup>342</sup> G often renders אין as οὐ + εἰμί (13: 2:5; 20:11; 28:17; 39:23; 40:8; 41:8, 15, 24, 39; 44:31; 45:6; 47:4, 13).

<sup>343</sup> See also 22:17 (ἥ μὴν) and 42:15 (νὴ τὴν ὑγίειαν).

<sup>344</sup> See also 41:50; 46:20, 28, 29. Similarly, G specifies נגא as Γέσεμ Ἀραβίας in 45:10; 46:34.

<sup>345</sup> G also translates מאן with οὐ θέλω in 39:8 and 48:19. See also לדת = οὐ + δύναμαι in 41:49.

<sup>346</sup> For similar quasi-double translations (8), see 4:15; 19:37, 38; 22:13; 35:20; 45:6; 48:16; 49:24. These cases do not count as double translations, because the two are interdependent (cf. §3.2.7).

<sup>347</sup> With ἔχω (5), see 16:4, 5, 11; 38:24, 25; with λαμβάνω (3), see 25:21; 30:41; 38:18. Philo, *Prel.* 130 finds a “huge difference” between them: αἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνειν, αἱ δὲ ἔχειν ἐν γαστρὶ οἶονται, παμμεγέθους οὕσης διαφορᾶς.

<sup>348</sup> For other residual cases not presented above or listed in the preceding notes (37), see 9:20; 10:18; 11:10; 14:5; 16:14; 18:5, 12; 19:8, 35; 22:7; 23:11; 24:55, 62; 25:11; 30:14, 18, 21, 41; 31:2, 5, 35; 32:10; 33:7; 34:25; 38:1; 40:17; 41:1, 15; 42:21; 44:7, 14, 17; 45:6; 49:17, 25, 26; 50:23.

### 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.<sup>1</sup>

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,<sup>2</sup> or have been devoted to

---

<sup>1</sup> John Merle Rife, “The Mechanics of Translation Greek,” *JBL* 52 (1933): 247.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 294–303; Sebastian Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity,” *GRBS* (1979): 81–84; Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo, Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia toimituksia Sarja B 237 (Helsinki: Suomalainen

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

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

---

Tiedeakatemias, 1987), 28–39; Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 25; Staffan Olofsson, “Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint,” in *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*, ConBOT 57 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 217–237.

<sup>3</sup> Wifstrand, “Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina,” 44–70; Raija Sollamo, “The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter,” in *XII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Melvin Peters, SCS 54 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006), 153–160; Perkins, “Order of Pronominal Clitics,” 46–76.

<sup>4</sup> Aejmelaesus, *Parataxis*; Georg Walser, “A Peculiar Word Order Rule for the Septuagint and for Cognate Texts,” in *X Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Bernard Taylor, SCS 51 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001), 499–511; *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*, Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 8 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001); “Die Wortfolge der Septuaginta,” in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 258–266.

<sup>5</sup> The only extended treatment of word order *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,” *Text* 13 [1986]: 59–84).

of the Hebrew text produces much more detailed results than would a word-level analysis.<sup>6</sup> 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%).<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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  $\delta\epsilon$ ), and yet his total (1,108) is much lower than the number of transpositions discovered by the granular alignment used in this study (*No Small Difference*, 35–54).

<sup>7</sup> 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.”

<sup>8</sup> 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 (*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.<sup>9</sup> 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 כִּי, 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.<sup>10</sup> A third lexico-syntactic environment, in which a temporal clause is introduced by וַיְהִי or וַהֲיָה, 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.<sup>11</sup>

---

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

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1971), 162–165 (§132); *IBHS* §§39.1c–d.

<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> From this perspective, *καί* and *δέ* serve more to give a

---

<sup>12</sup> Anneli Aejmelaesus 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.

<sup>13</sup> 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.”

<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

One distinctive feature of *δέ* (in relation to both *καί* and *ἵ*) 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.<sup>16</sup> 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-*ἵ* always

---

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*,” *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 ( *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 5 [Amsterdam: Gieben, 1995], 35).

<sup>15</sup> In relation to the fact that *καί* and *δέ* are often interchangeable, Aejmelaesus 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*” (*Parataxis*, 34–35).

<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup>

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

TABLE 10. MAIN TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS FOR CLAUSAL-ו

| Lemma        | ו in disjunctive clauses |       | ו in temporal frames |       | ו in preverbal position |       | Total |       |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| καί          | 338                      | 48.7% | 22                   | 28.9% | 1,662                   | 66.6% | 2022  | 61.9% |
| δέ           | 258                      | 37.2% | 51                   | 67.1% | 500                     | 20.0% | 809   | 24.8% |
| omit         | 44                       | 6.3%  | 1                    | 1.3%  | 288                     | 11.5% | 333   | 10.2% |
| οὖν          | 19                       | 2.7%  | 2                    | 2.6%  | 4                       | 0.2%  | 25    | 0.8%  |
| ὅς           | 11                       | 1.6%  |                      |       | 5                       | 0.2%  | 16    | 0.5%  |
| ἵνα          | 1                        | 0.1%  |                      |       | 15                      | 0.6%  | 16    | 0.5%  |
| other        | 23                       | 3.3%  |                      |       | 20                      | 0.8%  | 43    | 1.3%  |
| <b>total</b> | 694                      | 21.3% | 76                   | 2.3%  | 2,494                   | 76.4% | 3,264 |       |

Of these equivalents, it is really only *καί*, *δέ*, 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 *οὖν* to translate ו when it occurs in the form ועתה in a disjunctive clause;<sup>18</sup> he typically uses *ὅς* to translate ו opening a disjunctive clause that is

<sup>17</sup> 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. *μετὰ δέ* in **15:1**); or, G may (ii) move (e.g. *ἀλλὰ δὲ* in **41:23**) or (iii) supply (e.g. *τὸ δέ* 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.

<sup>18</sup> For G's use of *οὖν* for ו in ועתה, see §4.1.1.1.

parenthetical;<sup>19</sup> and he uses *ʾw* to translate clausal-*ʾ* mostly when it precedes a cohortative or *yiqtol* and follows a volitional form,<sup>20</sup> a sequence that typically signifies purpose in Hebrew.<sup>21</sup> In general, G most often translates clausal-*ʾ* as *καί* (61.9%), followed by *δέ* (24.8%) and omission (10.2%), and yet he employs *δέ* more often than *καί* for *ʾ* in temporal frames (67.1%, cf. 28.9% for *καί*) and almost as often as *καί* for *ʾ* in disjunctive clauses (37.2%, cf. 48.7% for *καί*). The translation of clausal-*ʾ* in the Pentateuch has already received extended treatment by Anneli Aejmelaesus, 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-*ʾ*.<sup>22</sup> My analysis largely confirms the earlier study by Aejmelaesus, 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:

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

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

---

<sup>19</sup> 11:4; 14:13; 16:1; 19:20; 22:24; 24:29, 43; 25:1; 28:12; 35:3; 38:1, 2, 6; 46:18, 25; 49:23.

<sup>20</sup> 14:23; 19:5; 24:14, 49, [54], 56; 27:4, 7, 41; 30:25, 26; 42:2; 43:8; [47:19]; 48:9; 49:1.

<sup>21</sup> *IBHS* §34.5.2; Joüon §116. For G's treatment of volitionals, see §6.1.1.4; for *yiqtol*, see §6.1.1.2.

<sup>22</sup> Aejmelaesus only counts "ʾ 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-ı 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.<sup>23</sup> As Greek often uses conjunctions other than *καί* in such contexts, G deploys postpositives—especially *δέ* and *οὖν*—to translate disjunctive-ı much more often (288/694) (41.5%) than he uses the same postpositives for clausal-ı 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.<sup>24</sup>

G translates disjunctive-ı with postpositives even more commonly than *καί* when the clause-initial constituent is *אֲנִי* (13/16)<sup>25</sup> (30:1), *הָאֵלֹהִים* (20/25)<sup>26</sup> (27:8), a pronominal subject

---

<sup>23</sup> 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).

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

<sup>25</sup> For *אֲנִי* (12) with a change in word order (11), see 13:9; 18:21; 20:7; 24:8, 49; 30:1; 31:8; 34:17; 42:16; 43:5; 47:5; with no word order change (1), see 4:7. For *אֲנִי* with a change in word order (1), see 31:52.

<sup>26</sup> For *הָאֵלֹהִים* 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 *אֲנִי* with a change in word order (2), see 20:7; 32:10.

(44/65)<sup>27</sup> (17:9), a demonstrative pronoun (16/29)<sup>28</sup> (10:1), or a nominal subject (135/253)<sup>29</sup> (4:2; 29:2; 47:13; 2:14).

|       |                                              |                                                                                           |
|-------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 30:1  | הבה לי בנים ואם אין מתה אנכי                 | Δός μοι τέκνα· εἰ δὲ μή, τελευτήσω ἐγώ.                                                   |
| 27:8  | ועתה בני שמע בקלי <sup>30</sup> ...          | νῦν οὖν, υἱέ, ἀκουσόν μου ...                                                             |
| 17:9  | ואתה את בריתי תשמר<br>אתה וזרעך אחריך לדורתם | Σὺ δὲ τὴν διαθήκην μου διατηρήσεις,<br>σὺ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν. |
| 10:1  | ואלה תולדת בני נח ...                        | Αὗται δὲ αἱ γενέσεις τῶν υἱῶν Νῶε, ...                                                    |
| 4:2   | ויהי הבל רעה צאן<br>נקין היה עבד אדמה        | καὶ ἐγένετο Ἀβελ ποιμὴν προβάτων,<br>Κάιν δὲ ἦν ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν.                      |
| 29:2  | והאבן גדלה על פי הבאר                        | λίθος δὲ ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι τοῦ φρέατος                                              |
| 47:13 | ולחם אין בכל הארץ                            | Σῖτος δὲ οὐκ ἦν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.                                                            |
| 2:14  | ונהר הרביעי הוא פרת                          | ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος, οὗτος Εὐφράτης.                                                  |

<sup>27</sup> For δέ 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 γάρ with a change in word order (1), see 14:12; for μὲν γάρ with a change in word order (1), see 43:14.

<sup>28</sup> For δέ 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.

<sup>29</sup> For δέ 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.

<sup>30</sup> G omission of קול is one of the residual omissions listed in §3.1.8.

G's use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  for  $\text{ו}$  in  $\text{ואם}$  is always contrastive (30:1),<sup>31</sup> while he captures the inferential sense of  $\text{ועתה}$  by translating  $\text{ו}$  as  $\text{οὕ}$  (27:8).<sup>32</sup> As subject pronouns are emphatic in both Hebrew and Greek,<sup>33</sup> G's use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  in translating  $\text{ו}$  before a Hebrew pronominal subject similarly emphasizes the subject or contrasts it with another participant (17:9). As in 10:1, when G uses  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  for  $\text{ו}$  before a demonstrative,  $\text{ו}$  is part of a formula that serves to introduce a new paragraph ( $\text{ואלה תולדת/שמות/ימי}$ ) or subparagraph ( $\text{ואלה בני}$ ).<sup>34</sup> The many cases where G translates disjunctive- $\text{ו}$  before a nominal subject with  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  are more varied, however, but often contrast the subject with another participant (4:2), introduce a parenthetical statement (29:2),<sup>35</sup> open a new paragraph (47:13),<sup>36</sup> or bring a paragraph to a close (2:14).

---

<sup>31</sup> KG II §§526; 530.4; Smyth §§2835; 2838. Furthermore, when G does not select  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  for  $\text{ו}$  in  $\text{ואם}$ , there is no contrast in the Hebrew (3): 17:17; 24:41; 31:50.

<sup>32</sup> *IBHS* §39.3.4f; *HALOT*, s.v. “עֵתָה” 3; KG II §§544.1–2; Smyth §2964; LSJ, s.v. “οὕ” A.II–III; Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 425–430. G prefers  $\text{οὕ}$  for  $\text{ו}$  in  $\text{ועתה}$  far more than the other translators of the Pentateuch (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 57–58). Many cases involve  $\text{ועתה}$  being translated as  $\text{νὺν οὕ}$ , and the correspondence could be analyzed in at least two other ways. First, the tokens could be matched according to their order, so that  $\text{νὺν} = \text{ו}$  and  $\text{οὕ} = \text{עתה}$ . 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  $\text{עתה}$  and  $\text{νὺν}$  (38/44) and the not uncommon equivalence between  $\text{ו}$  and  $\text{οὕ}$  (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 ( $\text{ועתה אם} = \text{εἰ οὕ}$ ) does  $\text{עתה}$  correspond to  $\text{οὕ}$ , and there  $\text{ו}$  is also present, and only in 43:10 ( $\text{כי עתה} = \text{ἤδη}$ ) does  $\text{עתה}$  clearly correspond to a Greek word other than  $\text{νὺν}$ .

<sup>33</sup> Cf. §3.1.7.3 note 117.

<sup>34</sup> KG II §531; Smyth §2836.

<sup>35</sup> KG II §531.2; LSJ, s.v. “ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ” A.II.2.a; *DGE*, s.v. “ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ” I.3; cf. Denniston’s discussion of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  for  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  (*The Greek Particles*, 169–170).

<sup>36</sup> *DGE*, s.v. “ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ” V.2; cf. Denniston’s “inceptive” use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  (*The Greek Particles*, 172–173).

In two other contexts, G renders disjunctive-ו 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)<sup>37</sup> (2:16–17) or a nominal object (17/49)<sup>38</sup> (19:6).

2:16–17 מכל עץ הגן אכל תאכל 'Από παντός ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ βρώσει φάγη,  
 וַמֵּעַץ הַדֵּעַת טוֹב וָרַע ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν,  
 לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

19:6 ויצא אלהם לויט הפתחה ἐξῆλθεν δὲ Λώτ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸ πρόθυρον,  
 וַהֲדִלַת סָגַר אַחֲרָיו τὴν δὲ θύραν προσέωξεν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.

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:<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> 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; 41:32, 50, 54; 45:22; 47:2; with no change in word order (1), see 16:1.

<sup>38</sup> 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.

<sup>39</sup> KG II §527; Smyth §§2904–2912.



|        |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18:12  | אחרי בלתי היתה לי עדנה<br>ואדני זקן                                                        | Οὐπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν,<br>ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτερος.                                                                                                     |
| 27:22  | הקל קול יעקב<br>והידים ידי עשו                                                             | Ἡ μὲν φωνὴ φωνὴ Ἰακώβ,<br>αἱ δὲ χεῖρες χεῖρες Ἡσαύ.                                                                                                                   |
| 38:23  | הנה שלחתי הגדי הזה<br>ואתה לא מצאתה                                                        | ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπέσταλκα τὸν ἔριφον τοῦτον,<br>σύ δὲ οὐχ εὗρηκας.                                                                                                            |
| 43:4-5 | אם ישך משלח את אחינו אתנו<br>נרדה ונשברה לך אכל<br>ואם אינך משלח [את אחינו אתנו]<br>לא נרד | εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀποστέλλεις τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν μεθ' ἡμῶν,<br>καταβησόμεθα καὶ ἀγοράσομέν σοι βρώματα·<br>εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀποστέλλεις τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν μεθ' ἡμῶν,<br>οὐ πορευσόμεθα· |

In contrast to the first two groups, G translates disjunctive-ו with postpositives less commonly than in general when the clause-initial constituent is a negative particle (i.e., לא, אל, or אין) (9/62)<sup>40</sup> (8:21; 40:23; 45:5), גם (4/23)<sup>41</sup> (44:9), הנה (6/62)<sup>42</sup> (29:2), a question word (0/15), כל (0/13), or anything else (1/18).<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> For δέ (3) with a change in word order (2), see 31:32; 40:23; with no change in word order (1), see 42:20; for μηδέ with a change in word order (3), see 19:17; 22:12; 45:5; for οὐδέ (2) with a change in word order (1), see 39:9; with no change in word order (1), see 3:3; for οὖν (1) with a change in word order, see 8:21.

<sup>41</sup> For δέ with a change in word order (2), see 15:14; 44:9; for οὐδέ with a change in word order (2), see 21:26+.

<sup>42</sup> For δέ (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.

<sup>43</sup> For δέ with no change in word order (1), see 14:4.

|       |                                                                   |                                                                                                             |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:21  | ולא אסף עוד להכות את כל [בשר] חי<br>כאשר עשיתי                    | οὐ προσθήσω οὖν ἔτι πατάξαι πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν,<br>καθὼς ἐποίησα                                             |
| 40:23 | ולא זכר שר המשקים את יוסף<br>וישכחו                               | οὐκ ἐμνήσθη δὲ ὁ ἀρχιοινοχός τοῦ Ἰωσήφ,<br>ἀλλ' ἐπελάθετο αὐτοῦ.                                            |
| 45:5  | ועתה אל תעצבו ואל יחר בעיניכם                                     | νῦν οὖν μὴ λυπεῖσθε <u>μηδέ</u> σκληρὸν ὑμῖν φανήτω                                                         |
| 44:9  | אשר ימצא [הגביע] אתו מעבדיך [יומת]<br>ונם אנחנו נהיה לאדני לעבדים | παρ' ᾧ ἂν εὕρεθῇ τὸ κόνδυ τῶν παίδων σου, ἀποθνησκέτω·<br>καὶ ἡμεῖς <u>δὲ</u> ἐσόμεθα παῖδες τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. |
| 29:2  | וירא והנה באר בשדה<br>נהנה שם שלשה עדרי צאן<br>רבצים עליה         | καὶ ὄρᾳ καὶ ἰδοὺ φρέαρ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ,<br>ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ τρία ποίμνια προβάτων<br>ἀναπαυόμενα ἐπ' αὐτοῦ.         |

G rarely translates disjunctive-ו before a negative particle as δέ or οὖν, and only when he separates it from οὐκ or μή (8:21; 40:23), in order to avoid confusion with *μηδέ*, *οὐδέ*, and *οὐκοῦν*, which mean more than the sum of their parts.<sup>44</sup> Furthermore, he only uses *μηδέ* or *οὐδέ* when it follows a prior negative, and thus carries the meaning of “neither ... nor” (45:5). Finally, when G does use a postpositive for ו in והנה, he never translates והנה as ἰδοῦ, in keeping with Greek idiom.<sup>45</sup> In sum, G’s care in selecting an appropriate conjunction for

<sup>44</sup> For *οὐδέ*/*μηδέ*, see KG II §535; Smyth §§2930–2950; SSG §83e; LSJ, s.vv. “οὐδέ” (A.II.2) and “μηδέ” (A); Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 190–199. For *οὐκοῦν*, see KG II §507.5e; Smyth §§2951–2954; LSJ, s.v. “οὐκοῦν,” *The Greek Particles*, 430–441. Note, the handful of transpositions involving *μηδέ* and *οὐδέ* 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.

<sup>45</sup> Despite direct and indirect interference from biblical idiom, it is telling that a TLG search for καὶ ἰδοῦ returns 3,578 hits, while ἰδοὺ δέ 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 καὶ ἰδοῦ is better Greek than ἰδοὺ δέ, as only καὶ ἰδοῦ occurs in the NT (75). Had a NT author chosen to use ἰδοὺ δέ, 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 ויהי and ויהיה 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,<sup>46</sup> but also on account of G's heightened tendency to use postpositives for the ו 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 ויהי (49/68)<sup>47</sup> (**38:1; 24:52**), but there are a few instances of frames with ויהיה (4/8)<sup>48</sup> (**12:12**).

---

<sup>46</sup> Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 123–124 (§110); *IBHS* §§32.2.6b, 4b.

<sup>47</sup> 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**.

<sup>48</sup> For δέ with a change in word order (2), see **27:40; 30:41**; for οὐν with a change in word order (2), see **12:12; 46:33**.

|       |                                           |                                                               |
|-------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 38:1  | וַיְהִי בַעַת הַהוּא                      | Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ                                 |
|       | וַיֵּרֶד יְהוּדָה מֵאֵת אָחִיו            | κατέβη Ἰούδας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ                           |
|       | וַיֵּט עַד אִישׁ עַדְלָמִי וְשִׁמו חִירָה | καὶ ἀφίκετο ἕως πρὸς ἄνθρωπὸν τινα Ὀδολλαμίτην, ὃ ὄνομα Ἰρᾶς. |
| 24:52 | וַיְהִי כַאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע                   | ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι                                      |
|       | עֲבַד אַבְרָהָם אֶת דְּבָרֵיהֶם           | τὸν παῖδα τὸν Ἀβραάμ τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτῶν                        |
|       | וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ אֶרְצָה לַיהוָה            | προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν κυρίου.                              |
| 12:12 | וַהֲיָה כִּי יֵרְאוּ אֶתְךָ הַמִּצְרִים   | ἔσται οὖν ὥς ἂν ἴδωσίν σε οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι,                       |
|       | וַאֲמָרוּ אֵשֶׁתּוֹ זֹאת                  | ἐροῦσιν ὅτι Γυνή αὐτοῦ αὕτη,                                  |
|       | וְהָרְגוּ אֹתִי וְאֶתְךָ יַחֲיוּ          | καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσίν με, σὲ δὲ περιποιήσονται.                    |

Since temporal frames establish a boundary between the preceding text and what follows, G's preference for postpositives is contextually and grammatically appropriate.<sup>49</sup>

**4.1.1.3 Clausal-ו before a verb.** By count, the majority of transpositions involving clausal-ו result from G's uses of a postpositive for clausal-ו when it occurs before a verb (455). Yet, this statistic must be balanced against the fact that in Genesis clausal-ו 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-ו in these other contexts more often than in general, the opposite is true for clausal-ו before a verb (509/2,494) (20.4%).

Nevertheless, certain lexical and syntactic factors influence G's use of δέ and other postpositives to translate clausal-ו before a verb, and often in combination with one another

<sup>49</sup> Copulative δέ is common "wenn die Rede von einem Gedanken zu einem neuen, von einem Momente 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 *δέ* to translate *ו* before the verb *אמר* (187),<sup>50</sup> usually as *εἶπεν δέ* (26:9–10) or *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν* (29:4–6).

|         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 26:9–10 | וּקְרָא אַבִּימֶלֶךְ לִיצְחָק<br>וַיֹּאמֶר [אֵלִי] אֵךְ הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁתְּךָ הוּא<br>וַאֲדֹכָא אֲמַרְתָּ אַחֲתִי הוּא<br>וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלִי יִצְחָק<br>כִּי אֲמַרְתִּי פֶן אָמוּת עָלַיָּה<br>וַיֹּאמֶר [אֵלִי] אַבִּימֶלֶךְ מָה זֹאת עָשִׂיתָ לָנוּ<br>כַּמְעוּט שֶׁכָּב אֶחָד הָעַם<br>אֶת אֲשֶׁתְּךָ<br>וְהִבֵּאתָ עָלֵינוּ אִשָּׁם | ἐκάλεσεν δὲ Ἀβιμέλεχ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ<br>καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἄρα γε γυνή σου ἐστίν·<br>ὅτι εἶπας Ἀδελφή μου ἐστίν;<br>εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Ἰσαὰκ<br>Εἶπα γάρ Μήποτε ἀποθάνω δι' αὐτήν.<br>εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Ἀβιμέλεχ Τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας ἡμῖν;<br>μικροῦ ἐκοιμήθη τις τοῦ γένους μου<br>μετὰ τῆς γυναικός σου,<br>καὶ ἐπήγαγες ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἄγνοιαν. |
| 29:4–6  | וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם יַעֲקֹב<br>אָחִי מֵאִין אַתֶּם<br>וַיֹּאמְרוּ מִחֶרֶן אֲנַחְנוּ<br>וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הִידְעָתֶם אֶת לִבְנֵי בֶן נַחוּר<br>וַיֹּאמְרוּ יָדַעְנוּ<br>וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הַשְׁלוּם<br>וַיֹּאמְרוּ שְׁלוּם                                                                                                                | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἰακώβ<br>Ἀδελφοί, πόθεν ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς;<br>οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ἐκ Χαρράν ἐσμεν.<br>εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Γινώσκετε Λαβὰν τὸν υἱὸν Ναχώρ;<br>οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Γινώσκομεν.<br>εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ὑγιαίνει;<br>οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ὑγιαίνει.                                                                                                 |

Though common, the second type (*ὁ δὲ εἶπεν*) 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,

<sup>50</sup> For *δέ* (186) with a change in word order (140), see 4:23; 13:8; 14:21, 22; 15:2, 7, 8, 9; 16:2, 5, 6, 9; 17:18, 19; 18:9, 10, 20, 26; 19:2, 7, 9, 12, 18, 31; 20:2, 6, 10, 11; 21:6, 12; 22:7, 8; 24:5, 6, 39, 45, 55, 65; 25:22, 31, 32; 26:9, 10, 16; 27:11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 35, 38, 41, 46; 29:4, 5, 6, 15, 19, 21, 25, 26; 30:3, 14, 15+, 23, 27, 29, 31, 34; 31:3, 26, 46, 48; 32:2, 9, 16, 27, 28; 33:9, 10, 13, 15; 34:4, 11, 30; 35:1, 2, 11; 37:8, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 26; 38:8, 11, 23, 24; 39:8; 40:8; 41:15, 39, 41, 44, 55; 42:12, 14, 18, 31, 33, 36, 37; 43:3, 6, 8, 11, 23; 44:15, 16, 17, 21, 25, 27; 45:3, 4, 17, 28; 46:2, 31; 47:4, [5], 8, 16, 23, 31; 48:9, 18, 21; with no change in word order (46), see 4:9; 16:8; 22:1, 7, 11; 24:18, 47, 56, 57, 58; 27:18, 20, 24, 32; 29:4, 5, 6, 8; 31:11; 32:26, 27; 33:5, 8, 15; 34:31; 37:16; 38:16, 17+, 18+, 29; 40:8; 42:7, 10, 13, 38; 43:7, 28; 44:7, 10, 23, 26; 46:2; 47:3, 30; for *οὖν* with a change in word order (1), see 41:24.

regardless of whether the speech formula initiates, terminates, or continues a dialogue,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is always a contextually appropriate choice.<sup>51</sup>

In addition to  $\text{אמר}$ , however, G also uses postpositives for clausal- $\text{ו}$  before other Hebrew verbs, especially when he translates the verb with a circumstantial participle, but most commonly before  $\text{בוא}$  (29/90),<sup>52</sup>  $\text{ראה}$  (23/81),<sup>53</sup>  $\text{ענה}$  (14/17),<sup>54</sup>  $\text{יצא}$  (10/35),<sup>55</sup>  $\text{מות}$  (10/42),<sup>56</sup>  $\text{שלח}$  (9/34),<sup>57</sup>  $\text{קום}$  (9/33),<sup>58</sup>  $\text{שמע}$  (7/18),<sup>59</sup> and  $\text{שאל}$  (5/10).<sup>60</sup> Like  $\text{אמר}$ , several of these verbs are used in connection with dialogue (i.e.,  $\text{ענה}$ ,  $\text{שמע}$ , and  $\text{שאל}$ ), and here, too,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  suits the context, given the back-and-forth of conversation, especially with  $\text{ענה}$ , which always involves a change in speaker (27:36–37).

---

<sup>51</sup> Aejmelaeus judges them “sound Greek expressions and skillful translations,” considering  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  appropriate on account of the frequent change in speaker and audience, which “fulfils the requirement of dissimilarity between items connected by  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ” (*Parataxis*, 37).

<sup>52</sup> 6:18; 7:7; 19:1; 23:2; 24:32, 67; 25:29; [30:10], 16; 31:24, 33; 34:20; 35:6, 27; 37:2; 40:6; 42:5, 29; 43:26; 44:14; [47:5], 7, 15, 17; with a circumstantial participle (5), see 14:13; 31:33; 42:6; 43:30; 47:1.

<sup>53</sup> 18:1; 26:2; 28:6; 30:9; 32:25; 35:9; 37:18; 39:3; 43:16; with a circumstantial participle (14), see 6:2, 5; 16:5; 19:1; 21:9; 29:31; 30:1; 37:4; 42:1, 7; 45:27; 48:8, 17; 50:15.

<sup>54</sup> 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.

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>60</sup> 26:7; 32:29; 37:15; 38:21; 43:27.

27:36–37      ויאמר [עשו לאביו]      καὶ εἶπεν Ἡσαὺ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ  
הלא אצלת לי ברכה [אבי]      Οὐχ ὑπελίπω μοι εὐλογίαν, πάτερ;  
... יען יצחק ויאמר לעשו ...      ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰσαὰκ εἶπεν τῷ Ἡσαὺ ...

37:27      לכו נמכרנו לישמעאלים      δεῦτε ἀποδώμεθα αὐτὸν τοῖς Ἰσμαηλίταις τούτοις,  
וידנו אל תהי בו      αἱ δὲ χεῖρες ἡμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν ἐπ' αὐτόν,  
כי אחינו [ו]בשרנו הוא      ὅτι ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν καὶ σὰρξ ἡμῶν ἐστίν.  
נישמעו אחיו      ἤκουσαν δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ.

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

6:1–2      ויהי כי החל האדם      Καὶ ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι  
לרב על פני האדמה      πολλοὶ γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,  
ובנות ילדו להם      καὶ θυγατέρες ἐγενήθησαν αὐτοῖς.  
ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם      ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
כי טבת הנה      ὅτι καλαὶ εἰσιν,  
ויקחו להם נשים מכל אשר בחרו      ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν, ὧν ἐξελέξαντο.

By translating ויראו in 6:2 as ἰδόντες δέ, 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 καί and δέ ultimately

<sup>61</sup> 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.

|       |                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 49:33 | ויכל יעקב לצות את בניו<br>ויאסף רגליו אל המטה ויגוע<br>ויאסף אל עמיו          | καὶ κατέπαυσεν Ἰακώβ ἐπιτάσσων τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ ἐξάρας τοὺς πόδας ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην ἐξέλιπεν<br>καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.       |
| 50:1  | ויפל יוסף על פני אביו<br>ויבך עליו וישק לו                                    | ¶ Καὶ ἐπιπεσὼν Ἰωσήφ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ<br>ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἐφίλησεν αὐτόν.                                                  |
| 2     | ויצו יוסף את עבדיו את הרפאים<br>לחנט את אביו<br>ויחנטו הרפאים את ישראל        | καὶ προσέταξεν Ἰωσήφ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐνταφιασταῖς<br>ἐνταφιάσαι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ ἐνεταφίασαν οἱ ἐνταφιασταὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ.        |
| 3     | וימלאו לו ארבעים יום<br>כי כן ימלאו ימי החנטים<br>ויבכו אותו מצרים שבועים יום | καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν αὐτοῦ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας·<br>οὕτως γὰρ καταριθμοῦνται αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ταφῆς.<br>καὶ ἐπένθησεν αὐτὸν Αἴγυπτος ἑβδομήκοντα ἡμέρας. |
| 4     | ויעברו ימי בכיתו<br>וידבר יוסף אל בית פרעה לאמר                               | ¶ Ἐπειδὴ δὲ παρήλθον αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ πένθους,<br>ἐλάλησεν Ἰωσήφ πρὸς τοὺς δυνάστας Φαραὼ λέγων ...                                              |

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.

|          |                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1:3      | וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אֹר<br>וַיְהִי אֹר                                                                                            | καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Γενηθήτω φῶς.<br><i>καὶ</i> ἐγένετο φῶς.                                                                                             |
| 24:57–58 | וַיֹּאמְרוּ נִקְרָא לְנֶעֱר<br>וְנִשְׂאֵלָה אֶת פִּיָּה<br>וַיִּקְרְאוּ לְרִבְקָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלֶיהָ<br>הֲתִלְכִּי עִם הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Καλέσωμεν τὴν παῖδα<br>καὶ ἐρωτήσωμεν τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς.<br><i>καὶ</i> ἐκάλεσαν Ῥεβέκκαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῇ<br>Πορεύσῃ μετὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; |

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 Ῥεβέκκαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῇ*) (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.

|      |                                              |                                                           |
|------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 37:9 | יַחֲלֹם עוֹד חִלּוֹם אַחֵר                   | εἶδεν δὲ ἐνύπνιον ἕτερον                                  |
|      | וַיִּסְפֹּר אֶתּוֹ לְאַחֵיו                  | καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτὸ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ |
|      | וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה חֲלֹמֹתַי חִלּוֹם עוֹד      | καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἐνυπνιασάμην ἐνύπνιον ἕτερον,              |
|      | וְהִנֵּה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְהַיָּרֵחַ              | ὥσπερ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη                                |
|      | וְאַחַד עֶשֶׂר כּוֹכָבִים מִשְׁתַּחֲוִים לִי | καὶ ἑνδεκά ἀστέρες προσεκύνουν με.                        |
| 10   | וַיִּסְפֹּר אֶל אָבִיו וְאֶל אַחֵיו          | [-----] <sup>62</sup>                                     |
|      | וַיַּגֵּד בּוֹ אֵת אֲשֶׁר חֲלָמָה            | καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ          |
|      | מִהַחֲלֹמֹת הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר חֲלָמָה            | τί τὸ ἐνύπνιον τοῦτο, ὃ ἐνυπνιάσθης.                      |
|      | הַבּוֹא נְבוּאָה                             | ἄρά γε ἐλθόντες ἐλευσόμεθα                                |
|      | אֲנִי וְאַחֵיךָ                              | ἐγὼ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου                    |
|      | לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לְךָ אֶרְצָה                 | προσκυνῆσαι σοι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν;                              |
| 11   | וַיִּקְנְאוּ בּוֹ אַחֵיו                     | ἐζήλωσαν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ ἀδελφοί αὐτοῦ,                       |
|      | וַאֲבִיו שָׁמַר אֶת הַדְּבָר                 | ὁ δὲ πατήρ αὐτοῦ διετήρησεν τὸ ῥῆμα.                      |

While G uses δέ for the ו 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 ו as καί until reaching the final form (וַיִּקְנְאוּ), for which he uses δέ ("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 δέ for clausal-ו 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 ו in combining two clauses into one (43:21).

<sup>62</sup> 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.

|       |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 27:36 | וַיֹּאמֶר הַכִּי קְרָא שְׁמוֹ יַעֲקֹב<br>וַיַּעֲקֹבֵנִי זֶה פַעֲמִים<br>אֶת בְּכֵרֵתִי לֶקַח<br>וְהִנֵּה עֵתָה לֶקַח בְּרַכְתִּי | καὶ εἶπεν Δικαίως ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ·<br>ἐπτέρνικεν γὰρ με ἤδη δεύτερον τοῦτο·<br>τά τε πρωτοτόκιά μου εἴληφεν,<br>καὶ νῦν εἴληφεν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου. |
| 30:27 | וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו לָבֵן<br>אִם נָא מִצְאֹתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ נַחֲשֵׁתִי<br>וַיְבַרְכֵנִי יְהוָה בְּגִלְלֶךָ                       | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Λαβάν<br>Εἰ εὖρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, οἰωνισάμην ἄν·<br>εὐλόγησεν γὰρ με ὁ θεὸς τῇ σῇ εἰσόδῳ.                                                   |
| 45:7  | וַיִּשְׁלַחֵנִי אֱלֹהִים לִפְנֵיכֶם<br>לְשׁוֹם לָכֶם שְׂאֵרִית בְּאֶרֶץ<br>וּלְהַחְיֹת לָכֶם לִפְלִיטָה גְדֹלָה                  | ἀπέστειλεν γὰρ με ὁ θεὸς ἔμπροσθεν ὑμῶν,<br>ὑπολείπεσθαι ὑμῶν κατάλειμμα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,<br>καὶ ἐκθρέψαι ὑμῶν κατάλειψιν μεγάλην.                                |
| 41:24 | וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל הַחֲרָטִים<br>וְאִין מִגִּיד לִי                                                                                   | εἶπα οὖν τοῖς ἐξηγηταῖς,<br>καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἀπαγγέλλων μοι.                                                                                                      |
| 45:13 | וַהֲגַדְתָּם לְאָבִי<br>אֶת כָּל כְּבוֹדִי בְּמִצְרַיִם וְאֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתָם                                               | ἀπαγγείλατε οὖν τῷ πατρί μου<br>πᾶσαν τὴν δόξαν μου τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ὅσα εἶδετε                                                                             |
| 43:21 | כִּסְפֵּנוּ בַּמִּשְׁקָלוֹ<br>וַנִּשָּׁב אִתּוֹ בִּידְנוֹ                                                                        | τὸ ἀργύριον ἡμῶν ἐν σταθμῷ<br>ἀπεστρέψαμεν νῦν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἡμῶν,                                                                                           |

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-*v* before a verb (41:24; 45:13), it comes as the conclusion of a preceding narrative or statement, and G's use of γὰρ 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-*v* 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-*v*.** In just four cases, G changes the order of words in translation due to translating phrasal-*v* with a postpositive, each of which is presented below.

|       |                                                      |                                                       |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 7:2   | מהבהמה הטהורה                                        | ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καθαρῶν                         |
|       | תקח לך שבעה שבעה [זכר] ו[נקבה]                       | εἰσάγαγε πρὸς σὲ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ, ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ,           |
|       | בְּמִן הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא טָהוֹרָה הוּא           | ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν μὴ καθαρῶν                      |
|       | שְׁנַיִם [שְׁנַיִם זָכָר] ו[נִקְבָּה]                | δύο δύο, ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ,                              |
| 34:28 | וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר בַּעִיר וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה לִקְחוּ | ὅσα τε ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ὅσα ἦν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ, ἔλαβον. |
| 29    | וַיְבִיזוּ [וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר בַּעִיר]                    | καὶ διήρπασαν ὅσα τε ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει                   |
|       | וְאֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר בַּבַּיִת                          | καὶ ὅσα ἦν ἐν ταῖς οἰکیαις.                           |
| 48:13 | וַיִּקַּח יוֹסֵף אֶת שְׁנֵיהֶם                       | λαβὼν δὲ Ἰωσήφ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ,                  |
|       | אֶת אֶפְרַיִם בִּימִינוֹ מִשְׁמָאל יִשְׂרָאֵל        | τόν τε Ἐφραίμ ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν δὲ Ἰσραήλ,     |
|       | וְאֵת מְנַשֶּׁה בְּשִׁמְלוֹ מִיְמִין יִשְׂרָאֵל      | τὸν δὲ Μανασσὴ ἐν τῇ ἀριστερᾷ ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ Ἰσραήλ,    |
|       | וַיַּגֵּשׁ [אֹתָם] אֵלָיו                            | ἤγγισεν αὐτοὺς αὐτῷ.                                  |

All of these examples involve lists of varying complexity. While G uses δέ to contrast the clean and unclean animals (7:2), he uses the combination τε ... καί to bind together logical pairs (everything in the city/field (34:28) and in the city/homes (34:29)).<sup>63</sup> The example in 48:13, however, involves G's use of δέ to organize a fairly complex Hebrew phrase around the opposition of Ephraim and Manasseh.<sup>64</sup>

#### 4.1.2 Pronominal Suffixes (194)

Hebrew uses pronominal suffixes extensively, attaching them to a variety of forms, but especially substantives, verbs, and prepositions.<sup>65</sup> 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

<sup>63</sup> KG II §522; Smyth §§2974–2979; *SSG* §26m; 78c, k; Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 511–513.

<sup>64</sup> For G's addition of τε and δέ (2x) in this phrase, see §3.2.3.3.

<sup>65</sup> *IBHS* §§16.4, 9–11; Joüon §§39d; 61; 94; 103.

Hebrew pronominal suffix.<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup> 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,

---

<sup>66</sup> 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 Soisalon-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.

<sup>67</sup> 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.

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:

| Suffix omitted      | Suffix “transposed” |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| לְכַבֹּשׁ — ἐναλλάξ | יְפֹאֵר — μύποτε    |
| תָּא — τὰς          | יִשְׁלַח — ἐκτείνῃ  |
| יָדָיו — χεῖρας     | יָדָיו — τὴν        |
| 3ms                 | 3ms χεῖρα           |
| Gen 48:14           | Gen 3:22            |

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)<sup>68</sup> (45:3);

(ii) personal belongings (29)<sup>69</sup> (43:22); and (iii) body parts (26)<sup>70</sup> (38:29).<sup>71</sup>

45:3 אַחִין οἱ ἀδελφοί

43:22 כַּסְפִּי τὸ ἀργύριον

38:29 יָדִי τὴν χεῖρα

In other cases (40),<sup>72</sup> too, G's use of the Greek article for a pronominal suffix does not alter the sense of the phrase much, as the possessive idea may be obvious from the context (47:19) or may be unnecessary according to Greek grammar and usage (43:22),<sup>73</sup> but in a few cases it seems that G's use of the definite article has altered the sense (39:14).

47:19 לְמָה נָמוּת לְעֵינֶיךָ גַּם אֲנַחְנוּ גַּם אֲדַמְתֵּנוּ [תָּשֶׁם] ἵνα οὖν μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν ἐναντίον σου καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐρημωθῇ,  
קִנָּה אֲתָנוּ וְאֵת אֲדַמְתָּנוּ בַּלְחָם κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν ἀντὶ ἄρτων,

43:22 אֲבֵרָהֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא עֶזְבָּ אἈβραάμ ὃς οὐκ ἐγκατέλιπεν  
חֶסֶדֶן וְאַמְתָּן מֵעַם אֲדָנִי τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μου

39:14 וְתִקְרָא לְאַנְשֵׁי בֵיתָה καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ

<sup>68</sup> 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); μήτηρ (3: 21:21; 24:55; 27:13); ὑπεναντίος (2: 22:17; 24:60); γυνή (44:27); θυγάτηρ (37:35); κυρία (16:4); παιδίσκη (21:12); παῖς (33:14); πλησίον (11:7); πρωτότοκος (27:32); συγγένεια (50:8); τέκνον (27:20).

<sup>69</sup> ὕδρια (6: 24:15, 16, 18, 20, 45, 46); ἀργύριον (3: 42:25, 35; 43:22); ἱμάτιον (3: 39:12, 16, 18); κτήνος (3: 36:6; 46:32; 47:1); βοῦς (2: 46:32; 50:8); μάρσιππος (2: 42:27; 44:1); δῶρον (33:10); θέριστρον (38:19); ὀρμίσκος (38:18); ποίμνιον (31:4); πρόβατον (50:8); κάμηλος (24:20); ῥάβδος (38:18); τετράπους (34:23); τόξον (27:3); φαρέτρα (27:3).

<sup>70</sup> διάνοια (4: 17:17; [24:15], 45; 27:41); ὀφθαλμός (4: 24:63; 37:25; 43:29; [45:20]); χεῖρ (3: 3:22; 38:29; 46:4); ψυχή (3: 34:3, 8; 35:18); ὦμος (3: 21:14; 24:15, 45); ἀριστερά (48:13); ἀργυρώνητος (2: 17:13, 23); δεξιά (2: 48:13, 14); πούς (2: 29:1; 49:33); πρόσωπον (2: 4:5; 43:31).

<sup>71</sup> KG II §461.2; Smyth §1121; SSG §1c. Cf. §3.1.3.2 note 57.

<sup>72</sup> [2:24]; 3:1, 7; 6:15; 9:2, 24; 11:4; 13:17; 14:6 17:10; 19:26; 20:13; 21:2; 22:6; 23:10, 18; 24:8, 27+; 27:30; 28:6, 12; 31:40, 49; 32:9; 33:3; 34:18; 35:16; 36:43; 38:14; 39:14; 40:10; 42:19; 47:19, 21; 48:6; 49:4, 17; 50:4, 5.

<sup>73</sup> 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 ביתה in 39:14 as a locative-ה, since he translates it as ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ (“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 ὄντας ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ (“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.<sup>74</sup>

**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)<sup>75</sup> or personal pronoun (8),<sup>76</sup> but also pronominal adjectives (10),<sup>77</sup> reflexive pronouns (7)<sup>78</sup> 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.<sup>79</sup>

|       |                    |                                  |
|-------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 30:23 | אסף אלהים את־חרפתו | Ἀφείλεν ὁ θεός μου τὸ ὄνειδος    |
| 3:5   | ונפקחו עיניכם      | διανοιχθήσονται ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί |

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).

<sup>74</sup> According to Soisalon-Soininen, this particular stylistic impulse is stronger in Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus than in Numbers and Deuteronomy (“Auslassung des Possessivpronomens,” 294).

<sup>75</sup> 4:23+; 19:21; 27:43; 29:32; 30:23, 32; 31:8+; 32:30; 42:28, 38; 43:5; 44:4, 29, 33.

<sup>76</sup> 3:5; 11:7; 25:24; 30:22; 36:7; 39:21; 49:20; 50:21.

<sup>77</sup> 9:5; 22:18; 24:41; 26:5; 30:27; 33:10; 37:7+; 47:18; 49:29.

<sup>78</sup> 4:23; 16:3; 19:17; 30:30; 32:1; 41:11; 49:16.

<sup>79</sup> 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.



|       |                            |                                                     |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 29:32 | כי ראה יהוה בעניי          | Διότι εἶδέν μου <sup>80</sup> κύριος τὴν ταπείνωσιν |
| 50:21 | וידבר על־לבם               | καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν                  |
| 25:24 | ימיה ללדת                  | αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν                          |
| 44:33 | ועתה ישב־נא עבדך תחת הנער  | νῦν οὖν παραμενῶ σοι παῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδίου          |
| 39:21 | ויתן חנן בעיני שר בית־הסהר | καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀρχιδεσμοφύλακος |
| 42:28 | הושב כספך                  | Ἀπεδόθη μοι τὸ ἀργύριον                             |

G translates the nominal suffix **יה** on **ימיה** 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,<sup>81</sup> 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,<sup>82</sup> lending emphasis to the modifier.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>80</sup> 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.

<sup>81</sup> KG II §423.15; Smyth §1476; *SSG* §22wd.

<sup>82</sup> 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).

<sup>83</sup> 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).

|       |                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22:18 | והתברכו בזרעך<br>כל גויי הארץ<br>עקב אשר שמעת בקלי                                                        | καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου<br>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς,<br>ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπήκουσας τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.                                                                                         |
| 37:7  | והנה אנחנו מאלמים אלמים בתוך השדה<br>והנה קמה אלמתִי וגם נצבה<br>והנה תסבינה אלמתיכם<br>ותשתחווין לאלמתִי | ὥμην ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα ἐν μέσῳ τῷ πεδίῳ,<br>καὶ ἀνέστη τὸ ἐμὸν δράγμα καὶ ὠρθώθη,<br>περιστραφέντα δὲ τὰ δράγματα ὑμῶν<br>προσεκύνησαν τὸ ἐμὸν δράγμα.                                   |
| 19:17 | ויהי כהוציאם אתם החוצה<br>ויאמר המלט על נפשך<br>אל תביט אחריך<br>ואל תעמד בכל הככר<br>ההרה המלט פן תספה   | καὶ ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἐξήγαγον αὐτοὺς ἔξω,<br>καὶ εἶπαν Σώζων σῶζε τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν·<br>μὴ περιβλέψῃς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω<br>μηδὲ στῆς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ·<br>εἰς τὸ ὄρος σῶζου, μήποτε συμπαράλημφθῇς. |
| 48:6  | ויחיו ומולדתך אשר הולדת אחריהם לך יהיו<br>על שם אחיהם יקראו<br>בנחלתם                                     | τὰ δὲ ἔκγονα, ἃ ἐὰν γεννήσῃς μετὰ ταῦτα, σοὶ ἔσσονται,<br>ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν κληθήσονται<br>ἐν τοῖς ἐκείνων κλήροις.                                                             |

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),<sup>84</sup> and he gives Joseph the same form in 37:7 in order to develop the contrast between his sheaves and those of his brothers.<sup>85</sup> 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 ἐκείνων 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

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

<sup>85</sup> 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),<sup>86</sup> personal belongings (7),<sup>87</sup> and interpersonal relations (3)<sup>88</sup> are common here, but, in contrast, these fronted modifiers lend additional emphasis to the nouns.<sup>89</sup>

**4.1.2.3 Verbal suffix** G also moves verbal suffixes in translation, usually the suffix on a finite verb (19),<sup>90</sup> in which case it is the verb's object (26:29; 12:1; 28:15), but also on infinitives (4),<sup>91</sup> 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),<sup>92</sup> and, with one exception (30:15),<sup>93</sup> he moves it directly before the Greek verb.

|       |                                                      |                                                                  |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 26:29 | כאשר לא נגענוך                                       | καθότι ἡμεῖς σε οὐκ ἐβδελυξάμεθα                                 |
| 12:1  | אל הארץ אשר אראך                                     | εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἂν σοι δείξω                                      |
| 28:15 | כי לא אעזובך עד אשר אם עשיתי את [כל]<br>אשר דברתי לך | οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω ἕως τοῦ ποιῆσαι με πάντα,<br>ὅσα ἐλάλησά σοι |
| 48:5  | עד באי אלך מצרימה                                    | πρὸ τοῦ με ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ εἰς Αἴγυπτον                           |
| 30:15 | לה המעט קחתך את אישי                                 | Οὐχ ἱκανόν σοι ὅτι ἔλαβες τὸν ἄνδρα μου                          |

<sup>86</sup> φωνή (4: 4:23; 27:43; 22:18; 26:5); πρόσωπον (2: 19:21; 43:5); ψυχή (2: 19:17; 32:30); αἶμα (9:5); ὀφθαλμός (3:5); καρδία (50:21); μήτρα (30:22); σῶμα (47:18); χεῖρ (33:10).

<sup>87</sup> δράγμα (2: 37:7+); μισθός (2: 31:8+); ἀργύριον 42:28; ὑπάρχοντα 36:7; κόνδυ [44:4].

<sup>88</sup> γυνή (4:23); παιδίσκη (16:3); παῖς (44:33).

<sup>89</sup> In relation to the positioning of ἐμός and σός 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.

<sup>90</sup> 3:15; 12:1; 20:11; 24:27; 26:29; 27:37; 28:15; 29:32; 31:42; 32:17, 26+; 41:51; 44:20; 45:8; 47:29; 49:8; 50:5, 17.

<sup>91</sup> 19:22; 30:15; 34:30; 48:5.

<sup>92</sup> For the cases involving fronted personal pronouns (4), see 20:11; 24:27; 27:37; 44:20.

<sup>93</sup> 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 *οὐ μὴ* (28:15),<sup>94</sup> 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.<sup>95</sup> I will present a similar set of cases in §4.2.2 involving the movement of independent forms.

#### 4.1.3 Directional *ἵ* (102)

Directional-*ἵ* is a Hebrew suffix that usually imparts an allative, but sometimes an ablative, locative, or temporal idea to its noun.<sup>96</sup> 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;<sup>97</sup> rather, he prefers to use a preposition, which necessarily precedes the noun. Because directional-*ἵ* 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

---

<sup>94</sup> Wifstrand, "Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina," 69. See §4.1.2 note 67.

<sup>95</sup> 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).

<sup>96</sup> *IBHS* §10.5; Joüon §§93c–k.

<sup>97</sup> KG I §135.3; Smyth §342. As discussed in §3.3.1, however, G utilizes the ablative suffix -*θεν* in the forms *ἄνωθεν*, *ἐκεῖθεν*, *ἐμπροσθεν*, *ἐντεῦθεν*, *ἐξωθεν*, *ἔσωθεν*, *κατόπισθεν*, *μακρόθεν*, *ὄθεν*, *ὀπισθεν*, and *πόθεν*.

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).<sup>98</sup>

|       |                        |                                             |
|-------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 11:31 | ללכת ארצה כנען         | πορευθῆναι εἰς γῆν Χανάαν                   |
| 41:57 | באו מצרימה וכל ה ארצות | καὶ παῖσαι αἱ χῶραι ἦλθον εἰς Αἴγυπτον      |
| 19:6  | ויצא אלהם לוט הפתחה    | ἐξῆλθεν δὲ Λὼτ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸ πρόθυρον |

The exceptions are relatively few (38) and mostly exhibit other consistent translation techniques: G always leaves the suffix untranslated on the adverbial forms שממה (19),<sup>99</sup> החוצה (7),<sup>100</sup> and מלמעלה (2),<sup>101</sup> for which he prefers to use the Greek spatial adverbs ἐκεῖ (14:10), ἔξω (39:12), and ἄνωθεν/ἐπάνω, respectively.

|       |                 |                        |
|-------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 14:10 | ויפלו שממה      | καὶ ἐνέπεσαν ἐκεῖ      |
| 39:12 | וינס ויצא החוצה | ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω |

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

<sup>98</sup> 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.

<sup>99</sup> 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.

<sup>100</sup> 15:5; 19:17; 24:29; 39:12, 13, 15, 18.

<sup>101</sup> G translates מלמעלה as ἄνωθεν in 6:16 and ἐπάνω in 7:20.

<sup>102</sup> G translates חלילה twice as μηδαμῶς (18:25+) and twice as μὴ γένοιτο (44:7, 17).

<sup>103</sup> For the remaining exceptional cases (3), see 10:19; 38:14; 44:14.

44:7 חלילה לעבדיך מעשות כדבר הזה μή γένοιτο τοῖς παισίν σου ποιῆσαι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο.

13:14 צפנה ונגבה וקדמה וימה πρὸς βορρᾶν καὶ λίβα καὶ ἀνατολὰς καὶ θάλασσαν

## 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 <u>כי</u> .     | 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).<sup>104</sup> Yet, this case is special for a few reasons. First, when Hebrew כל functions as a modifier, it is not an adjective but a noun in construct, and so it precedes the term it qualifies.<sup>105</sup> Second, G regularly places πᾶς in predicate position before the Greek article (i.e., its normal placement in Greek),<sup>106</sup> 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.

| No transposition | Transposition |
|------------------|---------------|
| אֵת              | אֵת           |
| כָּל — πᾶσαν     | כָּל — πᾶσαν  |
| ה — תֵּן         | ה — תֵּן      |
| אֶרֶץ — γῆν      | אֶרֶץ — γῆν   |
| Gen 13:15        | Gen 2:13      |

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 כל 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 אֵת (DDOM) and other prepositions with the Greek article, it is important to note that that he avoids placing

<sup>104</sup> 1:25, 30+; 2:6, 11, 13, 19, [20]+; 3:1; 12:5; 13:10, 11; 14:7, 11, 16; 17:8, 23; 19:25, [29]; 20:8; 26:11; 29:22; [31:9], 18+, [23], 37; 34:29+, [30]; 36:6[+]; 40:20; 41:8+, 35, [38], 48, 55, [56]; 42:6; 45:8, 13, 15, [18], 20, [23], 27; [46:6]; 47:12, 20.

<sup>105</sup> IBHS §9.5.3f; Joüon §§139e–i.

<sup>106</sup> 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”).<sup>107</sup>

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)<sup>108</sup> (15:16; 41:3; 26:33; 27:36), and by postponing them he signals the greater relevance of the noun (4)<sup>109</sup> (1:30, further below).<sup>110</sup>

|       |                                 |                                          |
|-------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 15:16 | ודור רביעי ישובו הנה            | τετάρτη δὲ γενεᾷ ἀποστραφήσονται ὧδε     |
| 41:3  | והנה שבע פרות אחרות עלות אחריהן | ἄλλαι δὲ ἑπτὰ βόες ἀνέβαινον μετὰ ταύτας |
| 26:33 | עד היום הזה                     | ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας                   |
| 27:36 | ויעקבני זה פעמים את בכרתי       | ἐπτέρνικεν γάρ με ἤδη δεύτερον τοῦτο     |

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

<sup>107</sup> KG II §465.6b; Smyth §1174a; SSG §38b(i).

<sup>108</sup> 3:24; 14:11; 15:16; 26:33; 29:34; [30:20]; [35:4]; 27:36; 31:21; 41:3, [23]; 42:11.

<sup>109</sup> 1:30; 25:4; 41:12, 38.

<sup>110</sup> Helma Dik, “Interpreting Adjective Position in Herodotus,” in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, ed. Egbert Bakker, Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava Supplementum 171 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 33–92; *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*, 89–103; Stéphanie J. Bakker, *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>111</sup> 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.<sup>112</sup> Finally, G fronts δεύτερον in 27:36 in order to draw attention to the fact that this is not the first but second (δύτερον) 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 אֶת כָּל יֵרֶק עֵשֶׂב לֶאֱכֹלָה 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 הַנִּמְצֵא בָּזָה אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ Μὴ εὐρήσομεν 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 אָחַד, Hebrew cardinal numbers typically precede their nouns as well as any article.<sup>113</sup> When G uses an anarthrous noun phrase, he often repositions the number after the noun (68).<sup>114</sup>

18:6 מֵאָה שָׁנָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה וְשֶׁבַע שָׁנִים ἑξήκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ

30:20 כִּי יִלְדֵּתִי לוֹ שְׁשֶׁה בָּנִים ἔτεκον γὰρ αὐτῷ υἱοὺς ἕξ

<sup>112</sup> 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.

<sup>113</sup> IBHS §15.2; Joüon §§142a–n.

<sup>114</sup> 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,<sup>115</sup> since numbers are often more salient than their nouns.<sup>116</sup> Similarly, when G uses an anarthrous 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).<sup>117</sup>

7:10      לַשְּׁבַעַת הַיָּמִים      μετὰ τὰς ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας  
33:1      וְעַל שְׁתֵּי הַשְּׁפָחוֹת      καὶ τὰς δύο παιδίσκας

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.

**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),<sup>118</sup> but

---

<sup>115</sup> For example, G sometimes keeps the number first with anarthrous ἔτος (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).

<sup>116</sup> Helma Dik notes that on the basis of some adjectives in Sophocles, quantifying adjectives tend to be placed before their noun heads ( *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*, 90–96).

<sup>117</sup> 1:16; 7:10, 11; 8:5; 9:23; 18:24, 28; 19:1; 21:30; 31:33; 33:1, [2]; 40:5, 12, 18; [41:4], [7]+, [20]+, [24]+, 26, 27+, [35]; 47:24.

<sup>118</sup> 5:5; 6:3; 9:28, 29; 16:16; 17:1, 24; 23:1; 25:7, 17; 35:28; 50:22, 26.

numbers are more often expressed in ascending grades (i.e., from 1s to 10s to 100s).<sup>119</sup> 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).<sup>120</sup> 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.<sup>121</sup> 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).<sup>122</sup>

|       |                                |                                |
|-------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 5:17  | חמש ותשעים שנה ושמונה מאות שנה | ἑτη ὀκτακόσια ἐνενήκοντα πέντε |
| 14:14 | שמונה עשר ושלוש מאות           | τριακοσίους δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ      |

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.

<sup>119</sup> 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).

<sup>120</sup> For G's omission of *καί*, see §3.1.2.2. That G preserves *καί* in 8:3 (μετὰ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἡμέρας) accords with the rule stated in note 121.

<sup>121</sup> 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.

<sup>122</sup> 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)<sup>123</sup> (3:16; 30:31; 19:9; 31:12) and personal pronouns (16)<sup>124</sup> (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.

|       |                                  |                                                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3:16  | והוא ימשל בך                     | καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει.                                         |
| 30:31 | מה אתן לך                        | τί σοι δώσω;                                                     |
| 19:9  | עתה נרע לך מהם                   | νῦν οὖν σέ κακώσομεν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκείνους.                          |
| 31:12 | כי ראיתי את כל אשר לבן עשה לך    | έώρακα γάρ ὅσα σοι λαβάν ποιεῖ.                                  |
| 11:8  | ויפץ יהוה אתם משם על פני כל הארץ | καὶ διέσπειρεν αὐτοὺς κύριος ἐκεῖθεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς, |
| 24:15 | ויהי הוּא טרם כלה לדבר [אל לבו]  | καὶ ἐγένετο πρὸ τοῦ αὐτὸν συντελέσαι λαλοῦντα ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ,     |

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.<sup>125</sup> In 24:15, however, G's choice to translate טרם with a preposition has motivated the repositioning

<sup>123</sup> 3:12, 16; 12:13; 15:2; 17:16; 18:12; 19:9; 20:5; 21:6, 26; 22:2; 23:9; 24:41, 45, 50; 25:22, 32; 26:2; 27:8, 38; 28:21, 22; 30:30+, 31; 31:12, 16; 32:9, 12; 34:30; 38:16, 18; 40:14; 44:17; 48:9.

<sup>124</sup> 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.

<sup>125</sup> 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).<sup>126</sup>

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

|       |                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7:4   | כִּי לַיָּמִים עוֹד שְׁבַע־אֲנֹכִי מִמָּטִיר עַל הָאָרֶץ                                                       | ἔτι γὰρ ἡμερῶν ἑπτὰ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ὕετον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν                                                                                                                  |
| 44:20 | יֵשׁ לָנוּ אֵב זָקֵן וְיֶלֶד זָקִים קָטָן [לֹו] וְאֶחָיו מֵת וְיֹוֹתֵר הוּא לְבָדּוֹ לְאִמּוֹ וְאִבּוֹ אֶהְיֶה | Ἔστιν ἡμῖν πατὴρ πρεσβύτερος, καὶ παιδίον γήρως νεώτερον αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπέθανεν, αὐτὸς δὲ μόνος ὑπελείφθη τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτὸν ἡγάπησεν. |

By placing ἔτι before postpositive γὰρ in 7:4, G emphasizes the flood's imminence ("in just seven more days"), whereas moving αὐτός before postpositive δέ in 44:20 shifts the subject from Joseph back to Benjamin,<sup>128</sup> 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.<sup>129</sup>

<sup>126</sup> See §4.1.2.3, especially note 94.

<sup>127</sup> 4:7; 7:4; 15:12; 19:38; 29:9; 34:14; [39:18]; 44:20.

<sup>128</sup> Concerning resumed topics, see Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek*, 21.

<sup>129</sup> For other cases (66), see 4:12, 15; 6:16; 7:16, 22; 8:3; 11:12; 12:20; 14:16; 17:12, 18; 18:1, 6, 11; 19:6, [15], 20, 38; 20:12; 22:3, 6; 23:6, 13; 24:27; 25:6; 26:28; 27:38; 28:2; 29:34; 30:12, 15; [31:32], 42; 32:28; 33:1, 16; 35:13; 37:4, 24, 29; 39:6; 40:5; 42:11, 13, 15, 22+, 24, 32; 43:15; 44:4, 9, 12, 14, 26; 45:16, 19, 20, 21; 47:23, 26; 48:7; 50:10, 12, 24, 25.

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 כִּי (84)

As with the more frequent use of postpositive conjunctions to translate Hebrew clausal-ו, G often uses the Greek postpositive γάρ for the Hebrew conjunction כִּי (82),<sup>130</sup> which entails a change in word order. In studying the use of causal ὅτι as a translation of Hebrew כִּי, Anneli Aejmelaeus makes a distinction between “direct” and “indirect” causation:<sup>131</sup> while Hebrew כִּי is used to introduce (i) complement clauses<sup>132</sup> and (ii) causal clauses conveying both (ii.a) direct and (ii.b) indirect causation,<sup>133</sup> Greek ὅτι is normally used only for (i) complement clauses<sup>134</sup> and (ii.a) direct causation,<sup>135</sup> whereas γάρ (like ὥς and ἐπεὶ) is used for (ii.b) indirect causation.<sup>136</sup> While traditional grammars do not make use of the terms *direct* and *indirect causation*, they confirm this comparison of ὅτι and γάρ

---

<sup>130</sup> 2:5; 3:5; 4:25; 15:16; 18:15, 19; 19:22, 30; 20:2, 11; 21:10, 16, 17, 18; 22:12; 26:3, 7, 9, 20, 24; 27:23; 28:11; 29:2, 9, 21, 34; 30:16, 20, 26, 30; 31:12, 15, 30, 31; 32:10, 20, 26, 30; 34:19; 35:7, 17, 18; 36:7; 37:17; 38:11, 14, 15, 16; 41:31, 49, 57; 42:4, 5, 23; 43:5, 10, 16, 25, 30, 32+; 44:26, 34; 45:3, 5, 6, 11, 26; 46:3, 30, 32, 34; 47:4, 13, 15, 18, 20+; 48:18; 49:4; 50:3, 19. In 2:17, G translates כִּי as δέ, and one additional case is counted here involving not כִּי but the particle כִּי translated as δέ (21:13).

<sup>131</sup> Anneli Aejmelaeus, “OTI *causale* in Septuagintal Greek,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, CBET 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 11–12.

<sup>132</sup> *IBHS* §38.8; Joüon §157.

<sup>133</sup> *IBHS* §38.4; Joüon §170d.

<sup>134</sup> KG II §550; Smyth §§2576–2588; *SSG* §§66; 79c; cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “OTI *recitativum* in Septuagintal Greek,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, CBET 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 31–42.

<sup>135</sup> KG II §569; Smyth §§2240–2248; *SSG* §45d.

<sup>136</sup> KG II §545; Smyth §§2803–2812.

with other words.<sup>137</sup> In light of this distinction, it is common for G to use ὅτι for כִּי when it expresses a direct causal relationship (3:14) but γάρ when כִּי expresses a causal or explanatory relationship of an indirect (19:22), implicit (4:25), parenthetical (2:5), or subjective (18:15) nature.<sup>138</sup>

|       |                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3:14  | ויאמר יהוה אלהים אל הנחש<br>כִּי עשית זאת ארור אתה<br>מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה                                             | καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ ὄφει<br>"Ὅτι ἐποίησας τοῦτο, ἐπικατάρατος σὺ<br>ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς·                                                            |
| 19:22 | מהר המלט שמה<br>כִּי לא אוכל לעשות דבר<br>עד באך שמה                                                                      | σπεῦσον οὖν τοῦ σωθῆναι ἐκεῖ·<br>οὐ γὰρ δυνήσομαι ποιῆσαι πρᾶγμα<br>ἕως τοῦ σε εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖ.                                                                                                 |
| 4:25  | וידע אדם עוד את [חוה] אשתו<br>[ותהר] ותלד בן<br>ותקרא את שמו שת [לאמר]<br>כִּי שת לי אלהים זרע אחר<br>תחת הבל כי הרגו קין | "Εγὼ δὲ Ἀδὰμ Εὕαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν υἱὸν<br>καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Σῆθ λέγουσα<br>'Εξανέστησεν γὰρ μοι ὁ θεὸς σπέρμα ἕτερον<br>ἀντὶ Ἀβελ, ὃν ἀπέκτεινεν Κάιν. |
| 2:5   | וכל שיח השדה טרם יהיה בארץ<br>וכל עשב השדה טרם יצמח<br>כִּי לא המטיר יהוה אלהים על הארץ<br>ואדם אין לעבד את האדמה ...     | καὶ πᾶν χλωρὸν ἀγροῦ πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς<br>καὶ πάντα χόρτον ἀγροῦ πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατεῖλαι·<br>οὐ γὰρ ἔβρεξεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,<br>καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἦν ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν γῆν, ...            |
| 18:15 | ותכחש שרה לאמר לא צחקתי כִּי יראה                                                                                         | ἡρνήσατο δὲ Σάρρα λέγουσα Οὐκ ἐγέλασα· ἐφοβήθη γὰρ.                                                                                                                                            |

<sup>137</sup> Kühner-Gerth note that the causal relationship expressed by γάρ relates to a preceding idea "zuweilen auch nur gedacht" ("at times left unstated") (KG II §545.6); Smyth likewise claims that γάρ "often refers to a thought implied in what has preceded" (§2810); Denniston, perhaps more pejoratively, says that with γάρ "the connexion of thought is sometimes lacking in logical precision" (*The Greek Particles*, 61). Cf. Albert Rijksbaron, who distinguishes between ὅτι, on the one hand, and ὡς, ἐπεί, and γάρ, 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]).

<sup>138</sup> According to Aejmelaeus, Genesis and Exodus—in contrast to other Septuagint translation units—usually make a proper distinction between ὅτι and γάρ when translating causal uses of כִּי. For Genesis, the ratio of γάρ to ὅτι as equivalents for causal כִּי is 87 : 68; in Exodus, 12 : 79. When acceptable cases of ὅτι-causale are bracketed, however, the ratios are even higher: G correctly uses γάρ in 78% of the cases ("OTI 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).<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> 2:11; 3:23; 6:17; 7:15; 21:17+; 30:26; 44:5, 9, 10, 16, 17.



|      |                        |                                         |
|------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 7:4  | באשר הוא שם            | ἐκ τοῦ τόπου οὗ ἐστίν                   |
| 18:6 | האדמה אשר לקח משם      | τὴν γῆν ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθη                   |
| 7:15 | מכל הבשר אשר ברוח חיים | ἀπὸ πασης σαρκὸς ἐν ᾧ ἐστίν πνεῦμα ζωῆς |

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.<sup>140</sup>

**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 *καί* and so form a compound phrase (9)<sup>141</sup> (8:18; 14:14) or stand in apposition to one another (3)<sup>142</sup> (45:12).

|       |                          |                                                                       |
|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:18  | נח ובניו ואשתו ונשי בניו | Nṵe καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ |
| 14:14 | ויקרא לרחל וללאה         | ἐκάλεσεν Δείαν καὶ Παχῆλ                                              |
| 45:12 | עיני אחי בנימין          | οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ Βενιαμὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου                                  |

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).

<sup>140</sup> For references to studies and grammars, see §§3.1.3.4; 3.1.7.1 and notes.

<sup>141</sup> 7:8; 8:18; 14:24; 22:24; 30:43; 31:4, 37; 32:7; 33:7.

<sup>142</sup> 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)<sup>143</sup> or otherwise seem more likely to reflect a textual variant (3),<sup>144</sup> while other cases effect certain syntactic changes and so more likely stem from G (20).<sup>145</sup>

### 4.3 Major Displacement (20 groups)

Quite rarely are words or even entire clauses relocated in more drastic ways (20),<sup>146</sup> 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?

|      |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                             |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18:8 | ויקח חמאה וחלב ובן הבקר אשר עשה<br>ויתן לפניהם<br>והוא עמד עליהם תחת העץ ויאכלו | ἔλαβεν δὲ βούτυρον καὶ γάλα καὶ τὸ μωσχάριον ὃ ἐποίησεν<br>καὶ παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐφάγσαν<br>αὐτὸς δὲ παρειστήκει αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον   |
| 33:4 | וירץ עשו לקראתו<br>ויחבקו<br>ויפל על צואר וישקו<br>ויבכו                        | καὶ προσέδραμεν Ἡσαὺ εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτῷ<br>καὶ περιλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἐφίλησεν<br>καὶ προσέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ ἔκλαυσαν ἀμφότεροι |

In both 18:8 and 33:4, it is not implausible that the short clauses ויאכלו and וישקו 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

<sup>143</sup> 2:4; 8:21; 11:14; 26:29; 31:17; 34:12; 41:56; 42:32.

<sup>144</sup> 1:11; 24:7; 31:32.

<sup>145</sup> 9:4; 11:7; 21:16+; 22:16; 23:6; 24:41; 25:7; 29:24; 30:37; 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.

<sup>146</sup> 18:8; 30:7, 10, 12; 31:10, 26, 33+++, 35, 44, 46, 48, 55; 33:4; 35:16; 37:9; 39:23; 47:5.

interruption of the sequence of preparing, bringing, and eating the food.<sup>147</sup> 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.<sup>148</sup>

#### 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

---

<sup>147</sup> 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).

<sup>148</sup> 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.

## 5 LEXICAL EQUIVALENCE

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,<sup>1</sup> in part as a means of assisting with the retroversion into Hebrew of textual variants based upon Septuagintal evidence.<sup>2</sup> In addition, lexical equivalence has often been invoked as evidence of the unity or multiplicity of translators for two textual units,<sup>3</sup> to measure the literalness of

---

<sup>1</sup> Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)* 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892–1906). For a critical review, see Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 100–109. Beyond the advantages of how Appendix II (described below) presents equivalences, the drawbacks of existing concordances further justify the inclusion in this work of a new lexical concordance.

<sup>2</sup> On the subject of retroversions from the Septuagint, see *Text-Critical Use*, esp. pp. 62–115.

<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> for dating and provenance,<sup>5</sup> and even to assess the meaning a translator intended for his words,<sup>6</sup> just to name a few major applications.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Wright, *No Small Difference*, 91–112. The methodological problems involved in studying lexical consistency have been discussed at length in Olofsson, “Consistency,” 14–30; cf. Martha Lynn Wade, “Evaluating Lexical Consistency in the Old Greek Bible,” *BIOSCS* 33 (2000): 53–75.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., Lee, *Lexical Study*; Joosten, “Aramaising Renderings,” 587–600; “The Septuagint as a Source of Information on Egyptian Aramaic in the Hellenistic Period,” in *Aramaic in Its Historical and Linguistic Setting*, ed. Holger Gzella and Margaretha Folmer, Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 50 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 93–105; Stefan Pfeiffer, “Joseph in Ägypten: Althistorische Beobachtungen zur griechischen Übersetzung und Rezeption von Gen 39–50,” in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 313–322; “Ägyptische Elemente,” 231–245; Robert J. V. Hiebert, “Innovative Elements in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint Pentateuch,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016), 306–315.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 305–318; Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 22–25.

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**

| Hebrew POS        | Total | One-to-one |       | Omitted |       | Main Greek POS     |       |       | (With groups)                |
|-------------------|-------|------------|-------|---------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|------------------------------|
| Content words     |       |            |       |         |       |                    |       |       |                              |
| common noun       | 6,685 | 6,059      | 90.6% | 130     | 1.9%  | = common noun      | 5,307 | 79.4% | ([82.1%] + 184) <sup>9</sup> |
| verb              | 5,132 | 4,982      | 97.1% | 51      | 1.0%  | = verb             | 4,835 | 94.2% | ([95.8%] + 84)               |
| proper noun       | 2,773 | 2,643      | 95.3% | 10      | 0.4%  | = proper noun      | 2,449 | 88.3% | ([90.6%] + 64)               |
| adjective         | 652   | 610        | 93.6% | 8       | 1.2%  | = adjective        | 318   | 48.8% | ([50.0%] + 8)                |
| Function words    |       |            |       |         |       |                    |       |       |                              |
| conjunction       | 4,773 | 4,207      | 88.1% | 510     | 10.7% | = conjunction      | 4,130 | 86.5% | ([87.4%] + 38)               |
| preposition       | 4,180 | 2,506      | 60.0% | 1,104   | 26.4% | = preposition      | 1,839 | 44.0% | ([53.4%] + 392)              |
| pron. suffix      | 3,468 | 3,089      | 89.1% | 298     | 8.6%  | = pers. pronoun    | 2,856 | 82.4% | ([82.7%] + 11)               |
| definite article  | 1,589 | 1,306      | 82.2% | 241     | 15.2% | = definite article | 1,301 | 81.9% | ([83.3%] + 22)               |
| אֵל (DDOM)        | 1,033 | 543        | 52.6% | 489     | 47.3% | = definite article | 525   | 50.8% | ([50.8%] + 0)                |
| relative particle | 422   | 355        | 84.1% | 14      | 3.3%  | = rel. pronoun     | 254   | 60.2% | ([62.1%] + 8)                |
| pers. pronoun     | 403   | 372        | 92.3% | 25      | 6.2%  | = pers. pronoun    | 202   | 50.1% | ([51.4%] + 5)                |

<sup>9</sup> 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%),<sup>10</sup> synthetic translation (404) (6.0%),<sup>11</sup> or expansive translation (92) (1.4%).<sup>12</sup> When G maintains quantitative equivalence (6,059)

---

<sup>10</sup> Usually, omission involves שְׁנָה and יוֹם in date formulae (49) or בֵּן and בֵּת 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.

<sup>11</sup> With synthetic translation, the Hebrew noun often 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 §3.3.3.2); 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+, 27+; 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.

<sup>12</sup> Usually, expansive translation involves a Hebrew noun with the directional-ָ 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: 2:9; 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)<sup>13</sup> (23:4; 17:12), but at times a verb (74)<sup>14</sup> (31:18; 43:28), adverb (50)<sup>15</sup> (1:5; 40:7), or other part of speech (62).<sup>16</sup>

|       |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 23:4  | גַּר וְתוֹשֵׁב אֲנֹכִי עִמָּכֶם                                                                                        | Πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν                                                                                                                  |
| 17:12 | וּבֶן שְׁמֹנֶת יָמִים יִמּוֹל לָכֶם<br>כָּל זָכָר לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם<br>יֵלִיד [בֵּיתְךָ] וּמִקְנֵת כֶּסֶף מִכֵּל בֶּן נָכָר | καὶ παιδίον ὀκτὼ ἡμερῶν περιτμηθήσεται ὑμῖν<br>πᾶν ἀρσενικὸν εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν,<br>ὁ οἰκογενῆς τῆς οἰκίας σου καὶ ὁ ἀργυρώνητος ἀπὸ παντὸς υἱοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, |
| 31:18 | וַיִּנְהַג אֶת כָּל מִקְנֵהוּ                                                                                          | καὶ ἀπήγαγεν πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ                                                                                                                        |
| 43:28 | וַיֹּאמְרוּ שְׁלֹם לְעַבְדְּךָ לְאַבְיִנוּ עוֹדֵנוּ חַי                                                                | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ὑγιαίνει ὁ παῖς σου ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ἔτι ζῇ.                                                                                                        |
| 1:5   | וַיְהִי עֶרֶב וַיְהִי בֹקֶר יוֹם אֶחָד                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα μία.                                                                                                              |
| 40:7  | מְדוּעַ פְּנִיכֶם רַעִים הַיּוֹם                                                                                       | Τί ὅτι τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν σκυθρωπὰ σήμερον;                                                                                                                     |

<sup>13</sup> G uses adjectives for common nouns so much due to the Hebrew word כָּל (355), which is morphologically a noun (cf. Youngblood, “Translation Technique,” 44). Otherwise, G frequently translates עַשִׂי as ἕκαστος (16), ἕτερος (31:49), or ἑκάτερος (40:5), זָכָר as ἄρσεν (13) or ἀρσενικός (5), בָּכָר as πρωτότοκος (15), נֶקֶבָה as θῆλυς (10), תָּנִיךְ as μέσος (9), עוֹלָם as αἰώνιος (8) or ἀέναιος (49:26), יָמִין as δέξιος (7), or מִמָּאֵל as ἀρίστερος (6). For other cases (119), see 1:2+, 9[+], 10, 11, [12], 21, 29, 30; 2:5, 12; 3:6, 21, 24; 4:20; 6:4, 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.

<sup>14</sup> Most often, G translates a Hebrew noun with the Greek participle ὑπάρχοντα (12: 12:5; 13:6; 14:16; 24:59; 31:18; 34:23; 36:6, 7+; 45:18; 46:6; 47:18), נָ as εἰμί in an age formula (7), עוֹלָם as ὑγιαίνω (5), or מָוֶת as ἀποθνήσκω (4) or τελευτάω (50:16). For other cases (29), see 2:17; 4:7; 6:5, 16, 21; 8:21; 9:3; 13:10; 14:13; 15:1, 17; 19:16, 25, 31; 22:16; 24:4, 13, [36]; 25:27; 27:46; 29:20; 30:37; 31:46, 48+; 32:8, 32+; 36:6, 43; 37:1; 39:22; 40:13; 41:36; 42:27, 38; 43:21; 45:21, 22, 27; 47:26; 49:3, 14, 17, 22.

<sup>15</sup> Often, G translates בֹּקֶר as πρωί (18), יוֹם as σήμερον (15), or פָּוֶה as ἔξω (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.

<sup>16</sup> 2:14, 16, 19+, 20, 21, 22+, 23; 3:1, 8, 9, 12, 20, 22, 24; 4:1, 16; 5:1, 2; 6:5, 17; 8:11; 9:16; 12:15; 13:16; 14:5; 15:2; 20:12+; 21:4; 22:12; 23:6, 8, 10, 18; 24:11, 23, 24, 55, 59; 25:9; 30:31, 40; [31:32]; 35:16; 36:24; 39:3, 6, 9, 23; 40:3, 7, 15; 41:44, 51; 44:14, 18; 45:1; 47:23; 48:7, 22.

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

**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%),<sup>19</sup> synthetic translation (41) (0.8%),<sup>20</sup> or expansive translation (58) (1.1%).<sup>21</sup> When G maintains quantitative equivalence (4,982) (97.1%), however, he nearly always uses a verb

---

<sup>17</sup> KG II §§403–405; Smyth §§1021–1029; *SSG* §23f.

<sup>18</sup> *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.

<sup>19</sup> Most often, omission occurs with אָמַר in speech formulae (7) (see §3.1.7.5), הָיָה 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.

<sup>20</sup> At times, G translates a verb synthetically due to using a Greek compound (9) (see §3.3.2.3) or rendering בִּאֲרָה as ἔως ἐλθεῖν (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.

<sup>21</sup> 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)<sup>22</sup> (4:2; 3:4), adjective (38)<sup>23</sup> (9:25; 24:1), adverb (22)<sup>24</sup> (37:13), or other part of speech (7).<sup>25</sup>

|       |                                                       |                                                    |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 4:2   | ... ויהי הבל רעה צאן ...                              | καὶ ἐγένετο Ἄβελ ποιμὴν προβάτων ...               |
| 3:4   | וַיֹּאמֶר הַנָּחַשׁ אֶל הָאִשָּׁה לֹא מוֹת תָּמוּתוֹן | καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ὄφις τῇ γυναικί Οὐ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε· |
| 9:25  | אַרְוֶה כְּנָעַן                                      | Ἐπικατάρματος Χανάν·                               |
| 24:1  | ... וַאֲבָרְהָם זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים ...             | Καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἦν πρεσβύτερος προβεβηκώς ἡμερῶν, ...   |
| 37:13 | לְכָה וְאֶשְׁלַחְךָ אֵלֵיהֶם                          | δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς αὐτούς                     |

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 adjectivally.<sup>26</sup>

**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%),<sup>27</sup> synthetic translation (16)

<sup>22</sup> Most often, the verb is (i) a participle (46): רעה = ποιμὴν (10); מות = νεκρός (8); רגל = 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: 2:16, 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): לַקְרָא = εἰς συνάντησιν (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.

<sup>23</sup> Most often, the verb is a participle (27): ארר = ἐπικατάρματος (6); ברך = εὐλογητός (6); טלא = διάλευκος (4) or σποδοειδής (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.

<sup>24</sup> A number of instances involve the verbs הלך and יהב 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.

<sup>25</sup> A few cases involve G translating ראה as the fossilized imperative ἰδοῦ (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.

<sup>26</sup> IBHS §§37.2, 4; Joüon §121. Greek participles also have these functions (KG II §480; Smyth §2049–2053; SSG §§31b–c).

<sup>27</sup> 23:1; 27:46; 35:10, 21; 41:33, 45+, 56; 42:1; 48:14. Cf. §3.1.8.

(0.6%),<sup>28</sup> or expansive translation (104) (3.8%).<sup>29</sup> 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)<sup>30</sup> (2:8; 41:1), only rarely using an adjective (12)<sup>31</sup> (50:13; 14:3) or a personal pronoun (11)<sup>32</sup> (28:3; 7:9).

|       |                                      |                                                                  |
|-------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:8   | ... ויטע יהוה אלהים גן בעדן מקדם ... | Καὶ ἐφύτευσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Ἑδεμ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ... |
| 41:1  | ... והנה עמד על היאר ...             | ᾧετο ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, ...                                |
| 50:13 | ... ויקברו אתו במערת המכפלה ...      | καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον τὸ διπλοῦν, ...                 |
| 14:3  | ... אל עמק השדים הוא ים המלח ...     | ... ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα τὴν ἀλυκὴν αὕτη ἡ θάλασσα τῶν ἁλῶν           |
| 28:3  | ... ואל שדי יברך אתך ויפרך וירבך ... | ὁ δὲ θεὸς μου εὐλογῆσαι σε καὶ αὐξήσαι σε, καὶ πληθύναι σε, ...  |
| 7:9   | ... כאשר צוה אלהים את נח ...         | ... καθὰ ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ ὁ θεός                                  |

While G may use a pronoun as a substitute for a proper noun (7:9),<sup>33</sup> he 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).

<sup>28</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> Typically, this involves inadequate tokenization of the Hebrew text, as in the case of proper nouns with the directional-ה 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.

<sup>30</sup> The bulk of these cases involve the divine name יהוה translated as κύριος (117) or θεός (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.

<sup>31</sup> G regularly translates מִכְפֶּלֶה as διπλοῦς (6) and שְׂדִים as ἀλυκός (3). See also 12:6; 22:2; 49:25.

<sup>32</sup> G regularly translates שְׂדִי as μου (3) or σου (2), cf. ἐμός (49:25 in note 31). The other cases involve personal names translated by αὐτός (6: 7:9; 14:5; 25:6; 47:10; 48:10, 15).

<sup>33</sup> Yet, G's use of the pronoun αὐτούς to represent Ἰωσήφ 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%),<sup>34</sup> synthetic translation (29) (4.4%),<sup>35</sup> or expansive translation (5) (0.8%).<sup>36</sup> When G maintains quantitative equivalence (610) (93.6%), however, he typically uses a Greek adjective (318) or demonstrative pronoun (227)<sup>37</sup> (**38:23**), less often a verb (34)<sup>38</sup> (**1:24**; **43:7**), noun (19)<sup>39</sup> (**10:8**; **38:21**), or other part of speech (12).<sup>40</sup>

|              |                                  |                                                              |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>38:23</b> | הנה שלחתי הגדי הזה ואתה לא מצאתה | ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπέσταλκα τὸν ἔριφον <u>τούτου</u> σὺ δὲ οὐχ εὗρηκας |
| <b>1:24</b>  | תוצא הארץ נפש חיה למינה          | Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν <u>ζῶσαν</u> κατὰ γένος                 |
| <b>43:7</b>  | העוד אביכם חי                    | Εἰ ἔτι ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν <u>ζῇ</u> ;                              |
| <b>10:8</b>  | הוא החל להיות גבר בארץ           | οὗτος ἤρξατο εἶναι <u>γίγας</u> ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.                 |
| <b>38:21</b> | איה הקדשה הוא בעינים על הדרך     | Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ <u>πόρνη</u> ἡ γενομένη ἐν Αἰνὰν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ;   |

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**)<sup>41</sup> and as a finite form when the adjective

<sup>34</sup> For these omissions (8), see especially §3.1.8: **2:23**; **7:11**; **18:13**; **27:46**; **31:24**, 29; **43:10**; [**44:4**].

<sup>35</sup> Synthetic translation is most common with the compound adverbials בזה (3), מזה (3), and מרחוק (2) (see §3.3.1.3) and when G uses the compound ἀρχιισιτοποιός for שר האפים (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**.

<sup>36</sup> For these rare expansive translations (5), see especially §3.4.5: **13:2**; **16:11**; **38:24**, 25; **42:21**.

<sup>37</sup> WHM considers forms like זה and אלה adjectives, but they have nominal functions (*IBHS* §17.1; Joüon §36).

<sup>38</sup> Most often, the adjective is חי (20): as a participle of ζάω (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 ζάω (7: **43:7**, 27, 28; **45:3**, 26, 28; **46:30**). Also common are גבר translated by ἐνισχύω (4) and ירא by φοβέω (3). For other cases (7), see **6:5**; **15:16**; **25:29**, 30; **27:21**, 24; **37:35**.

<sup>39</sup> Most frequent are גבור translated as γίγας (4) and קדש as 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**.

<sup>40</sup> **6:15**; **19:20**; **26:29**, 33; **33:2**, 18; [**35:4**]; **40:16**, 17; **43:11+**; **45:23**.

<sup>41</sup> *IBHS* §14.3.1; Joüon §121.

functions predicatively in a verbless clause (43:7).<sup>42</sup> Similarly, when he uses a noun for a Hebrew adjective, the adjective often functions as a substantive (10:8; 38:21).<sup>43</sup>

### 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%),<sup>44</sup> he does not usually translate them synthetically (39) (0.8%)<sup>45</sup> or expansively (17) (0.4%).<sup>46</sup> When G maintains quantitative equivalence (4,207) (88.1%), however, he virtually always

---

<sup>42</sup> *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.

<sup>43</sup> *IBHS* §14.3.3; Joüon §§86–87.

<sup>44</sup> 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+.

<sup>45</sup> Typically, synthetic translations involve Hebrew compound conjunctions (17) (see §3.3.1.2) or G's use of  $\kappa\alpha\gamma\omega$  (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.

<sup>46</sup> 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)<sup>47</sup> (10:21; 21:23), relative pronoun (19)<sup>48</sup> (25:1; 26:13), particle (12)<sup>49</sup> (27:34), preposition (8)<sup>50</sup> (11:4), or other part of speech (5).<sup>51</sup>

|       |                                          |                                                                                |
|-------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:21 | ולשם ילד גַם הוא                         | Καὶ τῷ Σὴμ ἐγενήθη καὶ αὐτῷ                                                    |
| 21:23 | ועתה השבעה לי באלהים הנה אִם תשקר לי     | νῦν οὖν ὁμοσόν μοι τὸν θεὸν μὴ ἀδικήσῃς με                                     |
| 25:1  | ויסף אברהם ויקח אשה נשמה קטורה           | Προσθέμενος δὲ Ἀβραάμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα, ἥ ὄνομα Χεττούρα                         |
| 26:13 | וילך הלוך וגדל עד בִּי גדל מאד           | καὶ προβαίνων μείζων ἐγένετο, ἕως οὗ μέγας ἐγένετο σφόδρα·                     |
| 27:34 | ויאמר ברכני גַם אני אבי                  | Εὐλόγησον δὴ καμέ, πάτερ.                                                      |
| 11:4  | ונעשה לנו שם<br>פָּן נפוצ על פני כל הארץ | καὶ ποιήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς ὄνομα<br>πρὸ τοῦ διασπαρῆναι ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς. |

Often, G uses adverbial καί for adverbial גַם (10:21; cf. 27:34)<sup>52</sup> and relative pronouns especially for disjunctive-ו 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%),<sup>53</sup> but also synthetic translation (503)

<sup>47</sup> Most often, it is גַם translated by adverbial καί (20: 3:6; 4:4, 22; 10:21; [19:15], 34, 35, 38; 22:20, 24; 24:44; 26:21; 27:31; 29:27, 33; 30:15; 38:10, 11; 44:29; 48:11). Also common are אִם (4: 21:23; 26:29; 32:26; 42:15), וְ (2: 19:19; 24:6), and וְ (2: 20:9; 30:15) translated as μὴ. For other cases (5), see 18:13; 21:13; 24:4; 29:15; 43:21.

<sup>48</sup> Most cases involve וְ (16: 11:4; 14:13; 16:1; 19:20; 22:24; 24:29, 43; 25:1; 28:12; 35:3; 38:1, 2, 6; 46:18, 25; 49:23), but a few times the conjunction is וְ (3: 4:25; 26:13; 27:20).

<sup>49</sup> 18:13; 20:11; [24:14], 19, 41, 55; 27:34, 38; 34:26, 28, [29]; 49:10.

<sup>50</sup> 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.

<sup>51</sup> 3:1; 24:15, 33, 45; 43:11.

<sup>52</sup> *IBHS* §16.3.5b; Joüon §146; *HALOT*, s.v. “גַם,” 2–6. For adverbial καί, see KG II §524; Smyth §§2881–2891.

<sup>53</sup> Omission occurs very often when G translates the preposition’s object as a bare noun (798) (see §3.1.1.1)—note that אֶת (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 לְכָם/לָךְ (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 לֵאמֹר (4) (see



(12.0%)<sup>54</sup> and expansive translation (67) (1.6%).<sup>55</sup> 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)<sup>56</sup> (9:3; 34:7; 16:16), adverb (14)<sup>57</sup> (4:15), relative pronoun (12)<sup>58</sup> (5:1), or other part of speech (16).<sup>59</sup>

---

§3.1.7.5). For most other cases (27), see §3.1.8: 14:24; 23:11; 24:32; 26:8; 27:46+; 28:9; 29:6; 30:34; 31:24, 29; 33:20; 34:12; 37:9; 41:12, 45, 56; 45:3, 22; 46:5, 31; 47:6, 24+; 48:1, 7; 50:14.

<sup>54</sup> 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 לְבַד (8) or בִּי (2) (see §3.3.3.1). For most other cases (67), see §3.3.3.4: 4:6, 7; 6:3, 6; 7:22; 8:21; 11:30; 12:18; 13:3; 15:13; 16:6, 8; 18:1, 11, 12; 19:8+, 12, 14, 17; 20:15+; 24:27, 47; 25:28; 26:32; 27:5, 45; 29:4; 30:15; 31:29, 35; 32:7, 13, 16, 17+; 34:9; 38:23, 25; 39:11, 19; 41:16, 19+, 38, 56; 42:7, 16, 28; 43:6, 23, 27; 44:4, 15, 18+, 19, 21, 28; 45:10; 46:29; 47:8, 19; 48:7; 49:13, 22.

<sup>55</sup> Expansive translation almost exclusively involves G's translation of לְבַד as ἀνὰ μέσον (59) (see §3.4.3). For other cases (8), see §§3.4.1.3; 3.4.3: 19:9; 21:26; 23:13; 29:30; 38:1; 43:3, 5; 49:22.

<sup>56</sup> Most often, this involves one of the inseparable prepositions לְ, בִּי, or לְבַד being translated (i) as ὡς (45): לְ (44: 3:5, 22; 9:3; 10:9; 13:10+, 16; [18:23], 25+; 19:31; 22:17+; 26:4; 27:12, 23, 27; 28:14; 29:13, 20; 31:2, 5, [15], 26; 32:12; 33:10; 34:7, 15, [16]; 38:11 (ὡςπερ), 29; 39:13, [18], 19; 41:49; 42:30; 44:10; 48:5, 20+; 49:4, 9+; 50:20); לְ (45:8); (ii) as ἵνα, always לְ (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; [44:4], 7; 47:15; 50:20); (iii) as ὅτε (11): לְ (10: 2:4; 12:4; 25:20, 26; 33:18; 34:25; 35:9; 36:24; 41:46; 42:21); לְ (24:30); (iv) as ἡνίκα (16): לְ (9: 16:16; 17:24, 25; 21:5; 30:42; 35:21; 38:5; 45:1; 48:7); לְ (7: 12:14; 19:15, 17; 24:30; 27:34, 40; 39:10); (v) as ὥστε, always לְ (8: 1:15, 17; 9:15; 15:7; 23:8; 34:22, 30; 45:27); or (vi) עַד translated as ἕως (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 1:6; 6:13; 7:22, 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.

<sup>57</sup> 4:15+; 7:16; 16:2; 18:10; 19:21, 26; 20:6, 18; 30:15; 31:4; 38:9; 41:21; 42:27.

<sup>58</sup> Most often, this involves temporal expressions like בְּיָמָיו (6: 2:4, 17; 5:1, 2; 21:8; 47:9) or the expression עַל כֵּן translated as οὐ ἐλέγχεν (3: 18:5; 19:8; 38:26). For other cases (3), see 19:31; 32:13; 44:1.

<sup>59</sup> 12:6; 19:28; 21:16; 25:5, 25; 33:12+; 34:14, 31; 37:24; 39:9; 41:23; 45:11; 49:16, 26+.

|       |                                                                                                 |                                                                                             |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:21 | וְלֶשֶׁם יָלַד גַּם הוּא                                                                        | Kaì τῷ Σῆμ ἐγενήθη καὶ αὐτῷ                                                                 |
| 9:3   | בִּירֶק עָשָׂב נָתַתִּי לָכֶם אֶת כָּל                                                          | ὥς λάχανα χόρτου δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰ πάντα.                                                      |
| 34:7  | בְּשִׁמְעֵם וַיִּתְּעֲצְבוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים                                                         | ὥς δὲ ἤκουσαν, κατενύχθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες,                                                      |
| 16:16 | וַאֲבֹרָם בֶּן שְׁמֹנִים שָׁנָה וְשֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים<br>בְּלִדְתִּי הִגֵּר אֶת יִשְׁמָעֵאל לְאֹבְרָם | Ἀβράμ δὲ ἦν ὀγδοήκοντα ἔξ ἐτῶν,<br>ἡνίκα ἔτεκεν Ἀγάρ τὸν Ἰσμαὴλ τῷ Ἀβράμ.                   |
| 4:15  | וַיִּשֶׁם יְהוָה לִקִּין אוֹת<br>לְבִלְתִּי הָכֹות אֹתוֹ כָּל מִצְאוֹ                           | καὶ ἔθετο κύριος ὁ θεὸς σημεῖον τῷ Κάιν<br>τοῦ μὴ ἀνελεῖν αὐτὸν πάντα τὸν εὕρισκοντα αὐτόν. |
| 5:1   | בְּיוֹם בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם<br>בְּדִמוֹת אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ                                | ἢ ἡμέρᾳ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀδάμ,<br>κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν.                       |

When G translates a Hebrew preposition as a Greek conjunction, it is often comparative  $\pi$ ,<sup>60</sup> for which G uses  $\omega\varsigma$  (9:3),<sup>61</sup> or the preposition is prefixed to an infinitive construct and introduces a subordinate clause (34:7; 16:16).<sup>62</sup>

**5.1.2.3 Pronominal suffix.** 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%),<sup>63</sup> but he does not often translate them synthetically (80)

<sup>60</sup> *IBHS* §11.2.9; Joüon §§133g–h.

<sup>61</sup> The Greek conjunction  $\omega\varsigma$  nearly functions as an accusative preposition in Greek, since comparative clauses are often elliptical (KG II §581.3; Smyth §§2464–2465; *SSG* §26n).

<sup>62</sup> *IBHS* §§36.2.2–3; Joüon §124k–l. Cf. §6.1.1.7.

<sup>63</sup> For most cases (246), see §3.1.3. For minor cases involving the omission of לָכֶם/לָךְ (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%)<sup>64</sup> or expansively (19:35).<sup>65</sup> 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)<sup>66</sup> (36:2), a demonstrative pronoun (14)<sup>67</sup> (6:21), or a relative pronoun (3:19)—or the definite article (128)<sup>68</sup> (29:1). Only rarely does he use a pronominal adjective (19)<sup>69</sup> (35:10), proper noun (8)<sup>70</sup> (37:36), or other part of speech (6).<sup>71</sup>

|       |                                                         |                                                                                             |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 36:2  | עשו לקח את נשיך                                         | Ἡσαὺ δὲ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκας <u>ἐαυτῷ</u> ...                                                    |
| 6:21  | ... והיה לך ולבם לאכלה                                  | ... καὶ ἔσται σοὶ καὶ <u>ἐκείνους</u> φαγεῖν.                                               |
| 3:19  | עד שובך אל האדמה כי ממנה לקחת                           | ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμψθης.                                          |
| 29:1  | וישא יעקב רגליו וילך ארצה בני קדם                       | Καὶ ἐξάρας Ἰακώβ <u>τοὺς</u> πόδας ἐπορεύθη εἰς γῆν ἀνατολῶν                                |
| 35:10 | ויאמר יעקב אל נא אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך ולקחת מנחתי מידך | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰακώβ Εἰ εὕρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον σου, δέξαι τὰ δῶρα διὰ τῶν <u>ἐμῶν</u> χειρῶν.      |
| 37:36 | והמדנים מכרו אתן אל מצרים לפוטיפר סריס פרעה שר הטבחים   | οἱ δὲ Μαδιγναῖοι ἀπέδοντο τὸν Ἰωσήφ εἰς Αἴγυπτον τῷ Πετεφρῇ τῷ σπάδοντι Φαραώ, ἀρχιμαγείρῳ. |

<sup>64</sup> Roughly one-third (28) of the cases of synthetic translation involve the handful 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.

<sup>65</sup> 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 (את אביה in 19:33 and עמו in 19:35), this harmonization is more likely due to G.

<sup>66</sup> 1:29, 30; 3:7; 4:19, 23; 6:2, 4, 14, 19, 21+; 8:9, 17; 11:4+, 29; 12:19; 13:11; 14:21; 16:3; 18:12, [13]; 19:10, 17; 22:3, 8, 16; 24:6, 10, 46; 25:20; 27:12; 28:2, 6; 30:30, 37, 40+; 31:23, 24, 29, 39; 32:1; 33:17; 36:2; 38:14, 19; 39:6, 16; 40:14; 41:11; 43:22, 32+; 47:23; 49:16; 50:5.

<sup>67</sup> 6:21; 19:9; 24:14+, [44]; 26:21; 38:10; 41:3, 13, 30; 42:36; 44:30; 48:6+.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. §4.1.2.1. Note, this count includes the single instance of the vocative particle ὦ (27:20).

<sup>69</sup> Most often it is the first-person and second-person pronominal adjectives ἐμός (10: 22:18; 24:41; 26:5; [31:31], 43; 33:10; 37:7+; 47:5; 49:29) and σός (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).

<sup>70</sup> 7:16; 12:20; 29:23; 37:36; 39:4, 23; 45:1, 26.

<sup>71</sup> [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),<sup>72</sup> 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.<sup>73</sup>

**5.1.2.4 Article.** The Hebrew article represented by the consonant ׀ occurs 1,589 times in Genesis. G breaks with quantitative equivalence by omitting the article with some regularity (241) (15.2%),<sup>74</sup> but he does not usually translate it synthetically (42) (2.6%)<sup>75</sup> 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).

---

<sup>72</sup> This point has been discussed in §3.1.3.2 and §4.1.2.1.

<sup>73</sup> *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.

<sup>74</sup> 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.

<sup>75</sup> 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).

|       |                                      |                                                                   |
|-------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19:15 | קום קח את אשתך                       | Ἀναστάς λάβε τὴν γυναῖκά σου                                      |
|       | ... ואת שתי בנותיך הנמצאת [וצא] ...  | καὶ τὰς δύο θυγατέρας, ἃς ἔχεις, καὶ ἔξελθε, ...                  |
| 32:32 | על כן לא יאכלו בני ישראל את גיד הנשה | ἐνεκεν τούτου οὐ μὴ φάγωσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ νεῦρον, ὃ ἐνάρκησεν |
| 39:11 | ויהי כהיום הזה                       | ἐγένετο δὲ τοιαύτη τις ἡμέρα,                                     |
|       | ויבא [יוסף] הביתה לעשות מלאכתו       | εἰσῆλθεν Ἰωσήφ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ποιεῖν τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ...           |
| 20:1  | ויסע משם אברהם ארצה הנגב             | Καὶ ἐκίνησεν ἐκεῖθεν Ἀβραὰμ εἰς γῆν πρὸς λίβα                     |
| 38:20 | וישלח יהודה את גדי העזים             | ἀπέστειλεν δὲ Ἰούδας τὸν ἔριφον ἐξ αἰγῶν                          |
|       | ביד רעהו העדלמי                      | ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιμένου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ὀδολλαμίτου                       |

Where G uses the Greek relative pronoun (19:15; 32:32), he has analyzed the Hebrew according to the relative use of the participle.<sup>76</sup>

**5.1.2.5 DDOM.** The Hebrew definite direct object marker **את** (1,033) could be grouped with the prepositions on morphosyntactic grounds, but it is often considered as having its own part of speech.<sup>77</sup> G often omits **את** (489) (47.3%)<sup>78</sup> 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 **את** with a preposition (13)<sup>79</sup> (34:2) or another part of speech (5).<sup>80</sup>

|       |                                    |                                                          |
|-------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 19:10 | וישלחו האנשים את ידם ויביאו את לוט | ἐκτείναντες δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες τὰς χεῖρας εἰσεσπάσαντο τὸν Λῶτ |
| 34:2  | ויקח אתה ושכב אתה                  | καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὴν ἐκοιμήθη μετ' αὐτῆς                      |

<sup>76</sup> IBHS §37.5; Joüon §§121; 145e. Cf. §6.1.1.6. Note, G read **נִשֵּׁךְ** in 32:32 as a verb and not a noun.

<sup>77</sup> IBHS §10.3; Joüon §§125e–j. This judgment is due to its restricted usage and diachronic analysis.

<sup>78</sup> Most omissions of **את** 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.

<sup>79</sup> 19:33, 34; 23:5, 10; 25:22; 26:10; 31:35; 34:2, 7, 16; 35:21; 44:6; 47:9.

<sup>80</sup> 1:30; 22:6; 34:28; 37:14; 39:22. The few cases involving *καί* may reflect a Vorlage that read **וְאֵת**, but **את** and *καί* have been matched since **ו** 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 **אֵת** (PREP) instead of **אֶת** (DDOM).

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

---

<sup>81</sup> For all but one omission (13), see §3.1.5.3. For the case in **47:5**, see §3.1.8.

<sup>82</sup> Usually, synthetic translation involves **אֲשֶׁר** 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**.

<sup>83</sup> In this anomalous case, G takes **אֲשֶׁר** causally, translating it as *ἀνθ' οὗ* (*IBHS* §38.4; Joüon §170e).

<sup>84</sup> Generally, G translates **אֲשֶׁר** 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.

<sup>85</sup> **6:4**; **11:7**; **18:24**; **21:2**; **22:14**; **24:3**; **30:38**; **31:13**; **34:13**; **38:10**; **40:13**; **42:21**; **44:2**.

<sup>86</sup> **6:17**; **27:40**; **38:25**; **39:3**; **44:1**; **49:1**.

|       |                                                                     |                                                                                                                                     |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1:7   | ויבדל [אלהים] בין המים<br>אשר מתחת לרקיע<br>ובין המים אשר מעל לרקיע | καὶ διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδατος,<br>ὃ ἦν ὑποκάτω τοῦ στερεώματος,<br>καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος. |
| 36:31 | ואלה המלכים אשר מלכו באדום                                          | Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ βασιλεύσαντες ἐν Ἑδῶμ                                                                                      |
| 24:3  | ואשבֿיעך ביהוה ... אשר לא תקח אשה                                   | καὶ ἐξορκιῶ σε κύριον ... ἵνα μὴ λάβῃς γυναῖκα                                                                                      |

Often, when G uses the Greek article for אשר, it is a way of avoiding a verbless relative clause in Greek, as in 1:7, where G has previously supplied ἦν for the same purpose.<sup>87</sup> 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%)<sup>88</sup> is more common than synthetic translation (6) (1.5%),<sup>89</sup> 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).<sup>90</sup>

|       |                                            |                                                                    |
|-------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 36:43 | הוא עשו אבי אדום                           | Οὗτος Ἡσαὺ πατὴρ Ἑδῶμ.                                             |
| 35:6  | ויבא יעקב לזוה<br>אשר בארץ כנען הוא בית אל | ἤλθεν δὲ Ἰακώβ εἰς Λοῦζα,<br>ἣ ἐστὶν ἐν γῇ Χανάαν, ἣ ἐστὶν Βαιθήλ, |
| 34:1  | כי חרפה הוא לנו                            | ἐστὶν γὰρ ὄνειδος ἡμῖν                                             |

<sup>87</sup> For G's use and avoidance of Greek verbless clauses, see §§3.2.2; 5.1.1.4.

<sup>88</sup> Most of these cases (22) have been discussed in §3.1.7.3, but for the others (3), see §3.1.8: 3:6; 7:2; 39:22.

<sup>89</sup> All cases but one involve G's use of ἀγώ (5) (see §3.3.2.2). For the residual case (41:19), see §3.3.3.4.

<sup>90</sup> 3:7, 10, 11, 19; 6:2; 9:3, 18; 12:11, 13, 14, 18, 19; 14:12, 13, 18; 17:12; 18:10; 19:20+; 20:2[+], 5+, 7, 12, 13, 16; 21:13, [17]+, 29; 23:13; 24:23, 47, 60; 25:16, 21; 26:7[+], 9+, 24; 27:38; 29:4, 12+, 15, 25; 30:33; 31:16, 43; 32:17; 34:14, 21, 23; 36:19; 37:2, 3, 27, 32, [33]; 38:16, 21; 40:12, 18; 41:25, 26++, 27, 31+; 42:6, 9, 11+, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 31, 32, 33, 34+; 43:12, 32; 44:10; 45:20; 47:6; 48:5, 9. The verb is εἰμί (except γίνομαι in 38:21).

When G uses εἰμί or γίνομαι, the Hebrew personal pronoun is typically a copula (34:1).<sup>91</sup>

## 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,<sup>92</sup> 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.<sup>93</sup> 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,

---

<sup>91</sup> *IBHS* §16.3.3; Joüon §§154i-j.

<sup>92</sup> 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.

<sup>93</sup> 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.



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;<sup>94</sup> (ii) consistent Greek equivalent;<sup>95</sup> (iii) main

---

<sup>94</sup> 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.

<sup>95</sup> 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: מְנַשֶּׁה, שָׁרָה); common nouns (8: אֵל, בָּכָר, בֵּר, גְּבִיעַ, בְּתוּלָה, קוֹל, רֶעֶב, תְּבֵה); adjectives (none); and verbs (רחץ). For lemmas in this group that are translated synthetically with



TABLE 12. COUNT OF TYPES IN CONSISTENCY GROUPS BY PART OF SPEECH

|                      | Proper Nouns |       |       | Common Nouns |       |       | Adjectives <sup>97</sup> |       |       | Verbs |       |       |
|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Hapaxlegomena</b> | 219          | 49.5% |       | 290          | 41.9% |       | 23                       | 30.3% |       | 163   | 35.7% |       |
| <b>Consistent</b>    | 170          | 38.5% | 76.2% | 198          | 28.6% | 49.3% | 25                       | 32.9% | 47.2% | 73    | 16.0% | 24.9% |
| <b>Main</b>          | 44           | 10.0% | 19.7% | 134          | 19.4% | 33.3% | 19                       | 25.0% | 35.8% | 128   | 28.1% | 43.7% |
| <b>No main</b>       | 9            | 2.0%  | 4.0%  | 70           | 10.1% | 17.4% | 9                        | 11.8% | 17.0% | 92    | 20.2% | 31.4% |
| <b>Total</b>         | 442          |       |       | 692          |       |       | 76                       |       |       | 456   |       |       |

TABLE 13. COUNT OF TOKENS IN CONSISTENCY GROUPS BY PART OF SPEECH

|                      | Proper Nouns |       |       | Common Nouns |       |       | Adjectives |       |       | Verbs |       |       |
|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Hapaxlegomena</b> | 219          | 7.9%  |       | 290          | 4.3%  |       | 23         | 5.7%  |       | 163   | 3.2%  |       |
| <b>Consistent</b>    | 1,295        | 46.7% | 50.7% | 1,140        | 17.1% | 17.8% | 92         | 22.8% | 24.1% | 255   | 5.0%  | 5.1%  |
| <b>Main</b>          | 1,226        | 44.2% | 48.0% | 4,663        | 69.8% | 72.9% | 262        | 64.9% | 68.8% | 3,603 | 70.2% | 72.5% |
| <b>No main</b>       | 33           | 1.2%  | 1.3%  | 592          | 8.9%  | 9.3%  | 27         | 6.7%  | 7.1%  | 1,111 | 21.6% | 22.4% |
| <b>Total</b>         | 2,773        |       |       | 6,685        |       |       | 404        |       |       | 5,132 |       |       |

Several generalizations may be drawn from the data presented in Tables 12 and 13. First, there is 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

<sup>97</sup> The four demonstrative adjectives, אֵלֶּה, זֶה, אֵל, and הַלְזֶה, 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,<sup>98</sup> 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.<sup>99</sup> 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

---

<sup>98</sup> 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).

<sup>99</sup> 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.<sup>100</sup> 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

---

<sup>100</sup> 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**

|                       | Proper Nouns |       | Common Nouns |       | Adjectives |       | Verbs |       |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Types                 |              |       |              |       |            |       |       |       |
| Doubly consistent     | 319          | 82.0% | 261          | 53.5% | 18         | 37.5% | 139   | 58.9% |
| Hapax. and consistent | 389          |       | 488          |       | 48         |       | 236   |       |
| Tokens                |              |       |              |       |            |       |       |       |
| Doubly consistent     | 1,108        | 73.2% | 665          | 46.5% | 36         | 31.3% | 236   | 56.5% |
| Hapax. and consistent | 1,514        |       | 1,430        |       | 115        |       | 418   |       |

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.

|                     |                |           |                   |          |                 |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|
| <b>Adjectives</b>   |                | גַּן      | (14) παράδεισος   | מִשְׁמֶר | (7) φυλακή      |
| צְדִיק              | (11) δίκαιος   | מִזְבֵּחַ | (13) θυσιαστήριον | שָׁנָה   | (7) ὄφης        |
| <b>Verbs</b>        |                | מְבוֹל    | (12) κατακλυσμός  | עָלָה    | (7) ὀλοκάρπωσις |
| חווה                | (23) προσκυνέω | דָּם      | (11) αἷμα         | עָרְלָה  | (7) ἀκροβυστία  |
| מֶלֶךְ              | (12) βασιλεύω  | נִקְבָּה  | (10) θῆλυς        | עָשָׂב   | (7) χόρτος      |
| <b>Common nouns</b> |                | שְׂבֻלָּה | (10) στάχυς       | קֶשֶׁת   | (7) τόξον       |
| מַיִם               | (92) ὕδωρ      | כֶּד      | (9) ὑδρία         | אֹר      | (6) φῶς         |
| לֵילִה              | (27) νύξ       | רָקִיעַ   | (9) στερέωμα      | אִוָּה   | (6) σημεῖον     |
| אָחִיךָ             | (25) ἀδελφή    | אֵיל      | (8) κριός         | מַטְעַם  | (6) ἔδεσμα      |
| גַּמֵּל             | (24) κάμηλος   | כֹּהֵן    | (7) ἱερεύς        |          |                 |

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

1:2 והארץ היתה תהו ובהו ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος

<sup>101</sup> 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).

200

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 צַדִּיק. Not only does G use 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 צַדִּיק/צִדְקָה as *δίκαιος/δικαιοσύνη* against this background.<sup>103</sup> 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.<sup>104</sup> The counts of such lemmas are given by part of speech in Table 15 below.

**TABLE 15. COUNTS OF NEARLY CONSISTENT LEMMAS BY PART OF SPEECH**

|                   | Proper Nouns |       | Common Nouns |       | Adjectives |   | Verbs |       |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|---|-------|-------|
| <b>Types</b>      |              |       |              |       |            |   |       |       |
| Nearly consistent | 7            | 15.9% | 30           | 22.4% | 0          | — | 16    | 12.5% |
| Main              | 44           |       | 134          |       | 19         |   | 128   |       |
| <b>Tokens</b>     |              |       |              |       |            |   |       |       |
| Nearly consistent | 701          | 57.2% | 2,430        | 52.1% | 0          | — | 1,053 | 29.2% |
| Main              | 1,226        |       | 4,663        |       | 262        |   | 3,603 |       |

<sup>103</sup> This point is argued in reference to Noah (see §7.4.1).

<sup>104</sup> 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),<sup>105</sup> common nouns (30),<sup>106</sup> and verbs (16),<sup>107</sup> 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).

|       |                              |                                                    |                         |
|-------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 36:2  | עשו לקח את נשיו              | Ἡσαὺ δὲ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκας ἑαυτῷ                      | (cf. כָּנַעַן = Χανάαν) |
|       | מבנות כנען ...               | ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν Χαναναίων, ...               |                         |
| 32:28 | כי שרית עם אלהים             | ὅτι ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ,                           | (cf. יכל = δύναμαι)     |
|       | ועם אנשים ותוכל              | καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός.                         |                         |
| 17:13 | המול ימול יליד ביתך          | περιτομῇ περιτμηθήσεται ὁ οἰκογενῆς τῆς οἰκίας σου | (cf. מול = περιτέμνω)   |
|       | ומקנת כסף ...                | καὶ ὁ ἀργυρώνητος, ...                             |                         |
| 15:5  | <sup>108</sup> הבט נא השמימה | Ἀνάβλεψον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν                          |                         |
| 38:24 | ויהי כמשלש חדשים             | Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τρίμηνον                           |                         |

At times, G's exceptional translations illuminate his interpretation of a particular passage, since, by departing from his more common translation equivalent, he signals, for example, that he thinks that the Hebrew word has a different sense in that context (9:4) or that his usual rendering is somehow inadequate (6:13; 12:2; 20:4). For more examples, see §5.2.2.

<sup>105</sup> See יַעֲקֹב (196/198), יוֹסֵף (160/162), אַבְרָהָם (139/140), פֶּרְעָה (93/97), כָּנַעַן (47/48), נֹחַ (42/43), and אֲדָם (12/13). The lemmas יוֹסֵף, אַבְרָהָם, and נֹחַ 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).

<sup>106</sup> See כָּל (350/368), אֶרֶץ (284/315), אֱלֹהִים (216/227), אָב (209/213), אָח (178/183), אִשָּׁה (150/152), שָׁם (110/115), בַּת (102/109), עֶבֶד (85/93), אָדָם (78/82), יָרַע (58/59), עִיר (47/48), מְקוֹם (47/48), מָלָךְ (44/45), שָׁמַיִם (42/44), אֱלֹהִי (42/43), נָפֶשׁ (41/43), בָּשָׂר (32/35), אָם (27/29), בְּרִית (26/27), בְּהֵמָה (21/23), בָּקָר (18/19), אֶכְלָ (16/17), חֹן (13/14), מְשֻׁפָּחָה (12/13), תּוֹלְדוֹת (12/13), חֹדֶשׁ (10/11), and חוּץ (10/11).

<sup>107</sup> See אָמַר (604/617), עָשָׂה (138/153), מָצָא (54/56), קָבַר (26/28), רָבָה (25/26), יָכַל (21/22), שָׁכַב (20/22), עָנָה (18/20), שָׁקָה (18/19), הֵרָג (16/17), מוֹלַ (16/17), פָּרָה (14/15), נָכַר (10/11), זָכַר (9/10), יָרַשׁ (9/10), and מָכַר (9/10).

<sup>108</sup> Only שָׁמַיִם and עִיר are excluded from group (ii) solely due to directional-ה (cf. §3.4.1.1; 4.1.3).

|      |                                                                                     |                                                                                               |                            |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 9:4  | אֲדָם בָּשָׂר בִּנְפֹשׁוֹ דָּמוֹ לֹא תֹאכְלוּ                                       | πλήν κρέας ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς οὐ φάγεσθε.                                                        | (cf. בָּשָׂר = σὰρξ)       |
| 6:13 | קָץ כָּל בָּשָׂר בָּא לִפְנֵי                                                       | Καιρὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔκει ἐναντίον μου                                                      | (cf. בָּשָׂר = σὰρξ)       |
| 12:2 | וְאֶעֱשֶׂךָ לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל וְאֶבְרַכְךָ<br>וְאֶגְדָּלְהָ שִׁמְךָ וְהָיָה בְּרַכָּהּ | καὶ ποιήσω σε εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ εὐλογήσω σε<br>καὶ μεγαλυνῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου, καὶ ἔσῃ εὐλογητός. | (cf. בְּרַכָּהּ = εὐλογία) |
| 20:4 | וְאֶבִּימֶלֶךְ לֹא קָרַב אֵלָיו וַיֹּאמֶר<br>אֲדָנִי הִגֹּי גַם צָדִיק תִּהְרַג     | Ἀβιμέλεχ δὲ οὐχ ᾔψατο αὐτῆς, καὶ εἶπεν<br>Κύριε, ἔθνος ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολείς;           | (cf. הָרַג = ἀποκτείνω)    |

In 9:4, G properly interprets בָּשָׂר 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 בָּשָׂר (“flesh”) in order to underscore the fault of humans (and not animals) for the worldwide flood.<sup>109</sup> Then, by interpreting בְּרַכָּהּ in a passive sense as εὐλογητός in 12:2, G takes this statement as synonymous with the verb וְאֶבְרַכְךָ in the preceding parallel line, which is significant in light of G’s focus on the moral development of Abraham throughout his story.<sup>110</sup> Finally, the translation of הָרַג (“kill”) as ἀπόλλυμι (“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 ἀπόλλυμι repeatedly to translate the Hebrew verb שָׁחַת (“destroy”).<sup>111</sup>

**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

<sup>109</sup> For an explanation of how G uses this and other translation choices in Gen 6 in order to increase human responsibility and decrease animal responsibility, of relevance to this story’s plot, see §7.4.1.

<sup>110</sup> For an extended argument in support of this claim, see §8.3.

<sup>111</sup> On the contextual significance of this intertextual link, see §8.3.2.

common root, i.e., root consistency.<sup>112</sup> 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,<sup>113</sup> but also quite a few others, including proper nouns (15),<sup>114</sup> common nouns (18),<sup>115</sup> adjectives (2),<sup>116</sup> and verbs (26).<sup>117</sup> 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).

---

<sup>112</sup> In relation to the use of Hebrew roots to interpret rare or difficult words, Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijin speak of “root-linked consistency” (“Etymological Translations in the Septuagint,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016], 199).

<sup>113</sup> For proper nouns (2), see כְּנַעַן and אֲדֹם; for common nouns (6), see זֶרַע, אֱלֹוֹי, בֶּקָר, אֶכְל, בְּרִכָּה, and תּוֹלְדוֹת; for verbs (4), see יָכַל, מוֹל, פָּרָה, and זָכַר.

<sup>114</sup> See קָדֵם (22), חֵת (13), בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע (11), כְּנַעֲנִי (11), גִּשְׁן (10), גֶּרָר (9), חֶרֶן (8), אֲמָרִי (6), חֲרִי (5), אֲשׁוּר (4), לֹז (4), מוֹאָב (3), תְּמַנָּה (3), גִּלְעָד (2), and סְכוּת (2). Since place names are often proper nouns, many of these cases involve the presence or absence of directional-ה (cf. note 108).

<sup>115</sup> See חֲלוֹם (34), הָר (22), זָכָר (18), פָּרִי (10), זָהָב (9), מוֹלְדֵת (9), עֵדֶר (9), מְגוֹר (6), חֲטָאֵת (4), חֲמָס (4), עֵד (4), אֶסּוֹן (3), מוֹשֶׁב (3), מְנָה (3), פֶּשַׁע (3), עֵדָה (2), עוֹר (2), and צִפּוֹן (2).

<sup>116</sup> See זָקֵן (9) and אִפָּה (8).

<sup>117</sup> See בָּרַךְ (73), שָׂאֵל (14), אָרַר (9), שָׁכַן (8), זָרַע (7), נָוֵס (7), רָגַל (7), מָלַט (5), נָחַשׁ (5), סָחַר (5), רָדַף (5), שָׁפַט (5), עָשָׂר (2), עוֹד (2), כִּסֶּף (2), חֲצָה (2), אָהַל (2), שָׁבָה (3), פָּקַח (3), פָּצַר (3), נָבַט (3), חָסַר (3), חָבַא (3), מָחָה (4), הִפָּךְ (2), and פָּגַשׁ (2).

TABLE 16. COUNTS OF CONSISTENT LEMMAS BY PART OF SPEECH ± CLOSE CASES.

|                             | Proper Nouns |       | Common Nouns |       | Adjectives |       | Verbs |       |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Types                       |              |       |              |       |            |       |       |       |
| Consistent                  | 170          | 76.2% | 198          | 49.3% | 25         | 47.2% | 73    | 24.9% |
| + near- and root-consistent | 192          | 86.1% | 246          | 61.2% | 27         | 50.9% | 115   | 39.2% |
| Total                       | 223          |       | 402          |       | 53         |       | 293   |       |
| Tokens                      |              |       |              |       |            |       |       |       |
| Consistent                  | 1,295        | 50.7% | 1,140        | 17.8% | 92         | 24.1% | 255   | 5.1%  |
| + near- and root-consistent | 2,109        | 82.6% | 3,717        | 58.1% | 109        | 28.6% | 1,496 | 30.1% |
| Total                       | 2,554        |       | 6,395        |       | 381        |       | 4,969 |       |

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),<sup>118</sup> as he generally transcribes or transliterates proper nouns to capture their shape and sound.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> 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).

<sup>119</sup> 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-Massoretic 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.<sup>120</sup> He may use indeclinable forms (Γέραρα in 10:19) or forms with some Greek morphological features, such as case endings (Γάζαν in 10:19)<sup>121</sup> or gentilic formations (15:19).

10:19                      באכה גררה עד עזה      ἕως ἐλθεῖν εἰς Γέραρα καὶ Γάζαν  
 15:19      ואת הקדמני ואת הקניני ואת הקנני      τοὺς Κεναίους καὶ τοὺς Κενεζαίους καὶ τοὺς Κεδμωναίους

Sometimes G does not represent the Hebrew word's form but uses a Greek proper noun that is a culturally-recognizable equivalent.<sup>122</sup>

<sup>120</sup> For the typical correspondences between Hebrew and Greek vowels and consonants in Genesis, see Knobloch's overview ("Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script," 166–169).

<sup>121</sup> Many instances are indeterminate as to case (Knobloch, "Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script," 270–288). See also Natalio Fernández Marcos, "Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta," *Sef* 37 (1977): 241–243.

<sup>122</sup> Αἴγυπτος/Aἰγύπτιος for מִצְרַיִם (86/90) (cf. Μεσράιμ); Αἰθιοπία for כּוּשׁ (1/4) (cf. Χούς); Εὐφράτης for פָּרָת (2) and Τίγρις for הַדִּקְלָה (1); Ἡλίου πόλις for אֵוֶן (3); Ἡρώων πόλις for שֵׁן (2/10) (cf. Γέσεμ); Ἰδουμαία for יְדוּמָה (1/13) (cf. Ἐδώμ); and Μεσοποταμία (Συρία) for אֶרֶץ פְּדוּן (11), פֶּדֶן (1), and אֶרֶץ נַהֲרַיִם (1), as well as Σύρος/Συρία for אֶרֶץ (8) and אֶרֶם (2/4) (cf. Ἀράμ). On Ἡλίου 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 Μεσοποταμία 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 אֲשּׁוּר, but Knobloch rightly notes that G's transcription of אֲשּׁוּר as Ἀσσούρ when it refers to a person (10:11, 22) represents the Hebrew form better (א as ου instead of υ) ("Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script," 75–76).

|       |                                          |                                                                                |
|-------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:14  | והנהר השלישי חדקל                        | καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ τρίτος Τίγρις·                                                 |
|       | הוא ההלך קדמת אשור                       | οὗτος ὁ πορευόμενος κατέναντι Ἀσσυρίων.                                        |
|       | והנהר הרביעי הוא פרת                     | ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος, οὗτος Εὐφράτης. <sup>123</sup>                        |
| 12:10 | וירד אברם מצרימה לגור שם                 | καὶ κατέβη Ἀβρὰμ εἰς Αἴγυπτον παροικῆσαι ἐκεῖ                                  |
| 41:45 | ויתן לו את אסנת בת פוטי פרע כהן און לאשה | καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν Ἀσεννέθ θυγατέρα Πετεφρῆ ἱερέως Ἑλίου πόλεως αὐτῷ γυναῖκα. |

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 מִצְרַיִם 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.<sup>124</sup>

Due to the referential meaning of proper nouns, G does not often give multiple formal representations of a single Hebrew proper noun,<sup>125</sup> 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

<sup>123</sup> On the rivers Τίγρις and Εὐφράτης in the Septuagint, see van der Meer, “Syria,” 206–207.

<sup>124</sup> For another list and discussion of such “substitutions” of Greek proper nouns for Hebrew proper nouns, see Hiebert, “Textual and Translation Issues,” 419–423.

<sup>125</sup> יִשָּׁן as Πισών (3) and Δησών (1); חַיִּי as Εὐαῖος (4) and Χορραῖος (1); נָחָה as Ἀνά (6) and Ὠνάς (2); צָרַר as Σήγωρ (6) and Ζόγορα (1); שָׁכַם as Συχέμ (4) and Σίκιμα (2); דָּן as Δαϊδάν (2) and Δαδάν (1); יָרַח as Ζάρα (3) and Ζάρε (2); חֵילָה as Εὐιλάτ (2) and Εὐιλά (2); עַיִן as Ὠς (2) and Ὠξ (1); שָׁבַא as Σαβά (2) and Σαβεῦ (1).



incidental people and places.<sup>126</sup> Only rarely does G blatantly mix up or combine well-known entities in his translation.<sup>127</sup>

35:5                      ויסעו [ישראל] בני יעקב      καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ἰσραὴλ ... τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ

37:3                      וישראל אהב את יוסף      Ἰακώβ δὲ ἠγάπα τὸν Ἰωσήφ

46:5                      בעגלות אשר שלח פרעה לשאת אתו      ἐπὶ τὰς ἀμάξας αἱ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰωσήφ ἄραι αὐτόν

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 יֹזָבֵב (= Ἰωβάβ),<sup>128</sup> or for lemmas with similar graphic and phonetic shapes, such as the representation of both הֲדַד and הֲדָר as Ἀδάδ.<sup>129</sup> With the latter group, it is often impossible to adjudicate among competing scribal and translational explanations.<sup>130</sup>

<sup>126</sup> For example, Frederick Knobloch finds it unlikely that G transcribed י or פ as ξ and not ζ, and he proposes a Greek scribe corrected BAYZ to BAYΞ and ΩZ to ΩΞ, erroneously changing Z to Ξ on the basis of their graphic similarity and the normal use of ξ (but not ζ) as a final consonant in Greek (“‘Transcription Technique’ and the Text of the Greek Genesis,” *BIOSCS* 35 [2002]: 106–107).

<sup>127</sup> שַׁעֲרַי as Ἐδώμ (1/9) (Σηίρ); שָׁן as Παμεσσή (1/10) (cf. Γέσεμ); יַעֲקֹב as Ἰσραήλ (1/198) and יִשְׂרָאֵל as Ἰακώβ (2/46); פְּלִשְׁתִּי as Γέραρα (1/8) (cf. Φυλιστινίμ); and פְּרָעָה as Ἰωσήφ (1/97) (cf. Φαραώ).

<sup>128</sup> Βάλα (6) for the place בָּלַע (2) and the person בָּלַע (4); Ἐνώχ (11) for הֲנוּךְ (10) and his son הֲנוּךְ (4:17); Ἰωβάβ (3) for two people named יֹזָבֵב (3); Θοβέλ (3) for תָּבֵל (1) and תֹּבֵל קִין (2); Μαμβρή (10) for the place מִמְרָא (8) and the person מִמְרָא (2); Μασσή (2) for the place מִשָּׂא (1) and the person מִשָּׂא (1); and Συχέμ (16) for the person שָׁכֵם (12) and the place שָׁכֵם (4/6).

<sup>129</sup> Ἀράμ (3) for אֲרָם (2/4) and אֲרָן (1); Ἀδάδ (3) for הֲדַד (2) and הֲדָר (1); Ἀσόμ (3) for חוּשִׁים (2) and חוּשִׁים (1); Αὐνάν (7) for אוֹנָן (5) and עֲנָן (2); Δησών (4) for דִּישׁוֹן (3) and דִּישׁוֹן (1/4); Ἰεμουήλ (2) for יְמוּאֵל (1) and הֲמוּל (1); Θαιμάν (6) for תִּימָנִי/תִּימָן (5) and תִּימָא (1); Θαμνά (7) for תִּמְנָע (3) and תִּמְנָה (3); Μόσοχ (2) for מִשָּׁח (1) and מִשָּׁח (1); Σαβά (3) for שָׁבָא (2/3) and שָׁבָא (1); Σάρα (18) for שָׂרָי (17) and שָׂרָה (1); Πετεφρῆς (5) for פֹּטִי פֶרַע (3) and פֹּטִיפַר (2); Σενναάρ (5) for שִׁנְעָר (4) and שִׁנְעָב (1); Χαρράν (9) for חָרָן (8) and כָּרָן (1); and Χορρί/Χορραῖος (6) for חֲרִי (5) and חֲרִי (1/5).

<sup>130</sup> For example, the case of Ἀδάδ for הֲדָר obviously involves the common confusion of ד and ר, 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.<sup>131</sup> For Hebrew proper nouns with an aetiological function, G often elects to represent the noun's denotation instead of its form,<sup>132</sup> and especially where the aetiology is made explicit by a naming event (11:9; 26:22).

|       |                                                                   |                                                                                                                      |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11:9  | על כן קרא שמה <u>בבל</u><br>כי שם בבל יהוה שפת כל הארץ            | διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς <u>Σύγχυσις</u><br>ὅτι ἐκεῖ συνέχεεν κύριος τὰ χεῖλη πάσης τῆς γῆς                   |
| 26:22 | ויקרא שמה <u>רחבות</u> ויאמר<br>כי עתה הרחוב יהוה לנו ופרינו בארץ | καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ <u>Εὐρυχωρία</u> λέγων<br>Διότι νῦν ἐπλάτυνεν κύριος ἡμῖν καὶ ἡῤῥησεν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς |
| 14:13 | ויבא הפליט ויגד לאברם העברי                                       | Παραγενόμενος δὲ τῶν ἀνασωθέντων τις ἀπήγγειλεν Ἀβραμ τῷ <u>περατῇ</u> .                                             |

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 עברי (“Hebrew”) as περατής (“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.<sup>133</sup>

Since he discusses different types of explanations in different parts of his work, use Appendix A (510–537) or Appendix B (538–548) and the companion index (638–652) to find his discussions of particular equivalences.

<sup>131</sup> Hermann Gunkel, *The Stories of Genesis*, ed. John Scullion and William Scott (Vallejo: BIBAL Press, 1994), 18–24.

<sup>132</sup> אֲבֵל מִצְרַיִם as πένθος Αἰγύπτου (1); בְּאֵר לְחַי רְאִי as φρέαρ (τῆς) ὀράσεως (2) and φρέαρ οὗ ἐνώπιον εἶδον (1); בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע as φρέαρ (τοῦ) ὄρκου (9) and φρέαρ (τοῦ) ὀρκισμοῦ (2); בֶּן-אֲוֵי as υἱὸς ὁδύνης μου (1); בֶּן-עַמִּי as υἱὸς τοῦ γένους μου (1); גִּלְעָד as βουνὸς μάρτυς/μαρτυρεῖ (2); יִגְר שְׁהִדוּתָא as βουνὸς τῆς μαρτυρίας (1); פְּנִיאָל/פְּנוּאֵל as εἶδος (τοῦ) θεοῦ (2); מִחְנֵי as παρεμβολαί (1); מִצְפָּה as ὄρασις (1); עֵין מִשְׁפָּט as πηγὴ (τῆς) κρίσεως (1); עֶשֶׂק as ἀδικία (1); סְבוֹת (1) סאנהאי (2); שְׁבַע as ὄρκος (1); and שְׁטָנָה as ἐχθρία (1). Sometimes, G alternates between formal and semantic representation: בָּבֶל as σύγχυσις (1/2) (cf. Βαβυλών); בֵּית-אֵל as οἶκος/τόπος θεοῦ (2/13) (cf. Βαίθῃλ); נְהָה as ζωή (1/3) (cf. Εὔα); עֶבְרִי as περατή (1/6) (cf. Ἑβραῖος); עֵדן as τρυφή (2/5) (cf. Ἑδεμ); and רְחוֹב as εὐρυχωρία (1/2) (cf. Ποωβώθ). Cf. Fernández Marcos, “Nombres propios,” 247–259.

<sup>133</sup> For the contextual significance of this translation choice, see §8.3.1. Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn (and Valérie Kabergs [co-author of 2012 article only]) see a translator’s creative handling of

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).<sup>134</sup> At times, it seems that G was unfamiliar with the Hebrew word and guessed at its meaning from context (15:7; 14:3).

|      |                                                                |                                                                                      |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 41:1 | ויהי מקץ שנתיים ימים ופרעה חלם<br>... והנה עמד על הַיָּאֵר ... | Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ δύο ἡμερῶν Φαραὼ εἶδεν ἐνύπνιον.<br>ᾤετο ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ,... |
| 23:9 | ויתן לי את מערת המכפלה                                         | καὶ δότω μοι τὸ σπήλαιον τὸ διπλοῦν                                                  |
| 15:7 | אני יהוה אשר הוצאתיך מאֶרֶץ כְּשָׁדִים ...                     | Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐξαγαγὼν σε ἐκ χώρας Χαλδαίων...                                   |
| 14:3 | כל אלה חברו אל עמק השִׁדִּים<br>הוא ים המלח                    | πάντες οὗτοι συνεφώνησαν ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα τὴν ἀλυκὴν<br>(αὕτη ἢ θάλασσα τῶν ἀλῶν).    |

G renders יָאֵר as ποταμός, which reflects its denotation, since יָאֵר 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 כפל that מְכַפֵּלָה means διπλοῦς (“double”),<sup>135</sup> which makes sense contextually, since the burial cave is to hold husband-and-wife pairs. It seems that G did

---

aetiology as a special window into understanding their approach to translation (“Content-Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique,” 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], 357–376; “The Study of Aetiological Wordplay as a Content-Related Criterion in the Characterization of LXX Translation Technique,” 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], 273–294).

<sup>134</sup> אָדָם as ἄνθρωπος (1/9) (cf. Ἀδάμ); אֹר as χώρα (3); אֵיל פֶּאֶרְזִי as τερέμινθος (τῆς) Φαράν (1); אֶפְרַת as ἱππόδρομος (1); גִּם as ἔθνος (2); זִוּיִם as ἔθνη ἰσχυρά (1); יָאֵר as ποταμός (7); מְגִד־לְעֶדֶר as πύργος Γάδερ (1); מוֹרְהָ/מִרְיָה as ὑψηλός (2); מְכַפֵּלָה as διπλοῦς (6); נָגַב as λίψ (2) and ἔρημος (1); קִרְיָתִים as πόλις (1); קִרְיַת אֶרְבַּע as πόλις τοῦ πεδίου (1/2) (cf. πόλις Ἀρβόκ); רִפְאִים as γίγαντες (1/2); שִׁי as μου (3), σου (2), and ἐμός (1); שִׁילָה (τὰ) ἀποκείμενα αὐτῶ (1); and שִׁדִּים as ἀλυκός (3).

<sup>135</sup> Etymological interpretation is not only common in the Septuagint, but an interpretive technique practiced by scholars and other readers in Hellenistic Alexandria (David Weissert, “Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques,” *Text* 8 [1973]: 31–44; Ausloos and Lemmelijn, “Etymological Translations,” 193–201).

not know the place names אֹר and שְׂדֵיִם, but figured that the first must be a “country” (χώρα), while the second must have something to do with salt (ἀλυκός), given the parenthetical gloss that follows. On occasion, G may draw out a proper noun’s felt denotation for more far-reaching literary reasons.

14:5    בא כדרלעמר והמלכים אשר אתו ...    ἤλθεν Χοδολλογόμορ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ  
           ויכו את רפאים בעשתרת קרנים    καὶ κατέκοψαν τοὺς γίγαντας τοὺς ἐν Ἀσταρώθ Καρνάιν  
           ... ואת הזוזים בהם    καὶ ἔθνη ἰσχυρὰ ἅμα αὐτοῖς ...

Here, G’s use of γίγαντες for רפאים and ἔθνη ἰσχυρά for זוזים is part of his interpretive move to develop themes of the exodus and conquest in the opening scenes of Abraham’s story.<sup>136</sup>

**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.<sup>137</sup> 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

<sup>136</sup> For an extended argument in support of this claim, see §8.3.1.

<sup>137</sup> 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: מִשֶּׁק as Μάσεκ (15:2); יָמִם as Ἰαμίν (36:24, cf. יָמִין); שָׁן as Σαυή (14:5, cf. שָׁן in 14:17); שָׁם as Σίκιμα (48:22, cf. שָׁם); שָׁלֵם as Σαλήμ (33:18, cf. שָׁלֵם); 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., עֲרַבִּין as ἀρραβών [38:17, 18, 20]; וְחָא as ἄχῃ [41:2, 18]), because he did not know the term (e.g., דְּבָרָא as φυτὸν σαβέκ [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.<sup>138</sup> The Hebrew word **אִישׁ** (“man, person”) provides a good example. In most contexts, G translates **אִישׁ** neutrally as *ἄνθρωπος* (“person”) (13:13), but he often prefers *ἀνὴρ* (“man, husband”) where it is particularly relevant that the referent is male (19:4; 2:23; 19:8) and *ἕκαστος* (“each”) where **אִישׁ** functions distributively (11:7).<sup>139</sup>

|       |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                        |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13:13 | וְאִנְשֵׁי סְדֹם רְעִים וְחֹטְאִים<br>לִיהוּה מַאֲד                                                               | οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ἐν Σοδόμοις πονηροὶ καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ<br>ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ σφόδρα.                                       |
| 19:4  | וְאִנְשֵׁי הָעִיר אֲנָשֵׁי סְדֹם נִסְבוּ עַל הַבֵּית<br>לְזָאת יִקְרָא אִשָּׁה כִּי מִן הָאִישׁ [ה] לָקַחָהּ זֹאת | καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως οἱ Σοδομίται περιεκύκλωσαν τὴν οἰκίαν<br>αὕτη ἀληθῆσεται γυνή ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐλήμφθη |
| 2:23  | זֹאת יִקְרָא אִשָּׁה כִּי מִן הָאִישׁ [ה] לָקַחָהּ זֹאת                                                           | αὕτη ἀληθῆσεται γυνή ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐλήμφθη                                                                   |
| 19:8  | הִנֵּה נָא לִי שְׁתֵּי בָנוֹת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדְעוּ אִישׁ<br>אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אִישׁ שִׁפְתֵי רֵעֵהוּ            | εἰσὶν δέ μοι δύο θυγατέρες αἱ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἄνδρα<br>ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον                      |
| 11:7  | אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אִישׁ שִׁפְתֵי רֵעֵהוּ                                                                      | ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον                                                                         |

While the gender of the “men of Sodom” (**אִנְשֵׁי סְדֹם**) is not directly relevant in 13:13, where G uses *ἄνθρωπος* for **אִישׁ**,<sup>140</sup> it matters in 19:4, since they intend to rape Lot’s guests: thus, G translates it as *ἀνὴρ*. Similarly, when **אִישׁ** is suffixed, it usually means “husband,” and so G

<sup>138</sup> Harl, *La Genèse*, 63: “Pour exprimer en grec les réalités concrètes du peuple 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.”

<sup>139</sup> Joüon §147b–d; *HALOT*, s.v. “אִישׁ” 9–12; Wevers, *Notes*, 708–709.

<sup>140</sup> Though it forms a contrast with **אִשָּׁה** (“woman”) in its most basic sense, **אִישׁ** is commonly used in construct with cities, nations, and communities in a partitive sense, where gender is not in focus (*HALOT*, s.v. “אִישׁ” 8).

selects *άνήρ* (2:23).<sup>141</sup> In this case, *άνθρωπος* would be inadequate, as in 19:8, where one can scarcely imagine Lot's two daughters never having known "a person" (*άνθρωπον*). The Hebrew noun *אֹהֶל* ("tent") presents another type of example, as G variously translates it as *σκηνή* ("tent") and *οἶκος/οἰκία* ("house(hold)"), 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.<sup>142</sup>

|       |                                                     |                                                                 |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12:8  | וַיֵּט [שם] אֹהֶל                                   | καὶ ἔστησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ                               |
| 9:27  | יִפֹּת אֱלֹהִים לִיפַת וַיִּשְׁכַּן בְּאֹהֶלִי שָׁם | πλατύνει ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰάφεθ καὶ κατοικησάτω ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τοῦ Σήμ |
| 25:27 | וַיַּעֲקֹב אִישׁ תָּם יֹשֵׁב אֹהֶלִים               | Ἰακώβ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἁπλαστός οἰκῶν οἰκίαν                         |

More similar to *אִישׁ*, G rejects his stereotyped rendering of *נַפְשׁ* ("person, life, soul") as *ψυχή* ("life, soul") in two cases where it has the sense of "person,"<sup>143</sup> even if he occasionally uses his stereotypical rendering where it does not seem to be the optimal choice (12:5).<sup>144</sup>

|       |                                                                 |                                                             |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 14:21 | תֵּן לִי הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְהִרְכַּשׁ קָח לְךָ                         | Δός μοι τοὺς ἄνδρας, τὴν δὲ ἵππον λάβε σεαυτῷ.              |
| 36:6  | וַיִּקַּח עִשָׂו ... וְאֵת כָּל נַפְשׁוֹת בֵּיתוֹ               | ἔλαβεν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ... καὶ πάντα τὰ σώματα τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ      |
| 12:5  | וַיִּקַּח אַבְרָם וְאֵת [כָּל] הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה בַּחֲרִן | καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἀβράμ ... καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτήσαντο ἐν Χαρράν |

G prefers *άνήρ* ("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).<sup>145</sup>

<sup>141</sup> The only exception is in 24:59, which mentions *אנשיו* ("his men"), i.e., the men who accompanied Abraham's servant on his journey to find Isaac a wife. G translates this contextually as (τοὺς) μετ' αὐτοῦ.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 66.

<sup>143</sup> Hiebert offers this as an example of "semantic differentiation" ("Genesis: To the Reader," 2).

<sup>144</sup> The other examples of *נַפְשׁ* in the sense of "person" and translated as *ψυχή* are all found in the genealogy of Gen 46 (8): 46:15, 18, [22], 25, 26+, 27+.

<sup>145</sup> Unlike *ψυχή*, *σώμα* is commonly used to mean "person," especially with slaves (LSJ, s.v. "σῶμα" A.II.2).

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 דְּבַר (“word, matter, thing”). In many contexts, G translates דְּבַר as ῥῆμα, since the Greek term ῥῆμα has a similarly general range of meanings that overlap with דְּבַר.<sup>146</sup> 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)<sup>147</sup> and πράγμα (“deed”) as a more appropriate object of a verb like ποιέω (“do”) (19:22),<sup>148</sup> and he selects the equivalents ἐπερώτησις (“questioning”) (43:7), πρόσταγμα (“command”) (24:50), and φωνή (“language”)<sup>149</sup> (11:1) to specify the type of “word” meant by דְּבַר.

|       |                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 34:18 | וַיִּטְבוּ דְּבָרֵיהֶם בְּעֵינֵי חֲמוּר<br>וּבְעֵינֵי שָׂכֵם בֶּן חֲמוּר                                                                                   | καὶ ἤρεσαν οἱ <u>λόγοι</u> ἐναντίον Ἑμμώρ<br>καὶ ἐναντίον Συχέμ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἑμμώρ.                                                                                                          |
| 19:22 | כִּי לֹא אוֹכַל לַעֲשׂוֹת דְּבַר עַד בֹּאךְ שִׁמְהָ                                                                                                        | οὐ γὰρ δυνήσομαι ποιῆσαι <u>πράγμα</u> ἕως τοῦ σε εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖ.                                                                                                                        |
| 43:7  | וַיֹּאמְרוּ שְׂאוּל שְׂאוּל הָאִישׁ לָנוּ<br>וּלְמוֹלַדְתָּנוּ לֵאמֹר<br>הָעוֹד אֲבִיכֶם חִי הִישׁ לָכֶם אֵח<br>וּנְגִיד לֹו עַל פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Ἑρωτῶν ἐπηρώτησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος<br>καὶ τὴν γενεὰν ἡμῶν λέγων<br>Εἰ ἔτι ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ζῇ; εἰ ἔστιν ὑμῖν ἀδελφός;<br>καὶ ἀπηγγείλαμεν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν <u>ἐπερώτησιν</u> ταύτην. |

<sup>146</sup> HALOT, s.v. “דְּבַר;” LSJ, s.v. “ῥῆμα.”

<sup>147</sup> LSJ, s.v. “λόγος” VII.4.

<sup>148</sup> G avoids translating דְּבַר as ῥῆμα in other cases where it is the direct object of עָשָׂה (3: 19:8; 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).

<sup>149</sup> LSJ, s.v. “φωνή” A.II.2.

24:50 ויען לבן ובתואל ויאמרו Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Λαβὰν καὶ Βαθουήλ εἶπαν  
מיהוה יצא הדבר Παρὰ κυρίου ἐξῆλθεν τὸ πρόσταγμα τοῦτο·  
לא נוכל דבר<sup>150</sup> אליך רע או טוב οὐ δυνησόμεθα οὖν σοι ἀντειπεῖν κακὸν καλῶ.

11:1 [לכלם] אחדים אחדת שפה אחת ודברים אחדים Καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἓν καὶ φωνή μία πᾶσιν.

The Hebrew adjective גָּדוֹל (“great”) is also vague, as it may variously denote greatness of size, extent, number, age, power, etc.<sup>151</sup> 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).

15:14 ו אחרי כן יצאו [הנה] ברכש גדול μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται ὧδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς

27:42 עשו בנה הגדל Ἡσαὺ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου

39:9 ואיך אעשה הרעה הגדלה הזאת καὶ πῶς ποιήσω τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ πονηρόν τοῦτο

The Hebrew noun טף 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.<sup>152</sup> 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),<sup>153</sup> συγγένεια (“kindred”) (50:8), οἰκία (“household”) (50:21), and παιδία (“children”) (45:19).

<sup>150</sup> G omits the second occurrence of דָּבָר in this verse, because the sense of “thing” is adequately conveyed by the neuter adjectives in Greek (KG II §403aγ; Smyth §1023; SSG §23fb).

<sup>151</sup> HALOT, s.v. “גָּדוֹל.”

<sup>152</sup> HALOT, s.v. “טף.”

<sup>153</sup> 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.



|       |                                                         |                                                               |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 43:8  | וְנָחִיָּה ... גַּם אֲנַחְנוּ גַּם אַתָּה גַּם טַפְּנוּ | ἵνα ζῶμεν ... καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ σὺ καὶ ἡ ἀποσκευὴ ἡμῶν            |
| 50:8  | רַק טַפָּם וְצֹאנָם וּבָקָרָם עִזָּבוּ                  | καὶ τὴν συγγένειαν καὶ τὰ πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας ὑπελείποντο   |
| 50:21 | אֲנִכִּי אֲכַלְכֵּל אֶתְכֶם וְאֶת טַפְכֶם               | ἐγὼ διαθρέψω ὑμᾶς καὶ τὰς οἰκίας ὑμῶν                         |
| 45:19 | קָחוּ לָכֶם ... עֲגֻלוֹת לְטַפְכֶם וּלְנִשְׁיֶכֶם       | λαβεῖν αὐτοῖς ἀμάξας ... τοῖς παιδίοις ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς γυναίξιν |

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 בָּרַךְ ("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.

|       |                                            |                                                    |
|-------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 1:22  | וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים                  | καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς                          |
| 9:26  | בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי שָׁם               | Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Σήμ                    |
| 14:19 | בָּרוּךְ אַבְרָם לֹאֵל עֲלִיּוֹן           | Εὐλογημένος Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ὑψίστῳ                |
| 12:3  | וַנְּבָרְכֶךָ בְּכָל מִשְׁפַּחַת הָאָדָמָה | καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς |

For בָּרַךְ in the *piel* and *pual*,<sup>154</sup> 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);<sup>155</sup> and for the *niphal* and *hithpael*, he uses the compound ἐνευλογέω (12:3), but syntax also plays a role, since בָּרַךְ in these stems always collocates

<sup>154</sup> According to WHM, בָּרַךְ does not occur in the pual in Genesis, but G seems to have read it as such in 48:20, where he translates יְבָרֶכֶךָ with the passive εὐλογηθήσεται. Cf. §6.1.2.3.

<sup>155</sup> 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 כ in Genesis.<sup>156</sup> G's treatment of the Hebrew verbs הפך and שכן is similar, as he translates הפך 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).

|       |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19:25 | ויהפך את הערים האל ואת כל הככר<br>ואת כל יושבי הערים<br>ו[כל] צמח האדמה | καὶ κατέστρεψεν τὰς πόλεις ταύτας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν περίοικον<br>καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν<br>καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐκ τῆς γῆς. |
| 3:24b | [וישם] את הכרבים<br>ואת להט החרב המתהפכת<br>לשמר את דרך עץ החיים        | καὶ ἔταξεν τὰ χερουβὶμ<br>καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην<br>φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς.                                     |
| 26:2  | אל תרד מצרימה<br>שכן בארץ אשר אמר אליך                                  | Μὴ καταβῆς εἰς Αἴγυπτον·<br>κατοικήσου δὲ ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἣ ἂν σοι εἴπω.                                                                                |
| 3:24a | ויגרש את האדם<br>וישכן מקדם לגן עדן                                     | καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ<br>καὶ κατώκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς                                                                   |

The case of the Hebrew verb ילד (“bear/produce a child”), however, is slightly more complicated. In Genesis, ילד 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 ילד in the *hiphil* and τίκτω (“give birth to”) for ילד in the *qal*, but also by using γεννάω for a number of cases involving ילד in the *qal* with a male subject, that is to say, by translating them as if they were *hiphil*.<sup>157</sup>

Stem-based variation is common with verbs of motion, since they are usually intransitive in the *qal* and transitive in the *piel* and *hiphil*.<sup>158</sup> With בוא, for example, G

<sup>156</sup> For *niphal* (3), see 12:3; 18:18; 28:14; for *hithpael* (2), see 22:18; 26:4. Cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 56.

<sup>157</sup> 4:18++; 6:4; 10:8, 13, 15, 24[+] +, 26; 22:23; 25:3.

<sup>158</sup> *IBHS* §§24.2e; 24.3.1b; 27.2a–b; Joüon §§52d; 54d.

typically uses the intransitive verb *έρχομαι* (16:8) and its cognates to translate *qal* forms, but the transitive verbs *άγω* (2:19), *φέρω* (27:4) and their derivatives for *hiphil* forms.

|      |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                         |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16:8 | ויאמר [מלאך יהוה לה] הגר שפחת שרי<br>אי מזה <u>באת</u> ואנה תלכי                                       | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου Ἀγὰρ παιδίσκη Σάρας,<br>πόθεν ἔρχῃ καὶ ποῦ πορεύῃ;                                                                      |
| 2:19 | ויצר יהוה אלהים [עוד] מן האדמה<br>כל חית השדה ואת כל עוף השמים<br><u>ויבא</u> אל האדם לראות מה יקרא לו | καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς ἔτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς<br>πάντα τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,<br>καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἰδεῖν, τί καλέσει αὐτά |
| 27:4 | ועשה לי מטעמים כאשר אהבתי<br><u>והביאה</u> לי ואכלה<br>בעבור תברכך נפשי בטרם אמות                      | καὶ ποιήσόν μοι ἐδέσματα, ὡς φιλῶ ἐγώ,<br>καὶ ἔνεγκε μοι, ἵνα φάγω,<br>ὅπως εὐλογήσῃ σε ἡ ψυχὴ μου πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν με.                                   |

Often, the meanings of a Hebrew verb in each stem are closely related to each other,<sup>159</sup> but not always, and in some cases a particular stem may have a technical sense, such as *הלך* 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.<sup>160</sup> Although G typically translates *הלך* with *πορεύομαι* or *έρχομαι* and their cognates, he uses a few distinct renderings for *הלך* in the *hithpael*.

|       |                                              |                                                                               |
|-------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13:17 | קום <u>התהלך</u> בארץ לארכה ולרחבה           | ἀναστὰς <u>διόδευσον</u> τὴν γῆν εἰς τε τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ εἰς τὸ πλάτος      |
| 3:8   | וישמעו את קול יהוה אלהים<br><u>מתהלך</u> בגן | Καὶ ἤκουσαν τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ<br><u>περιπατοῦντος</u> ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ |
| 5:2   | <u>ויתהלך</u> חנוך את האלהים                 | <u>εὐηρέστησεν</u> δὲ Ἐνώχ τῷ θεῷ                                             |

In its metaphorical sense, G translates *הלך* as *εὐαρεστέω* (“please”) (5:2), and he uses *διοδεύω* (“travel through”) (13:17) and *περιπατέω* (“walk around”) (3:8) for its more literal meaning.

<sup>159</sup> IBHS §21; Joüon §40.

<sup>160</sup> 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),<sup>161</sup> seeing that γῆ does not usually decline in the plural.<sup>162</sup>

41:57 באו מצרימה לשבר אל יוסף וכל ה[ארצות] καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ χώραι ἦλθον εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγοράζειν πρὸς Ἰωσήφ.

In the same way, G only uses the noun βρώματα (“(types of) food”) in the plural (6:21) and βρώσις (“eating”) in the singular (2:9),<sup>163</sup> irrespective of the Hebrew lemma and its grammatical number (usually אֲכָל, אֲכָלָה, or מֵאֲכָל).

6:21 ואתה קח לך מכל מאכל אשר יאכל ואתה קח לך מכל מאכל אשר יאכל, καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

2:9 ויצמח יהוה אלהים מן האדמה καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐξάντεται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

**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

<sup>161</sup> See 10:20, 31; [36:40]; [41:57].

<sup>162</sup> The plural of γῆ is rare in Greek (LSJ, s.v. “γῆ”); cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 277; Thackeray, *Grammar*, §10.6.

<sup>163</sup> The plural of βρώμα is common in Greek (LSJ, s.v. “βρώμα”). In addition, G often uses βρώσις in the phrase εἰς βρώσιν and typically in the sense of “eating” (LSJ, s.v. “βρώσις” [A.II], but not in 25:28, where it has a concrete meaning, i.e., “food,” [A.I]).

25:31 ויאמר יעקב [אל עשו] εἶπεν δὲ Ἰακώβ τῷ Ἡσαΐ  
מכרה כיום את בכרתך לי Ἀπόδου μοι σήμερον τὰ πρωτοτόκια σου ἐμοί

---

43:33 וישבו לפניו הבכר בכבתו ἐκάθισαν δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὁ πρωτότοκος κατὰ τὰ πρεσβεῖα αὐτοῦ

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 **בֶּשֶׂר** 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”)<sup>164</sup> (24:48) and then δικαιοσύνη (“justice”) (24:49).

24:48                      יהוה אלהי אדני אברהם    κύριον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἀβραάμ  
                                  אֲשֶׁר הִנַּחֲנִי בְּדֶרֶךְ אֱמֶת    ὃς εὐδόκωσέν μοι ἐν ὁδῷ ἀληθείας

---

24:49    אִם יִשְׁכַּח עֲשִׂים חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת אֶת אֲדֹנָי    εἰ οὖν ποιεῖτε ὑμεῖς ἔλεος καὶ δικαιοσύνην πρὸς τὸν κύριόν μου

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,<sup>165</sup> 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.<sup>166</sup>

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

<sup>164</sup> ἀλήθεια has ethical as well as epistemological associations (LSJ, s.v. “ἀλήθεια” II; DGE, s.v. “ἀλήθεια” II.1).

<sup>165</sup> HALOT, s.v. “אֱמֶת” 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.

<sup>166</sup> 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 הוּח as προσκυνέω and פָּרָה as αὐξάνω,<sup>167</sup> 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 פָּרָה, 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:

|       |                                                                                             |                                                                                                             |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 27:43 | וְקוֹם בָּרַח לֵךְ [פָּדָנָה אֲרָם] אֶל לָבָן                                               | ἀναστὰς ἀπόδραθι εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν πρὸς Λαβάν                                                            |
| 35:1  | וַעֲשֵׂה שֵׁם מְזוּבָּח לֵאלֹהֵי הַנְּרָאָה אֵלֶיךָ<br>בְּבָרְתְּךָ מִפְּנֵי עֲשׂוֹ אַחִיךָ | ποίησον ἐκεῖ θυσιαστήριον τῷ θεῷ τῷ ὁφθέντι σοι<br>ἐν τῷ ἀποδιδράσκειν σε ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰησὺ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου |
| 12:10 | וַיֵּרֶד אַבְרָם מִצְרִימָה לְגֹבַשׁ שָׁם                                                   | κατέβη Ἀβράμ εἰς Αἴγυπτον παροικῆσαι ἐκεῖ                                                                   |
| 32:4  | עִם לָבָן גֵּרְתִּי וְאַחֵר עַד עֵתָה                                                       | Μετὰ Λαβάν παρώκησα καὶ ἐχρόνισα ἕως τοῦ νῦν                                                                |
| 47:4  | לְגֹבַשׁ בְּאֶרֶץ בָּאוּ                                                                    | Παροικεῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ ἣκαμεν                                                                                   |
| 3:24  | וַיַּגְרֵשׁ אֶת הָאָדָם                                                                     | καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ                                                                                       |
| 21:10 | גֵּרְשׁ הָאִמָּה הַזֹּאת וְאֵת בְּנָהּ                                                      | Ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς                                                              |
| 16:2  | הִנֵּה נָא עֲצֹרֵנִי יְהוָה מִלִּדָּת                                                       | Ἴδου συνέκλεισέν με κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίττειν                                                                   |
| 20:18 | עֲצֹר עֲצֹר יְהוָה בְּעַד כָּל רַחֵם<br>לְבֵית אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ עַל דְּבַר שְׂרָה               | συγκλείων συνέκλεισεν κύριος ἔξωθεν πᾶσαν μήτραν<br>ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Ἀβιμέλεχ ἕνεκεν Σάρρας                   |

G's consistent rendering of בָּרַח 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

<sup>167</sup> 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:

|       |                                            |                                                                     |
|-------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 24:16 | והנער <u>טבת</u> מראה מאד                  | ἡ δὲ παρθένος ἤν <u>καλὴ</u> τῇ ὁψεί σφόδρα                         |
| 26:7  | ... על רבקה כי <u>טובת</u> מראה היא        | ... περὶ Ῥεβέκκας ὅτι <u>ώραία</u> τῇ ὁψεί ἤν                       |
| 29:17 | ורחל היתה <u>יפת</u> תאר ו <u>יפת</u> מראה | Ῥαχὴλ δὲ <u>καλὴ</u> τῷ εἶδει καὶ <u>ώραία</u> τῇ ὁψεί              |
| 39:6  | ויהי יוסף <u>יפה</u> תאר ו <u>יפה</u> מראה | Καὶ ἤν Ἰωσήφ <u>καλός</u> τῷ εἶδει καὶ <u>ώραῖος</u> τῇ ὁψεί σφόδρα |

In Hebrew, the two statements about Rebecca’s beauty (24:16; 26:7) are directly parallel (טבת מראה), as are the statements about Rachel (29:17) and Joseph (39:6) (יפת תאר ויפת מראה), and there are obvious semantic and structural similarities between these two sets. Yet, by translating טוב in 26:7 as ὠραῖος instead of καλός, and by varying his translation of the repeated term יִפְתָּה in both 29:17 and 39:6, translating it first as καλός and then as ὠραῖος, G increases the intertextual thematic links between these characters, since Rebecca, Rachel, and Joseph are all said to be both καλός and ὠραῖος.

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.<sup>168</sup> For example, G translates בֶּן (“son”) as τέκνον (“child”) instead of υἱός (“son”) to highlight Abraham's love for the child he is preparing to sacrifice (22:7–8):

22:7 ויאמר יצחק אל אברהם אביו ויאמר אבי      εἶπεν δὲ Ἰσαὰκ πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ εἶπας Πάτερ  
 ויאמר הנני בני      ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τί ἐστὶν τέκνον<sup>169</sup>

Or, G renders בִּגְדֵי (“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):<sup>170</sup>

27:15 ותקח רבקה את בגדי עשו ... החמדת      καὶ λαβοῦσα Ῥεβέκκα τὴν στολὴν Ἦσαυ ... τὴν καλήν  
 41:42 ויסר פרעה את טבעתו מעל ידו      καὶ περιελόμενος Φαραὼ τὸν δακτύλιον ἀπὸ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ  
 ויתן אתה על יד יוסף      περιέθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα Ἰωσήφ,  
 וילבש אתו בגדי שש      καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτὸν στολὴν βυσσίνην,  
 וישם רבד הזהב על צוארו      καὶ περιέθηκεν κλοιὸν χρυσοῦν περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ.

In another example, G translates אֲחֻזָּה (“possession”) as κατάσχεσις (“lasting possession”)—stronger than κτήσις (“possession”)—in reference to the land of Canaan given to Abraham by God and inherited by his progeny (17:8; cf. 47:11):

17:8 ונתתי [לך] את הארץ הזאת      δώσω σοι τὴν γῆν ταύτην  
 לזרעך אחריך אחזת עולם      καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σέ εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰώνιον

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.

<sup>168</sup> Hiebert, “Genesis: To the Reader,” 1–2; Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 247–254; Wevers, “Apologia,” 36–38.

<sup>169</sup> That τέκνον has an emotional quality is confirmed by the fact that this equivalence only occurs in speech.

<sup>170</sup> The other uses of στολή in Greek Genesis (as an equivalent of שְׂמֹלֶת [4: 35:2; 41:14; 45:22+] and בְּבוּשָׁה [49:11]) also seem to have special clothing in view.

While G could have translated יקץ (“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.<sup>171</sup>

The difference in nuance or meaning between such cognate simplex and compound verbs varies with each family,<sup>172</sup> but there are certain patterns with particular classes of

<sup>171</sup> Cf. the fourth category of neologisms in Hiebert, “Textual and Translation Issues,” 414.

<sup>172</sup> 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: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀνακύπτειν οὐκ ἔστι τὸ κύπτειν οὐδ’ ἐν τῷ καταπίνειν ἢν πάντως τὸ πίνειν οὐδ’ ἐν μαρσίππῳ ὁ ἵππος, οὕτως οὐδ’ ἐν τῷ καταφιλεῖν τὸ φιλεῖν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μυρίους εἰκοντές τινες ταῖς τοῦ βίου χαλεπαῖς ἀνάγκαις δεξιοῦνται. Only a sophist could maintain the equivalence between a horse (ἵππος) 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-).<sup>173</sup> 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” (καταδιώκω) (14:14) Lot’s captors in Dan and then “away” (ἐκδιώκω) to Hobah (14:15).

14:14 וַיִּרְדֵּף [אחריהם] עַד דָּן καὶ καταδιώξεν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἕως Δάν

15 וַיִּרְדֹּפֶם עַד חֹבֶבָה καὶ ἐκδιώξεν αὐτοὺς ἕως Χωβά

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)” (παρεβιάζομαι) Lot and themselves into his home (19:9), so they can violate his guests.

19:3 וַיִּפְצֹר בָּם וַיִּסְרוּ אֵלָיו καὶ καταβιάζετο αὐτούς καὶ ἐξέκλιναν πρὸς αὐτὸν

9 וַיִּפְצְרוּ בְּאִישׁ בְּלוֹט מֵאֵד καὶ παρεβιάζοντο τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν Λῶτ σφόδρα  
וַיִּגְשׁוּ לְשֹׁבֵר הַדֶּלֶת καὶ ἤγγισαν συντρίψαι τὴν θύραν

<sup>173</sup> 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,<sup>174</sup> 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.

19:30a כי ירא לִשְׁבֹּת בצוער ἐφοβήθη γὰρ κατοικῆσαι ἐν Σήγωρ

30b וישב במערה καὶ ὤκησεν ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ

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).

32:7 ויחץ את העם אשר אתו καὶ διείλεν τὸν λαὸν τὸν μετ’ αὐτοῦ

33:1 ... ויחץ [יעקב] את הילדים καὶ ἐπιδιείλεν Ἰακώβ τὰ παιδιά ...

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,<sup>175</sup> 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” (ἐξάλειψω) (7:4) his creation from the face of the earth.<sup>176</sup>

<sup>174</sup> The impermanence of Lot’s residence—as well as his negative association with the men of Sodom via the verb פָּצַר 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).

<sup>175</sup> 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).

<sup>176</sup> The flood account also furnishes another nice example of such variation with the verb שָׁחַת. At the opening of the narrative, the narrator first describes it as “corrupt” (ἐφθάρη) before God, and then God himself sees

6:7 אמחה את האדם אשר בראתי מעל פני האדמה Ἀπαλείψω τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃν ἐποίησα ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς  
7:4 ומחיתי את כל היקום אשר עשיתי ... καὶ ἐξάλειψω πᾶσαν τὴν ἐξανάστασιν ἣν ἐποίησα ...

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 (ἀρίθμησον) the stars if you can count them all (ἐξαριθμῆσαι).”<sup>177</sup>

15:5 וספר הכוכבים καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας  
5b אם תוכל לספר אתם εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς

It is difficult to capture the difference between σώζω (“save”) and διασώζω (“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.

19:17 ההרהר המלץ פן תספה εἰς τὸ ὄρος σώζου μήποτε συμπαρηλημφθῇς  
19 ואנכי לא אוכל להמלץ ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ δυνήσομαι διασωθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος

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:<sup>178</sup> Asher “gives” delight to rulers; Naphtali “gives also” beauty with his produce.

49:20 מאשר שמנה לחמו והוא יתן מעדני מלך Ἀσὴρ πίων αὐτοῦ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ αὐτὸς δώσει τρυφὴν ἄρχουσιν  
21 נפתלי אילת שלחה הנתן אמרי שפר Νεφθαλί στέλεχος ἀνειμένον ἐπιδίδου ἐν τῷ γενήματι κάλλος

that it is “utterly corrupt” (κατεφθαρμένη). Such variation serves to alleviate some of the redundancy inherent to this narrative in Hebrew (see §7.4.2).

<sup>177</sup> This is one of a number of G’s transformations of the rhetorical back-and-forth between God and Abraham in 15:1–6 that casts their dialogue in terms of salary negotiations and so alters the wider plot (see §8.3.1).

<sup>178</sup> This description is based on James Kugel’s broad characterization of the parallelism found in biblical Hebrew as “A, and what’s more, B” (*The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981]).

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 | וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת הָעֹרֵב       | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν κόρακα                 |
| 8   | וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת הַיּוֹנָה     | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν             |
| 10  | וַיִּסַּף אֶת הַיּוֹנָה ...   | καὶ ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν |
| 12  | [וַיִּסַּף אֶת הַיּוֹנָה] ... | καὶ ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν |

While ἀποστέλλω and ἐξαποστέλλω effectively have the same meaning,<sup>179</sup> 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.<sup>180</sup>

**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,

<sup>179</sup> 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.”

<sup>180</sup> 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 יָשַׁב and שָׁכַן. Though G translates יָשַׁב in a variety of ways, he levels the distinction between it and שָׁכַן by always translating שָׁכַן either as κατοικέω or as the cognate κατοικίζω, verbs he also uses to translate יָשַׁב. To a greater extent, G collapses the Hebrew synonyms שְׁפָחָה and אֲמָה 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:

|      |                                         |                                                           |
|------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 12:1 | ויאמר יהוה אל אברם לֵךְ מֵאֶרֶץ         | Kai eĩpen kýrios tṓ 'Abράμ 'Εξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου         |
| 4    | ואברם בן חמש שנים ושבעים שנה בצאתו מחרן | 'Αβράμ δὲ ἦν ἐτῶν ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε ὅτε ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ Χαρράν |
| 12:3 | ומקלל <י>ך אאר                          | kai τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι                      |
| 13:6 | ויהי רֵיב בֵּין ...                     | kai ἐγένετο μάχη ἀνὰ μέσον ...                            |
| 8    | אל נא תהי מריבת ביני וביניך             | Mḡ ἔστω μάχη ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ                       |

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.

|       |                                                 |                                                         |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 13:14 | שָׂא נָא עֵינֶיךָ                               | Ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ...                            |
| 16    | אִם יוּכַל אִישׁ לִמְנוֹת אֶת עֵפֶר הָאָרֶץ     | εἰ δύνανται τις ἐξαριθμῆσαι τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς           |
|       | גַּם זֶרַעַךְ יִמְנָה                           | καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐξαριθμηθήσεται                       |
| 15:5  | הִבֵּט נָא הַשְׁמִימָה                          | Ἀνάβλεψον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν                               |
|       | וּסְפֹר הַכּוֹכָבִים אִם תּוּכַל לִסְפֹּר אֹתָם | καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς |

By translating both נָשָׂא (13:14) and הִבֵּט (15:5) as ἀναβλέπω and both מְנָה (13:16) and סָפַר (15:5) as (ἐξ)αριθμέω, 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:<sup>181</sup>

δικ- : צָדִיק (11); צָדָקָה (3); צֶדֶק (2); חֶסֶד (5/12); נָקָם (2); נִקְיוֹן (1); חֶקֶה (1); and אָמַת (1/6)  
 ἀδικ- : חָמָס (4); פָּשַׁע (3); עָשָׂק (1); עֲשָׂק (1); עָוֹן (1/4); חָטָא (1/8); and דִּבָּר (1/64)

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,<sup>182</sup> but the wide range of Hebrew roots, even including the vague and flexible noun דִּבָּר. 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.

<sup>181</sup> For more discussion of this leveling, cf. Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 230–236; Hiebert, “Genesis: To the Reader,” 1.

<sup>182</sup> The Greek lemmas are: δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωμα, δίκαιος, ἐκδικέω, δικαιόω, ἀδικία, ἀδίκημα, ἀδικέω, ἄδικος.



### 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.

## 6 GRAMMATICAL EQUIVALENCE

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<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, or 3<sup>rd</sup>). 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,<sup>1</sup> many important studies have focused especially upon aspects of Hebrew verbal morphology and syntax.<sup>2</sup> Still, none of these important studies has analyzed G's treatment of the Hebrew verbal system as a whole.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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)**

| Conjugation            | Total | In narration | In speech   |
|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|
| wayyiqtol              | 2,151 | 2,017 93.8%  | 134 6.2%    |
| yiqtol                 | 474   | 29 6.1%      | 445 93.9%   |
| weqatal                | 211   | 15 7.1%      | 196 92.9%   |
| volatives <sup>4</sup> | 520   | 0 0.0%       | 520 100.0%  |
| qatal                  | 910   | 441 48.5%    | 469 51.5%   |
| participle             | 366   | 159 43.4%    | 207 56.6%   |
| infinitive construct   | 447   | 281 62.9%    | 166 37.1%   |
| infinitive absolute    | 53    | 13 24.5%     | 40 75.5%    |
| total                  | 5,132 | 2,955 57.6%  | 2,177 42.4% |

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.<sup>5</sup> For many conjugations, G uses separate grammatically and contextually

<sup>4</sup> Though “morphologically independent,” the cohortative (1<sup>st</sup> person), imperative (2<sup>nd</sup> person [positive]), and jussive (2<sup>nd</sup> person [negative], 3<sup>rd</sup> person) form a “functional class” (*IBHS* §34.1b; cf. Joüon §§114–116).

<sup>5</sup> 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;<sup>6</sup> less commonly, it signifies an epexegetical or apodotic relationship with what precedes.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, wayyiqtol represents a situation with perfective verbal aspect as a complete unity.<sup>8</sup> Because it

---

demonstrated its relevance for other aspects of translation technique: Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 172–173; James Aitken, “The Characterization of Speech in the Septuagint Pentateuch,” in *The Reception of the Hebrew Bible in the Septuagint and the New Testament*, ed. David J. A. Clines and Cheryl Exum (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013): 9–31.

<sup>6</sup> *IBHS* §§33.2.1; Joüon §§118c–i.

<sup>7</sup> *IBHS* §§33.2.3–4; Joüon §§118j–m.

<sup>8</sup> *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.<sup>9</sup>

In the vast majority of contexts, G translates wayyiqtol forms with either the aorist indicative (1,854) (86.2%) or the aorist participle (175)<sup>10</sup> (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,<sup>11</sup> as, like Hebrew wayyiqtol, the Greek aorist indicative and aorist participle are also used as main verb forms in Greek narrative,

---

<sup>9</sup> 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).

<sup>10</sup> **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.

<sup>11</sup> Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 122–123, 130–131, 133; James Barr, “Translators’ Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts,” in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Claude Cox, SCS 23 (Jerusalem: Scholars Press, 1986), 381–403.



and their perfective aspect presents a past situation neutrally as a whole.<sup>12</sup> While the prevalence of this equivalence leads to G's overuse of the aorist indicative in comparison to composition Greek,<sup>13</sup> G also translates wayyiqtol with the Greek imperfect indicative (69)<sup>14</sup> (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.).<sup>15</sup> G makes appropriate use of the Greek imperfect to present an action or state of affairs in one of these ways.<sup>16</sup> Although it is not always possible to determine the imperfective nuance with certainty, relatively clear examples can be found for each:

---

<sup>12</sup> KG II §§381; 386.1–7; Smyth §§1850–1852; 1923–1929; *SSG* §28da.

<sup>13</sup> *SSG* §28ca(i); T. V. Evans, "A Hebraism of Mixed Motivation," in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, ed. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 211–228; *Verbal Syntax*, 198–219; Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 222–227.

<sup>14</sup> This count includes instances of the verb εἶμι (20: 3:1; 4:17; 6:1; 9:18; 11:1, 30; 21:20; 25:20, 27; 26:34, [35]; 29:14, 20; 35:3, [21]; 39:2+, 6, 21; 40:4), which has no aorist (but cf. γίνομαι). For wayyiqtol translated by the imperfect indicative of other verbs (49), see 7:18++; 8:3+; 12:4; 14:12; 15:17; 19:3, 5+, 9, 15, 30; 21:14, 16; 25:21, 22, 34; 26:21, 31; 27:41; 30:39; 31:40; 32:7, 21, 24; 37:1, 18, 28, 34, 35; 38:11; 39:4, 8; 40:7, 20; 41:2, 3, 18, 56; 42:7; 43:30, 33; 44:12; 47:12, [14]; [49:23]+.

<sup>15</sup> KG II §§381; 383.1–4; Smyth §§1850–1852; 1889–1909; *SSG* §§28c(i)–(iii).

<sup>16</sup> Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 169–197; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 120–121.

|       |                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                              |             |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 32:24 | ויותר יעקב לבדו<br>ויאבק איש עמו עד עלות השחר                                      | ὑπελείφθη δὲ Ἰακώβ μόνος,<br>καὶ ἐπάλαυνεν ἄνθρωπος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωί.                                                                                     | durative    |
| 30:39 | ותלדן הצאן<br>עקדים נקדים וטלאים                                                   | καὶ ἔτικτον τὰ πρόβατα<br>διάλευκα καὶ ποικίλα καὶ σποδοειδῆ ῥαντά.                                                                                          | habitual    |
| 19:5  | ויקראו אל לוט ויאמרו לו<br>איה האנשים אשר באו אליך הלילה<br>הוציאם אלינו ונדעה אתם | καὶ ἐξεκαλοῦντο τὸν Λώτ, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς αὐτόν<br>Ποῦ εἰσιν οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ εἰσελθόντες πρὸς σὲ τὴν νύκτα;<br>ἐξάγαγε αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα συγγενώμεθα αὐτοῖς. | iterative   |
| 19:9  | ויפצרו באיש בלוט מאד<br>ויגשו לשבר הדלת                                            | καὶ παρεβιάζοντο τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν Λώτ σφόδρα,<br>καὶ ἤγγισαν συντρίψαι τὴν θύραν.                                                                               | conative    |
| 7:18  | ויגברו המים<br>וירבו מאד על הארץ<br>ותלך התבה על פני המים                          | καὶ ἐπεκράτει τὸ ὕδωρ<br>καὶ ἐπληθύνετο σφόδρα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,<br>καὶ ἐπεφέρετο ἡ κιβωτὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος. <sup>17</sup>                                       | descriptive |
| 41:56 | ויפתח יוסף את כל אשר בהם<br>וישבר ל[כל] מצרים                                      | ἀνέωξεν δὲ Ἰωσήφ πάντας τοὺς σιτοβολῶνας<br>καὶ ἐπώλει πᾶσιν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις.                                                                                | inchoative  |

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,<sup>18</sup> he often mixes in an imperfect indicative in order to slow down the pace, build narrative tension, and create the expectation of resolution.<sup>19</sup> For example, G combines aorist and imperfect forms in 21:14–15 to depict Hagar's expulsion dramatically:

<sup>17</sup> 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).

<sup>18</sup> See §§3.1.2.1; 4.1.1.3.

<sup>19</sup> 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

## Genesis 21:14–15

וַיִּשְׁכֶּם | וַיִּקַּח | וַיֵּתֵן 14 ἀνέστη δὲ Ἀβραάμ τὸ πρωὶ καὶ ἔλαβεν ἄρτους καὶ ἄσκὸν ὕδατος καὶ ἔδωκεν  
 וַתֵּלֶךְ | וַיִּשְׁלַח | שֶׁם Ἀγάρ, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὸν ὄμῳ καὶ τὸ παιδίον, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτήν. ἀπελθοῦσα  
 וַיֵּלֶךְ | וַיִּשְׁלַח | וַיֵּלֶךְ δὲ ἐπλανᾶτο τὴν ἔρημον κατὰ τὸ φρέαρ τοῦ ὄρκου. 15 ἐξέλιπεν δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐκ τοῦ  
 וַיֵּלֶךְ | וַיִּשְׁלַח | ἄσκοῦ, καὶ ἔρριψεν τὸ παιδίον ὑποκάτω μιᾶς ἐλάτης.

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 וַתֵּלֶךְ (“and she went”) as ἀπελθοῦσα δέ (“but having gone away”), using postpositive δέ 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 וַתֵּלֶךְ (“and she wandered”), for which G uses the imperfect ἐπλανᾶτο (“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.<sup>20</sup>

---

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]).

<sup>20</sup> 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’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” (Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 230).

Excluding the few cases where G omits a verb (24) or translates a verb with a non-verb (6),<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> Otherwise, he typically uses another tense of the indicative. G employs the historical present for wayyiqtol to portray an event vividly or dramatically,<sup>23</sup> 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).

|       |                                                        |                                                                                                  |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15:2  | ויאמר אברם אדני יהוה מה תתן לי<br>ואנכי הולך ערירי     | λέγει δὲ Ἀβράμ Δέσποτα, τί μοι δώσεις;<br>ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος. <sup>24</sup>                |
| 29:2  | וירא והנה באר בשדה<br>והנה שם שלשה עדרי צאן רבצים עליה | καὶ ὁρᾷ καὶ ἰδοὺ φρέαρ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ,<br>ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ τρία ποίμνια προβάτων ἀναπαυόμενα ἐπ' αὐτοῦ. |
| 39:16 | ותנח בגדו אצלה<br>עד בוא אדניו אל ביתו                 | καὶ καταλιμπάνει τὰ ἱμάτια παρ' ἐαυτῆς,<br>ἕως ἥλθεν ὁ κύριος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.               |

The two instances where G uses the future indicative for wayyiqtol differ from each other.

<sup>21</sup> See §5.1.1.2, which lists such cases for all verbal conjugations.

<sup>22</sup> These cases are analyzed in §3.1.2.1, as they involve G's omission of ו and his use of hypotaxis.

<sup>23</sup> KG §382.2; Smyth §1883; SSG §28b(ii); Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics* 22–25 [§7]; Voilila, *Présent et imparfait*, 91–106. Based upon his investigation of the historical present in the Greek Pentateuch, Voilila 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 ὁρᾶν, qui ont pourtant des parallèles en grec" (*Présent et imparfait*, 108).

<sup>24</sup> For the major significance of Abraham's statement within the larger plot, see §8.3.1.

33:10 ויאמר יעקב אל נא אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך ויאמר δὲ Ἰακώβ Εἰ εὕρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον σου,  
 ולקחת מנחתי מידי δέξαι τὰ δῶρα διὰ τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν.  
 כי על כן ראיתי פניך ἔνεκεν τούτου εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου,  
 כראת פני אלהים ὥς ἂν τις ἴδοι πρόσωπον θεοῦ,  
 ותִּרְצַנִי καὶ εὐδοκήσεις με·

49:17 יהי דן נחש עלי דרך καὶ γενηθήτω Δὰν ὄφεις ἐφ' ὁδοῦ  
 שפיפן עלי ארח ἐγκαθήμενος ἐπὶ τρίβου,  
 הנשך עקבי סוס δάκνων πτέρναν ἵππου,  
 ויפל רכבו אחור καὶ πεσεῖται ὁ ἵππενος εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.

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.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup>

27:36 ויאמר הכי קרא שמו יעקב καὶ εἶπεν Δικαίως ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ·  
 ויעקבני זה פעמים את בכרתי ἐπτέρονικα γάρ με ἤδη δεύτερον τοῦτο·

Also, G uses the pluperfect ἥδει for wayyiqtol only because οἶδα has no aorist.<sup>27</sup>

39:3 וירא אדניו כי יהוה אתו ἥδει δὲ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ὅτι κύριος μετ' αὐτοῦ  
 וכל אשר הוא עשה יהוה מצליח καὶ ὅσα ἂν ποιῇ, κύριος εὐοδοῖ.

<sup>25</sup> 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.)

<sup>26</sup> IBHS §33.2.2; Joüon §118j.

<sup>27</sup> 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 *וַיַּחְמוּ* in Greek in the form of a purpose clause.

|          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 30:38–39 | <p>וַיַּצַּג אֶת הַמַּקְלוֹת אֲשֶׁר פָּצַל<br/>         בְּרֹהֲטִים בְּשִׁקְתוֹת הַמֵּיִם<br/>         אֲשֶׁר תִּבְאֵן הַצֹּאֵן לְשִׁתּוֹת לִנְכַּח הַצֹּאֵן<br/>         בְּבֹאֵן לְשִׁתּוֹת<br/>         וַיַּחְמוּ הַצֹּאֵן אֶל הַמַּקְלוֹת</p> | <p>καὶ παρέθηκεν τὰς ῥάβδους, ἃς ἐλέπισεν,<br/>         ἐν ταῖς ληνοῖς τῶν ποτιστηρίων τοῦ ὕδατος,<br/>         ἵνα, ὡς ἂν ἔλθωσιν τὰ πρόβατα πιεῖν ἐνώπιον τῶν ῥάβδων,<br/>         ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πιεῖν,<br/>         ἐγκισσῇσιν τὰ πρόβατα εἰς τὰς ῥάβδους.</p> |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**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)<sup>28</sup> or (i.b) in the present (i.e., progressive, stative, inchoative, habitual);<sup>29</sup> 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).<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, Hebrew yiqtol is also

---

<sup>28</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> *IBHS* §§31.2–3; Joüon §§113c–g.

<sup>30</sup> *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 **וְאִם** and **וְכִּי**.<sup>31</sup>

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.<sup>32</sup> 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)<sup>33</sup> (2:6), but once the iterative aorist indicative (2:19),<sup>34</sup> and once he uses the resultative aorist indicative for an inchoative yiqtol (48:17).<sup>35</sup>

|       |                                                                                             |                                                                                                    |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:6   | וּבְיָמָיו מִן הָאָרֶץ<br>וְהִשְׁקָה אֶת כָּל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה                              | πηγῇ δὲ ἀνέβαινον ἐκ τῆς γῆς<br>καὶ ἐπότιζεν πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς                               |
| 2:19  | וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה<br>הוּא שְׁמוֹ                               | καὶ πᾶν, ὃ ἐὰν ἐκάλεισεν αὐτὸ Ἀδὰμ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν,<br>τοῦτο ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.                              |
| 48:17 | וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹסֵף כִּי יִשָּׁת אֲבִיו יָד יְמִינוֹ<br>עַל רֹאשׁ אֲפֵרַיִם וְיָרַע בְּעֵינָיו | ἰδὼν δὲ Ἰωσήφ ὅτι ἐπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ<br>ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἐφραίμ, βαρὺ αὐτῷ κατεφάνη, |

<sup>31</sup> *IBHS* §31.6; Joüon §§113a–b; 113h–k.

<sup>32</sup> Anssi Voitila, “La Technique de traduction du Yiqtol (l'imparfait hébreu) dans l'Histoire du Joseph grecque (Gen 39,39-50),” in *VII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Claude Cox, SCS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 223–237.

<sup>33</sup> 2:6; 3:1; 6:4; 29:2; 30:42; 43:32; 48:10. Cf. §6.1.1.1 and note 15. Similarly, G uses the imperfect indicative once for yiqtol that occurs in narration within speech (31:39).

<sup>34</sup> KG II §§392.4; 399.2; Smyth §§1790–1792; *SSG* §89l.2a.

<sup>35</sup> 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),<sup>36</sup> the gnomic future indicative (2:24; also 10:9),<sup>37</sup> or the emphatic aorist subjunctive (32:32).<sup>38</sup>

|       |                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 50:3  | וימלאו לו ארבעים יום<br>כי כן ימלאו ימי החנטים                           | καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν αὐτοῦ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας·<br>οὕτως γὰρ καταριθμοῦνται αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ταφῆς.                                                                  |
| 2:24  | על כן יעזב איש<br>את אביו ואת אמו<br>ודבק באשתו<br>והיו [שניהם] לבשר אחד | ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος<br>τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα<br>καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. |
| 32:32 | על כן לא יאכלו בני ישראל את גיד הנשה                                     | ἔνεκεν τούτου οὐ μὴ φάγωσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ νεῦρον,                                                                                                      |

Where yiqtol arguably has future time reference, G uses the Greek future indicative (4)<sup>39</sup> (38:9), and after טָרַם (בָּ) he translates it with the aorist infinitive (5)<sup>40</sup> (41:50).

|       |                                                  |                                                                        |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 38:9  | וידע אונן כי לא לו יהיה הזרע                     | γινούς δὲ Αὐνὰν ὅτι οὐκ αὐτῷ ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα, ...                      |
| 41:50 | וליוסף ילד שני בנים<br>בטרם תבוא [שבוע] שנת הרעב | Τῷ δὲ Ἰωσήφ ἐγένοντο υἱοὶ δύο<br>πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὰ ἑπτὰ ἔτη τοῦ λιμοῦ, |

Also, G uses the aorist subjunctive for yiqtol in certain types of subordinate clauses where Greek grammar requires a subjunctive verb (4).<sup>41</sup>

|       |                                                                   |                                                                                                            |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22:14 | וירא אברהם שם המקום ההוא יהוה יראה<br>אשר יאמר היום בהר יהוה יראה | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Κύριος εἶδεν,<br>ἵνα ἐπωσιν σήμερον Ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὤφθη. |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Incidentally, 22:14 also contains the remaining cases of narrative yiqtol, and G's use of the aorist indicative alters the temporal reference (הִירָא as εἶδεν and ὤφθη), a fact that is to be

<sup>36</sup> KG II §382.1; Smyth §1877; SSG §28b(v).

<sup>37</sup> KG II §387.3; Smyth §1914; cf. SSG §28gb.

<sup>38</sup> KG II §394.5; Smyth §1800; SSG §29ba(ii-a); 83ca.

<sup>39</sup> 2:19; 34:7; 38:9; 43:25. The case in 43:25 is a future periphrastic construction [μέλλω + infinitive].

<sup>40</sup> 2:5+; 19:4; 37:18; 41:50; also in speech (4: 24:45; 27:4, 33; 45:28). Cf. §3.2.1.4.

<sup>41</sup> [20:2]; 22:14; 26:7; 30:38.



explained by his interpretation of Gen 22, since God has now seen that Abraham has passed his most important and final test.<sup>42</sup>

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)<sup>43</sup> (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.<sup>44</sup>

21:6 ותאמר שרה צחק עשה לי אלהים ויאמר שרה כל השמע יצחק לי  
 εἶπεν δὲ Σάρρα Γέλωτά μοι ἐποίησεν κύριος·  
 ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἀκούσῃ, συγχαρεῖται μοι.

|       |                                      |                                                               |              |
|-------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 32:4  | ויצו אתם לאמר<br>כה תאמרו לאדני לעשו | καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς λέγων<br>Οὕτως ἐρεῖτε τῷ κυρίῳ μου Ἡσαύ | injunction   |
| 19:2  | ויאמרו לא כי ברחוב נלין              | εἶπαν δὲ Οὐχί, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πλατείᾳ καταλύσομεν.                | resolution   |
| 38:18 | ויאמר מה הערבון אשר אתן לך           | ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τίνα τὸν ἀρραβῶνά σοι δώσω;                        | deliberation |

G selects the aorist subjunctive, however, to translate yiqtol in a range of linguistic contexts: in main clauses (22), he uses it with οὐ μή in emphatic prohibitions and predictions (13)<sup>45</sup> (3:1)<sup>46</sup> and when it is deliberative (7)<sup>47</sup> (44:16) or cohortative (35:3; also 2:18). Here, the subjunctive captures the modal and volitional sense of Hebrew yiqtol.

<sup>42</sup> For an extended argument in support of this claim, see §8.3.3.

<sup>43</sup> To this could be added two aorist circumstantial participles subordinated to future indicatives (15:15; 22:5).

<sup>44</sup> KG II §§387.5–7; Smyth §§1916–1922; SSG §§28gc–gg.

<sup>45</sup> 3:1, 3; 6:3; 18:28, [29], 30, [31], 32; 23:6; 24:33; 28:15; 32:26; 42:15.

<sup>46</sup> KG II §§514.8–9; Smyth §§2754–2756, 1800.N; SSG §29ba(ii-a).

<sup>47</sup> 18:23; 27:37; 30:30; 31:43; 39:9; 44:16+.

|       |                            |                                                      |
|-------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| 3:1   | אף כי אמר אלהים            | Τί ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ θεός                                  |
|       | לא תאכלו מכל עץ הגן        | Οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ;   |
| 44:16 | ויאמר יהודה מה נאמר        | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας Τί ἀντεροῦμεν <sup>48</sup> τῷ κυρίῳ |
|       | לאדני [ו]מה נדבר ומה נצטדק | ἢ τί <u>λαλήσωμεν</u> ἢ τί <u>δικαιωθῶμεν</u> ;      |
| 35:3  | ונקומה ונעלה בית אל        | καὶ ἀναστάντες ἀναβῶμεν εἰς Βαιθῆλ,                  |
|       | ואעשה שם מזבח לאל          | καὶ <u>ποιήσωμεν</u> ἐκεῖ 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)<sup>49</sup> (18:26)<sup>50</sup> or relative clause (15)<sup>51</sup> (15:14),<sup>52</sup> in a final clause (21)<sup>53</sup> (27:19; 42:2)<sup>54</sup> or fear clause (14)<sup>55</sup> (31:24),<sup>56</sup> or in a temporal clause (7)<sup>57</sup> (38:11).<sup>58</sup> These uses of the Greek subjunctive correspond to the function of Hebrew *yiqtol* in subordinate clauses.

<sup>48</sup> The alternation of the deliberative subjunctive with the deliberative future indicative is classical (KG II §387.5b; Smyth §1916a; *SSG* §28gf).

<sup>49</sup> 8:26, 28+, 29, 30+, 31, 32; 24:14; 30:31; 31:8+, 52+; 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).

<sup>50</sup> KG II §571; Smyth §2297; *SSG* §29c(ii); 89a.

<sup>51</sup> 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).

<sup>52</sup> KG II §559; Smyth §§2560–2561; *SSG* §29c(i).

<sup>53</sup> 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).

<sup>54</sup> KG II §553; Smyth §§2193–2206; *SSG* §29c(iii).

<sup>55</sup> 3:22; 19:17, 19; 24:6; 26:9; 27:12; 27:45; 31:24, 31; 38:11; 38:23; 42:4; 47:18; 50:15+; also an aorist circumstantial participle (32:11).

<sup>56</sup> KG II §553b; Smyth §§2221–2239; *SSG* §29b(iv).

<sup>57</sup> 12:12; 24:41+; 27:40; 38:11; 40:14; 49:10; also, the aorist infinitive (3: 11:4; 29:8; 33:14).

<sup>58</sup> KG II §§566–567; Smyth §§2383–2461; *SSG* §29c(v).

|       |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                             |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18:26 | ויאמר יהוה אם <u>אמצא</u> בסדם<br>חמשים צדיקים בתוך העיר<br>ונשאתי לכל המקום בעבורם | εἶπεν δὲ κύριος Ἐὰν εὕρω ἐν Σοδόμοις<br>πεντήκοντα δικαίους ἐν τῇ πόλει,<br>ἀφήσω πάντα τὸν τόπον δι' αὐτούς.               |
| 15:14 | וגם את הגוי אשר <u>יעבדו</u> דן אנכי                                                | τὸ δὲ ἔθνος, ὃ ἔὰν δουλεύωσιν, κρινῶ ἐγώ.                                                                                   |
| 27:19 | קום נא שבה ואכלה מציד<br>בעבור <u>תברכני</u> נפשך                                   | ἀναστὰς κάθισον καὶ φάγε τῆς θήρας μου,<br>ὅπως <u>εὐλογήσῃ</u> με ἡ ψυχὴ σου.                                              |
| 42:2  | רדו שמה ושברו לנו [מעט אכל]<br>ונחיה ולא <u>נמות</u>                                | κατάβητε ἐκεῖ καὶ πρίασθε ἡμῖν μικρὰ βρώματα,<br>ἵνα ζῶμεν καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν.                                               |
| 31:24 | השמר לך פן <u>תדבר</u> עם יעקב מטוב עד רע                                           | Φύλαξαι σεαυτόν, μήποτε <u>λαλήσῃς</u> μετὰ Ἰακώβ πονηρά.                                                                   |
| 38:11 | ויאמר יהודה לתמר כלתו<br>שבי אלמנה בית אביך<br>עד <u>יגדל</u> שלה בני               | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας Θαμάρ τῇ νύμφῃ αὐτοῦ<br>Κάθου χήρα ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός σου,<br>ἕως <u>μέγας γένηται</u> Σηλὼμ ὁ υἱός μου. |

Where G understands a yiqtol form to refer to the present or the past, he selects the Greek present indicative (16)<sup>59</sup> (32:29) or the aorist indicative (3)<sup>60</sup> (49:25), respectively.

|       |                                                                 |                                                                                                                               |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 32:29 | וישאל יעקב ויאמר הגידה נא שמך ויאמר<br>למה זה <u>תשא</u> ל לשמי | ἠρώτησεν δὲ Ἰακώβ καὶ εἶπεν Ἀνάγγειλόν μοι τὸ ὄνομά σου.<br>καὶ εἶπεν "Ἴνα τί τοῦτο <u>ἐρωτᾷς</u> τὸ ὄνομά μου;               |
| 49:25 | ויעזרך את [אל] שדי<br>ויערך ברכת שמים מעל<br>ברכת תהום רבצת     | καὶ <u>ἐβοήθησέν</u> σοι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐμός,<br>καὶ <u>εὐλόγησέν</u> σε εὐλογίαν οὐρανοῦ ἄνωθεν<br>καὶ εὐλογίαν γῆς ἐχούσης πάντα. |

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.

<sup>59</sup> 13:16; 16:8; 18:14; 24:5; 29:26; 30:33; 31:35; 32:17, 29; 37:15; 42:1; 43:9; 44:5+, 7; 47:15.

<sup>60</sup> 43:7 [pluperfect of οἶδα]; 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),<sup>61</sup> he frequently chooses a Greek imperative ([aorist (14) (7:2)]; [present (6) (27:33)]), corresponding to the volitional uses of yiqtol.<sup>62</sup>

|       |                                |                                                          |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 7:2   | מהבהמה הטהורה                  | ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καθαρῶν                            |
|       | תקח לך שבעה שבעה [זכר] ו[נקבה] | εἰσάγαγε <sup>63</sup> πρὸς σὲ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ |
| 27:33 | ואברכהו גם ברוך יהיה           | καὶ εὐλόγησα αὐτόν, καὶ εὐλογημένος ἔστω.                |

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);<sup>64</sup> the future infinitive in an oath (21:23; also 26:29);<sup>65</sup> the aorist potential optative (44:8)<sup>66</sup> and optative of wish (49:8);<sup>67</sup> the aorist infinitive after a verb of command (3:17);<sup>68</sup> and the aorist indicative in a contrafactual apodosis (31:27).<sup>69</sup>

<sup>61</sup> 4:7+; 49:27. Cf. §5.1.1.2.

<sup>62</sup> Also, G uses a present participle in 9:2, because he has translated a yiqtol-relative clause substantively.

<sup>63</sup> With this choice, G harmonizes the form with the future indicative εἰσάξεις 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.

<sup>64</sup> KG II §384; Smyth §§1945–1947; SSG §28e.

<sup>65</sup> KG II §389.5b; Smyth §§1868; 2024; SSG §28gh.

<sup>66</sup> KG II §396; Smyth §§1824–1834; SSG §29db(ii).

<sup>67</sup> KG II §395.3–5; Smyth §§1814–1823; SSG §29db(i).

<sup>68</sup> KG II §473.2; Smyth §§1991–1999;

<sup>69</sup> KG II §574; Smyth §§2302–2312; SSG §89b.

|       |                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 24:31 | למה <u>תעמד</u> בחוץ<br>ואנכי פניתי הבית ומקום לגמלים                                              | ἵνα τί <u>ἔστηκας</u> <sup>70</sup> ἔξω;<br>ἐγὼ δὲ ἡτοίμακα τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τόπον ταῖς καμήλοις.                                                                              |
| 21:23 | ועתה השבעה לי באלהים הנה אם <u>תשקר</u> לי<br>ולניני ולנכדי                                        | νῦν οὖν ὁμοσόν μοι τὸν θεὸν μὴ <u>ἀδικήσῃν</u> με<br>μηδὲ τὸ σπέρμα μου μηδὲ τὸ ὄνομά μου                                                                                    |
| 44:8  | הן כסף אשר מצאנו בפי אמתחתינו<br>השיבנו אליך מארץ כנען<br>ואיך <u>ננב</u> מבית אדניך<br>כסף או זהב | εἰ τὸ μὲν ἀργύριον, δ' εὗρομεν ἐν τοῖς μαρσίπποις ἡμῶν,<br>ἀπεστρέψαμεν πρὸς σὲ ἐκ γῆς Χανάαν,<br>πῶς ἂν <u>κλέψαιμεν</u> ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ κυρίου σου<br>ἀργύριον ἢ χρυσίον; |
| 49:8  | יהודה אתה <u>יודוך</u> אחיך                                                                        | Ἰούδα, σὲ <u>αἰνέσασαισαν</u> οἱ ἀδελφοί σου·                                                                                                                                |
| 3:17  | כי שמעת לקול אשתך<br>ותאכל מן העץ<br>אשר צויתך לאמר לא <u>תאכל</u> ממנו<br>ארורה האדמה בעבורך      | Ὅτι ἤκουσας τῆς φωνῆς τῆς γυναικός σου<br>καὶ ἔφαγες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου,<br>οὗ ἐνετείλάμην σοι τούτου μόνου μὴ <u>φαγεῖν</u> ἀπ' αὐτοῦ,<br>ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου·  |
| 31:27 | ולא הגדת לי<br>ואשלחך בשמחה ובשרי<br>בתך ובכנור                                                    | καὶ εἰ ἀνήγγειλάς μοι,<br><u>ἐξαπέστειλα</u> ἄν σε μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ μετὰ μουσικῶν,<br>τυμπάνων καὶ κιθάρας.                                                               |

### 6.1.1.3 Weqatal (211).

The weqatal conjugation is the rarest of the Hebrew finite verbs in Genesis.<sup>71</sup> 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

<sup>70</sup> Stative verbs like *ἵστημι* often have present meaning in the perfect: KG II §384.3; Smyth §1946; *SSG* §28ec.

<sup>71</sup> 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.<sup>72</sup> 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)<sup>73</sup> (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.

|       |                                                        |                                                                                                       |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9:14  | והיה בענני ענן על הארץ<br>ונראתה [קשתי] בענן           | καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ συννεφεῖν με νεφέλας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν<br>ὀφθήσεται τὸ τόξον μου ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ, ...          |
| 29:15 | הכי אחי אתה ועבדתי חנם                                 | “Οτι γὰρ ἀδελφός μου εἶ, οὐ δουλεύσεις μοι δωρεάν·                                                    |
| 43:9  | אם לא הביאתיו אליך והצגתיו לפניך<br>וחטאתי לך כל הימים | ἐὰν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτὸν πρὸς σέ καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου,<br>ἡμαρτηκὼς ἔσομαι εἰς σέ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας. |
| 33:10 | אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך<br>ולקחת מנחתי מידי              | Εἰ εὕρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον σου,<br>δέξαι τὰ δῶρα διὰ τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν·                                   |

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.

|          |                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 28:20–22 | אם יהיה אלהים עמדי<br>ושמרני בדרך הזה אשר אנכי הולך<br>ונתן לי לחם לאכל ובגד ללבש<br>ושבתי בשלום אל בית אבי<br>והיה יהוה לי לאלהים | Ἐὰν ᾗ κύριος ὁ θεὸς μετ’ ἐμοῦ<br>καὶ διαφυλάξῃ με ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ταύτῃ, ᾗ ἐγὼ πορεύομαι,<br>καὶ δῶ μοι ἄρτον φαγεῖν καὶ ἱμάτιον περιβαλέσθαι,<br>καὶ ἀποστρέψῃ με μετὰ σωτηρίας εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου,<br>καὶ ἔσται μοι κύριος εἰς θεόν, |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

<sup>72</sup> IBHS §32.2; Joüon §119.

<sup>73</sup> 3:5; 9:14; 12:12; 17:14; 18:26; 24:8, 41; 27:40; 28:21; 29:15; 31:8+; 32:8, 18; 33:13; 34:16, 17; 43:9; 44:22, 26, 29, 31+, 32; 46:34; 47:24. The cases in 43:9 and 44:32 involve future periphrastic constructions, and the case in 34:17 is accompanied by another weqatal translated by an aorist circumstantial participle.

Following on his translation of יהיה as ἦ in a conditional protasis, G translates the next three weqatal forms with the Greek subjunctive (διαφυλάξῃ, δῶ, 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.<sup>74</sup> 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)<sup>75</sup> (**48:4**),<sup>76</sup> a subjunctive (16)<sup>77</sup> (**19:19**),<sup>78</sup> or an imperative (11)<sup>79</sup> (**45:9**), but also the aorist indicative (3)<sup>80</sup> (**26:22**), the perfect indicative (**26:24**), and the aorist optative (**43:14**).

---

<sup>74</sup> *IBHS* §32.2.1d; Joüon §§119h–p.

<sup>75</sup> **3:5**, 18; **4:14+**; **6:14**, 18+, 21+; **9:14**, 15, 16+; **12:3**, 12; **13:16**; **15:13**[+]; **16:11**; **17:5**, 6+, 7, 8+, 11+, 13, 16++, 19+, 20+; **18:18**, 19, 25; **22:18**; **24:4**, 7, 38, 40+, 43; **26:3**, 4++; **27:10+**, 12; **27:40**; **28:14++**; **30:33**; **32:12**; [**34:15**], 16+, 30; **40:13+**, 14+, 19+; **41:30+**; **42:38+**; **44:4**, 31; **45:10**, 11; **47:30++**; **48:4++**, 21; **50:24**, 25. This count includes one case in **6:3** where [οὐ μὴ + subjunctive] is functionally future.

<sup>76</sup> Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 121–122, 133.

<sup>77</sup> This occurs in a variety of clause types, i.e. in a conditional protasis (**12: 3:22+**; **28:20+**, 21; **32:8**, 17; **37:26**; **43:9**; **44:29**, [32]; **46:33**); in a fear clause (**19:19**), once after a circumstantial participle (**32:11**); in a relative clause (**2: 24:14**, 44). All cases involve the aorist subjunctive except **32:17** (present subjunctive).

<sup>78</sup> Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 124–126.

<sup>79</sup> Aorist imperative (**6: 27:44**; **41:34**, 35; **45:9**, 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.

<sup>80</sup> **26:10**, 22; [**35:3**]. The instance in **35:3** is actually the imperfect of εἰμί, which has not aorist.

|       |                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 48:4  | וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֵי הַנְּנִי מִפְּרֶךְ<br>וַיַּרְבִּיתֶךָ וַנִּתְּתֶיךָ לְקַהֵל עַמִּים<br>וַנִּתְּתִי [לְךָ] אֶת הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת<br>לְזֶרַעַךְ אַחֲרֶיךָ אַחֲזֹת עוֹלָם | καὶ εἶπέν μοι Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ <u>αὐξάνω</u> σε<br>καὶ <u>πληθυνῶ</u> σε καὶ <u>ποιήσω</u> σε εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν,<br>καὶ <u>δώσω</u> σοι τὴν γῆν ταύτην<br>καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σὲ εἰς κατὰσχεσιν αἰώνιον. |
| 19:19 | נִפְשִׁי וְאֲנֹכִי לֹא אוֹכַל לְהַמְלִט הַהֵרָה<br>פֶּן תִּדְבַקְנִי הָרְעָה וּמָתִי                                                                                 | ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ δύνησομαι διασωθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος,<br>μὴ <u>καταλάβῃ</u> με τὰ κακὰ καὶ <u>ἀποθάνω</u> ,                                                                                                       |
| 45:9  | מִהָרָו וְעַלֹּו אֵל אָבִי וְאַמְרַתֶּם אֵלָיו ...                                                                                                                   | <u>σπεύσαντες</u> οὖν <u>ἀνάβητε</u> πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ <u>εἶπατε</u> αὐτῷ ...                                                                                                                     |
| 26:22 | וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמָהּ רַחֲבוֹת וַיֹּאמֶר<br>כִּי עֵתָה הִרְחִיב יְהוָה לָנוּ וּפְרִינוּ בָאָרֶץ                                                                         | καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Εὐρυχωρία λέγων<br>Διότι νῦν <u>ἐπλάτυνεν</u> κύριος ἡμῖν καὶ <u>ἡύξησεν</u> ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.                                                                            |
| 26:24 | אֵל תִּירָא כִּי אַתָּה אֲנִי וּבְרַכְתֶּיךָ<br>וְהִרְבִּיתִי אֶת זֶרַעְךָ בַּעֲבוּר אֲבִרָהֶם עַבְדִּי                                                              | μὴ φοβοῦ· μετὰ σοῦ γάρ <u>εἰμι</u> καὶ <u>εὐλόγηκά</u> σε<br>καὶ πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου διὰ Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα σου.                                                                                       |
| 43:14 | וְאֵל שְׁדֵי יִתֵּן לָכֶם רַחֲמִים לִפְנֵי הָאֵשׁ<br>וְשַׁלַּח לָכֶם אֶת אַחֲיֵיכֶם [הָאֶחָד] וְאֶת בְּנִימִין                                                       | ὁ δὲ θεὸς μου <u>δώῃ</u> ὑμῖν χάριν ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,<br>καὶ <u>ἀποστείλῃ</u> τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑμῶν τὸν ἕνα καὶ τὸν Βενιαμίν·                                                                           |

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),<sup>81</sup> 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)<sup>82</sup> (41:30), perfect (3)<sup>83</sup> (17:20), or aorist indicative (47:25), or a modal advancement, i.e. where G uses the future after a subjunctive (10)<sup>84</sup> (3:22), imperative (8)<sup>85</sup> (45:10), or optative (28:3).

<sup>81</sup> 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).

<sup>82</sup> 7:4; 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.

<sup>83</sup> 17:20; 24:14; 26:24.

<sup>84</sup> 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 [μὴ + aorist subjunctive], and, since it expresses a prohibition, resembles the imperatives below.

<sup>85</sup> 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.



|          |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 41:29–30 | הנה שבע שנים <u>באות</u> שבע גדול בכל ארץ מצרים<br>וקמן שבע שני רעב אחריהן                             | ἰδοὺ ἐπταῖ ἔτη ἔρχεται εὐθηνία πολλή ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ·<br>ἔξει δὲ ἐπταῖ ἔτη λιμοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα, ...                                                                                                        |
| 17:20    | ולישמעאל [הנה] שמעתך<br>הנה <u>ברכתי</u> אתו והפריתי אתו<br>והרביתי אתו במאד מאד                       | περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαήλ ἰδοὺ ἐπήκουσά σου·<br>ἰδοὺ <u>εὐλόγηκα</u> αὐτὸν καὶ <u>αὐξάνω</u> αὐτὸν<br>καὶ πληθυνῶ αὐτὸν σφόδρα·                                                                                       |
| 47:25    | החיתנו <u>נמצא</u> חן בעיני אדני<br>והיינו עבדים לפרעה                                                 | Σέσωκας ἡμᾶς, <u>εὐρομεν</u> χάριν ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν<br>καὶ <u>ἐσόμεθα</u> παῖδες τῷ Φαραώ.                                                                                                         |
| 3:22     | הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו<br>לדעת טוב ורע ועתה<br>פן <u>ישלח</u> ידו<br>ולקח גם מעץ החיים ואכל<br>ותי לעלם | Ἴδοὺ Ἀδὰμ γέγονεν ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν<br>τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν,<br>καὶ νῦν μήποτε <u>ἐκτείνῃ</u> τὴν χεῖρα<br>καὶ <u>λάβῃ</u> τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ <u>φάγῃ</u><br>καὶ <u>ζήσεται</u> εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. |
| 45:9–10  | <u>רדה</u> אלי אל תעמד<br><u>וישבת</u> בארץ גשן והיית קרוב אלי                                         | <u>κατάβηθι</u> οὖν πρὸς με καὶ μὴ μείνης·<br>καὶ <u>κατοικήσεις</u> ἐν γῇ Γέσεμ Ἀραβίας καὶ ἔσῃ ἐγγύς μου                                                                                                 |
| 28:3     | ואל שדי <u>יברך</u> אתך<br><u>ויפרך</u> ויברך<br>והיית לקהל עמים                                       | ὁ δὲ θεός μου <u>εὐλογήσαι</u> σε<br>καὶ <u>αὐξήσαι</u> σε, καὶ <u>πληθύναι</u> σε,<br>καὶ <u>ἔσῃ</u> εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν·                                                                                 |

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),<sup>86</sup> performative perfect (17:20),<sup>87</sup> or resultative aorist (47:25)).<sup>88</sup> 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.<sup>89</sup> 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

<sup>86</sup> KG II §§382.5–6; Smyth §§1879–1882; SSG §28b(iv).

<sup>87</sup> KG II §§384.3–4; Smyth §§1946–1947; SSG §28eb.

<sup>88</sup> KG II §386.1; Smyth §1926; SSG §28da.

<sup>89</sup> KG II §397.2; Smyth §1839.

God's fear is aptly expressed by the future indicative ζήσεται (“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 ἔσῃ (“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.<sup>90</sup>

|        |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 38:9   | וידע אונן כי לא לו יהיה הזרע<br>והיה אם בא אל אשת אחיו<br>ושחת ארצה לבלתי נתן זרע לאחיו                                                                                                                   | γινούσ δὲ Αὐνὰν ὅτι οὐκ αὐτῷ ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα,<br>ἐγίνετο ὅταν εἰσῆρχετο πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ,<br>ἐξέχεεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.                                                                            |
| 2:6    | וּבַיּוֹם הַהוּא יָצָא אָדָם מִן הָאָרֶץ<br>וַהֲשִׁקָהּ אֶת כָּל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה                                                                                                                         | πῆγῃ δὲ ἀνέβαινε ἐκ τῆς γῆς<br>καὶ ἐπότιζεν πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 2:24   | עַל כֵּן יָעֻזׁ אִישׁ<br>אֶת אָבִיו וְאֶת אִמּוֹ<br>וּדְבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ<br>וְהָיוּ [שְׁנֵיהֶם] לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד                                                                                            | ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος<br>τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα<br>καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.                                                                                          |
| 29:2–3 | וְהָאֵבֶן גְּדֹלָה עַל פִּי הַבְּאֵר<br>וְנֹאסְפוּ שָׁמָּה כָּל הָעֹדְרִים<br>וְגִלְלוּ אֶת הָאֵבֶן מֵעַל פִּי הַבְּאֵר<br>וְהִשְׁקוּ אֶת הָצֹאן וְהַשִּׁיבוּ אֶת הָאֵבֶן<br>עַל פִּי הַבְּאֵר לְמַקְמָהּ | λίθος δὲ ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι τοῦ φρέατος,<br>καὶ συνήγοντο ἐκεῖ πάντα τὰ ποιμνία<br>καὶ ἀπεκύλιον τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ φρέατος,<br>καὶ ἐπότιζον τὰ πρόβατα καὶ ἀπεκαθίστων τὸν λίθον<br>ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τοῦ φρέατος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ. |

**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

<sup>90</sup> 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 Voiteda, *Présent et imparfait*, 207–216.



|       |                                                            |                                                                                                                                          |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 20:7  | ועתה השב אשת האיש                                          | νῦν δὲ ἀπόδος τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ,                                                                                                    |
|       | כי נביא הוא ויתפלל בעדך ותיחיה                             | ὅτι προφήτης ἐστὶν καὶ <u>προσεύχεται</u> περὶ σοῦ καὶ <u>ζήσῃ</u> .                                                                     |
| 6:21  | ואתה קח לך מכל מאכל אשר יאכל ואספת אליך והיה לך ולהם לאכלה | σὺ δὲ <u>λήμψῃ</u> <sup>97</sup> σεαυτῶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν βρωμάτων, ἃ ἔδεσθε, καὶ συνάξεις πρὸς σεαυτόν, καὶ ἔσται σοὶ καὶ ἐκείνοις φαγεῖν. |
| 19:22 | מהר <u>המלט</u> שמה                                        | σπεῦσον οὖν τοῦ <u>σωθῆναι</u> ἐκεῖ.                                                                                                     |

In spite of G's consistent approach to translating Hebrew imperatives, Greek morphology requires him to choose between the aorist and present stems,<sup>98</sup> 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).<sup>99</sup> Yet, certain contrastive pairs demonstrate G's understanding of the difference and his capacity to select the most appropriate form in each case.

|       |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                           |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 21:12 | כל אשר תאמר אליך שרה <u>שמע</u> בקלה                                                  | πάντα, ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπῃ σοὶ Σάρρα, <u>ἄκουε</u> τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῆς,                                                              |
| 27:43 | ועתה בני <u>שמע</u> בקלי וקום ברח לך [פדנה ארם]                                       | νῦν οὖν, τέκνον, <u>ἄκουσόν</u> μου τῆς φωνῆς, καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπόδραθι εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν                                  |
| 16:6  | הנה שפחתך ב יד<י>ך הנה שפחתך ב יד<י>ך <u>עשי</u> לה הטוב בעיניך                       | Ἴδου ἡ παιδίσκῃ σου ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου. <u>χρῶ</u> αὐτῇ, ὡς ἂν σοὶ ἀρεστὸν ᾖ.                                             |
| 19:8  | הנה נא לי שתי בנות אשר לא ידעו איש אוציאה נא אתהן אליכם ו <u>עשו</u> להן כטוב בעיניכם | εἰσὶν δέ μοι δύο θυγατέρες, αἱ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἄνδρα. ἐξάξω αὐτάς πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ <u>χρήσασθε</u> αὐταῖς, καθὰ ἂν ἀρέσκη ὑμῖν. |

In both pairs, the Hebrew text presents the same idiom twice with no significant differences (שמע and עשה הטוב בעיני), 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 (ἄκουε,

<sup>97</sup> λήμψῃ also follows a prior future indicative, but not as closely as in 20:7, especially given that δέ creates separation. For the way this helps resolve the redundancy of God's commands to Noah, see §7.4.2.

<sup>98</sup> KG II §389.6C; Smyth §1864; SSG §§28dfc, ha(iii); K. L. McKay, "Aspect in Imperative Constructions in New Testament Greek," *NT* 27 [1985]: 201–226.

<sup>99</sup> The verbs are ἀκούω, γίνομαι, κατέχω, οἰκέω, κατοικέω, ὁράω, πληθύνω, ποιέω, πορεύομαι, φέρω, and χράομαι.

present) (21:12),<sup>100</sup> but when Rachel tells her son Jacob to run away from Esau, she requests his obedience at the particular moment (ἄκουσον, 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 (χρῶ, 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 (χρήσασθε, aorist) (19:8).

The Hebrew jussive, in turn, has two main uses based upon its grammatical person: (i) after לֹא, 2<sup>nd</sup>-person jussives express prohibitions and negative commands, thus suppling the Hebrew imperative paradigm;<sup>101</sup> (ii) 3<sup>rd</sup>-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.<sup>102</sup>

For 2<sup>nd</sup>-person jussives in prohibitions (27), G uses one of two Greek prohibition constructions: (i) [μὴ + present imperative] (12)<sup>103</sup> or (ii) [μὴ + aorist subjunctive] (14).<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> 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).

<sup>101</sup> *IBHS* §34.4; Joüon §114i. In Genesis, 2<sup>nd</sup> person jussives always follow לֹא, except in 24:8 (לֹא). Cf. Joüon §114l.

<sup>102</sup> *IBHS* §34.3; Joüon §114g–l.

<sup>103</sup> Most often, with יֹאמַר translated by φησέω (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).

<sup>104</sup> 18:3; 19:7, 8, 17+; 22:12+; 24:8; 26:2; 37:22+; 42:22; 45:9; 49:4. Cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 125, 126–127. In 47:29, G uses [τοῦ + aorist infinitive], interpreting the prohibition as causally or epexegetically subordinate to

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.<sup>105</sup> 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.

|       |                                                                                     |                                                                                                           |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15:1  | אל תִּירָא אַבְרָם<br>אנכי מגן לך שכרך הרבה מאד                                     | Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ἀβράμ· ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου.<br>ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα.                                  |
| 24:57 | אל תִּאָחֲזוּ אֹתִי וִיהוּהַ הַצִּלִּיחַ דַּרְכִּי<br>שלחוני ואלכה לאדני            | Μὴ κατέχετε με, καὶ κύριος εὐόδωσεν τὴν ὁδόν μου.<br>ἐκπέμψατέ με, ἵνα ἀπέλθω πρὸς τὸν κύριόν μου.        |
| 37:22 | אל תִּשְׁפְּכוּ דָם<br>השליכו אותו אל הבור הזה אשר במדבר<br>ויד אל תִּשְׁלַחוּ בּוֹ | Μὴ ἐκχέητε αἷμα·<br>ἐμβάλετε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν λάκκον τοῦτον τὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,<br>χεῖρα δὲ μὴ ἐπενέγκητε αὐτῷ. |

By using the present imperative in 15:1 and 24:57, G has God tell Abraham not to be afraid (because he is),<sup>106</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup>-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.

<sup>105</sup> KG II §397.3; Smyth §§1840–1841; *SSG* §29e.

<sup>106</sup> For the connection between Abraham's fear and the preceding episodes, see §8.3.1.

imperative for commands and prohibitions (49),<sup>107</sup> 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),<sup>108</sup> usually where God is the subject (9:27a; 48:16a) or the speaker is not in control (48:16b),<sup>109</sup> 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).<sup>110</sup>

|          |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1:3      | ויאמר אלהים יהי אור ויהי אור                                                    | αἱ εἶπεν ὁ θεός <u>Γενηθήτω</u> φῶς. καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς.                                                                                                                 |
| 38:24    | זנתה תמר כלתך<br>וגם הנה הרר לזנונים<br>ויאמר יהודה הוציאוה ותשרף               | Ἐκπεπόρνευκεν Θαμάρ ἡ νύμφη σου,<br>καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει ἐκ πορνείας.<br>εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας Ἐξαγάγετε αὐτήν, καὶ <u>κατακαυθήτω</u> .                                 |
| 9:27     | יפת אלהים ליפת<br>וישכן באהלי שם<br>ויהי כנען עבד למו                           | <u>πλατύναι</u> ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰάφεθ<br>καὶ <u>κατοικησάτω</u> ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τοῦ Σήμ,<br>καὶ <u>γενηθήτω</u> Χανάαν παῖς αὐτῶν.                                           |
| 48:15–16 | האלהים ... האלהים ... המלאך<br>יברך את הנערים [האלה]<br>וידגו לרב בקרב הארץ     | Ὁ θεός ... ὁ θεός ... ὁ ἄγγελος ...<br><u>εὐλογῆσαι</u> τὰ παιδία ταῦτα, ...<br>καὶ <u>πληθυνθείησαν</u> εἰς πλῆθος πολὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.                                 |
| 4:11–12  | ועתה ארור אתה מן האדמה<br>כי תעבד את האדמה לא תספ תת כחה לך<br>נע וגד תהיה בארץ | καὶ νῦν ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ...<br>ὅτι <u>ἐργᾷ</u> τὴν γῆν, καὶ οὐ <u>προσθήσει</u> τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς δοῦναί σοι.<br>στένων καὶ τρέμων <u>ἔσῃ</u> ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. |

<sup>107</sup> Aorist imperative (35: 1:3, 6, 9+, 11, 14, 20, 24; 9:27+; 18:4; 23:9+; 24:55, 60; 26:28; 27:29, 31+; 30:24; 31:37; 33:14; 38:24; 41:33+, 34+, 35+; 42:16, 19; 44:18, 33; 45:5; 49:17); present imperative (14: 1:6, 22, 26; 13:8; 21:12; 24:51; 30:34; 31:35; 33:9; 34:21+; 37:27; 38:23; 47:5). Cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 127–128, 133.

<sup>108</sup> All aorist optative: 9:27; 16:5; 27:28; 28:3++, 4; 31:49; 43:14, 29; 48:16+, 20; 49:6[+].

<sup>109</sup> KG II §395.3–5; Smyth §§1814–1823; *SSG* §29db(i); Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 125–126, 183–187.

<sup>110</sup> 4:12; 9:26; 14:24; 19:20; 27:29+; 30:3; 31:53; 34:23; 42:20; 44:33; 47:4; 48:16; 49:26. Cf. *Verbal Syntax*, 121–122. G also uses several minor renderings of 3<sup>rd</sup> person jussives: the aorist subjunctive for impersonal prohibitions that G translates personally (2: 44:18; 45:20); elliptical translation of the impersonal construction ל אל יחר (2: 18:30, 32) as Μή τι; and a present participle (1:20) or aorist infinitive (42:16) where other syntactic transformations are involved.

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  $\text{יִסָּר}$  with the future indicative under the influence of the surrounding *yiqtol* forms, for which he also uses the future indicative.<sup>111</sup>

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);<sup>112</sup> (ii) in dependent clauses, to express purpose, result, or consecution.<sup>113</sup>

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  $\text{וְ}$ , and so are formally indistinguishable from independent clauses. Nevertheless, the independent-dependent distinction is useful for understanding Hebrew

---

<sup>111</sup> Of course, the future indicative may also have jussive force (see note 96).

<sup>112</sup> *IBHS* §34.5.1; Joüon §114b–f.

<sup>113</sup> 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.<sup>114</sup>

In its independent use, G uses mainly the hortatory subjunctive for the cohortative proper (22)<sup>115</sup> (19:32)<sup>116</sup> and the future indicative for the cohortative expressing a resolution (14)<sup>117</sup> (45:2),<sup>118</sup> but once the optative of wish (34:11).<sup>119</sup>

|       |                                                         |                                                                                                                        |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19:32 | לכה נשקה את אבינו יין<br>ונשכבה עמו<br>ונחיה מאבינו זרע | δεῦρο καὶ ποτίσωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν οἶνον<br>καὶ κοιμηθῶμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ ἐξαναστήσωμεν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σπέρμα. |
| 45:2  | ויאמר ישראל רב עוד יוסף בני חי<br>אלכה ואראנו בטרם אמות | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ Μέγα μοί ἐστιν, εἰ ἔτι ὁ υἱός μου Ἰωσήφ ζῇ.<br>πορευθεὶς ὄψομαι αὐτὸν πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν με.            |
| 34:11 | אמצא חן בעיניכם ואשר תאמרו אתן                          | Εὐροίμι χάριν ἐναντίον ὑμῶν, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπητε, δώσωμεν.                                                                |

<sup>114</sup> For the main equivalents (future indicative, aorist subjunctive), cf. Evans, *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).

<sup>115</sup> 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).

<sup>116</sup> KG II §394.4; Smyth §§1797–1799; *SSG* §29b(i).

<sup>117</sup> 18:5, 21; 19:8, 20; 32:20; 33:12, 15; 37:21; 45:28; 46:30, 31+; 50:5+; also, aorist circumstantial participles (5: 18:21; 33:12; 45:28; 46:31; 50:5).

<sup>118</sup> KG II §387.4; Smyth §1915; *SSG* §§28ge–gh. The use of the construction [οὐ μὴ + subjunctive] in 21:16 is similar to these resolutions with the future indicative.

<sup>119</sup> See note 108 above.

For the dependent use of the cohortative, G employs the subjunctive to express purpose or result explicitly (18)<sup>120</sup> (48:9; 29:21) and the future indicative to express consequence more weakly (31)<sup>121</sup> (26:3)

|        |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 48:9   | קחם נא אלי ואברכם                                                  | Προσάγαγέ μοι αὐτούς, ἵνα εὐλογῇσω αὐτούς.                                                                                        |
| 29:21  | הבה את אשתי כי מלאו ימי ואבואה אליה                                | Ἀπόδος τὴν γυναῖκά μου, πεπλήρωνται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι μου, ὅπως εἰσέλθω πρὸς αὐτήν.                                                   |
| 26:2-3 | אל תרד מצרימה שכן בארץ אשר אמר אליך גור בארץ הזאת ואהיה עמך ואברכך | Μὴ καταβῇς εἰς Αἴγυπτον· κατοικήσον δὲ ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἣ ἂν σοι εἴπω. καὶ παροίκει ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ, καὶ ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ καὶ εὐλογῇσω σε· |

That G intends the subjunctive to express purpose or result in these cases is confirmed by his rare translation of ו by ἵνα (48:9) or ὅπως (29:21).<sup>122</sup> 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.

<sup>120</sup> 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.

<sup>121</sup> 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.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. §4.1.1; Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 68–72.

**6.1.1.5 Qatal (910).** Hebrew qatal expresses perfective aspect,<sup>123</sup> and, as yiqtol and weqatal are often used in combination with similar meanings, so are qatal and wayyiqtol.<sup>124</sup> 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 ו and the verb (i.e., disjunctive syntax),<sup>125</sup> 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)<sup>126</sup> (78.6%) (**10:8; 21:1; 14:4b**)<sup>127</sup> or the imperfect indicative (50)<sup>128</sup> (11.3%) (**13:6; 14:4a**),<sup>129</sup> although he uses the imperfect more often for qatal (11.3%) than wayyiqtol (3.2%), since both qatal and the Greek imperfect frequently

---

<sup>123</sup> *IBHS* §§30.1–4; Joüon §112.

<sup>124</sup> *IBHS* §§32.2b; 32.2.1; 33.1.2e; Joüon §117a.

<sup>125</sup> On disjunctive syntax, see §4.1.1.1.

<sup>126</sup> To this could be added circumstantial participles with aorist indicatives: aorist participle (2: **8:9; 44:4** [gen. absolute]); present participle (**29:32**).

<sup>127</sup> Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 122, 133.

<sup>128</sup> For εἰμί, 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**.

<sup>129</sup> Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 155–169; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 120–121.

present background or subsidiary information.<sup>130</sup> Once, G uses the historical present for Hebrew qatal (33:17).<sup>131</sup>

|       |                                                                     |                                                                                                               |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:8  | וכוש ילד את נמרד<br>הוא החל להיות גבר בארץ                          | Χοὺς δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Νεβρώδ<br>οὗτος ἤρξατο εἶναι γίγας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς                                          |
| 21:1  | ויהוה פקד את שרה כאשר אמר<br>ויעש יהוה לשרה כאשר דבר                | Καὶ κύριος ἐπεσκέψατο τὴν Σάρραν καθὰ εἶπεν<br>καὶ ἐποίησεν κύριος τῇ Σάρρα καθὰ ἐλάλησεν                     |
| 13:6  | ולא נשא אתם הארץ לשבת יחדו<br>כי היה רכושם רב<br>ולא יכלו לשבת יחדו | καὶ οὐκ ἐχώρει αὐτοὺς ἡ γῆ κατοικεῖν ἅμα<br>ὅτι ἦν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῶν πολλά<br>καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο κατοικεῖν ἅμα |
| 14:4  | שתים עשרה שנה עבדו את כדורלעמר<br>ושלש עשרה שנה מרדו                | δώδεκα ἔτη ἐδούλευον τῷ Χοδολλογόμορ<br>τῷ δὲ τρισκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει ἀπέστησαν                                    |
| 33:17 | ויעקב נסע סכתה                                                      | Καὶ Ἰακώβ ἀπαίρει εἰς Σκηνάς.                                                                                 |

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 ἐγένετο μάχη) and then ultimate separation.<sup>132</sup> In 14:4, in turn, the twelve years of servitude expressed by the imperfect (ἐδούλευον) anticipate a thirteenth year of revolt (ἀπέστησαν).

<sup>130</sup> 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 ἴσθημι (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: 6:9; 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.

<sup>131</sup> Voityla, *Présent et imparfait*, 97–98. Cf. note 23.

<sup>132</sup> 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)<sup>133</sup> (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,<sup>134</sup> a point which helps explain the fact that G basically does not use the imperfect indicative for qatal in speech (9) (1.9%).<sup>135</sup> 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)<sup>136</sup> (18.1%), present (32)<sup>137</sup> (6.8%), and future (7)<sup>138</sup> (1.5%).<sup>139</sup> This fact reflects G's accurate interpretation of qatal in speech, which is often resultative, stative, or

---

<sup>133</sup> Also, circumstantial participles with the aorist indicative (3: 20:10; 27:35; 49:9).

<sup>134</sup> In a similar way, Voitiła 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).

<sup>135</sup> 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 οἶδα twice ([18:19]; 28:16).

<sup>136</sup> 1:29; 3:22; 9:2, 3; 16:5; 17:5, 20; 18:5, 12, 13, 20; 20:9, 16; 21:17; 22:20; 23:11; 24:27, 30, 31, [44]; 26:28; 27:2, 19, 36+, 45, 46; 29:21, 34; 30:16, 20, 26+, 29; 31:1+, 6+, 12, 15+, 16, 30, 39; 32:10; 33:8, 10; 34:30; 35:12; 37:17; 38:23+, 24, 26; 39:9; 41:15+, 28; 42:2, 7, 9, 14, 30; 43:3, 14+, 22; 44:5+, 15, 28, 32; 45:8, 16; 46:31, 32; 47:4, 5, 9, 15, 16, 18, 23, 25, 29; 48:19+.

<sup>137</sup> 4:9, 14; 9:13; 12:11; 16:5, 8; 18:21, 31; 19:19; 21:7; 23:11; 27:2, 4, 9; 29:5+; 30:13, 26, 29; 32:4, 10; 38:22; 39:8; 41:41; 42:11, 31; 44:27; 45:9; 46:34; 47:5, 18; 48:2, 22. Cf. Voitiła, *Présent et imparfait*, 55–68, 75–76.

<sup>138</sup> 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).

<sup>139</sup> 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.<sup>140</sup> 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.<sup>141</sup>

|       |                                                           |                                                                                                                     |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18:20 | זעקת סדם ועמרה כי רבה<br>וחטאתם כי כבדה מאד               | Κραυγὴ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας <u>πεπλήθυνται</u> ,<br>καὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν μεγάλαι σφόδρα·                           |
| 31:15 | הלוא כנכריות נחשבנו לו<br>כי מכרנו ויאכל גם אכול את כספנו | οὐχ ὥς αἱ ἀλλότριαι <u>λελογίσμεθα</u> αὐτῷ;<br><u>πέπρακεν</u> γὰρ ἡμᾶς καὶ κατέφαγεν καταβρώσει τὸ ἀργύριον ἡμῶν. |
| 16:8  | הגר שפחת שרי אי מזה באת ואנה תלכי                         | Ἀλλὰ παιδίσκη Σάρας, πόθεν <u>ἔρχη</u> καὶ ποῦ πορεύῃ;                                                              |

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” (πέπρακεν) and disinherited them. In 16:8, however, G uses the present πόθεν ἔρχη (“where are you coming from”) to capture the resultative idea of the qatal באת in idiomatic Greek.<sup>142</sup>

Similarly, G makes appropriate use of the perfect and present indicative to translate certain Hebrew stative verbs in speech,<sup>143</sup> most commonly ידע (“know”) (15)<sup>144</sup> (12:11;

<sup>140</sup> *IBHS* §§30.5.1c–e, 2b, 3c; Joüon §§112a, f–i.

<sup>141</sup> *KG II* §§382.3–4; 384.1–4; Smyth §§1885–1888; 1945–1947; *SSG* §28b(i), b(vi), ea.

<sup>142</sup> *KG II* §382.4b; Smyth §1886; *SSG* §28b(vi).

<sup>143</sup> Cf. note 141 (above) and *SSG* §28ec.

<sup>144</sup> Present indicative (10: 4:9; 12:11; 27:2; 29:5+; 30:26, 29; 39:8; 44:27; 47:5); perfect indicative (5: 31:6; 43:22; 44:15; 48:19+).

43:22), but also others, e.g., זקן (“be old”) (18:13),<sup>145</sup> הרה (“be pregnant”) (16:5), and קוץ (“be angry”) (27:46).

|       |                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                         |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12:11 | ידעתי כי אשה יפת מראה את                                                                 | Γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι γυνή εὐπρόσωπος εἴ·                                                                                                     |
| 43:22 | לא ידענו מי שם כספנו באמתחתינו                                                           | οὐκ οἶδαμεν, τίς ἐνέβαλεν τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τοὺς μαρσίππους ἡμῶν.                                                                         |
| 18:13 | האף אמנם אלד ואני זקנתי                                                                  | Ἄρά γε ἀληθῶς τέξομαι; ἐγὼ δὲ γεγήρακα.                                                                                                 |
| 16:5  | חמסי עליך אנכי נתתי שפחתי בחיקך<br>ותרא כי הרתה ואקל בעיניה                              | Ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ ἐγὼ δέδωκα τὴν παιδίσκην μου εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου<br>ἰδοῦσα δὲ ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει ἡτιμάσθην ἐναντίον αὐτῆς               |
| 27:46 | קצתי בחיי מפני בנות בני חת<br>אם לקח יעקב אשה<br>מבנות חת כאלה מבנות הארץ<br>למה לי חיים | Προσώχθικα τῇ ζωῇ μου διὰ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν υἱῶν Χέτ<br>εἰ λήμψεται Ἰακώβ γυναῖκα<br>ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων τῆς γῆς ταύτης<br>ἵνα τί μοι ζῆν |

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 1<sup>st</sup>-person verbs γεγήρακα (“I am so old”) and προσώχθικα (“I am vexed”), he uses the Greek perfect in particular to convey Sarah’s extreme age (18:13)<sup>146</sup> and the bitter intensity of Rachel’s emotional pain that Jacob has no suitable bride (27:46).<sup>147</sup>

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.<sup>148</sup>

<sup>145</sup> Cf. also 27:2 and the stative adjective πρεσβύτερος (3: 18:21; 19:31; 24:1).

<sup>146</sup> The perfect indicative reinforces the skepticism Sarah has already conveyed with Ἄρά γε ἀληθῶς (“really truly?”). For the way G uses this to contrast the faith of Sarah and Abraham and its significance for the larger plot of the Abraham narrative, see §8.3.2.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. notes 141–143 (above) and Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 38 (§10.2).

<sup>148</sup> The performative use of the Greek perfect indicative has only been recognized recently by grammarians (SSG §28eb; Anssi Voita, “The Use of Tenses in the L- and B-texts in the Kaige-section of 2 Reigns,” in *Die*

|       |                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 17:5  | ולא יקרא עוד את שמך אברהם<br>והיה שמך אברהם<br>כי אב המון גוים נתיך | καὶ οὐ κληθήσεται ἔτι τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἀβράμ<br>ἀλλ' ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἀβραάμ<br>ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε |
| 47:23 | הן קניתי אתכם היום ואת אדמתכם לפרעה                                 | Ἴδου κέκτημαι ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν σήμερον τῷ Φαραώ                                                             |
| 41:41 | ראה נתתי אתך על כל ארץ מצרים                                        | Ἴδου καθίστημί σε σήμερον ἐπὶ πάσης γῆς Αἰγύπτου                                                                 |
| 43:23 | כספכם בא אלי<br>ויוצא אלהם את שמעון                                 | τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν εὐδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχω<br>καὶ ἐξήγαγεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν Συμεών                                      |

In 17:5, God “makes” (τέθεικά) Abraham into a father of many nations as he gives him a new name; in 47:23, Joseph formally “acquires” (κέκτημαι) the Egyptians and their land “today” (σήμερον); in 41:41 Pharaoh “appoints” (καθίστημί) Joseph as second in command over all of Egypt; and in 43:23, Joseph formally “acknowledges receipt” (εὐδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχω) of the money his brothers believe to have stolen.<sup>149</sup> 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 (τέθεικα, 17:5); Isaac (εὐλόγηκα, 26:24); and Jacob (δέδωκα, 35:12).<sup>150</sup>

*Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.-25. Juli 2010*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, et al., WUNT 286 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 229–230). Since the status of an utterance as performative is pragmatically and contextually determined, this label requires defense in each case, but for a list of relatively sure cases (13), see perfect (8: 1:29; 9:2, 3; 17:5, 20; 38:26; 47:23, 25); present (5: 9:13; 23:11; 41:41; 43:23; 48:11).

<sup>149</sup> 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).

<sup>150</sup> 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.<sup>151</sup> Though the uses of the participle overlap to some extent,<sup>152</sup> 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;<sup>153</sup> and the verbal use as (iv) a predicate.<sup>154</sup> 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.

---

<sup>151</sup> *IBHS* §37.1; Joüon §§121a, k.

<sup>152</sup> 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.

<sup>153</sup> *IBHS* §§37.2, 4–5; Joüon §§121i–r.

<sup>154</sup> *IBHS* §37.6; Joüon §§121c–h.

For Hebrew substantival participles (44), G typically uses Greek nouns (42)<sup>155</sup> (42:9), and for Hebrew adjectival participles (40), he typically uses Greek adjectives (30)<sup>156</sup> (41:39), but also perfect and present participles (9)<sup>157</sup> (18:11), which are strongly adjectival.<sup>158</sup>

42:9 מרגלים אתם לראות את ערות הארץ באתם *Κατάσκοποι* έστε· κατανοῆσαι τὰ ἔχνη τῆς χώρας ἤκατε.

41:39 אין [איש] נבון וחכם כמוד *οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος φρονιμώτερος καὶ συνετώτερός σου·*

18:11 ואברהם ושרה זקנים באים בימים *Ἀβραὰμ δὲ καὶ Σάρρα πρεσβύτεροι προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν*

For Hebrew participles functioning as a relative (123), however, G normally uses a Greek participle (108),<sup>159</sup> which may function similarly as an alternative to a relative clause.<sup>160</sup>

Most often, he inflects the participle in the present (76)<sup>161</sup> (27:29) or perfect (7)<sup>162</sup> (19:14), which appropriately corresponds to the Hebrew participle's tendency to express general

<sup>155</sup> 4:2, 9, 22+; 13:7+, 8+; 21:16, 20; 23:3, 4, 6+, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16; 26:20+; [29:8]; 31:26, 39+; [33:14]; 35:17; 37:28; 38:28; 39:20; 42:9, 11, 14, 16, 31, 34; 46:32, 34; 47:3; 49:17; 50:2+. Cf. §5.1.1.2. For exceptions (2), see 4:7; 24:60.

<sup>156</sup> 2:9; 3:6, 14, 17; 4:11; 9:25, 26; 14:20; 24:27, 31; 26:29; 27:29; 28:17; 30:32, 33, 35+, 39, 42; 32:8; 41:6, [7], 23, [24], 27, 32, 33, 39; [43:28]; 49:7. Cf. §5.1.1.2.

<sup>157</sup> 14:19; 15:9++; 18:11; 20:3; 27:29; 30:33; 39:2.

<sup>158</sup> KG II §389.6E; Smyth §1872. For the contextual significance of the one exception (20:16), see §8.3.2.

<sup>159</sup> For an overview of G's use of the participle, including as a translation of the Hebrew participle, see Takamitsu Muraoka, "Syntax of the Participle in the Septuagint Books of Genesis and Isaiah," 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), 185–202.

<sup>160</sup> KG II §554.1; Smyth §§2050a; 2488; *SSG* §31cb.

<sup>161</sup> 1:11+, 12+, 26, 28, 29, 30; 2:11, 13, 14; 3:5, 8, [10], 24; 4:14, 15, 20; [6:20]; 7:14, 16, 21+; 8:17, 19; 9:6; 12:3[+]; 13:5; 14:7; 16:13; 18:25; 19:25; 21:9; 23:10, 18; 24:11, 65; 25:27; 26:11; 27:6, 12, 29+; 30:41; 31:10, 12; 32:15, 19, 20; 34:24, 30; 36:20; 37:17; 38:12; 40:8, 10; 41:8, 15, 24, 27, 35; 42:5, 30; 43:32; 45:12, 23+; 48:15, 16; 49:10, 11, 14, 17, 21, 25.

<sup>162</sup> 19:14; 25:27; [32:1]; 45:1; 49:21, 22+.

circumstances and states,<sup>163</sup> but he also uses the aorist (25)<sup>164</sup> (21:3), since the temporal and aspectual value of the Hebrew relative participle is ultimately determined by each context.<sup>165</sup>

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)<sup>166</sup> (14:22).

|       |                                                                                         |                                                                                                  |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 27:29 | אֲרִיךְ אֲרוּר וּמְבֹרָכִךְ בְּרוּךְ                                                    | ὁ καταρῶμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος, ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε εὐλογημένος.                                      |
| 19:14 | וַיֵּצֵא לוֹט וַיְדַבֵּר אֶל חֲתָנָיו<br>לְקַח בְּנָתָיו                                | ἐξῆλθεν δὲ Λῶτ καὶ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς γαμβροὺς αὐτοῦ<br>τοὺς εἰληφότας τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτοῦ       |
| 21:3  | וַיִּקְרָא אַבְרָהָם אֶת שֵׁם בְּנוֹ הַנּוֹלֵד לוֹ<br>אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה לוֹ שָׂרָה יִצְחָק | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου αὐτοῦ,<br>ὃν ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ Σάρρα, Ἰσαάκ. |
| 14:22 | הֲרִימְתִּי יָדִי אֶל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ<br>כִּנְהָ שְׂמִים וְאֶרֶץ                      | Ἐκτενῶ τὴν χεῖρά μου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὑψιστον,<br>ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν            |

Finally, when the Hebrew participle functions as a predicate (159),<sup>167</sup> 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.<sup>168</sup> Since the Hebrew predicative participle typically expresses durative

<sup>163</sup> *IBHS* §37.1f.

<sup>164</sup> 4:15, 21; 9:10, 18; 12:7; 14:10; 16:13; 21:3; 27:33; 30:36; [31:13]; 32:9; 35:1, 3; 36:35; 42:29; 43:12, 18; 46:8, 26+; 47:14; 48:5; 49:24; 50:14.

<sup>165</sup> Joüon §121i.

<sup>166</sup> 14:19, 22; 19:15; 21:6; 32:13; 38:29; 42:6. Only the final case (42:6) does not occur in a relative clause in Greek. A few exceptional cases (8) involve a Greek noun (6: 1:21, 29; 24:2; 45:8; 49:15; 50:11), adjective (23:16), or infinitive (19:14).

<sup>167</sup> This includes a handful of cases where the participle is paired with a form of הִיה 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).

<sup>168</sup> KG II §480.1; Smyth §2042; *SSG* §31g.

or progressive aspect when it has past and present reference,<sup>169</sup> but often the immanent future when it has future reference,<sup>170</sup> G generally uses the present (54)<sup>171</sup> (4:10; 20:3), future (13)<sup>172</sup> (15:14), or perfect indicative (5)<sup>173</sup> (42:38) for predicative participles in direct speech and the imperfect (37)<sup>174</sup> (24:21) or present indicative (8)<sup>175</sup> (2:10) for predicative participles in narration.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> *IBHS* §§37.6b–e; Joüon §121c–d, f.

<sup>170</sup> *IBHS* §37.6f; Joüon §121e.

<sup>171</sup> 4:10; 6:13+, 17; 7:4; 9:9, 12; 13:15; 15:2; 16:8; 18:17; 19:13, 14; 20:3, 7; 24:3, 13, 37, 42+, 49; 25:32; 27:8, 42; 28:13, 20; 29:33; 31:5, 12, 43; 32:6, [20]; 33:13+; 37:13, 16+, 19; 38:13; 41:9, 25, 28, 29; 42:22; 43:4, 5, 18; 44:30; 45:12, 26; 48:1, 21; 49:29; 50:24. Cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 119, 133; Voityla, *Présent et imparfait*, 24–43.

<sup>172</sup> 15:3, 14; 17:19; [24:43]; 27:46; 30:1; 37:30; 41:32; 48:4; future periphrasis (4: 4:12+, 14+) (*SSG* §31fc; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 239–242).

<sup>173</sup> 24:13, 43; 32:18; 34:22; 42:38.

<sup>174</sup> 1:2; 13:7; 14:13; 18:16; 19:1; 23:10; 24:15, 21+, 62; 25:28; 26:13; 28:12++; 29:6, 9; 30:36; 32:31; 34:19; 37:25++; 39:6, 23+; 41:2, 3, 5, 6; 47:14; imperfect periphrasis (6: 4:2, 17; 14:12; 29:2; 37:2; 39:23) (*SSG* §31fb; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 234–239). Similarly, G only uses the imperfect indicative in speech when a character is recounting a story (7: 24:45; 37:9; 40:17; 41:18, 19, 22, 23). Cf. *Verbal Syntax*, 121; Voityla, *Présent et imparfait*, 119–121, 146–154.

<sup>175</sup> 2:10; 15:12; 29:31; 31:20; 39:3, 20, 22; 42:23. Cf. Voityla, *Présent et imparfait*, 74–75, 86–87, 96–97.

<sup>176</sup> 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); 3<sup>rd</sup>-person imperative periphrasis in speech (2: 1:5; 27:33); and pluperfect periphrasis in narration (2: 18:22; 40:6). Cf. *SSG* §§31fd, fh; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 234, 245–246. For non-verbal renderings (prepositional phrase (34:25) and omission (39:22)), see §5.1.1.2.

|       |                                      |                                                                        |
|-------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4:10  | מה עשית קול דמי אחיך                 | Τί ἐποίησας; φωνή αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου                              |
|       | צעקים אלי מן האדמה                   | βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς.                                                |
| 20:3  | הנך מת על האשה אשר לקחת              | Ἴδού σὺ ἀποθνήσκεις περὶ τῆς γυναικός, ἣς ἔλαβες,                      |
| 15:14 | וגם את הגוי אשר יעבדו בן אנכי        | τὸ δὲ ἔθνος, ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύσωσιν, <u>κρινῶ</u> ἐγώ·                      |
| 42:38 | לא ירד בני עמכם                      | Οὐ καταβήσεται ὁ υἱός μου μεθ' ὑμῶν,                                   |
|       | כי אחיו מת והוא לבדו נשאר            | ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπέθανεν καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος <u>καταλέλειπται</u> ·    |
| 24:21 | והאיש משתאה לה                       | ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος <u>κατεμάνθανεν</u> αὐτήν,                               |
|       | [ו]מחריש לדעת ההצליח יהוה דרכו אם לא | καὶ <u>παρεσιώπα</u> τοῦ γῶναι εἰ εὐόδωκεν κύριος τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἢ οὐ. |
| 2:10  | ונהר יצא מעדן להשקות את הגן          | ποταμὸς δὲ <u>ἐκπορεύεται</u> ἐξ Ἑδεμ ποτίζειν τὸν παράδεισον·         |

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),<sup>177</sup> usually when it occurs in a genitive absolute (29:9) or after a verb of perception (24:63).<sup>178</sup> 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.<sup>179</sup>

|       |                                 |                                                                |
|-------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 29:9  | עודנו מדבר עמם                  | ἔτι αὐτοῦ <u>λαλοῦντος</u> αὐτοῖς                              |
|       | ורחל [בת לבן] באה               | καὶ Παχὴλ ἡ θυγάτηρ Λαβὰν ἤρχετο ...                           |
| 24:63 | וישא עיניו וירא והנה גמלים באים | καὶ ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδεν καμήλους <u>ἐρχομένας</u> . |
| 25:26 | ואחרי כן יצא אחיו               | καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ,                        |
|       | וידו אחוזת בעקב עשו             | καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ <u>ἐπείλημμένη</u> τῆς πτέρνης Ἡσαΐ·          |

<sup>177</sup> 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).

<sup>178</sup> KG II §482.1; Smyth §§2110–2115; SSG §31gd.

<sup>179</sup> 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,<sup>180</sup> although its most common position in Genesis (as elsewhere) is after a preposition to introduce a subordinate clause (420) (94.0%).<sup>181</sup> If one excludes G's regular translation of לאמר with a form of the participle λέγων (78),<sup>182</sup> 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,<sup>183</sup> but also in very specific contexts that include but are not limited to: after volitional verbs (24:8)<sup>184</sup> or verbs of capacity (34:14a);<sup>185</sup> epexegetically after substantives (34:14b);<sup>186</sup> to express purpose or result (32:5; 37:18);<sup>187</sup> after verbs of hindering (20:6);<sup>188</sup> and after prepositions (11:25).<sup>189</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> *IBHS* §36.2.1; Joüon §§124a–d.

<sup>181</sup> *IBHS* §§36.2.2–3; Joüon §§124k–l. This count includes infinitives construct after the following compound prepositions or functionally similar combinations (12): ביום (6: 2:4, 17; 3:5; 5:1, 2; 21:8); לעת (2: 24:11; 31:10); לפני (2: 13:10; 36:31); בעת (38:27); בכל (30:41).

<sup>182</sup> This equivalence has already been discussed in §3.1.1.2.

<sup>183</sup> KG II §471.3; Smyth §1968; *SSG* §30a.

<sup>184</sup> KG II §473.2; Smyth §§1991–1999; *SSG* §30bef.

<sup>185</sup> KG II §473.3; Smyth §2000; *SSG* §30bef.

<sup>186</sup> KG II §§473.5–6; Smyth §§2001–2007; *SSG* §30bc.

<sup>187</sup> KG II §§473.7; 478.4c; Smyth §§2008–2011; 1408; 2032e; *SSG* §30ba–bb.

<sup>188</sup> KG §§514.1–5; Smyth §§1392–1400; 2032d; 2038; 2739–2744; *SSG* §30c.

<sup>189</sup> KG II §478.4b; Smyth §2034b; *SSG* §30aba.

|        |                                                                  |                                                                                                      |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 24:8   | ... ואם לא תאבה האשה ללכת אחריו ...                              | ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλῃ ἡ γυνὴ πορευθῆναι μετὰ σοῦ ...                                                        |
| 34:14a | לא נוכל לעשות הדבר הזה                                           | Οὐ δυνασόμεθα ποιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο,                                                                 |
| 14b    | לתת את אחתנו לאיש אשר לו ערלה                                    | δοῦναι τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ, ὃς ἔχει ἀκροβυστίαν.                                                |
| 32:5   | ואשלחה להגיד לאדני לעשו                                          | καὶ ἀπέστειλα ἀναγγεῖλαι τῷ κυρίῳ μου Ἡσαΐ                                                           |
| 37:18  | ויתנכלו אתו להמיתו                                               | καὶ ἐπονηρεύοντο τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν.                                                               |
| 20:6   | גם אנכי ידעתי כי בתם לבבך עשית זאת<br>ואחשך גם אנכי אותך מחטן לי | Κἀγὼ ἔγνων ὅτι ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ ἐποίησας τοῦτο,<br>καὶ ἐφεισάμην ἐγὼ σοῦ τοῦ μὴ ἀμαρτεῖν σε εἰς ἐμέ. |
| 11:25  | ויחי נחור אחרי הולידו את תרח<br>תשע עשרה שנה ומאת שנה ...        | καὶ ἔζησεν Ναχώρ μετὰ τὸ γεννησάμεν αὐτὸν τὸν Θάρα<br>ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑννέα, ...                   |

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),<sup>190</sup> 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).

<sup>190</sup> [1:14]; 3:17; 14:17+; 15:10, 12; 18:2, 12; 19:1; 23:13; 24:17, 32, 62, 63, 65; 27:5, 6; 29:13; 30:16; 32:6, 24; 33:4; 35:16, 17; 38:21; 39:14; 46:29; 47:24.

infinitives: ל (167/195);<sup>191</sup> אחר (20/22);<sup>192</sup> מן (12/14);<sup>193</sup> עד (9/10);<sup>194</sup> לבלתי (4);<sup>195</sup> לפני (2);<sup>196</sup> על (41:32)<sup>197</sup>

finite verbs: ב (21/42);<sup>198</sup> כ (13/15);<sup>199</sup> ביום (6);<sup>200</sup> בעת (2: 31:10; 38:27); לעת (24:11)

participles: only after ל (14)<sup>201</sup> and כ (3: 27:5; 30:38; 50:17)<sup>202</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> 1:14, 15, 17, 18+; 2:3, 5, 10, 15+, 19; 3:6, 22, 23, 24; 4:2, 11, 26; 6:1, 17, 20; 7:3; [8:7], 8, 21+; 9:11, 15, 16; 10:8; 11:5, 6+, 31; 12:5, 10, 11; 13:6+, 16; 15:5, 7+; 16:3; 17:7; 18:7, 11, 19, 25, 27, 29, 31; 19:9+, 13, 19+, 20, 22, 30; [20:2], 6; 22:10; 23:2+, 8; 24:5, 8, 13, 20, 21, 23, 25, 33, [43], 48, 63; 25:22, 24, 32; 26:7; 27:5, 42; 28:4, 6, 20+; 29:26; 30:38+, 41; 31:7, 18, 19, 28, 29, 35; 32:5; 34:1, 6, 14+, 15, 17, 19, 22+, 30; 35:16; 36:7; 37:10, 12, 18, 25+, 35+; 38:13, 20, 26; 39:10+, 11, 14, 17; 41:15, 32, 49, 54, 57; 42:3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 25+, 27; 43:2, 18++, 20, 22, 30, 32; 44:22, 23, 26+; 45:1, 3, 7+, 27; 46:5, 28; 47:4, 29; 48:7, 10, 17; 49:15; 50:2, 7, 14. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 20–75. In his extended discussion of the Hebrew construction [ל + infinitive construct], Soisalon-Soininen distinguishes more finely between (i) independent, (ii) adnominal, and (iii) adverbial cases.

<sup>192</sup> 5:4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 30; 11:11, 13[+], 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25; 13:14; 14:17. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 115–116.

<sup>193</sup> 4:13; 16:2; 20:6; 23:6; 27:1; 29:19, 35; 30:9; 36:7; 44:7, 17; 46:3. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 100–110.

<sup>194</sup> 3:19; 8:7; 19:22; 27:45; 33:3; 34:5; 38:17; 43:25; 48:5. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 110–115.

<sup>195</sup> 3:11; 4:15; 19:21; 38:9. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 75, 78–80.

<sup>196</sup> 13:10; 36:31. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 116–117.

<sup>197</sup> Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 118–119.

<sup>198</sup> 2:4; 12:4; 16:16; 17:24, 25; 21:5; 25:20, 26; 30:41, 42; 33:18; 34:25; 35:9, 21; 36:24; 38:5; 41:46; 42:15, 21; 45:1; 48:7. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 80–93.

<sup>199</sup> 12:14; 19:17; 24:30+; 27:34; 29:13; 33:10; 34:7; 39:10, 13, [18], 19; 44:30. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 93–100.

<sup>200</sup> 2:4, 17; 3:5; 5:1, 2; 21:8. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 24–27. While Soisalon-Soininen treats the Hebrew infinitive construct after ביום, בעת, and לעת apart from infinitives construct after כ 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.

<sup>201</sup> 11:8; 17:22; 18:16, 33; 19:11; [24:14], 15, 18, 22, 45; 27:30; 34:7; 43:6; 49:33. Cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 38–39, 59, 65–66.

<sup>202</sup> Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 89–91. G also uses the Greek infinitive for Hebrew infinitives construct after the prepositions כ (18: 4:8; 9:14; 11:2; 19:29+, 33+, 35+; 28:6; 32:19, 25; 34:22; 35:1, 7, 17, 18; 38:28) and כ (2: 39:15; 44:31), and Greek finite verbs for Hebrew infinitives construct after the prepositions ל (14: 6:19; 19:31; 24:19; 27:20; 30:15; 31:26; 32:5; 33:8; 37:22; [39:17]; 41:16; 42:22; 50:16, 20), אחר (2: 41:39; 46:30), מן (2: 18:25; 31:29), and עד (39:16).



Further analysis reveals that where G regularly selects a Greek finite verb, the preposition governing the Hebrew infinitive construct is almost exclusively temporal,<sup>203</sup> largely because Greek does not normally use the construction [ἐν τῷ + infinitive] for temporal clauses.<sup>204</sup>

|          |                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                   |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12:4     | ואברם בן חמש שנים<br>ושבעים שנה בצאתו מחרן                                | Ἀβράμ δὲ ἦν ἐτῶν ἐβδομήκοντα πέντε,<br>ὅτε ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ Χαρράν.                                                                                     |
| 39:13–14 | ויהי כראותה כי עוב בגדו בידה<br>וינס [ויצא] החוצה<br>ותקרא לאנשי ביתה ... | καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς εἶδεν ὅτι κατέλιπεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῆς<br>καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω,<br>καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ... |
| 5:1      | ביום ברא אלהים אדם<br>בדמות אלהים עשה אתו                                 | ἡ ἡμέρᾳ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀδάμ,<br>κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν.                                                                             |
| 39:27    | ויהי בעת לדתה<br>והנה תאומים בבטנה                                        | Ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἔτικτεν,<br>καὶ τῇδε ἦν δίδυμα ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ αὐτῆς.                                                                               |

G typically translates a Hebrew infinitive construct with a Greek supplementary participle after verbs of cessation or exhaustion (11)<sup>205</sup> (24:22), the regular construction in Greek,<sup>206</sup> but also where he prefers another type of supplementary participle (18:16; 27:5), a

<sup>203</sup> IBHS §§36.2.2b; 11.2.5c, 9e; cf. Joüon §124k. G takes the preposition כ conditionally in 42:15, and he takes the preposition כ conditionally in 44:30 and comparatively in 33:10.

<sup>204</sup> 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 [כ + 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).

<sup>205</sup> 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).

<sup>206</sup> KG II §482.6; Smyth §2098; SSG §31e.

circumstantial participle (43:6; also 34:7),<sup>207</sup> or a genitive absolute (after temporal כ: 50:17; also 30:38).

|       |                                         |                                                                             |
|-------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 24:22 | ... הגמלים לשתות [כל] כלו ויהי כאשר כלו | ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἐπαύσαντο πᾶσαι αἱ κάμηλοι πίνουσαι, ...                   |
| 18:16 | ואברהם הלך עמם לשלחם                    | Ἀβραὰμ δὲ συνεπορεύετο μετ' αὐτῶν συμπροπέμπων <sup>208</sup> αὐτούς.       |
| 27:5  | ורבקה שמעת בדבר יצחק אל עשו בנו         | Ῥεβέκκα δὲ ἤκουσεν λαλοῦντος <sup>209</sup> Ἰσαὰκ πρὸς Ἡσαὺ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. |
| 43:6  | למה הרעתם לי להגיד לאיש העוד לכם        | Τί ἐκακοποιήσατέ με ἀναγγέιλαντες τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ εἰ ἔστιν ὑμῖν                  |
|       | חא                                      | ἀδελφός;                                                                    |
| 50:17 | ויבך יוסף בדברם אליו                    | καὶ ἔκλαυσεν Ἰωσήφ λαλοῦντων αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτόν.                              |

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).<sup>210</sup> 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.

<sup>207</sup> After ל (4: 18:16; 19:11; 34:7; 43:6); after כ (27:5).

<sup>208</sup> For the supplementary participle after verbs of motion, see KG §482.10; Smyth §2099; *SSG* §§31e; 70ae.

<sup>209</sup> For the supplementary participle after verbs of perception, see KG II §482.1; Smyth §§2110–2115; *SSG* §§31e; 70a.

<sup>210</sup> Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 147–152; Muraoka, “The Infinitive in the Septuagint,” 266–267.

|        |                                           |                                                                                      |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 37:35a | ויקמו כל בניו ובנותיו<br>לנחמו            | συνήχθησαν δὲ πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες,<br>καὶ ἦλθον παρακαλέσαι αὐτόν, |
| 35b    | וימאן להתנחם                              | καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν παρακαλεῖσθαι                                                         |
| 39:14  | ראו הביא לנו איש עברי לצחק בנו            | Ἴδετε εἰσήγαγεν ἡμῖν παῖδα Ἑβραῖον ἐμπαίζειν ἡμῖν.                                   |
| 17     | בא אלי העבד העברי<br>אשר הבאת לנו לצחק בי | Εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς με ὁ παῖς ὁ Ἑβραῖος,<br>ὃν εἰσήγαγες πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐμπαῖξάί μοι           |

All of Jacob's sons and daughters come with the intention of consoling him (παρακαλέσαι) (37:35a), but their attempts are unsuccessful (οὐκ ἤθελεν παρακαλεῖσθαι) (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" (ἐμπαίζειν 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" (ἐμπαῖξάί μοι), one which is particularly embarrassing for her husband.<sup>211</sup>

<sup>211</sup> 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)<sup>212</sup> (8:12), but also as the subject or predicate of a nominal clause (4)<sup>213</sup> (2:18), after למען (3)<sup>214</sup> (50:20), and in the expression באכה (5)<sup>215</sup> (10:30).<sup>216</sup> 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).

|       |                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:12  | את היונה [ויסף שלח] ...<br>ולא יספה שוב אליו עוד                            | ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστεράν,<br>καὶ οὐ προσέθετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔτι.                                                        |
| 2:18  | לא טוב היות האדם לבדו                                                       | Οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον·                                                                                                               |
| 50:20 | אתם חשבתם עלי רעה<br>[1]אלהים חשבה לטבה<br>למען עשה כיום הזה<br>להחית עם רב | ὕμεῖς ἐβουλεύσασθε κατ' ἐμοῦ εἰς πονηρά,<br>ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς ἀγαθά,<br>ὅπως ἂν γενηθῇ ὡς σήμερον,<br>ἵνα διατραφῇ λαὸς πολὺς. |
| 10:30 | ויהי מושבם<br>ממשא באכה ספרה הר הקדם                                        | καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ κατοίκησις αὐτῶν<br>ἀπὸ Μασσῆ ἕως ἐλθεῖν εἰς Σωφῆρα ὄρος ἀνατολῶν.                                                                 |

**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

<sup>212</sup> *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 יכל (3), infinitive (3: 24:50; 37:4; 44:1); after יטב, subjunctive (4:7); after סכל, indicative (31:28).

<sup>213</sup> *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).

<sup>214</sup> *IBHS* §36.2.2b; Joüon §124k; Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 75–78. G uses the subjunctive (3: 18:19; 37:22; 50:20).

<sup>215</sup> Always translated as ἕως ἐλθεῖν (5: 10:19+, 30; 13:10; 25:18). Cf. §3.3.3.1

<sup>216</sup> 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,<sup>217</sup> or (ii.b) to qualify a non-cognate verb based upon the meaning of the infinitive absolute;<sup>218</sup> and (ii) a verbal function to replace (ii.a) imperatives, (ii.b) finite verbs, (ii.c) participles, and (ii.d) infinitives construct.<sup>219</sup> 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.<sup>220</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup> *IBHS* §35.3.1; Joüon §§123d–l, o–p.

<sup>218</sup> *IBHS* §§35.3.2; 35.4; Joüon §§123m–n, r–s.

<sup>219</sup> *IBHS* §35.5; Joüon §§123t–x.

<sup>220</sup> Thackeray, "Infinitive Absolute," 597–601; Raija Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch," in *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea: V Congress de la IOSCS*, ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos, Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34 (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1985), 101–113; Emanuel Tov, "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX — Their Nature and Distribution," in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*, ed. Detlaf Fraenkel, et al., MSU 20 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 64–73; Muraoka, "Syntactical Perspective," 468.

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)<sup>221</sup> (37:8),<sup>222</sup> a cognate noun in the dative (11)<sup>223</sup> (20:37),<sup>224</sup> or by omission (6) (24:5).<sup>225</sup>

|       |                                                                |                                                                 |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 37:8  | הַמֶּלֶךְ תִּמְלֹךְ עָלֵינוּ<br>אִם מִשׁוֹל תִּמְשֹׁל בָּנוּ   | Μὴ βασιλεύων βασιλεύσεις ἐφ' ἡμᾶς<br>ἢ κυριεύων κυριεύσεις ἡμῶν |
| 20:37 | הָעֵד הָעֵד בְּנוֹ הָאִישׁ                                     | Διαμαρτυρία διαμαρτύρηται ἡμῖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος                       |
| 24:5  | הַהֶשֶׁב אֲשִׁיב אֶת בְּנֶךָ אֶל הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵאת מִשָּׁם | ἀποστρέψω τὸν υἱόν σου εἰς τὴν γῆν ὅθεν ἐξῆλθες ἐκεῖθεν         |

Less often, G uses a cognate accusative (3) (28:22; also 19:9; 50:15),<sup>226</sup> an adverb (30:16; also 32:12), or some other construction (5) (37:33; 44:28).<sup>227</sup>

|       |                                               |                                                             |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 28:22 | וְכָל אֲשֶׁר תִּתֵּן לִי עֲשֶׂה אֲעֲשֶׂה לָךְ | καὶ πάντων ὧν ἐάν μοι δῶς δεκάτην ἀποδεκατώσω αὐτά σοι      |
| 30:16 | כִּי שָׁכַר שְׁכַרְתִּיךָ בְּדוּדָאֵי בְנֵי   | σήμερον μεμίσθωμαι γάρ σε ἀντὶ τῶν μανδραγορῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου |
| 37:33 | טָרַף טָרַף יוֹסֵף                            | θηρίον ἤρπασεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ                                    |
| 44:28 | טָרַף טָרַף                                   | θηριόβρωτος γέγονεν                                         |

For other adverbial uses of the Hebrew infinitive absolute, i.e., usually where it occurs in a pair of coordinate infinitives absolute (10),<sup>228</sup> G exhibits a lot of flexibility, and

<sup>221</sup> 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.

<sup>222</sup> This resulting Greek construction is not ungrammatical, but it is pleonastic and unidiomatic (KG II §490.3; SSG §31db).

<sup>223</sup> 2:16, 17; 3:4; 17:13; 26:11; 31:15, 30; 40:15; 43:3; 44:5, 15. In 26:11, where θανάτῳ ἔνοχος ἔσται translates מוֹת יוֹמָת, the dative noun θανάτῳ is not cognate with the main verb but has a related meaning.

<sup>224</sup> KG II 410.2, Anmerkung 4; Smyth §1577; SSG §22wr.

<sup>225</sup> 20:7; 24:5; 27:30; 31:30; 43:7, 20.

<sup>226</sup> 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.

<sup>227</sup> 37:33; 44:28; 46:4; 50:24, 25.

<sup>228</sup> The infinitive absolute הִרְחַק 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   | וַיָּשׁוּבוּ מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ הַלֹּךְ וְשׁוֹב                                           | καὶ ἐνεδίδου τὸ ὕδωρ <u>πορευόμενον</u> ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς<br>וַיַּחֲסֵרוּ <u>ἐνεδίδου</u> καὶ ἡλαττονοῦτο ... |
| 5     | וְהָמִים הָיוּ הַלֹּךְ וְחֹסֶר                                                       | τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ <u>πορευόμενον</u> ἡλαττονοῦτο                                                               |
| 7     | וַיֵּצֵא יִצְחָק וְשׁוֹב עַד יְבִשְׁת׃ הָמִים                                        | καὶ ἐξελθὼν <u>οὐχ</u> ὑπέστρεψεν ἕως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὕδωρ                                            |
| 12:9  | וַיֵּסַע אַבְרָם הַלֹּךְ וְנֹסֵעַ הַגְּבָהָה                                         | καὶ ἀπῆρεν Ἀβράμ καὶ <u>πορευθεὶς</u> ἐστρατοπέδευσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ                                       |
| 26:13 | וַיַּגְדֵּל הָאִישׁ וַיֵּלֶךְ הַלֹּךְ וְגֹדֵל <sup>229</sup><br>עַד כִּי גָדַל מְאֹד | καὶ ὑψώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ <u>προβαίνων</u> μείζων ἐγένετο<br>ἕως οὗ 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 הַלֹךְ וְנֹסֵעַ (“gradually moving”) in 12:9, transforming this syntactically and lexically into πορευθεὶς 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.

<sup>229</sup> 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 גִּדֵּל (adjective) or גִּדֵּל (infinitive absolute).

|       |                                         |                                                     |
|-------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 17:10 | המול לכם כל זכר                         | περιτμηθήσεται ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν                   |
| 41:43 | ונתון אתו על כל ארץ מצרים               | καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐφ' ὅλης γῆς Αἰγύπτου          |
| 30:32 | אעבר בצאנך היום                         | παρελθάτω τὰ πρόβατά σου σήμερον                    |
|       | הסר <sup>230</sup> משם כל שה חום בכשבים | καὶ διαχώρισον ἐκεῖθεν πᾶν πρόβατον ἐν τοῖς ἀρνάσιν |

### 6.1.2 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).<sup>231</sup> 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.<sup>232</sup> 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%).

<sup>230</sup> The form הִסֵּר could be analyzed as either an imperative or an infinitive absolute.

<sup>231</sup> *IBHS* §20.2b; Joüon §§40–85; KG II §§358–371; Smyth §§363–364; 949–972; *SSG* §77.

<sup>232</sup> *IBHS* §21; Joüon §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),<sup>233</sup> in which case the actors and objects are not significantly altered in translation notionally, even though they are shuffled around grammatically.

|       |                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4:6   | למה חרה לך<br>ולמה נפלו פניך                                                                                    | "ἵνα τί περίλυπος ἐγένου,<br>καὶ ἵνα τί συνέπεσεν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου;                                                                                                                                                           |
| 18:25 | השפט כל הארץ לא יעשה משפט                                                                                       | ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν οὐ ποιήσεις κρίσιν;                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 9:2   | ומוראכם וחתכם יהיה<br>על כל חית הארץ<br>ועל כל עוף השמים<br>[ו]בכל אשר תרמש האדמה<br>ובכל דגי הים<br>בידכם נתנו | καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ φόβος ἔσται<br>ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς<br>καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ<br>καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς<br>καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης.<br>ὕπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῶν δέδωκα. |

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.<sup>234</sup> 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).<sup>235</sup> 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).

<sup>233</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> person to 2<sup>nd</sup> person (12: 4:6; 6:21; 18:25; 19:9; 31:35; 41:33+; 44:18, 19; 45:20; 49:4, 9); 3<sup>rd</sup> person to 1<sup>st</sup> person (8: 9:2, 6; 33:13; 42:10; 43:23; 44:33; 46:34; 47:4).

<sup>234</sup> On the Greek performative, especially as a translation of Hebrew qatal, see §6.1.1.5.

<sup>235</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> person to 2<sup>nd</sup> person (3: 8:17+; 42:16) or 1<sup>st</sup> person (41:38);

2<sup>nd</sup> person to 3<sup>rd</sup> person (6: 17:15; 18:4; 21:30; 28:14; 30:33; 38:29) or 1<sup>st</sup> person (2: 23:15; 31:28);

1<sup>st</sup> person to 3<sup>rd</sup> person (5: 26:22; 28:21; 30:32; 32:10; 49:31) or 2<sup>nd</sup> person (2: 16:2; 44:28).

|       |                                                           |                                                                                                                                    |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 28:14 | והיה זרעך כעפר הארץ<br>ופרצת ימה וקדמה<br>וצפנה ונגבה ... | καὶ ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς γῆς,<br>καὶ πλατυνθήσεται ἐπὶ θάλασσαν καὶ ἐπὶ λίβα<br>καὶ ἐπὶ βορρᾶν καὶ ἐπ' ἀνατολάς, ... |
| 16:2  | בא נא אל שפחתי אולי אבנה ממנה                             | εἰσελθε οὖν πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην μου, ἵνα τεκνοποιήσῃς ἐξ αὐτῆς.                                                                     |
| 17:15 | שרי אשתך לא תקרא את שמה שרי<br>כי שרה שמה                 | Σάρα ἡ γυνή σου, οὐ κληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Σάρα,<br>ἀλλὰ Σάρρα ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς.                                            |
| 26:22 | כי עתה הרחיב יהוה לנו ופרינו בארץ                         | Διότι νῦν ἐπλάτυνεν κύριος ἡμῖν καὶ ἡύξησεν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.                                                                      |

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).<sup>236</sup> In 26:22, however, G has taken the first common plural verbal agreement **לנו** on **פרינו** as a first common plural pronominal suffix (ἡμᾶς).

**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,<sup>237</sup> but it is important first to recall that the difference between singular

<sup>236</sup> 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.

<sup>237</sup> 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 ם, 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)<sup>238</sup> (13:7);<sup>239</sup> (ii) the Hebrew verb is in the singular before a plural or compound subject,<sup>240</sup> a context in which Greek generally requires plural agreement on the verb (12)<sup>241</sup> (1:14);<sup>242</sup> or (iii) the Hebrew verb is passive and singular, but G renders it as active and plural (7)<sup>243</sup> (6:21).

|      |                              |                                                               |
|------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13:7 | והכנעני והפרזי אז ישב בארץ   | οἱ δὲ Χαναναῖοι καὶ οἱ Φερεζαῖοι τότε <u>κατῴκουν</u> τὴν γῆν |
| 1:14 | יהי מארת ברקיע השמים         | <u>Γενηθήτωσαν</u> φωστῆρες ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ      |
| 6:21 | ואתה קח לך מכל מאכל אשר יאכל | σὺ δὲ λήμψῃ σεαυτῷ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν βρωμάτων ἃ <u>ἔδεσθε</u>    |

The remaining cases involve various interpretive adjustments to the source text of varying significance, illustrated by the following set of examples (35).<sup>244</sup>

<sup>238</sup> 1:20, 26, 28; 4:20; 6:1, [20]; 9:2; 10:19; 12:16; 13:7; 14:7; 32:5, 20; 34:30; 35:11; 37:25, 27; 41:54; 46:26, 27; 50:11.

<sup>239</sup> KG II §359; Smyth §949; *SSG* §77a.

<sup>240</sup> *IBHS* §7; Joüon §150.

<sup>241</sup> 1:14; 3:8; 5:23, 31; 9:23; 11:29; 24:55; 46:20[+], [21]; 47:28; 50:9.

<sup>242</sup> KG II §370.1; Smyth §§963–965; 967; for exceptions, see KG II §§370.2–6; Smyth §§966; 968–972; *SSG* §§77ba–bk.

<sup>243</sup> 6:21; 10:9; 12:15; 22:14; 25:10; 41:30; 50:26. Cf. §6.1.2.3.

<sup>244</sup> 2:17+, 18; 9:19; 10:25; 12:16; 15:17; 19:16, 17; 20:9; 21:30; 27:29; 34:11; 35:3, 26; 41:14+, 21, 34, 38, 49, 50; 42:16; 43:28, 34; 44:1+, 2, 28; 45:20; 46:27; 48:2, 10, 12; 49:31.

|       |                                |                                                            |
|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:17  | ומעץ הדעת טוב ורע              | ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν           |
|       | לא תאכל ממנו כי                | οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ                                       |
|       | ביום אכלך ממנו מות תמות        | ἢ δ' ἂν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε          |
| 41:38 | הנמצא כזה איש אשר רוח אלהים בו | Μὴ εὐρήσομεν ἄνθρωπον τοιοῦτον ὃς ἔχει πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ |
| 48:2  | ויגד ליעקב ויאמר               | ἀπηγγέλη δὲ τῷ Ἰακώβ λέγοντες                              |

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)<sup>245</sup> (11:3), often ὄδωρ for מים (7:17); (ii) Greek has a neuter plural subject and so uses singular agreement on the verb (14)<sup>246</sup> (41:29);<sup>247</sup> or (iii) a passive transformation is involved, which either triggers or allows the change in number (8)<sup>248</sup> (41:35).

|       |                                          |                                                                            |
|-------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11:3  | ויאמרו איש אל רעהו                       | καὶ εἶπεν ἄνθρωπος τῷ πλησίον                                              |
| 7:17  | וירבו המים וישאן את התבה                 | καὶ ἐπληθύνθη τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐπῆρεν τὴν κιβωτόν                               |
| 41:29 | הנה שבע שנים באות שבע גדול ...           | ἰδοὺ ἐπτα ἔτη ἔρχεται εὐθηνία πολλή ...                                    |
| 41:35 | ויצברו בר תחת יד פרעה<br>אכל בערים ושמרו | καὶ συναχθήτω ὁ σῖτος ὑπὸ χεῖρα Φαραώ<br>βρώματα ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν φυλαχθήτω |

<sup>245</sup> 1:9[+]; 4:6, 10; 7:10, 17+, 18+, 19, 20, 24; 8:1, 3+, [7], 8, 11, 13+; 11:3; 21:15; 23:1; 27:29+; 31:53 36:20; 42:21; 50:3.

<sup>246</sup> 1:20, 21; 7:16, 22; 31:8+; 35:7; 37:20; 41:29, 30, 54; 42:36; 43:30; 49:24.

<sup>247</sup> KG II §364; Smyth §§958–961; SSG §77bh.

<sup>248</sup> 7:19, 20; 9:2; 17:27; 19:15; 20:9; 41:35+. Cf. §6.1.2.3.

As with the previous group, the exceptional cases involve interpretational adjustments of varying significance (19).<sup>249</sup>

|       |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11:31 | ויקח תרח את אברם בנו<br>ואת לוט בן הרן בן בנו<br>ואת שרי כלתו אשת אברם בנו<br>ויוצ>א אתם מאור כשדים<br>ללכת ארצה כנען<br>ויבאו עד חרן וישבו שם | καὶ ἔλαβεν Θάρα τὸν Ἀβράμ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ τὸν Λῶτ υἱὸν Ἀρράν, υἱὸν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ τὴν Σάραν τὴν νύμφην αὐτοῦ, γυναῖκα Ἀβράμ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς χώρας τῶν Χαλδαίων<br>πορευθῆναι εἰς γῆν Χανάαν<br>καὶ ἦλθεν ἕως Χαρράν, καὶ κατώκησεν ἐκεῖ. |
| 27:29 | ארריך ארור<br>ומברכך ברוך                                                                                                                      | ὁ καταρώμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος,<br>ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε εὐλογημένος.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 17:10 | זאת בריתי אשר תשמרו<br>... המול לכם כל זכר ...                                                                                                 | καὶ αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διατηρήσεις,<br>... περιτμηθήσεται ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν, ...                                                                                                                                                                                                |

In 11:31, V read ויוציא as *hiphil* (with SP), and so G interpreted אתם as אֲתָם (not MT אֲתָם), 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 (κατώκησεν)<sup>250</sup> 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.<sup>251</sup>

<sup>249</sup> 4:5; 10:14; 11:31+; 14:10; 17:10; 18:9; 24:54; 25:18, 25; 26:21, 22; 33:13; 35:5, 16; 40:1; 43:25; 46:6; 49:26.

<sup>250</sup> On the relative permanence of κατοικέω/κατοικίζω in comparison to the simplex, see §5.2.2.5.

<sup>251</sup> 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,<sup>252</sup> certain major Hebrew stems generally serve as the middle and/or passive of other stems,<sup>253</sup> 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.<sup>254</sup> 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,<sup>255</sup> and certain verbs are always inflected as middle and/or passive, or always in certain tenses (i.e., deponents).<sup>256</sup> 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*,

---

<sup>252</sup> See, e.g., *IBHS* §22.2; Joüon §41.

<sup>253</sup> The minor stems are collectively so uncommon in Genesis as to draw any sweeping generalizations.

<sup>254</sup> *IBHS* §21.2n–o; Joüon §40a.

<sup>255</sup> KG II §372.2; Smyth §§356b; 366a; *SSG* §27a(i).

<sup>256</sup> KG II §§374–378; Smyth §§800–821; 1713–1758; *SSG* §27.

*pual*,<sup>257</sup> 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),<sup>258</sup> at least in certain tenses (22:19).<sup>259</sup> This is very often the case with Hebrew statives translated by Greek denominative verbs that are causative or factitive, especially those ending in -*ow* (19:13), -*izw/-azw* (31:36), or -*unw/-ainw* (8:14).<sup>260</sup>

|        |                                                  |                                                            |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22: 19 | וַיֵּשֶׁב אַבְרָהָם אֶל נַעֲרָיו                 | ἀποστρέφει <sup>261</sup> δὲ Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ |
| 19: 13 | כִּי מִשְׁחַתִּים אֲנַחְנוּ אֶת הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה | ὅτι ἀπόλλυμεν ἡμεῖς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον,                      |
|        | כִּי גִדְלָה צַעֲקָתָם אֶת פְּנֵי יְהוָה         | ὅτι ὑψώθη ἡ κραυγὴ αὐτῶν ἐναντίον κυρίου                   |
| 31: 36 | וַיַּחַר לִיעֲרֹב וַיִּרְבַּ בְּלָבוֹן           | ὠργίσθη δὲ Ἰακώβ καὶ ἐμαχέσατο τῷ Λαβάν·                   |
| 8: 14  | יִבְשֶׁה הָאָרֶץ                                 | ἐξηράνθη ἡ γῆ.                                             |

<sup>257</sup> 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. מִשְׁחַתִּים = τριετίζοντα/ουσαν three times in 15:9), and the fact that pual forms may often be taken as *piel* (cf. וַיִּכְסּוּ = ἐπεκάλυψεν in 7:19, 20).

<sup>258</sup> ἀποστρέφω (8: 15:16; 16:9; 22:19; 31:3; 31:55; 38:22; 42:24; 43:18); ὑψόω (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); ἀτεκνόω (4: 27:45; 31:38; 43:14+); φαίνω (4: 21:11; [35:22]; 38:10; 45:5); ταραάσσω (3: 40:6; 42:28; 43:30); ἐρημόω (2: [47:19]+); ὀργίζω (2: 31:36; 40:2); μεθύσκω (2: 9:21; 43:34); διασπείρω (2: 9:19; 11:4); πληρόω (2: 25:24; 29:21); ξηραίνω (2: 8:7, 14); ἀτιμάζω (2: 16:4, 5); ἐγείρω (2: 41:4, 7); ἐξεγείρω (2: 28:16; 41:21); κυρόω (23:20); καταφαίνω (48:17); ἐκτρίβω (47:18); πίμπλημι (6:13); ἐπιφέρω (7:18); ἐλαττονόω (18:28); στερέω (48:11); παραλύω (19:11); ἀμβλύνω (27:1); ἐνοχλέω (48:1); μεγαλύνω (43:34); σκληρύνω (49:7); περιστρέφω (37:7); πλατύνω (28:14); χαίρω (45:16).

<sup>259</sup> Many of the verbs involved are stative or intransitive in the present (cf. note 258).

<sup>260</sup> Smyth §866; Tov, “Causative Aspects of the Hiph’il,” 418–421. Cf. the second category of neologisms in Hiebert, “Textual and Translation Issues,” 413–414.

<sup>261</sup> 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).<sup>262</sup>

15:9 קחה לי עגלה משלשת ועז משלשת Λάβε μοι δάμαλιν τριετίζουσας καὶ αἴγα τριετίζουσας  
ואיל משלש ותר וגוזל καὶ κριὸν τριετίζοντα καὶ τρυγόνα καὶ περιστερὰν.

18:14 היפלא מיהוה דבר μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ῥῆμα;

It is also common for G to use a Greek passive form for a Hebrew active verb in an impersonal construction (13)<sup>263</sup> (2:20; 30:2);<sup>264</sup> 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.

2:20 ויקרא האדם שמות לכל הבהמה Καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ ὀνόματα πᾶσιν τοῖς κτήνεσιν  
ול[כל] עוף השמים ולכל חית השדה καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ,  
ולאדם לא מצא עזר כנגדו τῷ δὲ Ἀδὰμ οὐχ εὐρέθη βοηθὸς ὅμοιος αὐτῷ.

30:2 ויחר אף יעקב ברחל ... ἐθυμώθη δὲ Ἰακώβ τῇ Ῥαχὴλ ...

10:9 הוא היה גבר ציד לפני יהוה οὗτος ἦν γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ.  
על כן יאמר כנמרד גבור ציד לפני יהוה διὰ τοῦτο ἐροῦσιν Ὡς Νεβρώδ γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου.

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).<sup>265</sup>

<sup>262</sup> 11:6; 15:9++; 18:4, 14; 30:41; 47:27.

<sup>263</sup> 2:20; 6:21; 9:2; 11:9; 15:13; 25:30; 27:36; 30:2; 31:48; 39:19; 44:18; 48:1, 2.

<sup>264</sup> IBHS §§4.4.2; 22.7; 23.2.2e; Joüon §§128b; 155b–i.

<sup>265</sup> 7:19, 20; 24:33; 26:22; 27:18; 37:33; 41:38; 44:12; 48:20; 50:26.



27:17–18 ותתן את המטעמים ואת הלחם אשר עשתה *καὶ ἔδωκεν τὰ ἐδέσματα καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους, οὓς ἐποίησεν,*  
 ביד יעקב בנה *εἰς τὰς χεῖρας Ἰακώβ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς.*  
 ויבא אל אביו *καὶ εἰσῆγγεκεν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.*

44:12 ויחפש בגדול החל *ἡρεύνα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ἀρξάμενος*  
 ובקטן כלה *ἕως ἧλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν νεώτερον,*  
 וימצא הגביע באמתחת בנימן *καὶ εὔρεν τὸ κόνδυ ἐν τῷ μαρσίππῳ τῷ Βενιαμίν.*

In 27:18, G has reasonably interpreted ויבא as *hiphil* instead of *qal*, interpreting τὰ ἐδέσματα καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους as the direct object of εἰσῆγγεκεν, and he has taken וימצא in 44:12 as *qal* instead of *niphal*, maintaining continuity of subject with the preceding wayyiqtol (ויחפש).

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).<sup>266</sup> 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)<sup>267</sup> and indirect reflexive (31:44; 25:1; 44:5),<sup>268</sup> 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.

<sup>266</sup> τίθημι (10: 1:17; 2:8, 15; 4:15; 17:2; 40:3; 41:10; 42:17, 30; 47:26); διατίθημι (6: 9:17; 15:18; 21:27, 32; 26:28; 31:44); προστίθημι (5: 8:12; 25:1; 37:8; 38:26; 44:23); περιποιέω (3: 12:12; 31:18; 36:6); περιαιρέω (3: 38:14, 19; 41:42); ἐπιτίθημι (3: 9:23; 11:6; 37:34); νίπτω (2: 19:2; 43:31); νέμω (2: 41:3, 18); συντελέω (2: 18:21; 44:5); περιβάλλω (2: 28:20; 38:14); ἐνυπνιάζω (37:9); ἀφαιρέω (21:25); κατακαλύπτω (38:15); βόσκω (41:2); ὑπολείπω (50:8); ἐνδύω (38:19); παρατάσσω (14:8).

<sup>267</sup> KG II §§374.2–4; Smyth §§1717–1718; SSG §27cb.

<sup>268</sup> KG II §§374.5–6; Smyth §§1719–1722; SSG §27cb.

|       |                                                        |                                                                                                      |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 38:19 | ותסר צעיפה מעליה<br>ותלבש בגדי אלמנותה                 | καὶ περιείλατο τὸ θέριστρον ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς<br>καὶ ἐνεδύσατο τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς χηρεύσεως αὐτῆς.               |
| 19:2  | הנה נא אדני סורו נא אל בית עבדכם<br>ולינו ורחצו רגליכם | Ἴδού, κύριοι, ἐκκλίνετε εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ παιδὸς ὑμῶν<br>καὶ καταλύσατε καὶ νίψασθε τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν, |
| 14:8  | ויערכו אתם מלחמה בעמק השדים                            | καὶ παρετάξαντο αὐτοῖς εἰς πόλεμον ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι τῇ ἀλυκῇ                                            |
| 31:44 | ועתה לכה נברתה ברית אני ואתה                           | νῦν οὖν δεῦρο διαθώμεθα διαθήκην ἐγὼ καὶ σύ                                                          |
| 25:1  | ויספ אברהם ויקח אשה ושמה קטורה                         | Προσθέμενος δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα, ἥ ὄνομα Χεττούρα.                                              |
| 44:5  | הרעתם אשר עשיתם                                        | πονηρὰ συντετέλεσθε, ἃ πεποιήκατε.                                                                   |

The use of *προστίθμι* 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.<sup>269</sup> Yet, it is very interesting to find that everywhere G uses the middle of *προστίθμι* 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 *ἔτι* instead of *προστίθμι*). In 25:1, then, it seems that G uses *προσθέμενος δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα* to mean “Abraham took another wife for himself,” i.e., as if equivalent to *προσελάβετο ἔτι*. 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.

<sup>269</sup> SSG §30bg; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 52–53.

37:6 שמעו נא החלום הזה אשר חלמתי Ἀκούσατε τοῦ ἐνυπνίου τούτου, οὗ ἐνυπνιάσθηγ·

9 הנה חלמתי חלום עוד Ἴδού ἐνυπνιασάμην ἐνύπνιον ἕτερον

10:25 ולעבר ילד שני בנים καὶ τῷ Ἐβερ ἐγενήθησαν δύο υἱοί·

46:20 ויולד ליוסף בארץ מצרים ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰωσήφ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ

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.<sup>270</sup>

Beyond the cases illustrated above, more substantive transformations of voice are relatively rare (50),<sup>271</sup> having a variety of linguistic and literary effects upon the translation.

25:10 שמה קבר אברהם ושרה אשתו ἐκεῖ ἔθαψαν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Σάρραν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ

15:6 והאמן [אברם] ביהוה ויחשבה לו צדקה καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβρὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην

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 (ויקברו = καὶ ἔθαψαν).

However, G's use of the passive ἐλογίσθη in 15:6 for the *hiphil* ויחשבה 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.<sup>272</sup>

<sup>270</sup> Muraoka is less optimistic, speaking of the "functional neutralization" of the middle and passive of particular Greek verbs (*SSG* §27e).

<sup>271</sup> 4:13, 15, 26; 5:2; 6:20; 9:11; 12:15; 15:6; 16:2, 13; 17:15, 24, 27; 19:15, 17, 19; 22:18; 24:18, 67; 25:10; 26:4, 11, 20; 31:28, 40; 32:10, 13, 23; 34:30; 35:18; 37:35; 38:14, 23, 29; 39:5; 40:10; 41:13+, 32, 35+; [44:9], 21; 45:7, 19; 49:24+; 50:3, 16, 20.

<sup>272</sup> 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.

|       |                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12:13 | אמרי נא אחתי את                                                                                                                | εἰπὼν οὖν ὅτι Ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ εἰμι,                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 26:7  | וישאלו אנשי המקום ל[רבקה] אשתו<br>ויאמר אחתי הוא<br>כי ירא לאמר אשתי [היא]<br>פן יהרגני אנשי המקום על רבקה<br>כי טובת מראה היא | Ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου περὶ Ῥεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ,<br>καὶ εἶπεν Ἀδελφὴ μου ἐστίν·<br>ἐφοβήθη γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι Γυνή μου ἐστίν,<br>μήποτε ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου περὶ Ῥεβέκκας,<br>ὅτι ὡραία τῇ ὄψει ἦν. |
| 20    | ויריבו רעי גרר עם רעי יצחק<br>לאמר לנו המים                                                                                    | καὶ ἐμαχέσαντο οἱ ποιμένες Γεράρων μετὰ τῶν ποιμένων Ἰσαάκ,<br>φάσκοντες αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸ ὕδωρ·                                                                                                                                         |

In two other cases, where both 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronominal suffixes could make sense, it is likely that the difference resulted from confusion between י and ׀.<sup>273</sup>

|       |                                   |                                                                            |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 21:7  | היניקה בנים שרה כי ילדתי בן לזקני | θηλάζει παιδίον Σάρρα ὅτι ἔτεκον υἱὸν ἐν τῷ γήρει μου                      |
| 32:20 | אכפרה פניו<br>במנחה ההלכת לפני    | Ἐξιδάσσομαι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ<br>ἐν τοῖς δώροις τοῖς προπορευομένοις αὐτοῦ |

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):

|       |                                  |                                                     |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 44:19 | אדני שאל את עבדין                | κύριε σὺ ἠρώτησας τοὺς παῖδας σου                   |
| 26:24 | והרביתי את זרעך בעבור אברהם עבדי | καὶ πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου διὰ Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα σου |

G's choice generally not to alter the grammatical person of Hebrew pronouns and pronominal suffixes surely stems from his general desire to represent the meaning of the Hebrew accurately in Greek translation.

<sup>273</sup> In both cases, the fact that the next word is prefixed with ׀ may have lead to problems of word division, in which case G could have read the two forms as לזקני (21:7) and לפני (32:20), which he accurately translated as μου and αὐτοῦ, respectively.

## 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)<sup>274</sup> (6:3; 41:15) or a Hebrew plural with a Greek collective singular (5)<sup>275</sup> (40:11; 41:26).

|       |                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6:3   | לא ידון רוחי<br>בְּאָדָם לְעֵלָם<br>בשגם הוּא בִּשְׂר<br>והיו ימין מאה ועשרים שנה | Οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου<br>ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα<br>διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας,<br>ἔσονται δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἔτη. |
| 41:15 | ואני שמעתי עליך לאמר<br>תשמע חֲלוֹם לפתור אתו                                     | ἐγὼ δὲ ἀκήκοα περὶ σοῦ λεγόντων<br>ἀκούσαντά σε ἐνύπνια συγκρίναι αὐτά.                                                                                  |
| 40:11 | וכוס פרעה בידי<br>ואקח את העֲנַבִּים ואשחט אתם אל כוס<br>ואתן את הכוס על כף פרעה  | καὶ τὸ ποτήριον Φαραὼ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μου·<br>καὶ ἔλαβον τὴν σταφυλὴν καὶ ἐξέθλιψα αὐτήν εἰς τὸ ποτήριον,<br>καὶ ἔδωκα τὸ ποτήριον εἰς τὰς χεῖρας Φαραώ.     |
| 41:26 | שבע פרת הטבת שבע שנים הֵנָּה<br>ושבע השבלים הטבת שבע שנים הֵנָּה                  | αἱ ἑπτὰ βόες αἱ καλὰ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἐστίν,<br>καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ στάχυες οἱ καλοὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἐστίν·                                                                     |

<sup>274</sup> 1:25; 2:19; 6:3+, 20; 18:21; 24:3, 37; 28:22; 30:35, 41; 34:24; 41:15; 42:35; 47:20; 49:24+.

<sup>275</sup> 34:23; 40:11; 41:26+, 27.

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 (אחז ... חלום) or generally to all dreams (ἐνύπνια ... αὐτά) he hears (41:15), or such as whether a bunch of grapes are conceived of individually as grapes (אתם ... הענבים) or collectively as a bunch (τὴν σταφυλὴν ... αὐτὴν) (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 ἐστὶν conveys that both of the plural entities (i.e., seven cows, seven sheaves) are collective ciphers for seven years.<sup>276</sup>

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)<sup>277</sup> (7:13; 44:16).

---

<sup>276</sup> Alternatively, one could argue that ἔστω is specifically attracted to the neuter plural predicate nominative ἔτη, but the neuter status of ἔτη 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).

<sup>277</sup> 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).

|       |                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 17:27 | וכל אנשי ביתו<br>יליד בית ומקנת כסף מאת בן נכר<br>נמלו אתו                                                                             | καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ οἱ οἰκογενεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀργυρώνητοι ἐξ ἀλλογενῶν ἐθνῶν,<br>περιέτεμεν αὐτούς.                                                                                  |
| 7:13  | בעצם היום הזה בא נח שם חם ויפת בני נח<br>ואשת נח ושלשת נשי בניו<br>אתם אל התבה                                                         | ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε, Σὴμ, Χάμ, Ἰάφεθ, υἱοὶ Νῶε,<br>καὶ ἡ γυνὴ Νῶε καὶ αἱ τρεῖς γυναῖκες τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ<br>μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν.                                                        |
| 44:16 | ויאמר יהודה מה נאמר לאדני<br>[ו]מה נדבר ומה נצטדק<br>[ו]האלהים מצא את עון עבדיך<br>הנני עבדים לאדני<br>גם אנחנו גם אשר נמצא הגביע בידו | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας Τί ἀντεροῦμεν τῷ κυρίῳ<br>ἢ τί λαλήσωμεν ἢ τί δικαιωθῶμεν;<br>ὁ δὲ θεὸς εὗρεν τὴν ἀδικίαν τῶν παίδων σου.<br>ἰδοὺ ἐσμεν οἰκέται τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν,<br>καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ παρ' ᾧ εὗρέθη τὸ κόνδυ. |

In 17:27, G has translated the *niphal* form נמלו (“they were circumcised”) actively as περιέτεμεν (“he circumcised”) and thus taken the particle את as א (DDOM) instead of את (PREP), which logically requires a plural object according to this interpretation that highlights Abraham’s agency in circumcising his household.<sup>278</sup> 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 אדני 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

<sup>278</sup> 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).<sup>279</sup>

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%).<sup>280</sup>

---

<sup>279</sup> The counts of changes in grammatical number exclude cases of synthetic translation (cf. §5.1.1.1).

<sup>280</sup> 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); δρῦς (3: 13:18; 14:13; 18:1); ἔργον (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); ἀδελφός (2: 24:27; 27:29); αἶμα (2: 4:10, 11); ἀργύριον (2: 42:25, 35); γενεά (2: 6:9; 50:23); γένεσις (2: 2:4; 5:1); δεύτερος + ἔτος (2: 11:10; 45:6); κεφαλή (2: 28:11, 18); μεσημβρία (2: 43:16, 25); ὁσφύς (2: 35:11; 37:34); παροίκησις (2: 28:4; 36:7); πιότης (2: 27:28, 39); χρόνος (2: 26:1, 15); ἁμαρτία (41:9); ἁορασία (19:11); βασιλεία (14:1); γένημα (49:21); δεσπότης (15:8); δεύτερος (27:36); διανοέομαι (6:5); διασάφησις + αὐτός (40:8); δικαιοσύνη (32:10); ἐγώ (9:16); ἐκ + αἵρεσις (49:5); ἐλάτη (21:15); ἐπερώτησις (43:7); ἡμέρα (21:4); θεραπεία (45:16); θυσία (46:1); Ἰαμὴν (36:24); ἱματισμός (24:53); καλός (27:15); κοιλία (25:23); κοίτη (49:4); κριθή (26:12); νεότης (8:21); οἰκέτης (9:25); οἰκία (25:27); οἶκος (42:33); ὀλιγοστός (34:30); ὄνομα (25:13); ὄραμα (46:2); παιδίον (21:7); παῖς (46:34); παροικέω (37:1); πατήρ (31:3); πόλις (13:12); πορνεία (38:24); πτέρνα (49:17); σκεῦος (27:3); συλλαμβάνω + ἐγώ (30:8); ταφή (50:3); τερέμινθος (43:11); τόπος (36:40); τρυφή (49:20); υἱός (36:21); φακός (25:34); φαῦσις (1:15); φυλή (49:16); φωνή (11:1); χάρις (43:14); χεῖρ (49:24).

**TABLE 18. HEBREW SINGULAR DUAL AND PLURAL NOUNS REGULARLY TRANSLATED AS SINGULAR**

| Dual/plural | Singular      | Exceptions                     |
|-------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| אֱלֹהִים    | (206) θεός    | 5: 3:5; 31:30, 32; 35:2, 4     |
| פְּנִים     | (57) πρόσωπον | 1: 40:7                        |
| אֶפְסִים    | (6) πρόσωπον  |                                |
| עֵינִים     | (1) πρόσωπον  |                                |
| מַיִם       | (55) ὕδωρ     | 4: 1:10, 20, 21, 22            |
| שָׁמַיִם    | (44) οὐρανός  |                                |
| אֲדָנִים    | (26) κύριος   | 1: 19:2; cf. 49:23 [בְּעָלִים] |
| חַיִּים     | (20) ζωή      |                                |

Several of these Hebrew nouns are actually lexicalized as plural, i.e. they never occur in the singular (אֱלֹהִים, מַיִם, and שָׁמַיִם), 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 | למה גנבת את אלהי                       | ἵνα τί ἔκλεψας τοὺς θεοὺς μου                                 |
| 19:2  | ויאמר הנה נא אדני סורו נא אל בית עבדכם | καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ κύριοι ἐκαλίνατε εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ παιδὸς ὑμῶν |
| 40:7  | מדוע פניכם רעים היום                   | Τί ὅτι τὰ πρόσωπα <sup>281</sup> ὑμῶν σκυθρωπα 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 (19:1 שְׁנֵי הַמְּלָאכִים) who have come to rescue Lot from Sodom; in 40:7, it is two men whose faces are sullen due to their dreams.

<sup>281</sup> 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%),<sup>282</sup> the most Hebrew singular nouns being presented in Table 19 below.

---

<sup>282</sup> For other Hebrew singular nouns translated by Greek plurals (305), see also χείρ (22: 9:2; 16:12+; 19:10, 16; 27:17; 33:10; 35:4; 37:21, 22, 27; 39:6, 8, 12, 13, [23]; 40:11; 43:12, 15, 21, 26; 46:4); ἄρτος (13: 14:18; 21:14; 27:17; 41:54, 55; 43:31, 32; 45:23; 47:15, [16], 17+, 19); ὑπάρχω (11: 12:5; 13:6; 14:16; 24:59; 31:18; 34:23; 36:6, 7+; 46:6; 47:18); δῶρον (10: 4:4; 32:13, 18, 20, 21; 33:10; 43:11, 15, 25, 26); ἐρπετόν (10: 1:20, 24, 25, 26, [28]; 6:7, [19], 20; 7:23; [8:1]); ἡμέρα (9: 6:5; 7:4, 12, 17, 24; 8:3, 6; 50:3+); ψυχή (9: 1:20; 46:15, 18, 22, 25, 26+, 27+); ἀνατολή (8: 2:8; 10:30; 11:2; 12:8+; 13:11; 25:6; 29:1); ἄνθρωπος (8: 6:1, 2, 3, 4, 5; 8:21; 11:5; 49:6); ἔργον (7: 2:2+, 3; 3:17; 5:29; 8:21; 39:11); σὰρξ (7: 6:3; 40:19; 41:2, 3, 4, 18, 19); ἱμάτιον (6: 39:12+, 13, 15, 16, 18); ἀγαθός (5: 24:10; 45:18, 20, 23; 50:20); ὄρνειον (5: 6:20; 9:2, 10; 15:11; 40:19); πρωτοτόκια (5: 25:31, 32, 33, 34; 27:36); χρυσοῦς (5: 24:22+, 53; 37:28; 45:22); δίδραχμον (4: [20:14], 16; 23:15, 16); λύπη (4: 3:16+, 17; 5:29); μόσχος (4: 12:16; 20:14; 21:27; 24:35); πῆχυς (4: 6:15++; 7:20); χόρτασμα (4: 24:25, 32; 42:27; 43:24); ἀνήρ (3: 14:21; 32:6; 33:1); ἐνώπιον (3: 24:22, 30, 47); κτηνοτρόφος (3: 4:20; 46:32, 34); νύξ (3: 7:4, 12, [17]); οἰκία (3: 33:17; 34:29; 50:21); ὄριον (3: 10:19; 23:17; 47:21); πονηρός (3: 44:4; 50:17, 20); συναγωγή (3: 28:3; 35:11; 48:4); ἄκρος (2: 47:21+); ἀλλότριος (2: 35:2, 4); ἁμαρτία (2: 15:16; 18:20); ἁμνός (2: 30:40; 33:19); ἀριστερός (2: 13:9; 48:13); ἄρμα (2: 46:29; 50:9); ἀρχή (2: 1:16+); ἄρχων (2: 14:7; 49:20); ἄχυρον (2: 24:25, 32); δεξιός (2: 13:9; 48:13); ἔβδομος (2: 29:27, 28); εὐλογία (2: 33:11; 49:26); ἰχθύς (2: 1:26, 28); ἵχνος (2: 42:9, 12); κακός (2: 19:19; 50:15); καρπός (2: 4:3; 43:11); κοιλία (2: 41:21+); ὄνος (2: 32:5; 42:27); πόλις (2: 22:17; 24:60); τετράπους (2: 1:24; 34:23); ὦμος (2: 24:15, 45); ἀδελφός (24:55); ἀέναιος (49:26); Αἰγύπτιος (47:23); αἰώνιος (9:12); ἄκανθα (3:18); ἄλς (14:3); ἀνασφίζω (14:13); ἀνατέλλω (19:25); ἀνομία (19:15); ἀργυροῦς (24:53); βλαστός (40:10); γαμβρός (19:12); γένος (1:21); γένος + ὅς + ἐσθίω (40:17); γεώργιον (26:14); γυμνός (27:16); δέκα (24:55); δερμάτινος (3:21); δοκός (19:8); δυνάστης (50:4); δυνατός (47:5); ἐγχώριος (34:1); ἔθνος (35:11); εἰς + ὁ + ὀπίσω (49:17); ἔκγονος (48:6); ἐκλεκτός (23:6); ἐνύπνιον (41:15); ἐπί + ἀνατολή (28:14); ἔσχατος (49:1); ἦπαρ (49:6); θησαυρός (43:23); θυγάτηρ (34:17); θῦμα (43:16); θυμίαμα (37:25); θυσία (4:5); κακία (6:5); καλός (44:4); καταλύω (42:27); κλῆρος (48:6); λαμπάς (15:17); λάχανον (9:3); λέγω (45:21); λόγος (4:23); μέσος (15:10); μηρός (46:26); νεφέλη (9:14); νῶτον (9:23); ὁ (41:51); ὁδοιπόρος (37:25); ὁδός (18:19); ὀνομαστός (6:4); ὄρος (14:6); ὀστέον (29:14); ὄψις (41:21); παιδίον (45:19); παιδίσκη (32:5); παῖς (32:5); παρεμβολή (33:8); πατήρ (46:3); πεδίον (41:48); περὶχωρος (13:12); πλάγιος (6:16); ποίμνιον (31:4); πολίτης (23:11); πολὺς (17:5); πόνος (41:51); πορεῖον (45:17); πούς (49:19); πρεσβεῖον (43:33); πρόσταγμα (26:5); πύλη (38:14); ράβδος (30:38); ῥῆμα (41:37); σάγμα (31:34); σκηνή (4:20); σύστημα (1:10); σῶμα (34:29); τέκνον (49:3); τετράγωνος (6:14); τόξον (49:24); τρίβολος (3:18); τύμπανον (31:27); ὑγιαίνω (37:14); υἱός (45:11); φρέαρ (21:25); φυλάσσω (41:36); φύλλον (3:7); χειῖλος (11:9); χονδρίτης (40:16)

TABLE 19. HEBREW SINGULAR NOUNS REGULARLY TRANSLATED AS PLURAL

| Singular      | Plural                     | Exceptions                                     |
|---------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| שָׁנָה (62)   | שָׁנִים (62)               | 8: 7:11; 8:13; 11:10; 14:4, 5; 45:6; 47:18+    |
| צֶאֱנָן (61)  | צֶאֱנָנִים (54); κτήνη (7) |                                                |
| בְּהֵמָה (19) | κτήνη                      | 2: 6:7; 7:23; see also שָׂרָפָה = κτήνη (8:19) |
| מִקְנֵה (16)  | κτήνη                      |                                                |
| עוֹף (17)     | πετεινά                    | 3: 1:21; 7:14; 8:19                            |
| אֶכָּל (16)   | βρώματα                    | —see also מִאֲכָל = βρώματα (6:21)             |
| חֵיָה (15)    | θηρία                      | 2: 37:20, 33                                   |
| בְּקָר (12)   | βόες                       | —see also שׁוֹר = βόες (32:5)                  |

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),<sup>283</sup> or when the reference is unambiguously singular (37:20).

|       |                             |                                          |
|-------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 7:11  | בשנת שש מאות שָׁנָה לחיי נח | ἐν τῷ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τοῦ Νῶε |
| 14    | וכל העוֹף למיניהו           | καὶ πᾶν πετεινὸν κατὰ γένος              |
| 37:20 | חֵיָה רעה אכלתהו            | Θηρίον πονηρὸν κατέφαγεν αὐτόν           |

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 | ויהי כל הארץ שפה אחד ודברים אחדים [לכלם] | Καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἓν καὶ φωνὴ μία πᾶσιν          |
| 49:3 | ראובן בכרי אתהכחי וראשית אֹנִי           | Ῥουβὴν πρωτότοκός μου σύ ἰσχύς μου καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου |

<sup>283</sup> 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 רִשׁ (“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.<sup>284</sup> 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 ותשב מנגד <ו> ותשא את קלה ותבך και ἐκάθισεν ἀπέναντι αὐτοῦ ἀναβοῶσαν δὲ τὸ παιδίον ἔκλαυσεν

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

---

<sup>284</sup> *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) lexica 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,<sup>285</sup> form criticism and tradition history,<sup>286</sup> and literary or narrative criticism.<sup>287</sup> 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

---

<sup>285</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, Meridian Library 6 (New York: Meridian Books, 1957); Ernest W. Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Baden, *Composition of the Pentateuch; The Promise to the Patriarchs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

<sup>286</sup> Gunkel, *Stories of Genesis*; Gerhard von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in *The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 1–78; Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972); Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, JSOTSup 89 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990).

<sup>287</sup> Robert Longacre, *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48*, 2nd ed. (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003); Jonathan Grossman, *Abram to Abraham: A Literary Analysis of the Abraham Narrative*, *Alte Testament im Dialog* 11 (Bern: Peter Lang AG, 2016).

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  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  for disjunctive- $\gamma$  (§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:

|         |                             |                                                                  |
|---------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:4     | [זה ספר] תולדות השמים והארץ | This is the book of the generations of heaven and earth.         |
| 5:1     | זה ספר תולדת אדם            | This is the book of the generations of Adam (or “human beings”). |
| 6:9     | אלה תולדת נח                | These are the generations of Noah.                               |
| 10:1    | ואלה תולדת בני נח           | These are the generations of the sons of Noah.                   |
| 11:10   | אלה תולדת שם                | These are the generations of Shem.                               |
| 11:27   | ואלה תולדת תרח              | These are the generations of Terah.                              |
| 25:12   | ואלה תולדת ישמעאל בן אברהם  | These are the generations of Ishmael, the son of Abraham.        |
| 25:19   | ואלה תולדת יצחק בן אברהם    | These are the generations of Isaac, the son of Abraham.          |
| 36:1, 9 | ואלה תולדות עשו             | These are the generations of Esau.                               |
| 37:2    | אלה תולדות יעקב             | These are the generations of Jacob.                              |

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).<sup>1</sup> Yet, in my argument I will primarily consider the literary sensitivity of G as a translator in relation to the plot of

---

<sup>1</sup> Hiebert, “Genesis: To the Reader,” 1–2; Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 247–254; Wevers, “Apologia,” 36–38.

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 largely 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.<sup>2</sup> 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).<sup>3</sup> Each of these pertains both to content (πράγματα) and style (λέξεις).<sup>4</sup> As for the categories of consistency and concision that I use in the analysis of this chapter, concision<sup>5</sup> is directly counted among

---

<sup>2</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel 2:70.23–28).

<sup>3</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:79.21): Ἀρεταὶ δὲ διηγήσεως τρεῖς, σαφήνεια, συντομία, πιθανότης. Aphthonius, *Prog.* 2 (Rabe 3.3–4) adds Greek expression (ὁ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐλληγισμός). 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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 (λέξεις): clarity (2:80.8–83.13); concision (2:83.14–84.17); believability (2:84.18–85.27).

<sup>5</sup> 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<sup>6</sup> and unbelievable.<sup>7</sup>

This mindset is reinforced in the *progymnasmata* negatively in relation to the refutation (*ἀνασκευή*) and confirmation (*κατασκευή*) of narrative genres, especially fable (*μῦθος*) and narrative (*διήγημα/διήγησις*),<sup>8</sup> since inconsistency (*τὸ μαχόμενον*)<sup>9</sup> and redundancy (*τὸ πλεονάζον*)<sup>10</sup> are listed among the *topoi* (commonplace arguments) that are relevant to both.<sup>11</sup> While this fact indicates that fable and narrative are closely related

---

<sup>6</sup> Events that are misordered (*τὸ ... συγχεῖν τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὴν τάξιν τῶν πραγμάτων*) or duplicate (*τὸ δις 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 (*ἀλλήλοις ἀκόλουθα*). Contradictions hinder believability, since they disrupt the causal chain of events.

<sup>8</sup> Hermogenes distinguishes between *διήγημα* 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 *διήγημα* and *ποίημα* (*Prog.* 2 [Rabe 2.4–10]). Cf. Nicolaus, *Prog.* 3 (Felten 11.16–12.6).

<sup>9</sup> 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). Hermogenes, *Prog.* 5 (Rabe 11.8–10) and Aphthonius, *Prog.* 5 (Rabe 14.4) use *τὸ ἀνακόλουθον*, but Hermogenes also calls it *τὸ ἐναντίον*. Cf. Aristotle, *Poet.* 1455a.22–26; 1461a.31–1461b.21.

<sup>10</sup> 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 μὴδὲν ὄν, οἷον ἢ πρόσωπον ἢ πρᾶγμα 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” (*ἐπειδὴν λέγεται τι, οὗ ἀφαιρεθέντος οὐδὲν ἥττον διαμένει ἡ χρεῖα*). 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.

<sup>11</sup> 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 ἐλλείποντος/ἐλλιποῦς*), (iv) implausibility (*ἐκ τοῦ ἀπιθάνου/ἀπρεποῦς/ὅτι μὴ εἰκός ἐστιν*), (v) unconventionality (*ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυνήθους*), (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)<sup>12</sup> and a narrative (διήγημα) as “an expository account of events that have taken place or of events as if they had taken place” (λόγος ἐκθετικὸς πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων).<sup>13</sup> 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,<sup>14</sup> which is one reason why they mostly share the same topoi for refutation and confirmation, although the topoi of falsity (τὸ ψευδές) 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 ἀνομοίου/ψευδοῦς).

<sup>12</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 3 (Spengel 2:72.28). Cf. Hermogenes, *Prog.* 1 (Rabe 1.12–14): ψευδῇ μὲν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι, πάντως δὲ χρήσιμον πρὸς τι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ· ἔτι δὲ καὶ πιθανὸν εἶναι βούλονται; Aphthonius, *Prog.* 1 (Rabe 1.6): “Ἔστι δὲ μῦθος λόγος ψευδῆς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν; Nicolaus, *Prog.* 2 (Felten 5.9–15): Μῦθος τοίνυν ἐστὶ λόγος ψευδῆς τῷ πιθανῶς συγκεῖσθαι εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. λόγος μὲν ψευδῆς, ἐπειδὴ ὁμολογουμένως ἐκ ψεύδους σύγκειται· εἰκονίζων δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἂν ἐργάσαιτο τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, μὴ ἔχων τινὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ὁμοιότητα. γένοιτο δὲ ἂν πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ὁμοίος ἐκ τοῦ πιθανοῦ τοῦ περὶ τὴν πλάσιν.

<sup>13</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:78.15–16). Cf. Hermogenes, *Prog.* 2 (Rabe 2.1–2): Τὸ διήγημα βούλονται εἶναι ἔκθεσιν πράγματος γεγονότος ἢ ὡς γεγονότος; Aphthonius, *Prog.* 2 (Rabe 2.14–15): Διήγημά ἐστιν ἔκθεσις πράγματος γεγονότος ἢ ὡς γεγονότος. Nicolaus, *Prog.* (Felten 11.14–15): διήγημα δὲ ἐστίν, ὡς εἴρηται καὶ μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν, ἔκθεσις πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων.

<sup>14</sup> Nicolaus, *Prog.* 3 (Felten 13.4–13) κοινωνεῖ δὲ τὰ μυθικὰ διηγήματα τοῖς μύθοις [ἐν] τῷ ἀμφότερα δεῖσθαι πίστεως, διαφέρει δέ, ὅτι οἱ μὲν μῦθοι ὁμολογουμένως εἰσὶ ψευδεῖς καὶ πεπλασμένοι, τὰ δὲ μυθικὰ διηγήματα καὶ παρ’ ἄλλων ὡς γεγονότα ἱσθόρηται καὶ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἐστὶ γενέσθαι καὶ μὴ γενέσθαι. ἔτι κοινωνεῖ τὰ πλασματικά διηγήματα τοῖς μύθοις τῷ ἀμφότερα πεπλάσθαι, διαφέρει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἀλλήλων, ὅτι τὰ μὲν πλασματικά διηγήματα, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ἔχει φύσιν γενέσθαι, οἱ δὲ μῦθοι οὔτε ἐγένοντο οὔτε φύσιν ἔχουσι γενέσθαι.

impossibility (τὸ ἀδυνατόν) apply especially to narrative.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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,<sup>17</sup> as would have been appropriate for their actual use,<sup>18</sup> as well as (ii) the literary examples he gives for fable and

---

<sup>15</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:11–13): οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ τόποι χρήσιμοι καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν διηγημάτων ἀνασκευὴν τε καὶ κατασκευὴν; Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2.93.5–8): Περὶ δὲ ἀνασκευῆς καὶ κατασκευῆς εἵπομεν ὅτι οἱ αὐτοὶ τόποι χρήσιμοι, οἵπερ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μύθους, ἐν δὲ τοῖς διηγήμασι καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ ψευδοῦς καὶ ἀδυνάτου τόποι ἀρμόττουσιν ...

<sup>16</sup> 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): "Ἔστιν δὲ τῆς ῥητορικῆς εἶδη τρία τὸν ἀριθμόν· τοσοῦτοι γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τῶν λόγων ὑπάρχουσιν ὄντες. σύγκειται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τριῶν ὁ λόγος, ἐκ τε τοῦ λέγοντος καὶ περὶ οὗ λέγει καὶ πρὸς ὃν, καὶ τὸ τέλος πρὸς τοῦτόν ἐστιν, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἀκροατὴν. ἀνάγκη δὲ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἢ θεωρὸν εἶναι ἢ κριτὴν, κριτὴν δὲ ἢ τῶν γεγενημένων ἢ τῶν μελλόντων. ἔστιν δ' ὁ μὲν περὶ τῶν μελλόντων κρίνων ὁ ἐκκλησιαστής, ὁ δὲ περὶ τῶν γεγενημένων [οἶον] ὁ δικαστής, ὁ δὲ περὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ὁ θεωρός, ὥστ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἂν εἴη τρία γένη τῶν λόγων τῶν ῥητορικῶν, συμβουλευτικόν, δικανικόν, ἐπιδεικτικόν.

<sup>17</sup> 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 γυμνασμάτων αὐτῶν οὕτω ποιησόμεθα· πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς χρείας· βραχὺ τε γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ εὐμνημόνευτον, ἔπειτα δὲ τοῦ μύθου καὶ τῆς διηγήσεως, πλὴν τῆς τούτων ἀνασκευῆς τε καὶ κατασκευῆς· ταῦτα γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ὕστερα εἰσὶν πῶς εἶναι (*Prog.* 1 [Spengel 2:64.29–65.1]).

<sup>18</sup> "The order (*taxis*) 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.<sup>19</sup> 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*.<sup>20</sup> Still, both fables and narratives are typically woven into larger compositions (συμπλοκή),<sup>21</sup> and length is ultimately not just a matter of genre, but also of expansion (ἐπέκτασις) and contraction (συστολή),<sup>22</sup> while the level of detail and flourish also relates to elaboration (ἐξεργασία),<sup>23</sup> 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).

<sup>19</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:73.1–74.1).

<sup>20</sup> 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).

<sup>21</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:75.9–16; cf. 2:74.3–4): συμπλέκομεν δὲ ὧδε· ἐκθέμενοι τὸν μῦθον ἐπιφέρομεν διήγημα, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἢ ἀνάπαλιν τὸ μὲν διήγημα πρότερον, ὕστερον δὲ τὸν μῦθον, οἷον πεπλασμένον, ὅτι κάμηλος ἐπιθυμήσασα κεράτων καὶ τῶν ὠτῶν ἐστερήθη· τοῦτο προειπόντες ἐποίησμεν τὸ διήγημα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· παραπλήσιόν μοι δοκεῖ τι παθεῖν τῇ καμήλῳ ταύτῃ καὶ Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδός, καὶ ὅλον ἐφεξῆς τὸ διήγημα τὸ περὶ αὐτόν. *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:86.5–7; cf. 85.30): see text in note 22.

<sup>22</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:75.16–19; cf. 2:74.4–5): ἐπεκτείνομεν δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ μύθῳ προσωποποιίας μηχανήοντες, καὶ ποταμὸν ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων ἐκφράζοντες· τὸ ἐναντίον δὲ ποιοῦντες συστελλόμεν. *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:86.5–7; cf. 85.30): περὶ μὲν οὖν ἀπαγγελίας καὶ κλίσεως καὶ συμπλοκῆς, ἔτι δὲ συστολῆς τε καὶ ἐπεκτάσεως ἐν τῷ περὶ μύθων εἴρηται.

<sup>23</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 16 (Patillon 110–111).

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*,<sup>24</sup> 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,<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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

---

<sup>24</sup> Hermogenes, *Prog.* 5 (Rabe 5.1–19); Aphthonius, *Prog.* 5–6 (Rabe 10.9–16.16); Nicolaus, *Prog.* 6 (Felten 29.8–35.4).

<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>26</sup> 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 ἀδυνατόν) 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.<sup>27</sup> 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

---

<sup>27</sup> 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,<sup>28</sup> and redundancy is the repeated narration of the same event.<sup>29</sup> 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 heterogeneous language, while redundancy results from the piling up of synonyms or from excessive homogeneity in language.<sup>30</sup> 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

---

<sup>28</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 4 (Spengel 2:77.18–23): ὁ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μαχομένου τόπος τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, ὅταν δείξωμεν αὐτὸν ἐαυτῷ μαχόμενον τὸν μυθογράφον· τούτῳ δὲ χρηστέον οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἀλλ' ὅταν τι τῶν μέσων ἢ τελευταίων ἀνασκευάζωμεν, ἔπειτα καὶ ἐναντίον αὐτὸ δεικνύωμεν τοῖς προειρημένοις. Cf. Aristotle, *Poet.* 1455a.22–26; 1461a.31–33; 1461b.15–18.

<sup>29</sup> 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.

<sup>30</sup> 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,<sup>31</sup> but inconsistency, including self-contradiction (τὸ μαχόμενον), is also considered to be the “most combative” (ἀγωνιστικώτατος)<sup>32</sup> topos 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

---

<sup>31</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:79.28–31): δεῖ γὰρ ἔχασθαι ἀεὶ τοῦ πιθανοῦ ἐν τῇ διηγήσει· τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτῆς μάλιστα ἴδιον ὑπάρχει· καὶ τούτου μὴ προσόντος αὐτῇ, ὅσῳ ἂν μᾶλλον σαφὴς καὶ σύντομος ἢ τοσοῦτῳ ἀπιστοτέρα τοῖς ἀκούουσι καταφαίνεται. Concision and clarity become narrative vices in the absence of believability.

<sup>32</sup> Nicolaus, *Prog.* 6 (Felten 32.11–14): τὸ δὲ ἀγωνιστικώτατον καὶ μάλιστα ἡμῖν συμβαλλόμενον κεφάλαιόν <ἐστι> τὸ καλούμενον μαχόμενον, ὅπου τοῦτον ὥσπερ 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 (ἐναντία) 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.<sup>33</sup> 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.<sup>34</sup> Not all such flaws are of equal severity, however, and so, while the critic may actively search for contradictions and redundancy, most readers

---

<sup>33</sup> 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*).

<sup>34</sup> 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 השמים in 7:11 [P] and הַגִּשְׁם 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 וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה כִּי רְבָה רָעַת הָאָדָם בָּאָרֶץ וְכָל יִצְרַר מַחֲשַׁבַּת לְבֹו רָק רָע כָּל הַיּוֹם 6 וַיִּנָּחַם יְהוָה כִּי עָשָׂה  
אֶת הָאָדָם בָּאָרֶץ וַיִּתְּעַצֵּב אֶל לְבֹו 7 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֲמַחָה אֶת הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר בְּרָאֹתִי מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה  
מֵאָדָם עַד בְּהֵמָה עַד רֶמֶשׂ וְעַד עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּי נִחַמְתִּי כִּי עָשִׂיתִם  
12 וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָרֶץ וְהִנֵּה נִשְׁחָתָה כִּי הִשְׁחִית כָּל בָּשָׂר אֶת דְּרָכָהּ עַל הָאָרֶץ 13 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים  
לִנְחָ קֶץ כָּל בָּשָׂר בָּא לִפְנֵי כִּי מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ חֲמָס מִפְּנֵיהֶם וְהִנֵּנִי מִשְׁחִיתָם אֶת הָאָרֶץ

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.<sup>35</sup> 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 רעת האדם בארץ); in 6:12–13, however, he sees a corrupt earth (וירא אלהים את הארץ והנה נשחתה). Moreover, while the human evil stems from a mind bent on doing wrong (וכל יצר מחשבת לבו רק רע כל היום), the earth's corruption is due to both humans and animals having corrupted their way (השחית) (כל בשר את דרכו על הארץ) by acts of violence (מלאה הארץ חמס 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

---

<sup>35</sup> 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?<sup>36</sup>

Then as far as the guilty party is concerned, are only humans responsible, or are animals also to blame?<sup>37</sup>

### 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.<sup>38</sup> First, God repeatedly announces his destructive intentions.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> 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 מן קדם עובדיהון בישיא as מפניהם (“because of their evil deeds”). Neofiti, however, renders חמס 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 דעיהא דסטו מן ארחן דתקנן קדם יי (“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, Noah 4.

<sup>37</sup> 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 בסרא אנש (“every flesh, i.e. human”). Cf. Tanchuma, Noah 5, 12.

<sup>38</sup> LAB’s massive abridgement of this part of the account reflects a negative estimation of its prolixity (3:3–5).

<sup>39</sup> 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).

- |     |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                         |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6:7 | אֶמְחֶה את האדם אשר בראתי<br>מעל פני האדמה                                            | I will <u>wipe</u> the humanity that I created<br>off of the face of the earth                                                          |
| 13  | והנני <u>משחיתם</u> את הארץ                                                           | Behold, I will soon <u>destroy</u> them with the earth                                                                                  |
| 17  | ואני הנני <u>מביא את המבול</u> מים על הארץ<br><u>לשחת</u> כל בשרע                     | I will soon <u>bring the flood</u> , water upon the earth,<br>in order to <u>destroy</u> all flesh                                      |
| 7:4 | אנכי <u>ממסיר</u> על הארץ ...<br><u>ומחיתי</u> את כל היקום אשר עשיתי<br>מעל פני האדמה | I will soon <u>cause it to rain</u> upon the earth ...<br>and I will <u>wipe</u> everything that I made<br>off of the face of the earth |

- 6:11 ותשחת הארץ and the earth was corrupt  
 12 והנה נשחתה and [the earth] was corrupt  
 12 השחית כל בשר את דרכו all flesh corrupted its way

<sup>40</sup> 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 predication (6:8–9), which is stylistically pleonastic and potentially redundant.<sup>41</sup>

6:8 וְנֹחַ מָצָא חֵן בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה But Noah found favor before the Lord.

9b נֹחַ אִישׁ צַדִּיק Noah was a righteous man.

9c תָּמִים הָיָה בְּדִרְתּוֹ He was blameless in his generations.

9d אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים הִתְהַלֵּךְ נֹחַ 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

---

<sup>41</sup> 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 predication 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!<sup>42</sup>—and it is especially helpful if 6:14–22 and 7:1–5 are understood as chiefly about the ark and the animals, respectively.<sup>43</sup> 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,<sup>44</sup> 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.

---

<sup>42</sup> 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]: Ἐν τούτοις τε οὖν τὸ πιθανόν, καὶ ἐν ᾧ Θεόφραστος φησιν, ὅτι οὐ πάντα ἐπ' ἀκριβείας δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν, ἀλλ' ἓνια καταλιπεῖν καὶ τῷ ἀκροατῇ συνιέναι καὶ λογίζεσθαι ἐξ αὐτοῦ. συνεῖς γὰρ τὸ ἐλλειφθὲν ὑπὸ σοῦ οὐκ ἀκροατὴς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς σου γίνεται, καὶ ἅμα εὐμενέστερος. συνετὸς γὰρ ἑαυτῷ δοκεῖ διὰ σὲ τὸν ἀφορμὴν παρεσχηκότα αὐτῷ τοῦ συνιέναι, τὸ δὲ πάντα ὡς ἀνόητῳ λέγειν καταγινώσκοντι ἔοικεν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ. 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.

<sup>43</sup> Genesis Rabbah explicitly states that 6:22 concerns the ark (31.14) but 7:5 the animals (32.5).

<sup>44</sup> 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

6 ונח בן שש מאות שנה והמבול היה מים על הארץ ויבא נח ...  
10 ויהי לשבעת הימים ומי המבול היו על הארץ 11 בשנת שש מאות שנה לחיי נח בחדש השני  
בשבעה עשר יום לחדש ביום הזה נבקעו כל מעינת תהום רבה וארבת השמים נפתחו 12 ויהי הגשם  
על הארץ ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה 13 בעצם היום הזה בא נח שם חם ויפת בני נח ואשת נח  
ושלשת נשי בניו אתם אל התבה

6 Now, Noah was six hundred years old when the flood came upon the earth. So, Noah entered ...

10 And after seven days the waters of the flood came upon the earth, 11 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, 12 and there was rain upon the earth for forty days and forty nights. 13 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 לשבעת הימים ("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): ביום הזה ("on that day") and בעצם היום הזה ("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,<sup>45</sup> 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

---

<sup>45</sup> 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...” (מן הבהמה...) and later “all” (וכל החיה...), 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,<sup>46</sup> 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 ויהי המבול ארבעים יום [וארבעים לילה] על הארץ וירבו המים וישאו את התבה ותרם מעל הארץ 18 ויגברו המים וירבו מאד על הארץ ותלך התבה על פני המים 19 והמים גברו מאד מאד על הארץ ויכסו כל ההרים הגבהים אשר תחת השמים 20 חמש עשרה אמה מלמעלה גברו המים ויכסו [כל] ההרים [הגבהים]

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.<sup>47</sup> The pace slows, and the reader tracks how the waters progress. First, “they multiply” (וירבו). Then, they

---

<sup>46</sup> 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 (3:5; cf. Jubilees 5:23). As will be suggested below, this is likely how G understood the chronology of the passage.

<sup>47</sup> 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” (וַיִּגְבְּרוּ ... וַיִּרְבוּ מְאֹד). Next, “they increase very, very much” (וַיִּכְסּוּ כָּל הַהָרִים הַגְּבוּהִים) so that “all the tallest mountains are covered” (גִּבְרוּ מְאֹד מְאֹד). Finally, “they increase” (גִּבְרוּ) 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,<sup>48</sup> 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).<sup>49</sup> Similarly, the three-stage description of the ark rising in the flood could be taken as tedious: the waters first “lift the ark” (וַיִּשְׂאוּ אֶת הַתֵּבָה), it “rises off of the ground” (וַתֵּלֶךְ הַתֵּבָה עַל פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם), and then it “moves upon the surface of the water” (וַתֵּרָם מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ). Finally, although the narration of the floodwaters’ initial decrease is brief, it is more noticeably verbose in terms of style and content:

8:3    וַיִּשְׁבוּ הַמַּיִם מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ הַלּוֹד וְשׁוֹב    The waters gradually receded from off of the earth.  
           וַיִּחְסְרוּ הַמַּיִם מִקְצֵה חֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאֵת יוֹם    The waters decreased after 150 days.

Concision would require the combination of these two clauses.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> 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.

<sup>49</sup> 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.

<sup>50</sup> 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<sup>51</sup>—the Hebrew text gives a summary statement concerning the floodwaters:

7:24 וַיִּגְבְּרוּ הַמַּיִם עַל הָאָרֶץ חֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאָה יוֹם The waters increased<sup>52</sup> on the earth 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., וַיִּגְבְּרוּ הַמַּיִם עַל הָאָרֶץ (“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: חֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאָה יוֹם (“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 (גָּבַר) for 150 days? A common solution to this problem comes by way of assigning a meaning to the word גָּבַר that differs from its prior usage:<sup>53</sup> by force of logic, גָּבַר must not mean “increase” in its final occurrence but rather “remain high.”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> G’s different translations of כָּל אֲשֶׁר in 7:22 differentiate between animals (πάντα ὅσα) and humans (πάντες ὅς) and thus account for this repetition in a meaningful way. Cf. note 103.

<sup>52</sup> For a single sense of גָּבַר in this passage, see *HALOT*, s.v. “גָּבַר” qal 3; BDB, s.v. “גָּבַר” (qal) 2.a.

<sup>53</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1461a.31–33 suggests resolving a contradiction by appealing to multiple senses of a word.

<sup>54</sup> Jubilees 5:27 seems to reflect this interpretation of גָּבַר, whereas LAB 3:7 and 4Q252 1 I, 7 allow for the possibility that גָּבַר 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)<sup>55</sup> so that it “comes and goes until the water is dried off of the earth” (ויצא יצוא ושוב עד יבשת המים מעל הארץ), why must he also send the dove out for the same purpose?<sup>56</sup> 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

---

<sup>55</sup> 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.

<sup>56</sup> 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 וישוב), yet with a distinct purpose: להודיע לדורות הא[חרונות] (“to tell the latter generations”). 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.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> 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.

### 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

וירא | רבה רעת האדם | 5 Ἰδὼν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ  
כל יצר מחשבת | רק | כל היום | πᾶς τις διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας,  
ויתעצב אל לבו | וינחם | 6 καὶ ἐνεθυμῆθη ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ διενοήθη. 7 καὶ  
נחמתי | εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ἀπαλείψω τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν ἐποίησα, ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ  
ונח | ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἐρπετῶν ἕως πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅτι ἐθυμώθη ὅτι  
צדיק | תמים | בדרתיו | 9 ἐποίησα αὐτούς. 8 Νῶε δὲ εὗρεν χάριν ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ.  
9 Αὗται δὲ αἱ γενέσεις Νῶε· Νῶε ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος, τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ. τῷ  
θεῷ εὐηρέστησεν Νῶε. 10 ἐγέννησεν δὲ Νῶε τρεῖς υἱούς, τὸν Σήμ, τὸν Χάμ, τὸν Ἰάφεθ.  
חמס | 11 ἐφθάρη δὲ ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας. 12 καὶ εἶδεν κύριος ὁ  
דרכו | θεὸς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἦν κατεφθαρμένη, ὅτι κατέφθειρεν πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς  
קץ | בשר | γῆς. 13 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Νῶε Καιρὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔχει ἐναντίον μου, ὅτι  
חמס | ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καταφθείρω αὐτούς καὶ τὴν γῆν.<sup>58</sup>

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

<sup>58</sup> 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 (*κακία*). 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            רבה רעת האדם *ἐπληθύνθησαν*<sup>59</sup> αἱ *κακία*<sup>60</sup> τῶν *ἀνθρώπων*<sup>61</sup>  
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 *κακία* (“vices”) to render רעת (“evil”), which is collective singular by the consonantal orthography. In contrast to רעת,

---

<sup>59</sup> *ἐπληθύνθησαν* | G inflects the verb as plural so that it agrees grammatically with its plural subject. The form רבה may be parsed either as an adjective (feminine, singular, absolute) or a qatal form of רבב in the qal (3<sup>rd</sup> person, feminine, singular), as in Gen 18:20. G typically translates רב as πλῆθος (9/13) and reserves πληθύνω for the cognate verbs רבה (25/28) and רבב (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

<sup>60</sup> *κακία* | G frequently translates רעה (10) in the plural as πονηρά (3: 44:4; 50:17, 20) or κακά (2: 19:19; 50:15), but he uses *κακία* only here. G uses *κακία* in the singular, however, in 31:52. G may find linguistic justification for his interpretation, since the form רעת may be read as singular (רעת) or plural (רעת).

<sup>61</sup> *ἀνθρώπων* | 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 אדם. 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 οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων // 6:2 οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ).

κακίαι does not mean vice in general or multiple instances of a single vice,<sup>62</sup> but, according to its technical use, it denotes “types of vice,” just as ἀρεταί denotes “types of virtue.”<sup>63</sup>

Second, in contrast to the singular and stative adjective ὦν (“great”) used as a nonverbal predicate, the aorist passive verb ἐπληθύνθησαν (“[they] had multiplied”) implies a more explicit backstory.<sup>64</sup> Although later traditions and interpreters would find manifold vices present in the elusive account of 6:1–4,<sup>65</sup> G’s prior translation of Genesis 1–5 seems to have

---

<sup>62</sup> Rösel is correct to associate the terms κακία and ἀδικία 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 ἀδικίας (“injustice,” i.e., “all vice”), as I argue here. Rösel does capture the universal character of ἀδικίας in another way, however, since he takes it as accusative plural instead of genitive singular ( *Übersetzung*, 160, 161, 165, 233).

<sup>63</sup> 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 *περὶ 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: Πάσας μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ τὰς ἀρετὰς εἶναι δυνατόν, ἀλλήλαις γὰρ ἀντακολουθοῦσιν, τὰς δὲ κακίας οὐχ οἶόν τε 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” (ἀρεταί): τὰ μὲν γὰρ οἰκεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ γεννήματα αἱ ὀλόκληροι ἀρεταί, τὰ δὲ συγγενῇ φαύλων αἱ ἀνάρμοστοι κακίαι. Cf. the statement by John Chrysostom given in note 65.

<sup>64</sup> The circumstantial participle used to introduce 6:5 (Ἰδὼν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός...) is likely meant to reinforce the possibility of interpreting 6:5ff. 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 τούτοις in 6:3—perhaps in V—likewise forges a connection between 6:1–4 and the flood narrative: Οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις.

<sup>65</sup> 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. Ἐκ γὰρ τῆς πονηρᾶς ταύτης πράξεως, καθάπερ ἀπὸ πηγῆς τινος, καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ αὐτοῖς ἐτίκτετο ἁμαρτήματα· διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, Αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ὅπου γὰρ πορνεία, καὶ ἀσέλγεια, καὶ τοσαύτη ἀκολασία, εἰκὸς καὶ μέθην, καὶ παροινίαν, καὶ πολλὴν ἀδικίαν, 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 (οὐκ ἡσχύνοντο) (3:1), and so virtuous.<sup>66</sup> Yet, they compromised human virtue with a bad decision, ironically introducing the vice of folly (ἄφροσύνη)<sup>67</sup> by heeding the bad advice of the cleverest (φρονιμώτατος, 3:1) of

---

notes the moral decline from virtue (ἀρετή) to vice (κακία) among Seth's virtuous line only after seven generations.

<sup>66</sup> At least two distinct lines of thought connect virtue and shame in classical ethics. First, the roots *αἰσχ-* and *κακ-* may be used casually as synonyms: “*Kalos* [καλός] and *aiskhros* [αἰσχροός] 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* [καλός] thus most often corresponds to our ‘admirable’, ‘creditable, honourable’, and *aiskhros* [αἰσχροός] 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 καλόν and τὸ αἰσχρόν in apposition to ἀρετή and κακία: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λέγωμεν περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας καὶ καλοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ. 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 ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶν ἡ αἰσχύνη, εἴπερ γίνεται ἐπὶ τοῖς φαύλοις ... φαύλου δὲ καὶ τὸ εἶναι τοιοῦτον οἷον πράττειν τι τῶν αἰσchrῶν). The Greek concept of shame also has a positive side. According to Plato, *Leg.* 646e.3–647b.2, αἰσχύνη/αἰδώς 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.

<sup>67</sup> 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 (δοκεῖ δὲ φρονίμου εἶναι τὸ δύνασθαι καλῶς βουλευσασθαι περὶ τὰ αὐτῷ ἀγαθὰ καὶ συμφέροντα, οὐ κατὰ μέρος, οἷον ποῖα πρὸς ὑγίειαν, πρὸς ἰσχύν, ἀλλὰ ποῖα πρὸς τὸ εὖ ζῆν ὅλως) and *Nic. eth.* 1141b.9–10 (τοῦ γὰρ φρονίμου μάλιστα τοῦτ' ἔργον εἶναι φαμεν, τὸ εὖ βουλευέσθαι). 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.<sup>68</sup> To this initial decline in human moral reasoning, Cain supplied first a vice of excess by his bad temper (ὀργιλότης)<sup>69</sup> and then one of deficiency, i.e., cowardice (δειλία) or lack of courage.<sup>70</sup> Most recently, human vice was made complete by the addition of intemperance (ἀκολασία).<sup>71</sup> 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

---

ἔτι τὸ ἔργον ἀποτελεῖται κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν ἡθικὴν ἀρετὴν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρετὴ τὸν σκοπὸν ποιεῖ ὀρθόν, ἡ δὲ φρόνησις τὰ πρὸς τοῦτον.

<sup>68</sup> 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).

<sup>69</sup> Cain is easily upset (ἐλύπησεν 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 λυπούμενός γε ἀνδρεῖος, ὁ δὲ λυπούμενος δειλός). Furthermore, *Eth. nic.* 1126a.4–8 describes the opposite of ὀργιλότης (“bad temper”), i.e., ἀοργησία (“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 (ἐκδεδίκηται) for a minor offense (τραῦμα, μῶλωπα).

<sup>70</sup> 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).

<sup>71</sup> 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).<sup>72</sup> 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 חמ (‘‘violence’’)<sup>73</sup> twice as ἀδικία<sup>74</sup> (‘‘injustice’’), the single vice that collectively represents all vices.<sup>75</sup> What is more, G’s choice of ἀδικία creates contrastive lexical resonance with the

---

<sup>72</sup> 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).

<sup>73</sup> The concept of חמ (‘‘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 חמ as a kind of theft (see note 36). Wevers claims that G intentionally translated חמ 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 חמ to ἀδικία transfers the blame from humans and animals to humans alone.

<sup>74</sup> ἀδικία | G always translates חמ 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.

<sup>75</sup> 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 ἀρετή), and the opposite goes for injustice, as stated in 1130a.8–10: αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ δικαιοσύνη οὐ μέρος ἀρετῆς ἀλλ’ ὅλη ἀρετὴ ἐστίν, οὐδ’ ἡ ἐναντία ἀδικία μέρος κακίας ἀλλ’ ὅλη 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 δίκαιος<sup>76</sup> (“just”)<sup>77</sup> but also τέλειος<sup>78</sup> (“complete”),<sup>79</sup> being master of all the virtues by virtue of having the cardinal one: δικαιοσύνη (“justice”).<sup>80</sup> 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.

<sup>76</sup> δίκαιος | קַדִּיץ => δίκαιος is a consistent rendering (11/11).

<sup>77</sup> 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 קַדִּיץ,” because G consistently translates the Hebrew root קַדִּיץ with the Greek root δίκ- (*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 δίκ- to be present in the Hebrew root קַדִּיץ. 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 Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus WUNT 219, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 221–235.

<sup>78</sup> τέλειος | G translates מִמְת 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.

<sup>79</sup> For its moral connotation, see BDAG, s.v. “τέλειος” 4.a. As with δίκαιος, the adjective “complete” (τέλειος) implies “complete virtue” (ἀρετὴ τελεία) (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” (ἀληθεῖς δόξαι), the traits of a “complete person” (τέλειος ἄνθρωπος) (*Leg.* 653a; cf. *Phdr.* 249c). See also note 75.

<sup>80</sup> Philo, *Deus* 122 paraphrases Noah’s virtue as τὴν ἐν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς τοῦ Νῶε 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 ἐμφαίνει. Τὸ γὰρ δίκαιος ὄνομα ἔθος ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τῶν πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν μετιόντων λέγειν. ... Πάντα πληρώσας, φησὶν, ἅπερ ἐχρῆν ἄνθρωπον ἐπιδείξασθαι ἀρετὴν ἐλόμενον (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ, Τέλειος), οὐδὲν ἐλλειοπῶς, ἐν οὐδενὶ χωλεύων. Οὐ τὸ μὲν κατορθώσας, ἐν τῷ δὲ διαμαρτῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐν πάσῃ ἀρετῇ τέλειος ᾗν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν ἐπιδείξασθαι.

of the masses and the complete virtue of the one man Noah in two small ways.<sup>81</sup> First, by using contrastive *δέ* for Noah's introduction ("But Noah found favor..."),<sup>82</sup> Noah's character is explicitly constructed in opposition to the rest of humanity; second, G translates בדרתיו ("in his generations") with a singular object in the phrase ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ<sup>83</sup> αὐτοῦ ("in his generation"), so that Noah's virtue is understood specifically in contrast to his contemporaries and not necessarily all humans before him.<sup>84</sup> Finally, the ethical resonance of ἀδικία and κακία is amplified by the lexical equivalent G selects for *תחת* in this passage, since (κατα)φθείρω is not only suitable for describing the destruction of natural disasters<sup>85</sup> but has decidedly ethical connotations.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> G also forms a lexical contrast between Noah and those who died in the flood in 7:23 by translating *מחה* and *נאש* with verbs derived from a common root: when everything is "wiped out" (ἐξηλείφθησαν), Noah alone (μόνος) is "left behind" (κατελείφθη) (cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 136; Wevers, *Notes*, 100). This contrast is reinforced by the interpretation of *תא* 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): ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι // χαλεπόν, χερσὶν τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόῳ // τετράγωνον, ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον. Cf. LSJ, s.v. "τετράγωνος" A.II.

<sup>82</sup> This contrastive *δέ* accurately represents the Hebrew disjunctive syntax. For G's use of *δέ*, see §4.1.1.

<sup>83</sup> *γενεᾷ* | G only translates *דרת* as singular here (1/6), thus harmonizing with the singular *דר* in *בדור הזה* later in 7:1. For singular => plural, see §6.2.2.2.

<sup>84</sup> 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.

<sup>85</sup> For *φθειρ-* used of natural disasters and floods, see Plato, *Tim.* 22b–23c; *Leg.* 677; Apollodorus, *Bib.* 1.7.2.

<sup>86</sup> For the ethical connotation of this root, see LSJ, s.vv. "φθείρω" A.I.3, "καταφθείρω" A.I.2. In Aristotle's technical vocabulary, existing virtues may be "corrupted" (φθίρεται) (*Eth. nic.* 1103b.7–8; 1104a.11–13; et passim). Inasmuch as *φθίρεται* is used in this philosophical sense in opposition to intransitive verbs like *γίνεται* ("come into being") and *αύξεται* ("increase"), it could be translated as "diminish," but it never loses its

6:5                      וְכָל יֵצֶר מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ    καὶ πᾶς τις<sup>87</sup> διανοεῖται<sup>88</sup> ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ  
                              רַק רָע כָּל הַיּוֹם     ἑπιμελῶς<sup>89</sup> ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας<sup>90</sup>  
every inclination of the thoughts of one's mind/heart    each person plans evil deeds in his heart  
                              was only evil all day long                  with great care all his days

Second, G has supplied a volitional<sup>94</sup> dimension to מחשבת (“thoughts”) by rendering it as

διανοεῖται (“plans”),<sup>95</sup> the object of which is not abstract “evil” (רע) but concrete “evil deeds” (τὰ πονηρά).<sup>96</sup> That this transformation is not itself unintentional is indicated by the subsequent choice to translate רק (“only”) quite inventively as ἐπιμελῶς (“with great care”).<sup>97</sup> Finally, by rendering the singular phrase כל היום (either “all day long” or “all their days”)<sup>98</sup> 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” (προσεπινοεῖν ἐτέρας κακίας). Based on these terms, Didymus, *In Gen.* 159 seems to think that ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ also means “whole-heartedly”: Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔ[τυχεν ἐπ]ράττετο παρὰ αὐτῶν ἡ χ[ακία] ἀλλ’ «ἐπιμελῶ[ς] καὶ βεβο[υ]λημένως· τοῦτο γὰρ δηλ[οῖ] τὸ «ἐ[ν] τῇ καρδίᾳ». Cf. John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 22.5 (PG 53:192.8–18).

<sup>95</sup> Rösel argues that G was at a loss for how to translate יצר מחשבת, 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).

<sup>96</sup> 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 ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων (“on account of human actions”).

<sup>97</sup> 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 (προαίρεσις, 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 of הגוי גם צדיק תהרג as ἔθνος ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολεῖς, which explicitly connects intentionality with guilt (cf. §8.3.2). Rösel translates ἐπιμελῶς 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).

<sup>98</sup> 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 משהיתה חמה זורחת ועד שהיתה שקועת (“from sunrise to sunset”); cf. Ps 1:2 יומם ולילה (“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,<sup>99</sup> 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 קץ כל בשר בא לפני    Καὶρὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου<sup>100</sup> ἤκει ἐναντίον μου  
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 on דרכו.<sup>101</sup>

6:11 השחית כל בשר את דרכו    κατέφθειρεν πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ  
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 σὰρξ (“flesh”)—grammatically feminine—G interprets σὰρξ as human.<sup>102</sup> As a

<sup>99</sup> 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 ἐκούσιον) but not choice (προαίρεσις): τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἐκουσίου καὶ παῖδες καὶ τᾶλλα ζῶα κοινωνεῖ, προαιρέσεως δ’ οὐ (*Eth. nic.* 1111b.8–9).

<sup>100</sup> 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 אִישׁ or אָדָם.

<sup>101</sup> In a similar way, G’s use of masculine agreement in 9:6 “he who sheds human blood” (ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου) excludes animals from this new legislation, although G previously said they would also be punished for manslaughter (9:5). The Hebrew phrase שֶׁפַךְ דָּם הָאָדָם may include both humans and animals.

<sup>102</sup> Philo, in *Deus* 140–144 and *QG* 1.99, makes a point of the lack of grammatical concord between σὰρξ 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 משחיתם (“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 אשר (“all that”) first with reference to the animals (πάντα ὅσα [“everything that”]) and then concerning human beings (πᾶς ὅς [“everyone who”]).<sup>103</sup> 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.<sup>104</sup>

---

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 αὐτοῦ, 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 αὐτοῦ as σὰρξ qua ἄνθρωπος.<sup>103</sup> 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).

<sup>104</sup> 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.<sup>105</sup> 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 ויתעצב אל לבו (“he was deeply troubled in his mind”).<sup>106</sup> Avoiding the idea that God would regret the creation of humans,<sup>107</sup> G sees

---

<sup>105</sup> 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.

<sup>106</sup> 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*).

<sup>107</sup> Aquila recognizes the semantic incongruity between נחם and ἐνθυμέομαι, correcting G’s ἐνεθυμήθη to μετεμελήθη and his ἐθυμώθη to μετεμελήθη. Cf. Syrohexaplar ἀπέστρεψε 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 *καίγε* revisers—regularly avoided translating נחם (*niphal*) with μεταμελέομαι or μετανόεω, 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 διενόηθη 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”<sup>108</sup> (ἐνθυμήθη) 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:

|     |                                                 |                                              |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 6:6 | וַיִּנְחַם יְהוָה                               | καὶ ἐνθυμήθη <sup>109</sup> ὁ θεὸς           |
|     | כִּי עָשָׂה אֶת הָאָדָם בָּאָרֶץ                | ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,       |
|     | וַיַּעֲצַב אֶל לְבוֹ                            | καὶ διανοήθη. <sup>110</sup>                 |
|     | And the Lord <u>regretted</u>                   | Indeed, God <u>contemplated</u>              |
|     | having made humans on the earth,                | the fact that he made humanity on the earth, |
|     | and <u>he was deeply troubled in his mind</u> . | and <u>he came to a decision</u> .           |

<sup>108</sup> 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 θυμώω (*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 ὅτι. 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 ἐθυμώθη 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.

<sup>109</sup> ἐνθυμήθη | G chooses to translate נחם with ἐνθυμέομαι only here (1/9), and he never uses ἐνθυμέομαι otherwise (but cf. θυμέω in 6:7).

<sup>110</sup> διανοήθη | The verb עצב only occurs two other times in Genesis, but G expresses its emotive dimension in those cases, selecting κατανύσσομαι (34:7) and λυπέω (45:5). G’s selection of διανοέομαι here is likely related to the presence of אל לבו 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.<sup>111</sup> However, even if one takes διενοήθη as an ingressive aorist (“began to consider”)<sup>112</sup> or a complexive aorist (“he thought about”),<sup>113</sup> the deliberative process quickly comes to an end, as God voices the decision he has made in what immediately follows:

6:7 ויאמר יהוה אמוחה את האדם אשר בראתי      καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ἀπαλείψω τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν ἐποίησα,  
 מעל פני האדמה מאדם עד בהמה      ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους  
 עד רמש ועד עוף השמים      καὶ ἀπὸ ἐρπετῶν ἕως πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,  
 כי נחמתי כי עשיתם      ὅτι ἐθυμώθη<sup>114</sup> ὅτι ἐποίησα αὐτούς.

Unfortunately, the meaning of ἐθυμώθη, 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

<sup>111</sup> 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: ἐννοῖαν καὶ διανόησιν, τὴν μὲν ἐναποκειμένην οὖσαν νόησιν, τὴν δὲ νοήσεως 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).

<sup>112</sup> KG II §386.5; Smyth §§1924–1925. This possibility seems the least likely, since the prior verb ἐνεθυμήθη—regardless of whether one takes it as “grew angry” or “contemplated”—implies that God has already started the thinking process.

<sup>113</sup> 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).

<sup>114</sup> ἐθυμώθη | G chooses to translate נחם as θυμώ only here (1/9). Elsewhere, G only uses θυμός to render חרה (3: 30:2; 39:19; 44:18), but in none of these cases is the verb preceded by the compound ἐνθυμέομαι.

expression of intense<sup>115</sup> emotion (“I am very angry”).<sup>116</sup> 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,<sup>117</sup> in which case ἐθυμώθην may share the meaning of ἐνεθυμήθη above: “I contemplated.”<sup>118</sup> 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.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> 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).

<sup>116</sup> 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).

<sup>117</sup> See Renehan, “Compound and Simplex.”

<sup>118</sup> Symmachus attests the compound form in this verse: ἐνεθυμ[...]. Without any justification, Wevers claims that the sense of ἐνεθυμέομαι “would indeed be inappropriate” for the second occurrence of נחם (*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).

<sup>119</sup> 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 אל לבו, which also occurs in 8:21 in the phrase אל לבו ... ויאמר (“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 אל לבו, 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 עק (“end”) as καιρός<sup>120</sup> (“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<sup>121</sup> 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.<sup>122</sup>

#### 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

---

<sup>120</sup> καιρός | G translates עק as καιρός only here (1/5), but elsewhere עק occurs on the form עקמ (i.e., as the object of the preposition מן), which G translates synthetically as μετά (4:3; 8:6; 16:3; 41:1). Otherwise, G select καιρός (13) to translate מועד (4), עת (3), עצם (2), and פעם (2). Aquila and Symmachus reject καιρός as an adequate representation of עק, preferring τέλος and πέρας, respectively.

<sup>121</sup> 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.

<sup>122</sup> Many interpreters understand the long period of time between 6:1 and 7:6 as indicative of God’s mercy and forbearance, a provision for a time of repentance. Cf. Philo, *QG* 1.100; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 24.3 (PG 53:209.26–33); Didymus, *In Gen.* 169.5.

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)<sup>123</sup> (7:4).<sup>124</sup> In a similar way, the initial statement by the narrator in 6:11 that the earth is “corrupt” (ἐφθάρη) before God is immediately corrected<sup>125</sup> to a more intense form of expression in 6:12: God sees that it is “utterly corrupt” (κατεφθαρμένη) because “all flesh has

---

<sup>123</sup> ἀπ/ἐξαλείπω | G consistently translates נחם, which only occurs in the flood narrative, with one of these cognate verbs (4/4). Once, G uses ἐξαλείφω to render another verb (נחש in 9:15), thus having God promise first not to “destroy” (καταφθείρω) 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.

<sup>124</sup> 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).

<sup>125</sup> Robert Renahan 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 (κατέφθειρεν)<sup>126</sup> his way.” This alternation serves to rationalize the repetition, such that the gravity of the matter is gradually intensified.<sup>127</sup>

G also varies expression in regard to the animals, translating חיה(ה)ל (“to live”) variously as ἵνα τρέφῃς (“in order to nourish,” 6:19), τρέφεσθαι (“to nourish,” 6:20), and διατρέψαι (“to nourish continually,” 7:3).<sup>128</sup> Not only does G vary between simplex and compound forms, i.e., τρέφω (“nourish”) and διατρέφω (“nourish continually”), but he also varies construction<sup>129</sup> and aspect.<sup>130</sup> Furthermore, by translating the imperative תק (“take”) in 6:21 with the future indicative as λήμψῃ<sup>131</sup> (“you will take”), the only command that God gives Noah in 6:13–21 pertains to the construction of the ark. On the other hand, by rendering the yiqtol form תקת (“you will take”) in 7:2 with the aorist imperative εἰσάγαγε<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> (κατα)φθείρω | See note 86. For the simplex/compound alternation, see §5.2.2.5.

<sup>127</sup> 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.

<sup>128</sup> (δια)τρέφω | G’s use of (δια)τρέφω (“feed/sustain (continually)”) for חיה 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).

<sup>129</sup> ἵνα τρέφῃς | For infinitive construct => subjunctive, see §6.1.1.7 (cf. §3.1.1.2).

<sup>130</sup> διατρέψαι | 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 δια (“continually,” i.e., “from start to finish”). Cf. Smyth §§1648; 1685.

<sup>131</sup> λήμψῃ | For imperative => finite verb (7/302), see §6.1.1.4.

<sup>132</sup> εἰσάγαγε | For yiqtol => imperative (14/474), see §6.1.1.2. Lexically, G has rendered תקל as if it were בוא, since the equivalence תקל = εἰσάγω only occurs twice (2/142, cf. 12:15), whereas εἰσάγω (11/13) corresponds to בוא everywhere else.



(“bring in”), G frames God’s speech in 7:1–4 specifically in relation to the animals.<sup>133</sup> This, in turn, resolves the redundancy created by the two execution formulae, which specifically state that Noah did all that God “commanded” (ἐνετείλατο) him to do: first he built the ark (6:22) and then he rounded up the animals (7:5).<sup>134</sup>

#### 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 והמבול היה 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

---

<sup>133</sup> G’s interpretation of לך 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 תקח (εἰσάξεις) in 7:2 and תביא (εἰσάγαγε) 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 קח (λήμψη) is used in 6:21 in reference to the food.

<sup>134</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 24.5 (PG 53:213.16–21) states that God’s initial directions regarding the animals made no distinction (ἀδιορίστως) between clean and unclean, which warrants a second set of more specific instructions.

water”),<sup>135</sup> 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” (διὰ)<sup>136</sup> 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.<sup>137</sup>

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

---

<sup>135</sup> Wevers notes but offers no explanation for this syntactic change. In relation to 7:17, he claims that ὁ 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).

<sup>136</sup> διὰ | G translates מפני (14) causally as διὰ on only one other occasion (27:46). For G’s treatment of compound prepositions, see §3.3.1.1.

<sup>137</sup> 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.<sup>138</sup> 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 ἐποποιίᾳ τὸ ἄλογον), “because (the audience) is not looking at the person doing the action” (διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁρᾶν εἰς τὸν πράττοντα).<sup>139</sup> 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 σκηνῆς ὄντα γελοῖα ἂν φανείη), but “no one picks up on this in epic” (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἔπεσιν λανθάνει),<sup>140</sup> 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., 3<sup>rd</sup>-person narration, speech) over against drama (i.e., enactment).<sup>141</sup> Perhaps G’s two subtle attempts to correct this impossibility worked, as his readers do not give any direct indication that they noticed it.<sup>142</sup> Then again, they may

---

<sup>138</sup> Paul Grice, “Logic and Conversation,” in *Speech Acts*, ed. Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan, Syntax and Semantics 3 (New York: Academic Press, 1975): 41–58; Jeffrey Stackert, “Pentateuchal Coherence and the Science of Reading,” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. Jan Gertz et al., FAT 111 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 253–68.

<sup>139</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1460a.12–14.

<sup>140</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1460a.14–17.

<sup>141</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1448a.18–25.

<sup>142</sup> It is interesting that, for example, Philo, *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 of 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<sup>143</sup> of the repetition and the risk of redundancy in several ways.

#### Genesis 7:17–20, 24

17 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ κατακλυσμὸς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπληθύνθη τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐπῆρεν τὴν κιβωτόν, καὶ ὑψώθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. 18 καὶ ἐπεκράτει τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐπληθύνετο σφόδρα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπεφέρετο ἡ κιβωτὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος. 19 τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἐπεκράτει σφόδρα σφοδρῶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν πάντα τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά, ἃ ἦν ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 20 δέκα πέντε πῆχεις ἐπάνω ὑψώθη τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν πάντα τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά.

וַיִּגְבְּרוּ וַיִּכְסּוּ 24 καὶ ὑψώθη τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἡμέρας ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα.

<sup>143</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 25.5–6 (PG 53:226.10–11, 18–20) says that Moses's narration "amplifies fear" (αὐξεῖ τὸν φόβον) and "causes what took place to swell" (ἐξογκοῖ τὸ γεγενημένον), later claiming that the precise daily increase of the waters is carefully narrated: "Οὐα πῶς ἀκριβῶς ἡμῖν διηγεῖται τὴν πολλὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φορὰν, καὶ ὅτι ἐφ' ἐκάστης αὐξήσιν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ πλημμύρα τῶν ὑδάτων."

First, G makes use of the imperfect<sup>144</sup> to translate the wayyiqtol and qatal forms in 7:18–19 to create a sense of mounting anticipation that is not fulfilled<sup>145</sup> until the aorist form ἐπεκάλυψεν (“it covered”) in 7:19. Second, in translating the repetitive expression מֵאֵד מֵאֵד (“very, very much”), G elects to vary the expression by means of polyptoton: σφόδρα σφοδρῶς<sup>146</sup> (“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<sup>147</sup> the two verbs of which it is the subject (וַתִּרָם [“it rose”] => ὑψώθη [“it was raised”];<sup>148</sup> וַתֵּלֶךְ [“it moved”] => ἐπεφέρετο<sup>149</sup> [“it was carried”]). G also increases the agency of the waters by translating both occurrences

---

<sup>144</sup> ἐπεκράτει, ἐπληθύνετο, ἐπεφέρετο, ἐπεκράτει | For wayyiqtol => imperfect (69/2,151), see §6.1.1.1; for qatal => imperfect (67/911), see §6.1.1.5.

<sup>145</sup> 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]).

<sup>146</sup> σφοδρῶς | Only here does G choose to render מֵאֵד as σφοδρῶς (1/37), a form he does not use otherwise.

<sup>147</sup> ὑψώθη, ἐπεφέρετο | For active => passive, see §6.1.2.3.

<sup>148</sup> Wevers judges ὑψώθη 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).

<sup>149</sup> 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: ἥ τε δὲ Ἀττικὴ κατεδύετο καὶ ἐπιφερομένη Αἰγιναίη νηὺς κατέδυσε τῶν Σαμοθρηϊκῶν τὴν νέα; 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 ἤλθ = 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 **ויכסו כל ההרים** (“all the mountains were covered”)<sup>150</sup> as *ἐπεκάλυψεν πάντα τὰ ὄρη*, thus keeping *τὸ ὕδωρ* (“the water”) as the subject from the prior clause in each case.<sup>151</sup>

What is more, G resolves the implied contradiction of 7:24 by differentiating his translations of the Hebrew verb **גבר** (“increase”). As long as the water is rising, he translates **גבר** (7:19, 20) as *ἐπεκράτει*<sup>152</sup> (“was prevailing”),<sup>153</sup> but once it reaches its highest point in 7:20, he begins to translate **גבר** as *ὑψώθη*,<sup>154</sup> 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.<sup>155</sup> In contrast to the Hebrew text, where **גברו** in 7:20 and **ויגברו** again in 7:24 imply that the waters continued to

<sup>150</sup> The form **ויכסו** in 7:19–20 was likely read by G as active (piel) instead of passive (pual).

<sup>151</sup> 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.

<sup>152</sup> *ἐπεκράτει* | G only uses *ἐπικράτεω* of the flood and the famine under Joseph (41:57; 47:20 [חזק]). Outside of this passage, **גבר** only occurs again in 49:26 (*ὑπερισχύω*).

<sup>153</sup> For the metaphorical use of *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: *εἴτα λιμοῦ ἐπικρατήσαντος, ὥστε τινὰς καὶ ἐς τὸν ποταμὸν ἑαυτοὺς ἐμβαλεῖν μὴ φέροντας τὸν λιμόν, ἐστασίασαν*. Cf. Eudoxus, *Selenodromium secundum cyclum duodecim annorum* 183.21–25, 186.32 (Franz Boll: *Codices Germanici*, Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 7 [Brussels: Lamertin, 1908]: 183–187).

<sup>154</sup> *ὑψώθη* | G normally selects *ὑψόω* to translate other verbs (7/9), i.e. **גדל** (4) and **רום** (3). Unlike **גבר**, however, both **גדל** and **רום** explicitly denote height. Aquila and Symmachus reject G’s *ὑψώθη* in 7:20 and 7:24, preferring *ἐνεδυναμώθη* and *ἐπεκράτησεν*, respectively, and thus retaining the contradiction.

<sup>155</sup> 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 *ὑψώθη* as dynamic in 7:20 (“Ansteigen des Wassers”) and stative in 7:24 (“sein Bleiben auf dem in 7,20 benannten Höchststand”), but he does not explain why **גבר** 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)<sup>156</sup> the mountains, reaching their “highest” (ὕψωθῃ) point at fifteen cubits above the highest mountains. Afterwards, they do not rise any further but stay at this “height” (ὕψωθῃ) for 150 days (7:24).<sup>157</sup>

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).

---

<sup>156</sup> 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.

<sup>157</sup> The interpretation that the water rose for forty days, reached its apex, and remained there for 150 days, is widespread. See, e.g., Josephus, *A.J.* 1.3.5 §§89–90: Ἐπισημάναντος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὕειν ἀρξαμένου τὸ ὕδωρ ἡμέραις τεσσαράκοντα ὅλαις κατεφέρετο, ὡς ἐπὶ πήχεις πεντεκαίδεκα τὴν γῆν ὑπερέχειν.... παυσαμένου δὲ τοῦ ὕετοῦ μόλις ἤρξατο ὑποβαίνειν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐφ’ ἡμέρας ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα. Philo, *QG* 2.29 explains that the water 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 τοσαύτας, φησὶν, ἡμέρας ἔμεινε κορυφούμενον τὸ ὕδωρ; 26.3 (PG 53:232–233): μετὰ τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τὰς τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας, ἃς ἡ τῶν ὑδάτων φορὰ κατεφέρετο, ὁρῶν ἐπὶ ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρου τὰ ὕδατα μένοντα.

## Genesis 8:3–5

וישובו | מעל הארץ הלוך ושוב ויחסרו 3 καὶ ἐνεδίδου τὸ ὕδωρ πορευόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἐνεδίδου καὶ ἡλαττονοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ μετὰ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἡμέρας. 4 καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἡ κιβωτὸς ἐν μηνὶ τῷ ἑβδόμῳ ἑβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός, ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ Ἀραράτ. 5 τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ πορευόμενον ἡλαττονοῦτο ἕως τοῦ δεκάτου μηνός· ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑνδεκάτῳ μηνί, τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ μηνός, ᾤφθησαν αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ὀρέων.

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 ושוב);<sup>158</sup> (ii) moving the first infinitive absolute before the preceding prepositional phrase (πορευόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς instead of מעל הארץ הלוך);<sup>159</sup> (iii) joining the two clauses asyndetically by providing no discrete equivalent for ו;<sup>160</sup> and (iv) translating the second infinitive absolute as a finite verb (ἐνεδίδου).

8:3 וישובו המים מעל הארץ הלוך ושוב καὶ ἐνεδίδου τὸ ὕδωρ πορευόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἐνεδίδου ויחסרו המים καὶ ἡλαττονοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ μετὰ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἡμέρας. מקצה חמשים ומאת יום

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.

<sup>158</sup> For G's handling of the infinitive absolute, see §6.1.1.8.

<sup>159</sup> For G's displacement of adverbial modifiers, i.e. ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, see §4.2.2.

<sup>160</sup> 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 שׁוּב, but he recasts it syntactically in order to make sense of the redundancy created by the two virtually synonymous Hebrew clauses.<sup>161</sup> This stage of abatement comes to a close when the ark “gets lodged” (ἐκάθισεν)<sup>162</sup> on Mt. Ararat. In representing the second stage, G imitates the first, translating the infinitive absolute idiom הָיוּ הַלֹךְ וְחָסָר (“gradually receded”) with a circumstantial participle and an imperfect indicative: τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ πορευόμενον ἡλαττονοῦτο (“and the water decreased as it went”).<sup>163</sup> As with their rising, G narrates the floodwaters’ initial abatement theatrically.

---

<sup>161</sup> G’s interpretation of שׁוּב 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 ו of שׁוּב could have been read a י, such that he or a previous scribe took the verb שׁוּב as yiqtol, and G does use the imperfect more often for yiqtol in narrative (see §6.1.1.2).

<sup>162</sup> ἐκάθισεν | A rare equivalent for נָח (1/4), G only uses καθίζω (7/8) otherwise for יָשָׁב. 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 καθισάντων τῶν πλοίων εἰς πᾶσαν ἤλθον ἀπορίαν; Strabo, *Geogr.* 2.3.4 καθίσαι γὰρ τὸ πλοῖον, ἡσυχῇ δέ, ὥστε μὴδ’ ἀθροῦν διαλυθῆναι.

<sup>163</sup> 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 ἐγένετο μετὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἠνέωξεν Νῶε τὴν θυρίδα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, ἣν ἐποίησεν,  
וישלח | הערב | ויצא 7 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν κόρακα τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ· καὶ ἐξελθὼν  
יצוא ושוב οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν ἕως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.
- מאתו | היונה | וישלח 8 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς  
מצאה | היונה | ותשב 9 καὶ οὐχ εὐροῦσα ἢ περιστερὰ ἀνάπαυσιν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῆς ὑπέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς  
וישלח τὴν κιβωτόν, ὅτι ὕδωρ ἦν ἐπὶ παντὶ προσώπῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ  
ויקחה | ויבא 10 ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν.
- ויחל | ויסף שלח | היונה 10 καὶ ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ ἐτέρας πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ.  
ותבא | היונה | והנה 11 καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ περιστερὰ τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέραν, καὶ εἶχεν φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος  
וידע ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔγνω Νῶε ὅτι κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.
- וייחל | ויסף שלח | היונה 12 καὶ ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ ἐτέρας πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν, καὶ οὐ  
יספה שוב προσέθετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔτι.

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” (ויצא יצוא ושוב) until the land is completely dry. In a surprisingly bold move,

even though it is only a matter of one little word,<sup>164</sup> G completely alters<sup>165</sup> this fact in his translation: καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν (“and once it went out, it never returned”).<sup>166</sup>

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

---

<sup>164</sup> 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.

<sup>165</sup> 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 וְשׁוּב 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., ἐξήρχετο 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.

<sup>166</sup> 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): Οὐκ ἐπειδὴ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνέστρεψε, τὸ, “Ἐως, προσέθηκεν ἡ θεία Γραφή· ἀλλ’ ἰδίωμα τοῦτό ἐστι 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 **מֵאֵצְלוֹ** as referring to the raven instead of Noah, thus “after it”<sup>167</sup> (*ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ*)<sup>168</sup> 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*,<sup>169</sup> 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”<sup>170</sup> 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<sup>171</sup> and finite verbs in order to enhance the internal parallelism of each sending.

---

<sup>167</sup> The translation “after” is intentionally vague, as *ὀπίσω* 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, *La Genèse*, 137). An allative reading is recommended by LSJ, s.v. “*ὀπίσω*,” which only gives *ὀπίσω* followed by the genitive in an allative sense (see I.4), although BDAG, s.v. “*ὀπίσω*” suggests diachronic shift with *ὀπίσω*, since it gives both spatial (see 2.a) and temporal meanings (see 2.b). Like Rösel, Wevers interprets *ὀπίσω* temporally, as he thinks that the rendering *ὀπίσω 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 *ἔτι* and *ἐτέρας* seems to belie what was said about *ὀπίσω 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 *ὀπίσω* 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 *ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ ἐτέρας* in reference to the prior phrase *ὀπίσω 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.

<sup>168</sup> *ὀπίσω* | Only here does G render **מֵאֵצְלוֹ** (14) with *ὀπίσω*. For G’s translation of compound prepositions, see §3.3.1.1.

<sup>169</sup> For G’s alternation between simplex and compound verbs, see note 125 and §5.2.2.5.

<sup>170</sup> See §5.2.2.5, which discusses the judgment of John Lee (*Lexical Study*, 93).

<sup>171</sup> *ἐξελθὼν, εὐροῦσα, ἐκτείνας, ἐπισχὼν, ἐπισχὼν* | 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,<sup>172</sup> presented with an aorist circumstantial participle.

8:7 καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν

9a καὶ οὐχ εὐροῦσα ... ὑπέστρεψεν

9b καὶ ἐκτείνας<sup>173</sup> τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἔλαβεν ... καὶ εἰσήγαγεν

10 καὶ ἐπισχὼν ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν

12 καὶ ἐπισχὼν ... πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν

Third, G increases the lexical parallelism in the passage. Usually, the Hebrew uses the verb שׁוּב (“return”) to describe a bird’s return (8:7, 9, 12), but 8:11 has וַתָּבֵא (“and it came [in]”). G simultaneously assimilates the two terms to one another and preserves a distinction between them, by selecting ἀναστρέφω<sup>174</sup> (“return again”) to translate בּוֹא. 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.

<sup>172</sup> The dove’s actions in 8:11 form a distinct pattern of aorist followed by imperfect (ἀνέστρεψεν ... καὶ εἶχεν).

<sup>173</sup> Anneli Aejmelaeus notes that the expression יָדָהּ 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).

<sup>174</sup> ἀναστρέφω | Only here does G choose to translate בּוֹא as if it were שׁוּב (1/220). Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 106.

## 7.5 Conclusion

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,<sup>175</sup> 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.<sup>176</sup> 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

---

<sup>175</sup> Additional cases of G's elimination of stylistic inconsistency could be mentioned, such as G's translation of ויגוע by ἀπέθανεν in 7:21 and יכרת by ἀποθανεύται in 9:11 as if rendering מות or his use of ἄνθρωπος for both אדם and איש, but such choices have a minor effect and have been thoroughly documented by Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 145–200.

<sup>176</sup> 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 ἐστὶν ἱστορία ἢ σύστημα διηγήσεως).<sup>177</sup> 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.

---

<sup>177</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel 2:60.2-6): ὁ τε γὰρ καλῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως διήγησιν καὶ μῦθον ἀπαγγείλας καλῶς καὶ ἱστορίαν συνθήσει, καὶ τὸ ἰδίως ἐν ταῖς ὑποθέσεσι καλούμενον [ἴδιον] διήγημα (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλο τί ἐστὶν ἱστορία ἢ 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 (ὅλον) requires a beginning, a middle, and an end. *Beginning* means that which does not by necessity (ἐξ ἀνάγκης) follow from another event,<sup>1</sup> 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 (ἐξ ἀνάγκης) or by statistical probability<sup>2</sup> (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 (μήθ' ὁπόθεν ἔτυχεν ἄρχεσθαι μήθ' ὅπου ἔτυχε τελευτᾶν) but should make use of the forms I have stated.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup> For example, the same ideas can be found in the *progymnasmata* 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Lit. “from something else,” but in this context Aristotle is discussing ἡ σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων (“the composition/arrangement of events”) (*Poet.* 1450b.22).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1450b.26–34: ὅλον δέ ἐστιν τὸ ἔχον ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευτήν. ἀρχὴ δέ ἐστιν ὃ αὐτὸ μὲν μὴ ἐξ ἀνάγκης μετ' ἄλλο ἐστίν, μετ' ἐκεῖνο δ' ἕτερον πέφυκεν εἶναι ἢ γίνεσθαι· τελευτὴ δὲ τοῦναντίον ὃ αὐτὸ μὲν μετ' ἄλλο πέφυκεν εἶναι ἢ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἢ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἄλλο οὐδέν· μέσον δὲ ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ μετ' ἄλλο καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνο ἕτερον. δεῖ ἄρα τοὺς συνεστῶτας εὖ μύθους μήθ' ὁπόθεν ἔτυχεν ἄρχεσθαι μήθ' ὅπου ἔτυχε τελευτᾶν, ἀλλὰ κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς εἰρημέναις ιδέαις.

<sup>4</sup> 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 πῶς δεῖ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς ἔξῃν ἢ ποιήσις). Tragedy (ἡ τῆς τραγωδίας 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,<sup>5</sup> and one of the topoi used for the confirmation and refutation of fables and narratives is ἐκ τῆς τάξεως (“from disorder”).<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> On Theon’s view of concision, see §7.1 and esp. notes 3 and 5.

<sup>6</sup> For the confirmational/refutational topoi common to fable and narrative, see §7.1 and esp. note 11.

<sup>7</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1448a.18–25; cf. Nicolaus, *Prog.* 3 (Felten 12.7–17): Τῶν δὲ διηγημάτων εἰς διαφορὰ πρὸς ἄλληλα τρεῖς· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀφηγηματικά, τὰ δὲ δραματικά, τὰ δὲ μικτά. ἀφηγηματικά μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν, ὅσα ἀπὸ μόνου λέγεται τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντος αὐτά, οἷα ἐστὶ τὰ παρὰ Πινδάρῳ· δραματικά δέ, ὅσα οὐκ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συντιθέντος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσώπων λέγεται, οἷα τὰ ἐν τοῖς κωμικοῖς καὶ τραγικοῖς δράμασι· μικτά δὲ τὰ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων συγκείμενα, οἷα τὰ Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡροδότου καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, πῇ μὲν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντος ἐκφερόμενα, πῇ δὲ ἐξ ἐτέρων προσώπων.

<sup>8</sup> 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 τραγωδίας ποιήσις ἔτι δὲ κωμωδία καὶ ἡ διθυραμβοποιητικὴ καὶ τῆς αὐλητικῆς ἡ πλείστη καὶ χιθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι (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.<sup>9</sup>

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 ἑνα ᾗ),<sup>10</sup> but only if they represent a “unitary action” (μία πράξις).<sup>11</sup> 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 ἀφαιρουμένου), the unity of the whole is altered and disturbed (διαφέρεσθαι καὶ κινεῖσθαι τὸ ὅλον), since that which makes no clear difference whether present or absent (ὁ γὰρ προσὸν ἢ μὴ προσὸν μηδὲν ποιεῖ ἐπίδηλον) is not (really) a part of the whole unity” (οὐδὲν μόνον τοῦ ὅλου ἐστίν).<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> 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.

---

<sup>9</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 5 (Spengel 2:86.7–17).

<sup>10</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1451a.16–19: Μῦθος δ' ἐστὶν εἷς οὐχ ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται ἐὰν περὶ ἑνα ᾗ· πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἄπειρα τῷ ἐνὶ συμβαίνει, ἐξ ὧν ἐνίων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἓν· οὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἐνὸς πολλαί εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πράξις.

<sup>11</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1451a.30–32: χρὴ οὖν, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις μιμητικαῖς ἢ μία μίμησις ἐνός ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ τὸν μῦθον, ἐπεὶ πράξεως μίμησις ἐστὶ, μιᾶς τε εἶναι καὶ ταύτης ὅλης.

<sup>12</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1451a.32–35: καὶ τὰ μέρη συνεστάναι τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως ὥστε μετατιθεμένου τινὸς μέρους ἢ ἀφαιρουμένου διαφέρεσθαι καὶ κινεῖσθαι τὸ ὅλον· ὁ γὰρ προσὸν ἢ μὴ προσὸν μηδὲν ποιεῖ ἐπίδηλον, οὐδὲν μόνον τοῦ ὅλου ἐστίν.

<sup>13</sup> 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 (ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ), such that each event links to the next from beginning to end through the middle.<sup>14</sup> This, in turn, relates to the cardinal narrative virtue, i.e., “believability” (πιθανότης),<sup>15</sup> as well as the topos variously termed ἐκ τοῦ ἀπιθανοῦ (“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

---

<sup>14</sup> 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).

<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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).<sup>17</sup> 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.

---

<sup>16</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 1455b.24–29. “Ἔστι δὲ πάσης τραγωδίας τὸ μὲν δέσις τὸ δὲ λύσις, τὰ μὲν ἔξωθεν καὶ ἔνια τῶν ἔσωθεν πολλάκις ἢ δέσις, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἢ λύσις· λέγω δὲ δέσιν μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τούτου τοῦ μέρους ὃ ἔσχατόν ἐστιν ἐξ οὗ μεταβαίνει εἰς εὐτυχίαν ἢ εἰς ἀτυχίαν, λύσιν δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς μεταβάσεως μέχρι τέλους·

<sup>17</sup> Aristotle, *Poetics* 1451b.33–1452a.4: τῶν δὲ ἀπλῶν μύθων καὶ πράξεων αἱ ἐπεισοδιώδεις εἰσὶν χεῖριςται· λέγω δ’ ἐπεισοδιώδη μῦθον ἐν ᾧ τὰ ἐπεισόδια μετ’ ἄλληλα οὐτ’ εἰκὸς οὐτ’ ἀνάγκη εἶναι. τοιαῦται δὲ ποιοῦνται ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν φαύλων ποιητῶν δι’ αὐτοὺς, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν διὰ τοὺς ὑποκριτάς· ἀγωνίσματα γὰρ ποιοῦντες καὶ παρὰ τὴν δύναμιν παρατείνοντες τὸν μῦθον πολλάκις διαστρέφειν ἀναγκάζονται τὸ ἐφεξῆς. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ μόνον τελείας ἐστὶ πράξεως ἢ μίμησις ἀλλὰ καὶ φοβερῶν καὶ ἐλεεινῶν, ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται καὶ μάλιστα [καὶ μᾶλλον] ὅταν γένηται παρὰ τὴν δόξαν δι’ 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<sup>18</sup> and the partial

---

<sup>18</sup> 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),<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> However, where two sources have been combined within a single account

---

<sup>19</sup> 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).

<sup>20</sup> 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,<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> a reader is

---

came to have its final form. At the same time, reading the reconstructed sources of Genesis (i.e., J, E, and P) comparatively does help one see the potential literary problems created by their combination.

<sup>21</sup> 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–12bα; **19:29**."

<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.

---

to Ishmael's birth; (3) Lot separates from Abraham and settles in wicked Sodom; (4) God makes his covenant with Abraham and renames him; (5) Isaac is born in fulfillment of God's promise. Lot's separation has been united with the destruction of Sodom, and Isaac's birth directly follows the promise. Similarly, Josephus, *A.J.* 1.12.1 §§207–212 groups the two Abimelech stories, and Apoc.Ab. 8–9 jumps directly from Gen 12:1–3 to Gen 15.

<sup>23</sup> 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 12:8) 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).

- 11: 27 – 12: 9 Abram<sup>24</sup> travels to Canaan upon accepting God's covenantal promise.
- 12: 10 – 12: 20 Abram sojourns in Egypt and passes Sarah off as his sister.
- 13 Abram and Lot separate on account of quarreling.
- 14 Abram rescues Lot from war.
- 15 Abram enters into a covenant with God.
- 16 Abram fathers Ishmael by Hagar at Sarah's request.
- 17 Abraham enters into a covenant with God again.
- 18: 1 – 19: 38 Abraham and Lot receive heavenly guests with divergent outcomes.
- 20 Abraham sojourns in Gerar and passes Sarah off as his sister again.
- 21: 1 – 21: 21 Abraham fathers Isaac by Sarah and casts Ishmael out with Hagar.
- 21: 22 – 21: 34 Abraham and Abimelech make a covenant.
- 22 Abraham is tested by God and almost sacrifices Isaac.
- 23 Abraham acquires a burial plot for Sarah.
- 24 Abraham acquires a wife for Isaac.
- 25: 1 – 25: 11 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.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> 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.

<sup>25</sup> 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' ἀλλήλα* ("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

וַיֹּהִי אָמַר אֱלֹהִים אַחֲרֵי הִפָּרֵד לוֹט מֵעֲמֹו ...

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” (אַחֲרֵי הִפָּרֵד לוֹט מֵעֲמֹו) overtly establishes only a temporal link between the two halves of Gen 13, it covertly suggests a causal one:<sup>26</sup> God was unable to reveal to Abraham the full extent of his promise of land as long as Lot was in the way,<sup>27</sup> and the expansion of the promise in 13:14–18 vis-à-vis the abbreviated form in

---

<sup>26</sup> The Rabbis were aware that אַחֲרֵי was not always just temporal but sometimes also causal, but their attempts to make such an orthographic distinction (i.e., by differentiating the biforms אַחֲרֵי and אַחֲרֵי) 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.”

<sup>27</sup> 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” (מִבֵּית אָבִיךָ): “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.<sup>28</sup>

Just as the author of Hebrew prose often expects the reader to read between the lines by understanding ו ("and") as "and so" or אחרי ("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.<sup>29</sup> 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 כי שמע יהוה אל עניך ("because Yahweh has heard your oppression"), this is complicated by the use of the same root ענן ("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).

<sup>28</sup> 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, *A.J.* 1.7.1 §154, for example, claims that Abraham adopted (εἰσέποιήσατο) Lot on account of having no legitimate child (γενήσιου παιδὸς ἀπορῶν). Cf. Jub 13:18.

<sup>29</sup> 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” (וַהֲתַעֲנִי) 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.<sup>30</sup> 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

---

<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup> 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

---

<sup>31</sup> For Aristotle, character (ἥθος) reveal ethical choice (προαίρεσις): ἔστιν δὲ ἥθος μὲν τὸ τοιοῦτον ὃ δηλοῖ 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: ἔξει δὲ ἥθος μὲν εἰάν ὥσπερ ἐλέχθη ποιῆ φανερόν ὁ λόγος ἢ ἡ πράξις προαίρεσιν τινα <ἢ τις ἂν> ᾗ, χρηστὸν δὲ εἰάν χρηστὴν (1454a17–19). Furthermore, character and plot are interwoven with one another, as Aristotle favor those plots that represent an “ethically moderate” character (ὁ μετὰξὺ), i.e., “one who is not distinguished in virtue (ἀρετή) and justice (δικαιοσύνη) and who does not fall into misfortune (δυστυχία) due to vice (κακία) and depravity (μοχθηρία), but rather due to some mistake (ἁμαρτία): ὁ μήτε ἀρετῇ διαφέρων καὶ δικαιοσύνη μήτε διὰ κακίαν καὶ μοχθηρίαν μεταβάλλων εἰς τὴν δυστυχίαν ἀλλὰ δι’ ἁμαρτίαν 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 (τελευτῶσα ἐξ ἐναντίας) for relatively better characters (τοῖς βελτίοσι) and relatively worse ones (χείροσιν): δευτέρα δ’ ἡ πρώτη λεγομένη ὑπὸ τινῶν ἐστὶν σύστασις, ἡ διπλὴν τε τὴν σύστασιν ἔχουσα καθάπερ ἡ Ὀδύσσεια καὶ τελευτῶσα ἐξ ἐναντίας τοῖς βελτίοσι καὶ χείροσιν. δοκεῖ δὲ εἶναι πρώτη διὰ τὴν τῶν θεάτρων ἀσθένειαν (*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

ותהר ותלד שרה לאברהם בן לזקניו למועד אשר דבר אתו אלהים

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.<sup>32</sup> 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 (למועד הזה) or to the one in 18:14 ([למועד] הזה). 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

---

<sup>32</sup> 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 תִּירָא** ("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 **מנ** 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.<sup>33</sup> 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

---

<sup>33</sup> 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 ταύτη μάλιστα δειχθῇ τοῦ πατριάρχου τὸ φιλόθεον, ὅτι καὶ ἐναντία ταῖς ὑποσχέσεσιν ὁρῶν τέως ἐκβαίνοντα τὰ πράγματα ὁ μακάριος, οὐκ ἐθορυβεῖτο, οὐδὲ διεταράττετο, ἀλλ' ἀκίνητον εἶχε τὸν λογισμὸν, πεπεισμένος ὅτι δὴ 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 σκοπεῖ, πῶς καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν παρακολουθούντων πειρασμῶν ἢ τοῦ δικαίου ἀρετὴ μᾶλλον ἐξέλαμπε, τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν 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.<sup>34</sup> 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 *post hoc* coincides with *propter hoc*.

### 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

---

<sup>34</sup> 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” (*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                      ותהי שרי עקרה אין לה ולד      καὶ ἦν Σάρα στεῖρα καὶ οὐκ ἐτεκνοποίει<sup>35</sup>  
 Sarai was barren; she had no child.    Sara was barren and could not produce children.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> ἐτεκνοποίει | The Hebrew noun וְלֹד only occurs here in Genesis, and G only uses τεκνοποιέω again in 16:2 // 30:3 to translate בָּנָה. Furthermore, G rarely translates the cognate יָלַד as τέκνον (2/19: 33:6, 7), but uses τέκνον instead as a minor match for בֶּן (18/393).

<sup>36</sup> When negated, the imperfect indicative is often best translated with a modal auxiliary verb: Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 158: “Dans les exemples traités jusqu’ici [including οὐκ ἐτεκνοποίει in Gen 11:30], l’ind.impf est employé de sorte qu’il fréquemment une lecture où le traducteur peut utiliser l’auxiliaire ‘pouvoir’, comme en Gen 16,1 : ‘elle ne pouvait pas engendrer’ ou Ex 15,22 : ‘ils ne pouvaient pas toujours trouver’.” Cf. Smyth §1896; Timothy Schehr, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb in Septuagint Genesis 1-15* (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1990), 89–91.



12: 4a וילך אברם כאשר דבר אליו יהוה και ἐπορεύθη Ἀβράμ καθάπερ<sup>42</sup> ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ κύριος  
וילך אתו לוט και ὥχετο<sup>43</sup> μετ' αὐτοῦ Λώτ

And Abram went as the Lord told him, And Abram went just as the Lord told him,  
and Lot went with him. and Lot set out 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 כאשר ("as") as καθάπερ ("just as"), where the enclitic particle -περ furnishes an extra ounce of emphasis.<sup>44</sup> But what is more, by translating the same form וילך ("and he went") variously, i.e., with the aorist ἐπορεύθη ("he went") in reference to Abraham and with the imperfect ὥχετο ("he set out")<sup>45</sup> in reference to Lot, G insinuates that these two men begin but do not end their journey together,<sup>46</sup> which is relevant to their geographic

<sup>42</sup> καθάπερ | G only translates כאשר (39) emphatically as καθάπερ on one other occasion (50:6), although he often could have used this form, such as in translating כאשר as καθά (17), καθώς (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 καθάπερ, G uses this particle only on ὥσπερ (5: 37:9; 38:11; 41:2, 18, 22).

<sup>43</sup> ὥχετο | To render הלך in the *qal* (115), G typically uses πορεύομαι and cognates (66) or ἔρχομαι and cognates (27), but rarely in the imperfect (2/8: 18:16; 37:25), preferring rather οἴχομαι and cognates (5/8), a root confined to the imperfect (cf. LSJ, s.v. "οἴχομαι"). 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.

<sup>44</sup> 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 γενησομένῳ ... 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 ἡργόμενος) and sought to change their convictions. Didymus, *In Gen.* 210–211 interprets the promise of being a great nation as implying virtue (Μέγα δέ ἐστιν τῷ ὄντι γινόμενος ἔθνος, ὅταν ἐξ ἀρετῶν κοσμηῇται) and that of being a blessing as implying progress toward complete virtue (τὴν ἐπὶ τελείαν ἀρετὴν προκοπὴν).

<sup>45</sup> For the common use of οἴχομαι in reference to departure, see LSJ, s.v. "οἴχομαι" I; Voitila, *Présent et imparfait*, 189; for the inchoative imperfect, see Smyth §1900; *SSG* §28c(iv).

<sup>46</sup> Philo, *Migr.* 148–150 is aware of the difference indicated here, allegorizing και ὥχετο μετ' αὐτοῦ Λώτ as a sign of Lot's inconsistency and wavering (ἀπόλυσις). Cf. Didymus, *In Gen.* 213. Genesis Rabbah 39.13 also wishes to downplay Lot's participation, interpreting וילך ("he went") as טפל ("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.<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Just as G develops the themes of later narratives, Genesis Rabbah 40.6 systematically compares what is written about Abraham (בְּאַבְרָם כְּתִיב) and what is written about Israel (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּתִיב). For recent accounts of the narrative parallels, see Thomas Dozeman, "The Wilderness and Salvation History in the Hagar Story," *JBL* 117 (1998): 23–43; Thomas Römer, "The Exodus in the Book of Genesis," in *The Pentateuch in Recent Research*, ed. Stig Norin, SEÅ 75 (Uppsala: Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet, 2010), 1–20; Grossman, *Abram to Abraham*, 116.

<sup>48</sup> 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

קתע"י 12:8 καὶ ἀπέστη ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἀνατολὰς Βαιθήλ, καὶ ἔστησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ,  
 Βαιθήλ κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ Ἀγγαὶ κατ' ἀνατολὰς· καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν ἐκεῖ θυσιαστήριον τῷ κυρίῳ  
 ונסוע הלך | ע"י καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. 9 καὶ ἀπῆρεν Ἀβρὰμ καὶ πορευθεὶς ἐστρατοπέδευσεν  
 הנגבה ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

G's translation of Abraham's first movement in this passage seems to explain it as a response to what precedes. By translating קתע"י ("he moved on") as ἀπέστη<sup>49</sup> ("he withdrew"),<sup>50</sup> 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" (נסוע), G has Abraham "pull out"<sup>51</sup> (ἀπαίρω),<sup>52</sup> and while G's source describes Abraham's subsequent travels as הלך ונסוע הנגבה ("gradually moving toward the Negev"), G transforms this quite radically<sup>53</sup> into καὶ πορευθεὶς ἐστρατοπέδευσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ("and after he traveled he encamped in the desert"). By using the verb στρατοπεδεύω<sup>54</sup> ("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.

<sup>49</sup> ἀπέστη | G only translates קתע"י 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.

<sup>50</sup> 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: μετῆρεν and μετῆγεν are attributed to Aquila, and ἀπῆρεν to Symmachus.

<sup>51</sup> For the elliptical use with an implied object, see LSJ, s.v. "ἀπαίρω" A.II.2; *DGE*, s.v. "ἀπαίρω" II.2.

<sup>52</sup> ἀπῆρεν | G typically renders נסע (12) as ἀπαίρω (7) or ἐξαίρω (1) and only uses ἀπαίρω elsewhere for קתע"י (2).

<sup>53</sup> 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 (καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν πολέμων ἔθος ἐστὶ λέγειν). John takes Abraham's soldier-like mobility as a sign of his virtue. Didymus, *In Gen.* 224 also interprets the warfare motif here in terms of Abraham's character: Κἄν γὰρ τέλειός τις ᾗ, οὐκ ἀπαλλάττεται τῶν πολεμούντων.

<sup>54</sup> ἐστρατοπέδευσεν | G only uses this verb here. For his more usual translation of נסע as ἀπαίρω, see note 52.



Abraham's movements in unambiguously military terms,<sup>55</sup> and yet with the subtler change of the allative הנגבה ("toward the Negev") to the locative ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ<sup>56</sup> ("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 נִגַּב as ἔρημος (13:1, 3), i.e., as if it were מִדְבָּר ("desert").<sup>57</sup>

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 כבד הרעב ("the famine was severe") as ἐνίσχυσεν<sup>58</sup> ὁ λιμός ("the famine grew strong"),<sup>59</sup> 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,

---

<sup>55</sup> 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 ἀφιγμένος ἐκ τῆς γῆς τῆς ὑπὲρ Βαβυλῶνος Χαλδαίων λεγομένης), which makes sense given his mode of travel in Gen 12.

<sup>56</sup> ἐρήμῳ | Other than its three occurrences before and after Abraham's time in Egypt, G usually translates נִגַּב (7) as λίψ (3) or ἀνατολή (1). Otherwise G only uses ἔρημος as a consistent match for מִדְבָּר (8).

<sup>57</sup> G's translation of הנגבה 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, ἔρημος was rejected for νότος.

<sup>58</sup> ἐνίσχυσεν | To be sure, G usually uses ἐνισχύω (4) or ἰσχυρός (2) to translate כָּבֵד (9), but this is used almost exclusively in relation to famines. The only exception is in 50:11 (ἰσχυρός).

<sup>59</sup> Aquila used βαρύνω (either ἐβαρύνθη or ἐβάρυνεν), preferring the idea of "heavy" to that of "strong."

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 *וְאֵתְךָ יְחִי* ("but they will let you live") with *περιποιέω*<sup>60</sup> in the middle voice as *σὲ δὲ περιποιήσονται* ("but you they will save<sup>61</sup> for themselves" or "you they will take as their own special possession [*περιποιήσεις*]"). Furthermore, G presents these nameless and stationless Egyptians, Pharaoh's "officials" (*רִשָׁי*), as *ἄρχοντες*<sup>62</sup> (12:15), a term which may have general political ("rulers") or, as often, specifically military ("commanders")<sup>63</sup> connotations. Finally, G intensifies the threat they pose by increasing their agency via a transformation of voice.

12:15                      וְתָקַח הָאִשָּׁה בֵּית פַּרְעֹה      καὶ εἰσήγαγον<sup>64</sup> αὐτήν εἰς τὸν οἶκον 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.

<sup>60</sup> *περιποιήσονται* | The *piel* of *חיה* (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 *רכש* (2/4: 31:18; 36:6).

<sup>61</sup> LSJ, s.v. "*περιποιέω*" A.II.1. Erroneously 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 *ζώσουςιν*.

<sup>62</sup> *ἄρχοντες* | G always uses the root *ἀρχ-* for *רָשָׁה* (25), but usually as a prefix. G only uses *ἄρχων* again in 47:5.

<sup>63</sup> A military sense is listed as primary by both LSJ, s.v. "*ἄρχων*" A.I and *DGE*, s.v. "*ἄρχων*" I. In addition, G's use of *ἄρχων* in 14:7 within a martial context favors this sense here.

<sup>64</sup> *εἰσήγαγον* | For G's use of active for passive, see §6.1.2.3. Lexically, G's use of *εἰσάγω* for *לָקַח* (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” (נגעם ... נגע) 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’)”<sup>65</sup> (ἤτασεν) him and his household “with great and painful tests”<sup>66</sup> (ἐτασμοῖς μεγάλοις καὶ πονηροῖς).<sup>67</sup> 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 הָלַךְ (“go”) in

---

<sup>65</sup> LSJ, s.vv. “ἐτάζω, ἔτασις, ἐτασμός, ἐξετάζω, ἐξέτασις, ἐξετασμός.” The nouns terminating in -ις 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 ἐξετασάμεν, 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 ἐξετάζω [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 ἔτασις/ἐτασμός; and “visitation” for ἐξέτασις/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 ἐστίν, ἦτασε;) and glosses it as δίκην ἀπῆτησε (“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 (יִד) Pharaoh, and God sends a spirit to afflict him (רוח מכדש למכתשה).

<sup>66</sup> Aquila found fault with G’s translation of נגעם ... נגע, though two different corrections are ascribed to him: the direct equivalent ἤπτετο ἀφαίς and the more interpretive ἐβασάνισεν (and also a conflate reading).

<sup>67</sup> ἤτασεν ... ἐτασμοῖς | G only translates נגע (8) as ἐτάζω here, using mainly ἄπτω (5), since נגע often has a sense that is less violent. Both nouns, נגע and ἐτασμός, as well as the verb ἐτάζω occur only here in Genesis.

12:19 as ἀπότρεχε<sup>68</sup> (“retreat”),<sup>69</sup> reminiscent of Abraham’s prior withdrawal from Canaanite territory (12:8). Furthermore, G has Pharaoh’s subordinates not just “send (Abraham) away” (וישלחו) but “escort”<sup>70</sup> (συμπροπέμψαι)<sup>71</sup> 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”<sup>72</sup> (μάχη).<sup>73</sup> Yet, since Abraham’s entourage not only moves like an army (12:8–9) but also acts

---

<sup>68</sup> ἀπότρεχε | G only uses ἀποτρέχω in the form of the present imperative ἀπότρεχε, here and in 24:51 to translate the qal imperative of הלך (19), and in 32:9 to translate the qal imperative of שוב (7).

<sup>69</sup> 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 הלך 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”).

<sup>70</sup> While the prefix συν- gives συμπροπέμω a comitative sense, like προπέμω 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. “προπέμω” 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.

<sup>71</sup> συμπροπέμψαι | G translates πλῆ (66) as συμπροπέμω only here and again in 18:16, most often using ἀποστέλλω (41) or ἐξαποστέλλω (10). G does not use συμπροπέμω otherwise.

<sup>72</sup> 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 ἐμβριθεστάτης γενομένης), and Abraham preferred defeat (ἡττη) to victory (ἄχρι 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).

<sup>73</sup> μάχη | The nouns ריב and מריבה 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 κρίνω 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,<sup>74</sup> 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"<sup>75</sup> (ἐποίησαν πόλεμον μετὰ) the kings of the Jordan Valley (14:2), who had "revolted" (ἀπέστησαν) after twelve years of enslavement (14:4) and "conspired" (συνεφώνησαν)<sup>76</sup> 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

---

<sup>74</sup> 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); Matitiah 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 Tribble, "Hagar: The Desolation of Rejection," in *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*, OBT 13 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 9–36.

<sup>75</sup> 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.

<sup>76</sup> Aquila rejected συμφωνέω for συμβάλλω, a verb that, alongside συνέρχομαι, is also attributed to Symmachus.

terminology without direct support from his source. For example, G translates ימי אמרפל (“the days of Amraphel”) contextually as τῆ βασιλείᾳ<sup>77</sup> τῆ Ἀμαρφαλ (“the kingship of Amraphal”). Second, he refers to Lot’s רכש (“possessions”) with the technical term ἀποσκευή,<sup>78</sup> which likely denotes not only “baggage” but also “(soldier’s) family” (14:12; cf. 14:16).<sup>79</sup> Third, G consistently interprets the phrase רכש סדם (14:11, 16, 21) not as Sodom’s רכש (“possessions”) but their רכש (“horses”), translating רכש as ἡ ἵππος<sup>80</sup> (“cavalry”). Furthermore, perhaps at a loss as to the precise meaning of the form וירק (“and he emptied”), G has Abraham rather “count” (ἡρίθμυσεν)<sup>81</sup> his troops in preparation for his search-and-rescue mission. Finally, G dramatically captures Abraham’s military progress by

<sup>77</sup> βασιλεία | Only here does G translate יום (154) as βασιλεία (3), which he otherwise reserves for מַמְלָכָה (2).

<sup>78</sup> ἀποσκευή | More often G uses the more general terms ὑπάρχοντα (4) and κτήσις (1) to translate רכש (11) interpreted as רכוש (8). G also uses ἀποσκευή in three cases to render עַרְבִּי (7).

<sup>79</sup> 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 Schorch, “Genesis,” 183. Cf. §5.2.2.2.

<sup>80</sup> ἡ ἵππος | G only uses ἵππος (3) in the feminine here in Gen 14. When interpreting רכש (11) not as רכש but as רכוש, G uses ὑπάρχοντα (4), ἀποσκευή (3), or κτήσις (1), which all denote possession of some type.

<sup>81</sup> ἡρίθμυσεν | G’s rendering of רִיק (2) as κατακενόω 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. “ריק” *hiphil* 5). G may have read וידק with SP, but the conjectural lemma דוק in the sense “review, muster” (cf. *HALOT*, s.v. “דוק III”) 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”<sup>82</sup> (κατεδίωξεν) Lot’s captors and them “chase (them) off”<sup>83</sup> (ἐξέδιωξεν),<sup>84</sup> although both times he is translating דרד (“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,<sup>85</sup> 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 רפאים (“Rephaim”)<sup>86</sup> as γίγαντας<sup>87</sup> (“giants”) and זוזים (“Zuzim”) as ἔθνη ισχυρά<sup>88</sup> (“strong nations”),<sup>89</sup> each of which evokes the tall and powerful foes encountered by the Israelites on the verge of conquering the land of Canaan.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, G uses the technical term ἀποσκευή both here and again in 15:14, which

---

<sup>82</sup> 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).

<sup>83</sup> See LSJ, s.v. “ἐκδιώκω” and *DGE*, s.v. “ἐκδιώκω” 1, according to which ἐκδιώκω denotes chasing off/away.

<sup>84</sup> κατεδίωξεν ... ἐξέδιωξεν | G always renders the verb דרד (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 דלק (31:36) and דפק (33:13), hapaxlegomena in Genesis.

<sup>85</sup> Philo, *Abr.* 225–226 argues that this chapter is the surest proof (σαφεστάτη πίστις)—implying the existence of additional evidence—that Abraham was courageous (ἀνδρεῖος) and apt in battle (πολεμικός).

<sup>86</sup> Aquila rejected G’s interpretation and preferred to transliterate as Παφαίν.

<sup>87</sup> γίγαντας | The proper noun רפאים (2) occurs again in 15:20, where G transliterates it as Παφαῖν. G has a certain affinity for γίγας, as he uses it as the sole match for both נפילים (6:4) and גבור (4: 6:4; 10:8, 9+).

<sup>88</sup> ἔθνη ισχυρά | Both the proper noun זוזים and the collocation ἔθνος ισχυρόν only occur here in Genesis.

<sup>89</sup> Symmachus rejected G’s interpretation and preferred to transliterate as Ζοιζομμεί.

<sup>90</sup> Both Greek phrases allude to the conquest: ἔθνη ισχυρά is an allusion to the גוים 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 רפאים, the נפילים, and the ענקים (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 העברי ("the Hebrew") as ὁ περατής ("the crosser")<sup>91</sup> gestures to the common phrase עבר הירדן (ב), typically translated as πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Like the Israelites, who possess the land of Canaan by crossing the Jordan River,<sup>92</sup> Abraham is now defending the kings who live across the Jordan.<sup>93</sup>

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

---

<sup>91</sup> While Aquila etymologized עברי similarly as περατής, Symmachus preferred Ἐβραίω. 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.

<sup>92</sup> 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 מעבר הנהר ("from across the river [Euphrates]"), the Israelites conquered the land after defeating the Amorites who lived בעבר הירדן ("across the Jordan").

<sup>93</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 35.3 (PG 53 326.11–19) reasonably interprets this curious appellation in terms of Abraham crossing over the Euphrates (περᾶν ... τὸν Εὐφράτην) when he left Chaldea across the Euphrates (πέραν τοῦ Εὐφράτου), 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

אל 15:1 Μετὰ δὲ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα κυρίου πρὸς Ἀβράμ ἐν ὁράματι λέγων Μὴ  
 - | שכרך | מגן | תירא | φοβοῦ, Ἀβράμ· ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου· ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα. 2 λέγει δὲ Ἀβράμ  
 אדני יהוה | הולך | ערירי | Δέσποτα, τί μοι δώσεις; ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μάσεκ τῆς οἰκογενοῦς μου,  
 הן | ונהג | דבר | οὗτος Δαμασκὸς Ἐλιέζερ. 3 καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβράμ Ἐπειδὴ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔδωκας σπέρμα, ὁ δὲ οἰκογενής  
 וספר | לספר | μου κληρονομήσει με. 4 καὶ εὐθύς φωνή θεοῦ ἐγένετο πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων Οὐ κληρονομήσει σε  
 והאמן | ויחשב | οὗτος, ἀλλ' ὃς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ, οὗτος κληρονομήσει σε. 5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εἶπεν  
 אוֹתָם | ויחשב | αὐτῷ Ἀνάβλεψον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς.  
 והאמן | ויחשב | καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου. 6 καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβράμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη 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 אל תירא ("do not be afraid") using the negated present imperative μὴ φοβοῦ<sup>94</sup> ("stop being afraid"), G implies that Abraham is and has been afraid

<sup>94</sup> μὴ φοβοῦ | 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 אל תירא and cognate formulations with the present imperative instead of the aorist subjunctive, except in 35:17, where he translates אל תירא synthetically as θάρσει, which definitely interprets the Hebrew expression as implying a present state of fear by representing the negative לֹא 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 Μὴ φοβηθῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν, ὅτι αὐριον ταύτην τὴν ὥραν ἐγὼ παραδίδωμι τετροπωμένους αὐτοὺς ἐναντίον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ; 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.<sup>95</sup> In response to this fear, G embraces the vivid metaphor of God as defender by translating the verbless clause אֲנִי מִגֹּן (‘‘I [am] your shield’’) verbally as ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω<sup>96</sup> σου (‘‘I am shielding you from above’’),<sup>97</sup> a striking metaphor<sup>98</sup> that imagines God holding a shield over Abraham’s head to

---

pressing any aspectual difference: ‘‘From the aspectual opposition in μὴ φοβεῖσθε μὴδὲ δειλιάσητε De 1.22 [actually 1.21] are we to conclude that the process of φοβεόμαι 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 φοβεῖσθε) is hoped to produce an actual act of bravery (μὴδὲ 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.

<sup>95</sup> 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 (εὐπραγίας) 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 νόμῳ δίχα πολέμου ζώντων ἐκείνων, ἀναιρουμένων, ἐξελαυνομένων.

<sup>96</sup> ὑπερασπίζω | In Genesis, the root גמ only occurs here as a noun (גִּמָּה) 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.

<sup>97</sup> Symmachus is attributed with the reading ὑπερμάχομαι καθάπερ ὄπλον.

<sup>98</sup> 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 αὕτη ἡ λέξις τὴν ἐμφασιν. Ἐγὼ ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν Χαλδαίων σε ἀναστήσας, ἐγὼ ὁ ἐνταῦθα σε

protect him, a declaration that should calm Abraham's fears. On the other hand, by translating שכרך ("your pay/reward") as μισθός<sup>99</sup> ("pay"), God recognizes that Abraham, like a "mercenary" (μισθοφόρος), expects to be paid for his military service, and by supplying the future-tense copula ἔσται<sup>100</sup> ("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 אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה ("Lord Yahweh") distinctively as δεσπότης<sup>101</sup> ("master"),<sup>102</sup> he also converts this mercenary-sovereign dynamic into a

---

ἀγαγών, ἐγὼ ὁ τῶν κινδύνων τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐλευθερώσας, ἐγὼ ὁ καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δεύτερον ὑποσχόμενός σοι καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου δώσειν τὴν γῆν ταύτην, ἐγὼ σου ὑπερασπίζω. ἐγὼ ὁ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν περιφανέστερον πᾶσιν ἀποδεικνύς σε, ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου· τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐγὼ ὑπεραγωνίζομαι, ἐγὼ ὑπέρμαχος γίνομαι, ἐγὼ φροντίζω, ἐγὼ πάντα τὰ δυσχερῆ εὐκολὰ σοι καθίστημι, ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου. Philo, *Her.* 58 interprets ὑπερασπίζω allegorically as God's providence in sustaining Abraham's life.

<sup>99</sup> μισθός | G always translates שכר (7) and the cognate מַשְׂכָּר (3) as μισθός and only uses μισθός for this root.

<sup>100</sup> ἔσται | For G's addition of verbs in main clauses and its interpretive significance, see §3.2.2.1.

<sup>101</sup> δεσπότης | The divine name אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה only occurs twice in Genesis and only in this chapter. G translates it synthetically as δέσποτα in 15:2 but as δέσποτα κύριε in 15:8. G does not use δεσπότης otherwise.

<sup>102</sup> 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 δοῦλος/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,<sup>103</sup> as the powerful party is also responsible for compensation.<sup>104</sup> Then, by translating הֵלֵךְ (“I am going”) quite radically as ἀπολύομαι<sup>105</sup> (“I am released”),<sup>106</sup> perhaps justifying this translation as a loosely metaphorical extension of הָלַךְ, 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),<sup>107</sup> perhaps the son of his

---

<sup>103</sup> Philo, *Her.* 22 recognizes the complexity of Abraham’s combined directness (θάρσος) and deference (εὐλάβεια): Ἀλλὰ σκόπει πάλιν, ὅτι εὐλαβεῖα τὸ θαρρεῖν ἀνακράται. τὸ μὲν γὰρ „τί μοι δώσεις;” θάρσος ἐμφαίνει, τὸ δὲ „δέσποτα” εὐλάβειαν. 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 (θαυμάσιοι δὲ ἀρεταὶ ἢ τε εὐτολμία καὶ ἢ ἐν τῷ δέοντι 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 (ὅταν ἀμαρτημάτων καθαρεύῃ) (*Her.* 5–6). Cf. Brayford, who says that Abraham follows this title expressing “deference” with words that “lack any sense of gratitude” (*Genesis*, 297).

<sup>104</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 36.4 (PG 53 338.14–19) takes Abraham’s words as a sign of his grief (ἐαυτοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν δδύνην) and dejection (ἀθυμίαν) at not having received his promised payment (μισθόν), i.e., a son.

<sup>105</sup> ἀπολύομαι | G’s use of ἀπολύομαι is unique as a translation of הָלַךְ in the *gal* (115) and is used for no other word in Genesis. Furthermore, it is quite rare in the Septuagint as a whole (Exod 33:11 [= שׁוּב]; Num 20:29 [= גַּל]; Ps 33:1 [= שׁוּב]).

<sup>106</sup> The basic meaning of ἀπολύω—frequently passive—is release from any restraint or obligation, including specifically military service (LSJ, s.v. “ἀπολύω” C.I). Though it can be used in a metaphorical sense as a euphemism for death, i.e., release from life (C.II.2), 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 (μισθός, 15:1), giving (δώσεις, 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 (ἐφιλοσόφει): “Ὅρα πῶς ἐκ προοιμίων ὁ δίκαιος ἐφιλοσόφει, ἀπόλυσιν καλῶν τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἔξοδον. Οἱ γὰρ μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὴν ἀρετὴν μετιόντες, ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν ζωῆς μεταστῶσιν, ἀληθῶς ὥσπερ ἀπολύονται τῶν ἀγώνων, καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν ἀνίενται. Καὶ γὰρ μετὰ στασίς τις ἐστὶ τοῖς ἐναρέτως βιοῦσιν ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω, ἀπὸ τῆς προσκαιροῦ ζωῆς ἐπὶ τὴν διηνεκὴ καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσαν. Ἐγὼ δὲ, φησὶν, ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος. John’s ever-positive evaluation of Abraham precludes the bartering interpretation given above, but he directly acknowledges that ἀπολύω really means “release.”

<sup>107</sup> ἄτεκνος | The adjective אֲתֵכְנֹס 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 τεκν-, 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 הן (“behold”) in the phrase הן לי לא נתתה זרע (“Behold! You have not given me offspring”) with the emphatic causal conjunction ἐπειδὴ<sup>108</sup> (“since in fact”), which directly blames God for the diminished severance pay that Abraham is purportedly willing to accept.<sup>109</sup>

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 הנה (“behold”) temporally as εὐθύς<sup>110</sup> (“immediately”)<sup>111</sup> and by exchanging the impersonal דבר יהוה (“the word of Yahweh”) for the palpable φωνή<sup>112</sup> 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’ ὅς

---

statement that Sarah could not produce children (οὐκ ἐτεκνοποίει) in 11:30. G does not use the adjective ἄτεκνος again, but he uses the cognate verb ἀτεκνώνω on several occasions (5: 27:45; 31:38; 42:36; 43:14+).

<sup>108</sup> ἐπειδὴ | The translation of הן as ἐπειδὴ is singular. Elsewhere G interprets it as הנה (HALOT, s.v. “הן” 1) by selecting ἰδοὺ (4: 3:22; 11:6; 19:34; 47:23) or in its Aramaic conditional sense (HALOT, s.v. “הן” 2) by choosing εἰ (4: 4:14; 27:37; 39:8; 44:8). Elsewhere, G uses ἐπεὶ (2) and ἐπειδὴ (5) to translate a variety of Hebrew constructions in a causal or temporal way.

<sup>109</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 36.4 (PG 53 338.38–45) says that God rewards Abraham’s prior self-restraint, even though with the ἐπειδὴ clause he begins to speak boldly (παρρησιάζεται): Σκόπει μοι καὶ ἐντεῦθεν τοῦ δικαίου τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς τούτους στρέφων ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ οὐδέποτε ἐδυσχέρανεν, οὐδέποτε βαρὺ τι ἐφθέγγετο· ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν προτραπείς ἐκ τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν ῥημάτων, παρρησιάζεται πρὸς τὸν Δεσπότην, καὶ τῶν ἔνδοθεν λογισμῶν τὴν ταραχὴν κατὰδηλον ποιεῖ, καὶ δείκνυσιν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔλκος· δι’ ὃ καὶ ταχεῖαν τὴν ἰατρειάν ἐδέξατο.

<sup>110</sup> εὐθύς | G typically renders הנה as ἰδοὺ (78/129) and only uses adverbial εὐθύς for this form (cf. 24:45; 38:29).

<sup>111</sup> Philo, *Her.* 66 says that God effectively cuts Abraham off (ἐπισπεύσας ... ἔφθασε τὸν λαλοῦντα): τότε καὶ ἐπισπεύσας ὁ θεὸς ἔφθασε τὸν λαλοῦντα, τῆς ῥήσεως προαποστείλας ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν διδασκαλίαν. „εὐθύς” γάρ φησι ...

<sup>112</sup> φωνή | G typically translates דבר (64) as ῥῆμα (46), only using φωνή again in 11:1. Otherwise φωνή (27) is G’s standard rendering of הן (23/25).

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.

And Abram believed the Lord,                      And Abram believed God,  
and he (?) considered this as his righteousness    and this was considered as his justice.

415

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:<sup>117</sup>

### Nehemiah 9:7–8

אתה הוא יהוה האלהים אשר בחרת באברהם והוצאתו מאור כשדים ושמת שמו אברהם ומצאת את  
לבבו נאמן לפניך וכרות עמו הברית לתת את ארץ הכנעני החתי האמרי והפרזי והיבوسی והגרגשי  
לתת לזרעו ותקם את דברך כי צדיק אתה

However, G does not preserve this ambiguity in translation.<sup>118</sup> If he had, then the two clauses could have been read as parallel with the second being understood epexegetically,

---

Brill, 1990), 103–130. As Fitzmyer carefully documents, the view that Abraham is the subject “is not adopted by the majority of commentators on Genesis 15, but the ambiguity of the Hebrew verbal form has to be recalled at least, because it has affected the interpretation of this crucial verse” (“Interpretation of Genesis 15:6,” 258–259).

<sup>117</sup> Fitzmyer, “Interpretation of Genesis 15:6,” 258–259.

<sup>118</sup> Fitzmyer argues that G’s translation removes the ambiguity (i) by supplying a full subject (Ἀβραάμ) for והאמן—here reconstructed in V, since this type of plus is indicative of the textual tradition as a whole (see §2.2.1.1), although G does sometimes supply pronominal subjects (see §3.2.5.1)—and (ii) by rendering the ambiguous form ויחשבה passively as εὐλογίσθη: “The sense of the verse may not be radically changed in this Greek translation, but the use of the passive at least has eliminated the ambiguity of the original” (“Interpretation of Genesis 15:6,” 261). However, Fitzmyer’s ultimate conclusion that G had a different Vorlage on the basis of 4Q225 2 I, 7–8 of “Pseudo-Jubilees” (ויא[מין אברהם ב]אלו[הי]ם ותחשב לו צדקה) seems incorrect. To be sure, the Qumran fragment agrees verbatim with G’s translation, but it is far more likely that this text’s author was influenced—like Paul—by the interpretation found in G’s translation, and not vice versa. First, while G does not often change the voice of Hebrew verbs in translation, he does do so where he feels it is necessary (§6.1.2.3), a point that Fitzmyer does not consider. Most significantly for his own argument, though, Fitzmyer tries to shrink the lengthy span of time between Greek Genesis and 4Q225 (30 BC – AD 20) via Jubilees (c. 150 BC) by saying that “the Greek translation of the Septuagint would, then, be possibly older [than Jubilees]” (265–268). Yet, the possible gap between Greek Genesis and 4Q225 is surely larger than he admits. G was likely the first of the Pentateuchal translators, and the Greek Pentateuch was most likely produced in the first early part of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. This date, which has been well established for some time and is still held today, is based on the internal evidence of phonology and morphology, vocabulary, and syntax (Gerard Mussies, “Phonology and Morphology of Septuagint Greek,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H*:

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 וַיַּחשְׁבֶה (“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.<sup>119</sup> That is what is meant by καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (“it was considered as his

---

*Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016], 89–97; John Lee, “The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Documentary Evidence,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016], 98–108; *Lexical Study*; Anssi Voita, “Septuagint Syntax and Hellenistic Greek,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016], 109–118; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 263–264.

<sup>119</sup> G could also have captured this interpretation by keeping וַיַּחשְׁבֶה active in his translation (e.g., ὁ δὲ θεὸς 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 δέ to mark the contrasting subjects, and he does not often use δέ for the ἵ of a wayyiqtol form (§4.1.1.3). Finally, if G had used the active ἐλογίσατο, he would also have translated its object as αὐτό or τοῦτο, 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,<sup>120</sup> 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

וְשָׂרָי | לֹא יָלְדָה | שָׂרָא דὲ ἡ γυνὴ Ἀβρὰμ οὐκ ἔτικτεν αὐτῷ. ἦν δὲ αὐτῇ παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία, ἥ ὄνομα Ἀγάρ. 2 εἶπεν  
 עֲצָרַי | מְלֻדָּת | נָא | דὲ Σάρα πρὸς Ἀβράμ Ἰδοὺ συνέκλεισέν με κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν· εἰσελθε οὖν πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην  
 אוֹלִי | אַבְנָה | וְיִשְׁמַע | μου, ἵνα τεκνοποιήσῃς ἐξ αὐτῆς. ὑπήκουσεν δὲ Ἀβράμ τῆς φωνῆς Σάρας. 3 καὶ λαβοῦσα Σάρα ἡ  
 וְתָקַר | γυνὴ Ἀβράμ Ἀγάρ τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν τὴν ἑαυτῆς παιδίσκην, μετὰ δέκα ἔτη τοῦ οἰκῆσαι Ἀβράμ ἐν γῆ  
 חֲמִשִּׁי | חָנָאָן, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν Ἀβράμ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς αὐτῷ γυναῖκα. 4 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς Ἀγάρ, καὶ  
 וְיִשְׁפֹּט | συνέλαβεν. καὶ εἶδεν ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει, καὶ ἡτιμάσθη ἡ κυρία ἐναντίον αὐτῆς. 5 εἶπεν δὲ Σάρα  
 וְהָעֲנָה | πρὸς Ἀβράμ Ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ· ἐγὼ δέδωκα τὴν παιδίσκην μου εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου, ἰδοῦσα δὲ ὅτι  
 וְשָׂרָא | ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει, ἡτιμάσθη ἐναντίον αὐτῆς· κρίναι ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ. 6 εἶπεν δὲ  
 וְהָעֲנָה | Ἀβράμ πρὸς Σάραν Ἰδοὺ ἡ παιδίσκη σου ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου· χρῶ αὐτῇ, ὥς ἂν σοι ἀρεστόν ᾖ. καὶ  
 וְהָעֲנָה | ἐκάκωσεν αὐτὴν Σάρα, καὶ ἀπέδρα ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῆς.

<sup>120</sup> 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  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ <sup>121</sup> (“now”) for Hebrew  $\text{ו}$  to begin a new episode and to reintroduce Sarah topically, as she has been largely absent since 12:10–20. Furthermore, by translating  $\text{לֹא יָלְדָה}$  (“bore no children”) with the imperfect<sup>122</sup> as  $\text{οὐκ ἔτικτεν}$  (“could bear no children”), G aptly resumes the narrative thread that was initiated by Sarah’s introduction with another negated imperfect in 11:30:  $\text{οὐκ ἐτεκνοποίει}$  (“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  $\text{עָצָר}$  (“prevent”) as  $\text{συγκλείω}$ <sup>123</sup> (“close up”)<sup>124</sup> and the bound infinitive  $\text{מִלִּדְת}$  (“from bearing children”) with the

---

<sup>121</sup>  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  | For G’s use of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  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  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  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  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  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.

<sup>122</sup> For qatal => imperfect indicative, see §6.1.1.5.

<sup>123</sup>  $\text{συγκλείω}$  | G always renders  $\text{עָצָר}$  (3) as  $\text{συγκλείω}$  (cf. the parallel in 20:18) and uses  $\text{συγκλείω}$  nowhere else.

<sup>124</sup> 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  $\text{συμμύω}$  and cognates, though others are attested, e.g.,  $\text{ἀποπιέζω}$  “close over with fat” (*Nat. mul.* 20.2; *Steril.* 229.2) and  $\text{συμφύω}$  “grow together” (Aristotle, *Gen. an.* 773a). Yet, the specific term  $\text{συγκλείω}$ , which shares the  $\text{συν-}$  prefix with  $\text{συμμύω}$  and  $\text{συμφύω}$ , is used by Hippocrates when he explains why Scythian women are not particularly fertile (*Aēr.* 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” ( $\text{μάλιστα μὲν τὸ θεῖον ἐν τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισιν αἴτιον εἶναι}$ ) (*Nat. mul.* 1.1–2). It is not clear, however, that  $\text{συμμύω}$  can be used with an explicit agent, and so G’s choice of  $\text{συγκλείω}$  may reflect the need to attribute this action to God. Both Aquila and Symmachus reject this use of  $\text{συγκλείω}$ , preferring rather  $\text{ἐπέσχε(ν)}$  and  $\text{συνέσχε(ν)}$ , respectively.



up”) with the rendering τεκνοποιήσης (“you may produce a child”),<sup>131</sup> G has Sarah remove herself from God’s plan for Abraham’s progeny. Finally, by correctly interpreting ל ... וישמע (“[he] listened to”) as ὑπήκουσεν<sup>132</sup> (“he obeyed”), G indicates Abraham’s complicity in Sarah’s plan,<sup>133</sup> 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 ותקל גברתה בעיניה (“and her mistress was as nothing in her sight”) in 16:14 implies Hagar’s contempt for Sara. Yet, by translating ותקל ... בעיניה (“[she] was as nothing in her eyes”) passively as ἡτιμάσθη ... ἐναντίον αὐτῆς<sup>134</sup> (“she was/felt

---

Sarah (τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύσαντος) to give Hagar to Abraham because he was upset about having no heir yet (δυσφορῶν δὲ ἐπὶ γυναικὶ μὴ κυύσῃ). Cf. Jub 14:21; Didymus, *In Gen.* 235. John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 39.2 (PG 53 362.31–33) also claims Abraham believed Ishmael to be the promised son (καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἐνόμιζεν αὐτῷ λοιπὸν τὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας πεπληρῶσθαι). Cf. *Hom. Gen.* 40.1 (PG 53 369.59–61); 40.2 (PG 53 370.20–34).

<sup>131</sup> Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all rejected τεκνοποιήσης lexically and morphologically: while Aquila corrected it to οἰκοδομηθήσομαι, which replicates the usual denotation of בנה, Symmachus and Theodotion both preferred τεκνωθῶ.

<sup>132</sup> ὑπήκουσεν | G usually translates שמע (64) neutrally as ἀκούω (45), but he does use ὑπακούω on several other occasions (4) as well as other cognate compounds (12). Otherwise G only uses ὑπακούω to translate שמע in 41:40. In each case, however, ὑπακούω denotes “listen” in the sense of “obey.”

<sup>133</sup> Philo, *Prel.* 68 makes a point out of the fact that Abraham did not just hear (ἀκούων) but obeyed (ὑπακούων) Sarah’s instructions, although since Sarah represents wisdom, he interprets this obedience favorably: οὐ γὰρ ἀκούων ἀλλ’ ὑπακούων εἰσάγεται· τὸ δὲ ἐστὶ τοῦ συναινεῖν καὶ πειθαρχεῖν εὐθυβολώτατον ὄνομα.

<sup>134</sup> ἡτιμάσθη | Though לקל occurs seven times in Genesis, there are no good parallels, the closest in reference to the floodwaters decreasing ([8:7], 8, 11). Outside Gen 16, G does not use ἀτιμάζω, 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 קצץ. 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.<sup>135</sup> 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

חמסי עליך Ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ

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 ἀδικοῦμαι<sup>136</sup> ἐκ σοῦ, however, which is a variant on a well-known petitionary formula,<sup>137</sup> G has Sarah make Abraham the cause as well as the object of her

<sup>135</sup> Philo, *Prel.* 152 relates the dishonor Sarah feels to an excessive amount of honor given by Abraham to Hagar (τὴν μὲν ὡς γαμετὴν ἐξετιμήσατε). In *QG* III.22, he finds significance in the passive voice of ἡτιμάσθη, which attributes no blame to Hagar but merely states the facts.

<sup>136</sup> ἀδικοῦμαι | G always translates the noun דָּקָה (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.

<sup>137</sup> The petitionary formula [ἀδικοῦμαι ὑπό + alleged offender] is used to introduce the exposition of the case (Anna DiBittonto, “Frammenti di petizioni del periodo tolemaico: studio sul formulario,” *Aegyptus* 67 [1976]: 116). The use of ἐκ instead of ὑπό is likely due to interference from Hebrew כִּי, since Hebrew does not express the agent by a prepositional phrase. In fact, G rarely uses ὑπό (14) and when he does, almost exclusively in a spatial sense. G rarely uses ὑπό to express agency (26:29; 45:21, 27), and in each case ὑπό does not correspond to a Hebrew preposition. Yet, this choice may be a subtle acknowledgment by Sarah that she was not directly wronged by (ὑπό) 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’ οὗ. 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.<sup>138</sup> Of course, this indictment primarily reflects Sarah’s subjective perspective, yet by translating Abraham’s command for Sarah to “do” (עשׂ) whatever she wants to Hagar as a standing order with the present imperative χρῶ<sup>139</sup> (“use”), G establishes Abraham’s culpability for what she does next. What is more, as G renders ונתנה (“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: μη̄ ἐξέστω δὲ Ἡρακλείδῃ γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπεισάγεσθαι ἐφ’ ὕβρει Δημητρίας μηδὲ τεκνοποιεῖσθαι ἐξ ἄλλης γυναικὸς μηδὲ κακοτεχνεῖν μηδὲν παρ ευρέσει μηδεμιᾷ Ἡρακλείδῃ εἰς Δημητρίαν· εἰὰν δὲ τι ποῶν τούτων ἀλίσκῃται Ἡρακλείδης καὶ ἐπιδείξῃ Δημητρία ἐναντίον ἀνδρῶν τριῶν, οὓς ἂν δοκιμάζωσιν ἀμφοτέρω, ἀποδότω Ἡρακλείδῃ Δημητρία τὴν φερνὴν ἣν προσηνέγκατο (δραχμῶν) Α, καὶ προσαποτεισάτω ἀργυρίου Ἀλεξανδρείου (δραχμᾶς) Α. While no dowry is returned in Gen 16 (but Hagar is!), the fact that Abraham has “produced children by another woman” (τεκνοποιεῖσθαι 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].  
<sup>138</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 38.4 (PG 53 355.53–356.7) praises Abraham for the ineffable patience (τὴν ἄφατον μακροθυμίαν), respect (αἰδῶ), and forbearance (συγγνώμην) he shows to Sarah in her irrational accusation (τῆς ἀλόγου 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 (οὐκ ὀρθῶς).

<sup>139</sup> χρῶ | Lexically, G rarely translates נתן (153) as χρᾶμαι (4), and he only uses this verb in one other case as a translation of נתן (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 χρᾶμαι 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 χρᾶμαι is used again in a sexual context.

harshly”) as ἐκάκωσεν<sup>140</sup> (“she abused”),<sup>141</sup> 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

---

<sup>140</sup> ἐκάκωσεν | G only uses the verbs ταπεινῶ (4) and κακῶ (3) to translate ענה (5) and ערע (11), typically matched in that order. The exact counts of equivalences, however, are complicated by the reconstruction in 15:3 [והרעו אתם] וענו אתם, 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 ערע, which forms a new contrast with the subsequent translation of ענה in 16:9 as ταπεινῶ. G portrays Sarah’s actions as harsh and the angel’s command to Hagar as a call for submission and not affliction.

<sup>141</sup> 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 (ταῖς φωναῖς) but to the true sense (τὰ δι’ ὑπονοιῶν σημαινόμενα) of the words: μὴ παραγώμεθα οὖν ταῖς φωναῖς, ἀλλὰ τὰ δι’ ὑπονοιῶν 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 ποιά κάκωσις ὠφέλιμόν) and actually a great good (μέγα ἀγαθόν) (*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

Ἐγένετο δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐτῶν ἐνενήκοντα ἑννέα, καὶ ὤφθη κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ εἶπεν  
 אֵל שַׁדַּי | הַתְּהִלָּה | וְהָיָה תָמִיד    αὐτῷ Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου· εὐαρέσκει ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ καὶ γίνου ἄμεμπτος,

First, by translating God’s self-identification as אֵל שַׁדַּי (“El Shaddai”) with the appellation ὁ θεός σου<sup>142</sup> (“your god”), G forges a novel intertextual link to God’s self-disclosure in 15:7

<sup>142</sup> ὁ θεός σου | G always translates אֵל שַׁדַּי as if it were a suffixed form of אֱלֹהִים, 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]).



(Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός ...),<sup>143</sup> 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" (התהלך לפני והיה תמים).<sup>144</sup> The last mention of someone "walking" with God was in reference to Noah (6:9),<sup>145</sup> but there it was stated as a fact, and so its use in a command here may be sufficient to signal God's displeasure.<sup>146</sup> Yet, by translating התהלך ("walk")

---

<sup>143</sup> At one level, G's chooses *ὁ θεός σου/μου/ὁ ἐμός* as a generic translation of the cryptic name *אל שדי*. 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 *אל שדי* in God's self-disclosure to Moses in Exod 6:2–3, where God trades his old name *אל שדי* for the new one *יהוה* (לא נודעתי) (*אני יהוה וארא אל אברהם אל יצחק ואל יעקב באל שדי ושמי יהוה לא נודעתי*), it seems that G finds the special importance of *אל שדי* 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 (*אנכי יהוה אלהיך אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים מבית עבדים*), which is structurally and lexically similar to the one already seen in Gen 15:7 (*אני יהוה אשר הוצאתיך מאור כשדים*), in a covenant passage that explicitly refers to the exodus (15:13–14). So, by translating *אל שדי* consistently as *ὁ θεός σου/μου/ὁ ἐμός*, G situates Gen 17 within the broader narratives of the Pentateuch extending back to the covenant with Abraham in Gen 15 and forward to the covenant with Israel at Sinai/Horeb. Philo, *Mut.* 23 also sees God's self-designation 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 βελτιουμένων*) but *κύριος ὁ θεός* to those who are perfect (*τελείων δὲ ἀμφοτέρων, κύριος ὁμοῦ καὶ θεός*).

<sup>144</sup> 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).

<sup>145</sup> Perhaps G found the difference between *התהלך את* (Noah) and *התהלך 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. "הלך" *hithpael* does not note any difference between the two collocations.

<sup>146</sup> Though not finding fault with Abraham, Philo, *Mut.* 1–2 interprets Abraham's age as 99 but almost 100 as symbolic of his progress (*προκοπή*) toward perfection (*τελειότης*). Cf. *Mut.* 24; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.12.2 §214.

with the present imperative *εὐαρέσται*<sup>147</sup> (“be pleasing”), G clearly indicates that God desires for Abraham to achieve the state of pleasing him. In addition, by translating the second command *והיה תמים* (“and be complete”) with the present imperative *γίνου*<sup>148</sup> *ἄμεμπτος*<sup>149</sup> (“become irreproachable”), G shows that God thinks Abraham has yet to achieve this state and is now open to reproach:<sup>150</sup> 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.

---

<sup>147</sup> *εὐαρέσται* | G always uses *εὐαρεστέω* to translate *הלך* in the *hithpaal* (9) when it carries this technical sense (**6: 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15**), and he only uses *εὐαρεστέω* in one other case to translate *שרת* (**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 *εὐαρεστέω* 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).

<sup>148</sup> *γίνου* | Although the imperative of *היה* is rare (also in **12:2; 24:60**), G’s use of the present imperative *γίνου* instead of the aorist *γενοῦ* 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 *γίνομαι* and *εἰμί* as translations of *היה*. G translates *היה* with *γίνομαι* (155) roughly as often as *εἰμί* (150), and his choice usually corresponds with the tense he selects, as he nearly always uses *γίνομαι* 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 *εἰμί*. 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 *γίνου* 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).

<sup>149</sup> *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.

<sup>150</sup> Didymus, *In Gen* 250 compares God’s act of reproaching Abraham here to oiling an athlete for a competition (*ἀλείφων δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς ἀγῶνα*), 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 וְאַתְנָה בְּרִיתִי ("so that I will make my covenant") in the apodosis of God's opening statement as καὶ θήσομαι 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).<sup>151</sup> 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,<sup>152</sup> 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 τέθεικά; 17:20 εὐλόγηκα), neither refers to the enactment of the covenant itself. On the contrary, G uses the future of ἵστημι 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.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> G also uses the similar verb δίδωμι in relation to the covenantal sign of the rainbow in 9:12.

<sup>152</sup> 9:17; 15:18; 21:27, 32; 26:28; 31:44. 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.

<sup>153</sup> When ἵστημι 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 *τέθεικα*<sup>154</sup> (“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 *תָּתַן*, as well.

### Genesis 17:5

ἰ καὶ οὐ κληθήσεται ἔτι τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἀβράμ, ἀλλ' ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἀβραάμ, ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν *תָּתַן* *τέθεικά* σε.

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 *תָּתַן* 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.<sup>155</sup> This means, in contrast to Sarah’s plan, that no human

---

maintain with future generations a covenant already established in the (recent) past: 9:11 (καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι κατακλυσμὸς ὕδατος); 17:7 (εἰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον, εἶναί σου θεὸς καὶ τοῦ σπέρματός σου μετὰ σέ); 17:19 (πρὸς αὐτόν [i.e., Isaac] εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτόν); 17:21 (πρὸς Ἰσαάκ).

<sup>154</sup> *τέθεικα* | For G’s use of the performative perfect, see §6.1.1.5.

<sup>155</sup> Philo, *Mut.* 70 interprets Abraham’s change of name as a change of his character (ἡθῶν ἐπανόρθωσιν) (cf. 76; *QG* III.43, 53). Also, the consistent use of the name Ἀβραάμ 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

תקרא Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ Σάρα ἡ γυνή σου, οὐ κληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Σάρα,  
 בן | - | שרה | כי | ἀλλὰ Σάρρα ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς. 16 εὐλογῆσω δὲ αὐτήν καὶ δώσω σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς τέκνον. καὶ  
 עמים εὐλογῆσω αὐτήν καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἔθνη καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔσονται.

G has assimilated the renaming of 17:15 to that of 17:5 by passivizing the active תקרא (‘‘you will call her name’’) as κληθήσεται<sup>156</sup> τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς (‘‘her name will be called’’) and supplying the future-tense copula ἔσται<sup>157</sup> (‘‘it will be’’), while he has conformed 17:5 to 17:15 by translating the conjunction ו (‘‘and’’) as ἀλλά<sup>158</sup> (‘‘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 אברהם to אברהם involves the addition of a letter (ה), the change from שרי to שרה exchanges one letter (י) for another (ה). In Greek, however, both names double one letter, so that Ἀβραάμ has an extra alpha (α) and Σάρρα an extra rho (ρ).<sup>159</sup> Finally, by translating בן (‘‘son’’) as τέκνον<sup>160</sup> (‘‘child’’), G connects this awaited

---

says that in Gen 12 Abraham still awaits perfection (ἔτι τελείωσιν ἐπιδέχεται), specifically because his name has not yet changed (οὐπω γὰρ μετακέκληται).

<sup>156</sup> κληθήσεται | For active => passive, see §6.1.2.3.

<sup>157</sup> ἔσται | For G’s addition of verbs in main clauses and its interpretive significance, see §3.2.2.1.

<sup>158</sup> ἀλλά | It is quite rare for G to translate ו (4,264) in a strongly adversative sense as ἀλλά (6: 17:5; [21:23]; 40:23; 45:1; 47:30; 48:19). As here, such cases involve negation in the preceding clause (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 61–63).

<sup>159</sup> 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 Ἀβράμ and Σάρα; afterwards they are Ἀβραάμ and Σάρρα.

<sup>160</sup> τέκνον | In most cases G translates בן (383) as υἱός (327), but τέκνον is not rare (18). G also uses τέκνον to translate ילד (33:6, 7) and אִן (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 ἐτεκνοποίει) 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.<sup>161</sup>

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.

### Genesis 17:20

ברכתי    περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαήλ ἰδοὺ ἐπήκουσά σου ἰδοὺ εὐλόγηκα αὐτὸν καὶ αὐξάνω αὐτὸν καὶ πληθυνῶ αὐτὸν σφόδρα  
 נשיא    δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει καὶ δώσω αὐτὸν εἰς ἔθνος μέγα

First, by translating ברכתי with a performative perfect εὐλόγηκα<sup>162</sup> (“I hereby bless”), 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 נשיא (“princes”) as ἔθνη<sup>163</sup> (“nations”), G downgrades Ishmael’s blessing by removing any regal connotations—in contrast, G upgrades Abraham’s status in 23:6 by using βασιλεύς (“king”) to translate the same noun נשיא 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.

---

“Translation Techniques and Beyond,” in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, ed. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82 (Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001), 18–19.

<sup>161</sup> This harmonization is striking given the variety of Hebrew words: יָלַד (11:30), בָּנָה (16:2), and בָּן (17:16).

<sup>162</sup> εὐλόγηκα | For G’s use of the performative perfect, see §6.1.1.5.

<sup>163</sup> ἔθνη | Though infrequent, G usually translates נשיא (4) more directly as βασιλεύς (23:6) or ἀρχων (25:16; 34:2). Otherwise, ἔθνος is G’s stereotyped translation of יָג (25), and he sometimes uses it to render עַם (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 שמר (“keep”) with the compound form διατηρέω<sup>164</sup> (“observe carefully”), which connotes both scrupulous and intergenerational observance, as the prefix διά may be used both intensively and diachronically.<sup>165</sup> 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

וּנְכַרְתָּהּ וְאֵת אֲפֶרְיָהּ וְאֵת אֶלְעָזָר בְּנֵי אֲבִימֶלֶךְ הָעַרְמְלִית וְאֵת אֶתְנָדָן בֶּן אֲבִימֶלֶךְ הָעַרְמְלִית  
καὶ ἀπερίτμητος ἄρσεν ... ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς ὅτι τὴν διαθήκην μου  
הפך דיסכעדאסען

While the Hebrew expression וּנְכַרְתָּהּ הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהוּא (“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 כרת (“cut”), translating it as ἐξολεθρεύω<sup>166</sup> (“destroy utterly”). In addition, the figurative interpretation of הפך (“break, invalidate”) as διασχεδάννυμι<sup>167</sup> (“scatter to the winds”) not only captures the gravity of such a breach of covenant, but it

<sup>164</sup> διατηρέω | G only uses διατηρέω (3) to translate שמר (16), but he more commonly uses (δια)φυλάσσω (10).

<sup>165</sup> Smyth §§1648; 1685.

<sup>166</sup> ἐξολεθρεύω | G only uses the intensive verb ἐξολεθρεύω here. For analogous uses of כרת, also *niphal*, G uses ἀποθνήσκω (9:11) and ἐκτρίβω (41:36).

<sup>167</sup> διασχεδάννυμι | Both פרך and διασχεδάννυμι 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 περιέτεμεν<sup>168</sup> (“he circumcised”),<sup>169</sup> 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

---

<sup>168</sup> περιέτεμεν | For passive => active, see §6.1.2.3.

<sup>169</sup> This contrasts with the disputed interpretation of R. Levi in Genesis Rabbah 47.9 that the use of the *niphal* נמלו and not the *qal* מל 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<sup>170</sup> 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.<sup>171</sup>

### Genesis 18:3–5

אל נא תעבר | אם נא 18:3 καὶ εἶπεν Κύριε, εἰ ἄρα εὗρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, μὴ παρέλθῃς τὸν παῖδά σου. 4  
 נא | ורחצו | והשענו λημφθῆτω δὲ ὕδωρ, καὶ νιψάτωσαν τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν, καὶ καταψύξατε ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον. 5 καὶ  
 פח להם λήμψομαι ἄρτον, καὶ φάγεσθε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο παρελεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῶν, οὗ εἵνεκεν  
 עברתם ἐξεκλίνατε πρὸς τὸν παῖδα ὑμῶν.

To begin with, G casts Abraham’s speech in a deferential tone with his deft use of particles.

By translating נא אם (“if in any way”)<sup>172</sup> in Abraham’s initial request as εἰ ἄρα<sup>173</sup> (“if

<sup>170</sup> Josephus, A.J. 1.11.4 §204 interprets Lot’s fate as wretched (ταλαιπώρως): ἐνταῦθα τοίνυν ὑπὸ τε ἀνθρώπων ἐρημίας καὶ τροφῆς ἀπορίας ταλαιπώρως διῆγεν.

<sup>171</sup> Based on some of the textual evidence presented here, Brayford calls G’s presentation of Abraham’s hospitality “even more pronounced” (*Genesis*, 310). Cf. Heb 13:2.

<sup>172</sup> HALOT, s.v. “אם” 6.c.

<sup>173</sup> εἰ ἄρα | G does not use the particle combination εἰ ἄρα elsewhere, but he uses ἄρα twice: once to translate רק (20:11) and once to translate תא (26:9). In Genesis, אם נא only occurs in the phrase נא אם (5: 18:3; 30:27; 33:10; 47:29; 50:1), which G always translates as εἰ εὗρον/εὔρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον, except here.

indeed”), G implies that Abraham considers it unlikely that he has already found favor with his Lord,<sup>174</sup> thus having Abraham imply his social inferiority to his guests. Then, by rendering the emphatic particle נָ (‘‘surely’’) in the following verse as δὴ<sup>175</sup> (‘‘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.<sup>176</sup> In a similar way, G develops Abraham’s deferential attitude by having him intimate a double debt to his guests. First, by rendering תֵּעָבֵר מֵעַל (‘‘pass from’’) as παρέλθης<sup>177</sup> (‘‘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<sup>178</sup> (‘‘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 וַרְחֲצוּ רַגְלֵיכֶם (‘‘wash your feet’’) in the third person as νιψάτωσαν<sup>179</sup> τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν (‘‘let

---

<sup>174</sup> KG II §543.8–10; Smyth §2796; Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 37–38.

<sup>175</sup> δὴ | G only uses δὴ for נָ here, but twice for נָ in parallel contexts (27:34, 38). In all three cases δὴ follows an imperative. For G’s translation of נָ in different constructions, including after imperatives (see §3.1.5.1).

<sup>176</sup> KG II §500.4; Smyth §2846; Mayser, *Grammatik*, II.3.133–134 (§164.7); Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 236–240.

<sup>177</sup> παρέλθης | The Hebrew verb עָבַר (qal) collocates with a range of prepositions in Genesis, this being the only case of עָבַר מֵעַל or another ablative preposition. Although G uses παρέρχομαι/παραπορεύομαι to translate עָבַר (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 מֵעַל (31)—usually ἀπό (20)—with the definite article, see §3.3.1.1.

<sup>178</sup> ἐκκλίνω | This is the only case in which G translates עָבַר (20) as ἐκκλίνω, which he also uses to translate סָוַר (19:2, 3) and נָטָה (38:16). The assimilation of this verse to 19:2–3 will be discussed below.

<sup>179</sup> 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,<sup>180</sup> and he translates וַהֲשִׁעֵנו (“relax”) more specifically as καταψύξατε<sup>181</sup> (“cool off”), and so has him offer them shade from the noonday sun (18:1). Also, G multiplies Abraham’s offer of פת וְחֶלֶב (“a bite of bread”) by translating it in 18:5 simply as ἄρτον (“bread”),<sup>182</sup> and he magnifies Abraham’s service by having him not “set” (יָתַן) their food before them but “wait on” (παρέθηκεν)<sup>183</sup> them personally. Finally, when the guests are ready to depart in 18:16, G does not have Abraham simply “send them off” (שָׁלַח) but “escort them on their way” (συμπροπέμπων<sup>184</sup> αὐτούς), so that he treats them like kings from start to finish.<sup>185</sup>

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<sup>186</sup>—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.<sup>187</sup> First, G compares the two scenes from the

---

<sup>180</sup> 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).

<sup>181</sup> καταψύξατε | Both ἵψ and καταψύχω occur only here in Genesis.

<sup>182</sup> The same may be true of מִים (מַעַם) in 18:4, but מַעַם has conservatively been reconstructed as a minus in V.

<sup>183</sup> παρέθηκεν | G only translates יָתַן (150) as παρατίθημι (5) here, a verb he typically uses for שָׁלַח (48) in contexts involving hospitality (3: 24:33; 43:31, 32), but once for יָצַח (30:38).

<sup>184</sup> συμπροπέμπων | This echoes Abraham’s send-off from Egypt in 12:20 (see note 71 for translation details).

<sup>185</sup> Philo, *Migr.* 173 takes συμπροπέμπων as a sign of Abraham’s virtue, apostrophizing ὦ παγκάλῃς ἐπανισώσεως (“O, what great parity!”), although he interprets συν- such that Abraham is also being escorted on his way (καθ’ ἣν ὁ παραπέμπων παρεπέμπετο). He then uses Exod 23:20–21 to conclude that Abraham has not yet reached a state of moral perfection: ἕως μὲν γὰρ οὐ τετελείωται, ἡγεμόνι τῆς ὁδοῦ χρῆται λόγῳ θείῳ.

<sup>186</sup> 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.

<sup>187</sup> 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, γνώμῃ δ’ ἡλλοτριωμένους. Similarly, Josephus, A.J.

outset by translating the disparate time phrases כַּחַם הַיּוֹם (“in the heat of the day”) (18:1) and בָּעֶרֶב (“in the evening”) (19:1) in a parallel fashion with an adverbial genitive of time as μεσημβρίας<sup>188</sup> (“at midday”) and ἑσπέρας<sup>189</sup> (“in the evening”). Second, he translates the verb סוּר in reference to the visitors’ “turning aside” to stay with Lot in 19:2–3 as ἐκκλίνω<sup>190</sup> (“bend away”), the same way he handled the verb עָבַר (“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<sup>191</sup> (“wash [for yourselves]”) for the same second-person command, which indicates that the guests will do this themselves.<sup>192</sup> Perhaps G translates the initial rejection of Lot’s hospitality לֹא (“No”) emphatically as οὐχί<sup>193</sup> (“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 Ἀβραάμου χρηστότητος). Cf. Origen, *Sel. Gen.* (PG 116): ὁ ἐκείνου συγγενῆς καὶ μιμητῆς 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.

<sup>188</sup> μεσημβρίας | In its other occurrence, G translates חַם as καῦμα (8:22) and otherwise only uses μεσημβρία to translate צהרים (42:16, 25).

<sup>189</sup> ἑσπέρας | G typically translates עֶרֶב as ἑσπέρα (11/13) and does not use ἑσπέρα otherwise.

<sup>190</sup> ἐκκλίνω | סוּר (qal) occurs again in 49:19, but it is not a good parallel (49:10). For ἐκκλίνω, see note 178.

<sup>191</sup> νίψασθε | A comparison of the other two occurrences of νίπτω reveals the same distinction: in 43:24 Joseph’s servant brings water to wash (νίψαι) the brothers’ feet, but in 43:31 Joseph washes (νιψάμενος) his own face.

<sup>192</sup> Differentiating νιψάτωσαν and νίψασθε, Muraoka suggests that G intends “to underscore this host’s poor standard of hospitality” (“Translation Techniques,” 19; cf. Brayford, *Genesis*, 317).

<sup>193</sup> οὐχί | Though G often translates לֹא 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” (פּצַר) to achieve their goals (19:3, 9). To be sure, Lot “trying to force” (κατεβιάζετο) the messengers to lodge with him is less offensive than the men of Sodom “trying to force (contrary to nature)”<sup>194</sup> (παρεβιάζοντο)<sup>195</sup> Lot into handing over the visitors, but the bare association is not positive.<sup>196</sup>

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.<sup>197</sup> When Sarah overhears that she will soon give birth to a son (18:10), she laughs to herself:

---

<sup>194</sup> As has been argued by G. B. Caird, the verb παραβιάζομαι is difficult to translate (especially in contrast to καταβιάζομαι), because παραβιάζομαι combines flaunting what a culture holds to be natural (παρά)—here, heterosexual relations—with the application of excessive force (βία): “The definition [of παραβιάζομαι] 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 παραβιασμοὶ καὶ κλαυσιγέλωτες to denote unnatural and bitter-sweet pleasures, and for παραβιασμός 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).

<sup>195</sup> κατεβιάζετο ... παρεβιάζοντο | In each of its occurrences, G translates פּצַר (3) with a different cognate (βιάζω in 33:11; καταβιάζομαι in 19:3; παραβιάζομαι 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).

<sup>196</sup> Later (i.e., in 19:8), the phrase כָּטִיב בְּעֵינֶיכֶם 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 Λῶτ οἷος ὁ Ἀβραάμ, διὰ τοῦτο, ὀκνοῦντες διελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν, βίας χρῆζουσιν.

<sup>197</sup> 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,” *JSL* 15 [1984]: 65–89).

18:12                      אחרי בלתי היתה לי עדנה    Οὐπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν ἔως τοῦ νῦν

Will I feel pleasure after I am worn out?    Well, it certainly has not happened for me yet!

Apparently interpreting the infinitive construct בלתי (“I am worn out”) as the homographic conjunction (“lest”)<sup>198</sup> and the noun עדנה (“pleasure”) as a form of the preposition עד (“until”),<sup>199</sup> 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.”<sup>200</sup> To be sure, Sarah intends for this statement to imply her doubt, as when God (mis)quotes what she thinks as האף אמנם אלד (“Will I really truly bear a child?”), the sarcasm of which G aptly captures by translating האף אמנם (“really truly?”) as ἄρα γε,<sup>201</sup> a particle combination that carries a similar pragmatic force.<sup>202</sup> Yet, even as G’s

---

<sup>198</sup> Aquila corrects G’s interpretive rendering to μετὰ τὸ κατατριβῆναι, Symmachus to μετὰ τὸ παλαιωθῆναι.

<sup>199</sup> Aquila corrects this translation to τρυφερία, Symmachus to ἀκμή.

<sup>200</sup> 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 (τεκνοποίησής) but not in 30:3 (τεκνοποιήσομαι), 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 ἐγὼ for the Hebrew גַּם-אֲנִי” (“Taming and Shaming,” 194 note 423).

<sup>201</sup> ἄρα 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 האף 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.

<sup>202</sup> 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 ironically<sup>203</sup> 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 *היפלא מיהוה דברו* ("Is anything impossible for Yahweh?") with *μή*,<sup>204</sup> 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 כי צחקת* ("No, you did laugh.") with gusto as *Οὐχί*<sup>205</sup> *ἀλλὰ ἐγέλασας* ("No! You did laugh.").<sup>206</sup> 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

---

<sup>203</sup> 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.

<sup>204</sup> *μή* | For G's translation of the Hebrew question particle, see §3.1.5.2.

<sup>205</sup> *Οὐχί* | See note 193.

<sup>206</sup> 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 αὐτὴν, Οὐχί, 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

ה 18:17 ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν Μὴ κρύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ; 18 Ἀβραάμ δὲ  
 היו יהיה | ועצום γινόμενος ἔσται εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολύ, καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς. 19  
 ידעתי | למען אשר ἤδειν γὰρ ὅτι συντάξει τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτόν, καὶ φυλάξουσιν τὰς ὁδοὺς  
 ע'יו πρὸς αὐτόν. κυρίου ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν· ὅπως ἂν ἐπαγάγη κύριος ἐπὶ Ἀβραάμ πάντα, ὅσα ἐλάλησεν

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 *היו יהיה* (“will certainly be”) as *γινόμενος ἔσται*<sup>207</sup> (“will gradually become”), a very curious Greek formulation<sup>208</sup> that clearly echoes God’s command in 17:1 that Abraham “become” (*γίνου*)

<sup>207</sup> *γινόμενος 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 *εἶμι* is especially odd. The only Septuagintal parallel is in 3 Kgdms 13:32.

<sup>208</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 42.3 (PG 54 388.39–43) discusses the curious expression *γινόμενος 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 ἕτερόν τι αἰνίττεσθαι αὐτόν διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, Ἀβραάμ δὲ γινόμενος ἔσται εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ, ἀντὶ τοῦ, Σὺ μὲν ὁ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐλόμενος, καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς προστάγμασι πειθόμενος, καὶ τὴν ὑπακοὴν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ γενήσῃ.* John’s combined use of aorist (*ἐλόμενος*) 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 עָצוֹם ("mighty")—unique in Genesis here—as πολὺ ("numerous") (17:4–6; cf. 13:16; 15:5).<sup>209</sup> Yet, G's divergent interpretation of the reason God gives for his prediction is most significant:

18: 18           ... כִּי יָדַעְתִּי לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יְצוּהוּ אֶת בְּנָיו ... ἤδεν γὰρ ὅτι συντάξει τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ ...

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 יָדַע ("choose")<sup>210</sup> 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 יָדַע ("know"), despite its unusual combination with a final clause (לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר).<sup>211</sup> As a result, G's translation ἤδεν 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.<sup>212</sup> Finally, by translating the phrase כִּל אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר עָלָיו ("everything he has said about/on behalf of/to him")<sup>213</sup> personally as

<sup>209</sup> While Aquila etymologizes עָצוֹם as ὀστέϊνον, Symmachus interprets it as ἰσχυρόν.

<sup>210</sup> For this usage, see *HALOT* s.v. "יָדַע" *qal* 7.a and the parallels listed there, i.e., Jer 1:5; Hos 13:5; Amos 3:2.

<sup>211</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 256–257; Harl, *La Genèse*, 176–177.

<sup>212</sup> 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 ἡ ἐπίτασις), since he will ensure his own and his progeny's virtue.

<sup>213</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. "עָלָיו;" *IBHS* §11.2.13. Nailing down the meaning of עָל 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 עָל was often used interchangeably with אֵל and לָ ( *HALOT* 6; *IBHS* §11.2.13g). If G took עָל in this last sense, he had linguistic justification for his translation.

πάντα ὅσα ἐλάλησεν πρὸς<sup>214</sup> αὐτόν (“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” (δίκαιος) alongside the “impious” (ἀσεβής). Given this chapter’s formulaic content, it is not surprising to find the word δίκαιος 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).<sup>215</sup> First, G characterizes the wicked men of Sodom in terms of justice by translating Lot’s command רק לאנשים האל אל תעשו דבר (“Just don’t do anything to these men!”) in 19:8 as μόνον εἰς τοὺς ἄνδρας τούτους μὴ ποιήσητε μηδὲν ἄδικον<sup>216</sup>

---

<sup>214</sup> πρὸς | G rarely translates the Hebrew preposition לַ 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.”

<sup>215</sup> T.Ab. B 6:13 implies this interpretation in having the visitor tell Abraham “I am on my way to protect your brother Lot from Sodom” (ὑπάγω τηρῆσαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν Λώτ ἀπὸ Σοδόμων).

<sup>216</sup> 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’ *תִּשְׁבָּח* (“faithfulness”) but their *δικαιοσύνη*<sup>217</sup> (“justice”) (19:19). In a similar way, while both Abraham and Lot speak of finding *יָחַד* (“favor”) with their visitors (18:3; 19:19), G interprets this as *χάρις* (“favor”) for Abraham but *ἔλεος*<sup>218</sup> (“pity”) for Lot.

18:3 *תִּשְׁבָּח יָחַד מִצְאָתִי נָא אֲדֹנָי אֱמַר* Κύριε, εἰ ἄρα εὗρον *χάριν* ἐναντίον σου

19:19 *תִּשְׁבָּח יָחַד עֲבַדְךָ מִצָּאָה נָא הִנֵּה* ἐπειδὴ εὗρεν ὁ παῖς σου *ἔλεος* ἐναντίον σου

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

*תַּסְפֵּה גַם אֶתָּה* Ἀναστὰς λάβε τὴν γυναῖκά σου καὶ τὰς δύο θυγατέρας ἃς ἔχεις καὶ ἔξελθε ἵνα μὴ καὶ σὺ συναπόλη  
ταῖς ἀνομίαις τῆς πόλεως

<sup>217</sup> *δικαιοσύνη* | More often G translates *תִּשְׁבָּח* (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.

<sup>218</sup> *ἔλεος* | Unlike the alternation between *ἔλεος* and *δικαιοσύνη* as equivalents for *תִּשְׁבָּח*, G always translates *יָחַד* (14) as *χάρις* except in this verse. G only uses *ἔλεος* (7) for these two terms.

By translating ספה (“destroy”) with the compound συναπόλλυμι<sup>219</sup> (“destroy along with”) and fronting the emphatic subject גם אתה (“you as well”) for extra emphasis,<sup>220</sup> G reminds the reader of the comitative idea Abraham previously expressed in 18:23,<sup>221</sup> 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.<sup>222</sup> 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” (οἰκέω) in a cave (19:30),<sup>223</sup> the ultimate resolution of having “set out” (ῥήκετο) 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

---

<sup>219</sup> συναπόλλυμι | G has three translations of ספה (4): ἀπόλλυμι (1), συναπόλλυμι (2), and συμπαλαμβάνω (1). Though the compound συναπόλλυμι only occurs in 18:23 and 19:15, G uses the simplex ἀπόλλυμι throughout this passage for תהש (7: 18:28+, 29, 30, 31, 32; 19:13), as well as to translate הרג in 20:4 and אבד in 35:4.

<sup>220</sup> For G’s fronting of verbal arguments for emphasis, see §4.2.2.

<sup>221</sup> Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 190.

<sup>222</sup> 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]).

<sup>223</sup> κατοικέω ... οἰκέω | 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 (ῥήκετο).

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.<sup>224</sup> 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 בעלת בעל (“possessed by a husband,” lit. “owned by an owner”), G locates her status in the Greek legal sphere by translating this as συνωκηκυῖα ἀνδρί<sup>225</sup> (“living with a man”).<sup>226</sup> In a similar way, G’s repeated use of the technical term ἀποδίδωμι<sup>227</sup> (“give back”) to render השיב (“return”) in 20:7 is reminiscent of the kinds of legal restitution envisioned by Ptolemaic petitions and also marriage contracts.<sup>228</sup> What is more, G develops Abimelech’s legal innocence by changing the narrator’s testimony in 20:4 that he did not “approach” (קרב אל) Sarah into a claim that he did not “touch” (ἄπτω)<sup>229</sup> her, which now harmonizes with God’s version of the story (20:6).

---

<sup>224</sup> 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.

<sup>225</sup> συνωκηκυῖα ἀνδρί | The verb בעל and the cognate noun בעל—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.

<sup>226</sup> 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.

<sup>227</sup> ἀποδίδωμι | Most often G translates the *hiphil* and *hophal* of שׁוּב (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 מָכַר (9), but also נָתַן (2) and יָהַב (1).

<sup>228</sup> Recall ἀποδότω 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” (DiBittonto, “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, ἐλεῆσαι με γράψας Λεοντίσκῳ τῷ ἀρχιφυλακίτῃ ἐπισκεψάμενον τὴν λείαν ἀποδοῦναι.

<sup>229</sup> ἄπτω | Other than this case, G always translates קָרַב (5) directly as ἐγγίζω (4). Similarly, G only uses the verb ἄπτω as a translation of נָגַע (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

גם צדיק | תהרג 20:4 ... καὶ εἶπεν Κύριε, ἔθνος ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολείς; 5 οὐκ αὐτός μοι εἶπεν Ἀδελφή μου  
ובנקין ἐστίν; καὶ αὐτή μοι εἶπεν Ἀδελφός μου ἐστίν. ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ χειρῶν ἐποίησα  
τοῦτο.

By translating כפי ובנקין (“and with innocence in my hands”) as καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ<sup>230</sup> 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 ἔθνος ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δίκαιον (“an unwitting and just nation”),<sup>231</sup> he justifies Abimelech's actions on the explicit grounds that Abimelech acted in ignorance. In addition, by rendering תהרג (“will you kill ... ?”) as ἀπολείς<sup>232</sup> (“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.

20:9 ומה חטאתי לך μή τι ἡμάρτομεν εἰς σέ  
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

<sup>230</sup> δικαιοσύνη | The Hebrew noun נְקִיּוֹת only occurs here in Genesis. For G's uses of δικ-, see §5.2.2.6.

<sup>231</sup> For other cases of uncommon substantive additions by G, see §3.2.8.

<sup>232</sup> ἀπολείς | G only translates הרג (17) as ἀπόλλυμι, elsewhere using ἀποκτείνω (16). For G's use of (συν)ἀπόλλυμι, see note 219.

“at all”), G constructs Abimelech’s defensive rebuke of Abraham as a more explicit self-absolvement 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.<sup>233</sup> 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

יִרְאָתָא אֱלֹהִים | רק 20:11 εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ· Εἶπα γάρ ἄρα οὐκ ἔστιν θεοσέβεια ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ,  
והרגוני | וגם ἐμέ τε ἀποκτενοῦσιν ἕνεκεν τῆς γυναικός μου. 12 καὶ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἀδελφή μου ἔστιν ἐκ πατρός,  
אֲלֵל' οὐκ ἐκ μητρός· ἐγενήθη δέ μοι εἰς γυναῖκα. 13 ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἐξήγαγέν με ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ  
דסדק οἴκου τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ εἶπα αὐτῇ Ταύτην τὴν δικαιοσύνην ποιήσεις ἐπ' ἐμέ· εἰς πάντα τόπον,  
οὗ ἂν εἰσέλθωμεν ἐκεῖ, εἰπὸν ἐμέ ὅτι Ἀδελφός μου ἔστιν.

First, in translating Abraham’s unsubstantiated assumption that the people of Gerar were godless, G represents יִרְאָתָא אֱלֹהִים (“fear of God”) as an absence of θεοσέβεια<sup>234</sup> (“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<sup>235</sup> (“it seems”).

<sup>233</sup> Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 6.2 (Doutreleau 186–189) contrasts Abimelech as a moral superior to Pharaoh in Gen 12:10–20, as well. Cf. Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 64.

<sup>234</sup> θεοσέβεια | Neither the phrase יִרְאָתָא אֱלֹהִים nor the compound θεοσέβεια occur again in Genesis. For G’s use of synthetic translation resulting from Greek compounding, see §3.3.2.3.

<sup>235</sup> 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<sup>236</sup> (“and so”) and fronting the emphatic pronoun ἐμέ<sup>237</sup> (“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 וְגַם (“and yet”) as καὶ γάρ<sup>238</sup> (“and actually”), and then by infusing irony into his gesture toward Sarah’s complicity in the con, a sign not of her דַּחַק (“loyalty”) but her δικαιοσύνη<sup>239</sup> (“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

כסות 20:16 תְּחִי דֵּה סָרַרָּה עֵיפֶּן יִדּוּן דִּדְדֹּוּכָא חִילִּיָּא דִּידְרַחְמָא תִּפְּ אֲדֵלְפֹּי סוּ. תַּאֲזָּתָּה עֵסְתִּי סוּי עִיִּס תִּמְהֵן  
 עינים | ואת כל ונכחת τοῦ προσώπου σου καὶ πάσαις ταῖς μετὰ σοῦ· καὶ πάντα ἀλήθευσον.

First, G interprets the money that Abimelech gives to Abraham as specifically meant to restore Sarah’s “honor” (τιμή), translating עִיִּס כַּסוּת (“covering of eyes”) as εἰς τιμὴν<sup>240</sup> τοῦ προσώπου σου (“for the honor of your face”). If Sarah’s marital relationship to Abraham had been compromised, dishonor would have resulted.<sup>241</sup> Second, while Abimelech emphasizes

<sup>236</sup> 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 ו (5) (cf. §4.1.1.4).

<sup>237</sup> ἐμέ | For G’s fronting verbal arguments for pragmatic emphasis, see §4.1.2.3 and §4.2.2.

<sup>238</sup> καὶ γάρ | G uses the particle combination καὶ γάρ on three other occasions (9:5; 16:13; 35:16). Since G frequently omits וְ in the presence of another conjunction, it is significant that he represents it as γάρ here (cf. §4.1.1).

<sup>239</sup> δικαιοσύνη | For G’s treatment of דַּחַק and his use of δικαιοσύνη, see note 217.

<sup>240</sup> τιμὴν | The Hebrew noun תִּמְהָ only occurs here in Genesis, and G’s only other use of τιμή is in the sense of “price” (44:2), a contextual translation of תְּמָרָה.

<sup>241</sup> Pomeroy, “Married Women,” 95–98.

Sarah's innocence by saying **וְאַתָּה כָּל וְנִכְחַת** ("and you are entirely vindicated"), G renders this as **καὶ πάντα ἀλήθευσον**<sup>242</sup> ("and tell the whole truth"), which either means that she is to corroborate that Abimelech did not touch her<sup>243</sup> 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**,<sup>244</sup> 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

---

<sup>242</sup> **ἀλήθευσον** | The *niphal* of **נִכַּחַת** only occurs here in Genesis. The *hiphil* occurs more frequently (5), and G renders it as **ἐλέγχω** (3) and **ἡτοιμάζω** (2). Elsewhere G only uses **ἀλητεύω** once as a synthetic translation of **נִכַּחַת וְנִכְחַת**, but the equivalence between **ἀληθ-** and **נִכַּחַת** (6) is nearly consistent (cf. **24:49**).

<sup>243</sup> 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 ἀθῶός εἰμι τῆς ἀμαρτίας· μανθανέτω παρὰ σοῦ, ὥς οὐδὲν εἴργασται 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 τίς εἶ; πόθεν ἦλθες ἐπ' ἡϊόνας; τίς ὁ φύσας; // πάντα δ' ἀλήθευσον, μὴ ψευδόμενόν σε νοήσω** (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 **δέ**, 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.

<sup>244</sup> 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

[תא] קחצ 21:9 ἰδοῦσα δὲ Σάρρα τὸν υἱὸν Ἀγάρ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, ὃς ἐγένετο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, παίζοντα μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς, ...

In translating what Sarah sees, G departs substantially from his source. While the Hebrew version has Ishmael either “mocking” or “molesting” (תא קחצ) Isaac,<sup>245</sup> G interprets this action quite neutrally as “playing with”<sup>246</sup> (παίζοντα<sup>247</sup> μετὰ), reading תא (DDOM) as תא (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.<sup>248</sup> Furthermore, it makes sense of several facts, such as why

<sup>245</sup> HALOT, s.v. “קחצ” gives two senses for the *piel*: (1) “joke” or “make fun of” and (2) “fondle.”

<sup>246</sup> LSJ, s.v. “παίζω, ἐμπαίζω.” While παίζω can move from “playing” (A.1.3) to “jesting” or even “mockery” (A.II), the collocation with the preposition μετὰ 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.

<sup>247</sup> παίζοντα | The *piel* of קחצ 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.

<sup>248</sup> 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 ἤξιον παρατρέφειν τούτῳ τὸν Ἰσμαῆλον ὄντα πρεσβύτερον καὶ κακουργεῖν δυνάμενον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῖς ἀποθανόντος. 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 laeserat, 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, οἵμαι που, τῆς παιδιᾶς ἣν ὁ 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” (ὕπῃκουσεν) her voice (16:2). Moreover, G’s translation of רעע בעיני (“displease”) in 21:11–12 as σκληρόν<sup>249</sup> φαίνεσθαι/εἶναι (“seem/be cruel”), corroborates this view, which signals Abraham’s disapproval of Sarah’s unfounded punishment of Hagar and Ishmael.<sup>250</sup> 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 מצחק unambiguously as an offense, albeit one of several possible types: (i) sexual misconduct; (ii) idolatry; (iii) murder; or (iv) pretension towards the inheritance.

<sup>249</sup> σκληρόν | The qal of רעע occurs five times in Genesis, and G uses three different periphrastic renderings: σκληρόν φαίνεσθαι/εἶναι (21:11, 12), πονηρόν φαίνεσθαι (35:22; 38:10), and βαρὺ φαίνεσθαι (48:17). Since רעע has a very general signification, G adapts each Greek usage to fit the context. While σκληρός (“cruel, harsh”) does not suit these other contexts, G does use the term σκληρός elsewhere in reference to Joseph’s feigned harsh speech to his brothers (42:7, 30 [= קָשָׁה]); the cruel treatment Joseph received from his brothers (45:5 [= חָרָה]); and with Reuben (49:3+ [= יָחַר]), 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).

<sup>250</sup> Josephus, *A.J.* 1.12.3 §216 says that Abraham found Sarah’s suggestion quite savage (ὠμότατον), i.e., to cast out mother and child in a helpless state: πάντων ὠμότατον ἡγούμενος εἶναι παῖδα νήπιον καὶ γυναῖκα ἄπορον τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐκπέμπειν. Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 73 also says Abraham found this exceedingly savage (ὠμὸν ἄγαν), which is why he did not heed it without God’s endorsement (οὐχ ὑπήκουσε· 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

אם תשקר 21:23 νῦν οὖν ὁμοσόν μοι τὸν θεὸν μὴ ἀδικήσῃν με μηδὲ τὸ σπέρμα μου μηδὲ τὸ ὄνομά μου  
 וכחשׁ | ו ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἣν ἐποίησα μετὰ σοῦ ποιήσεις μετ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ τῇ γῇ ἣ σὺ παρώκησας ἐν αὐτῇ

In Hebrew, Abimelech asks Abraham to swear not to “act deceitfully” (רַקְשָׁה), but G recasts this in the familiar terms of “justice,” translating it as ἀδικήσῃν<sup>251</sup> (“to commit injustice”). In addition, while Abimelech characterizes his previous treatment of Abraham as רַחֲמָה (“loyalty”) in Hebrew, G interprets this as δικαιοσύνην<sup>252</sup> (“justice”), sealing the contrast by translating the clausal-ו between these two elements adversatively as ἀλλά<sup>253</sup> (“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.

---

<sup>251</sup> ἀδικήσῃν | The Hebrew verb רַקַּשׁ only occurs here in Genesis. For G’s use of ἀδικεῶ, see note 136. The future infinitive is exceedingly rare in G. In fact, the only other place he uses it is in the phrase μὴ ποιήσῃν 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 ὁμνυμι and other verbs of speech/thought (*Infinitive*, 150–151).

<sup>252</sup> δικαιοσύνην | On רַחֲמָה and δικαιοσύνη, see note 217.

<sup>253</sup> ἀλλά | On ו 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:<sup>254</sup> 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 been 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

---

<sup>254</sup> 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 נסח 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 Nikiprowetzky*, 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 ἡγερῆ as 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,<sup>255</sup> 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

וַיֹּאמֶר קָח נָא אֶת בְּנֶךְ אֶת יְחִידְךָ אֲשֶׁר אֹהֶבֶת אֶת יִצְחָק

Before naming Isaac, God first refers to him as “your son” (בְּנֶךְ), “your only<sup>256</sup> one” (יְחִידְךָ), and “whom you love” (אֲשֶׁר אֹהֶבֶת), 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 אֶת. In translating this

---

<sup>255</sup> Søren Kierkegaard, “Fear and Trembling,” in *Existentialism: Basic Writings*, ed. Charles Guignon and Derk Pereboom (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1995): 18–69; Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 8–23; Sherryll Mleynek, “Aristotle and God: The Poetics of Sacrifice,” *JAAR* 62 (1994): 107–121.

<sup>256</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “יְחִיד” 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 *את שני נעריו* (“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 *אתו* (“with him”), which brings the discrepancy between the indefinite noun phrase *δύο παῖδας* (“two boys”) into more obvious contrast with the phrase *Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ* (“Isaac his son”), which follows. Finally, G regularly differentiates his translations of the Hebrew word *נער* (“boy”) in this chapter, translating it as *παῖς* (“child, slave”) (22:3, 5, 19) in reference to these two extras and reserving the affectionate term *παιδάριον*<sup>263</sup> (“little child”) (22:5, 12) in reference to Isaac. Yet, in addition to *υἱός* (“son”) and *παιδάριον* (“little child”), G also uses the term *τέκνον*<sup>264</sup> (“child”) to translate *בן* 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

---

<sup>263</sup> *παιδάριον* | G uses the diminutive *παιδάριον* as a minor match for the nouns *נער* (6/27) and *נָעִר* (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 *נער*, see note 261.

<sup>264</sup> *τέκνον* | G very often translates *בן* as *υἱός* (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 [= *ἱσ*]). 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 (*ἡλικία*): διὸ καὶ τέκνον αὐτὸν προσεῖπε, τὸ δ’ ἐστὶν εὐνοίας καὶ ἡλικίας ὄνομα ἐν ταῦτῳ (*Prel.* 40).

Isaac calls Abraham *πάτερ*<sup>265</sup> (“father”) (22:7).<sup>266</sup> While this seems particularly affectionate when it occurs in the phrase *τί ἐστίν*<sup>267</sup> *τέκνον* (“What is the matter, child?”), used to translate the Hebrew expression *הנני בני* (“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 ἐξ 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” (*οὐκ ἐτεκνοποίει* [Heb. *לד*]); in 15:2, Abraham claimed he was “childless” (*ἄτεκνος* [Heb. *עריר*]); 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. *בן*]) 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

---

<sup>265</sup> *πάτερ* | G always translates *אב* 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).

<sup>266</sup> 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

<sup>267</sup> *τί ἐστίν* | Only in 21:17 does G use the question *τί ἐστίν* in direct statement to translate *מה לך*. In its three other occurrences, it serves as a translation of *הנני*, but each case involves the speaker expressing concern for the other person. As with *הנה* more generally, G usually translates the suffixed form *הנני* as *ἰδοὺ* (9/13).

does obeying God mean sacrificing his beloved son, but it also means relinquishing his surety of the promise.<sup>268</sup>

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

כי עתה ידעתי 22:12 καὶ εἶπεν Μὴ ἐπιβάλλῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον μηδὲ ποιήσῃς αὐτῷ μηδέν· νῦν γὰρ ἔγνων  
ממני ὅτι φοβῆ τὸν θεὸν σύ, καὶ οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ.

First, G makes use of the dramatic aorist of γινώσκω in translating כי עתה ידעתי (“for now I know”) as νῦν γὰρ ἔγνων (“for now I know”),<sup>269</sup> instead of using οἶδα in the perfect or pluperfect (as in the similar formulation כי ידעתי in 18:19). This accentuates rather than obscures the fact that God is claiming to know something now that he did not before.<sup>270</sup> 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

---

<sup>268</sup> Josephus, *A.J.* 1.13.1 §§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.

<sup>269</sup> KG II §386.9; Smyth §1937; Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 29–30 (§8.3.2).

<sup>270</sup> 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 (ἔγνων) but that Abraham has made known (ἐγνώρισας) his fear of God by passing the test (cf. the reading νῦν ἔδειξας attributed to ὁ ἐβραῖος). Wevers gives a similar interpretation but stays closer to the text, taking νῦν γὰρ ἔγνων 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 מן in the phrase מן חשך ("withhold from") causally as *δία* ("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).<sup>271</sup> Later, G has the angel name Abraham's actions explicitly as obedience, as he accurately translates שמעת בקולי ("you listened to my voice") in 22:18 as ὑπήκουσας<sup>272</sup> 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: Κύριος 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 (ὄψεται) a sheep. The place name κύριος 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 בִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי ("I swear by myself")

---

<sup>271</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 47.3 (PG 54:432.12–13) glosses δι' ἐμέ as διὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα τὸ ἐμὸν, διὰ τὸ ἐπίταγμα τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ, which acknowledges the emphasis that G has placed on the reason for Abraham's obedience.

<sup>272</sup> ὑπήκουσας | For G's treatment of שמע and his use of ὑπακούω, see note 132.

correctly as a performative *κατ' ἐμαντοῦ*<sup>273</sup> ὥμοσα<sup>274</sup> (“I hereby swear by myself”), making contextually appropriate use of both the solemn preposition *κατά* with the genitive and the performative aorist.<sup>275</sup> Then, in introducing the apodosis of the oath, G translates the Hebrew conjunction *כִּי* (“that”) with the particle combination *ἢ μήν*<sup>276</sup> (“verily”), commonly used to introduce an oath. Finally, in reference to Abraham obeying God’s voice (*יְקַבֵּל*), G retains and fronts the possessive pronoun for emphasis: *τῆς ἐμῆς*<sup>277</sup> 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.<sup>278</sup> This last set of translation choices, in particular, has a dramatic quality (cf. also *νῦν γὰρ ἔγνω* in 22:12), a fact that should probably be explained in

---

<sup>273</sup> *κατ' ἐμαντοῦ* | G only uses *κατά* with the genitive in two other cases, again as a translation of *בְּ* (31:54), also as a modifier of *ῥήνυμι* in an oath, and later also as a translation of *לִפְנֵי* (50:20). For the idiomatic use of *κατά* in oaths, especially with *ῥήνυμι*, see LSJ, s.v. “*κατά*” A.II.4.a.

<sup>274</sup> *ὥμοσα* | 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.

<sup>275</sup> 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 συνηθείᾳ χρησάμενός*) in order to emphasize the certain fulfillment of the promise.

<sup>276</sup> *ἢ μήν* | G only uses this particle combination again in 42:16 to convey the solemnity of Joseph’s oath accusing his brothers of being spies: *νῆ τὴν ὑγίειαν Φαραώ ἢ μήν κατάσκοποι ἐστε* (see §9.3.4 and notes 246–247 there). For the common use of *ἢ μήν* in solemn oaths, see LSJ, s.v. “*ἢ*” I.1; Mayser, *Grammatik*, II.3.146 (§164.14.2a); Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 350–351.

<sup>277</sup> *ἐμῆς* | G translates a suffixed form of *קִי* with the emphatic pronominal 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.

<sup>278</sup> 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.<sup>279</sup>

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.<sup>280</sup> 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.<sup>281</sup> 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

---

<sup>279</sup> 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 υἱὸν ἢ υἱὸς μητέρα ἀποκτείνει ἢ μέλλει) (*Poet.* 1453b.19–21).

<sup>280</sup> 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 μελλῆσαι καὶ μὴ πράξαι χεῖριστον· τό τε γὰρ μίαιρόν ἐχει, καὶ οὐ τραγικόν· ἀπαθεὶς γάρ) (*Poet.* 1453b.37–39).

<sup>281</sup> 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 נשיא אלהים ("prince of God") as βασιλεύς<sup>282</sup> παρὰ<sup>283</sup> θεοῦ ("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<sup>284</sup> ("it was confirmed")<sup>285</sup> to translate ויקם ("it became") in order to certify Abraham's legal possession of this slice of his promised inheritance.<sup>286</sup> Then, in 24:40, G effectively translates התהלכתי

---

<sup>282</sup> βασιλεύς | G's most neutral translation of נשיא is ἄρχων (25:16; 34:2). Whereas the rendering as ἔθνος 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 מלך (44/45). The effect is not lost on John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 48.1 (PG 54:434.63–435.2, 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).

<sup>283</sup> παρὰ | 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.

<sup>284</sup> ἐκυρώθη | G does not use κυρώ elsewhere, and וקם is translated variously according to its diverse usages.

<sup>285</sup> For the legal usage, see LSJ, s.v. "κυρώ" A.1.

<sup>286</sup> 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 Σάρρας τελευτήν.

לפניו (“I walked before him”) with the aorist *εὐηρέστησα*<sup>287</sup> (“I pleased”)<sup>288</sup> in order to signal Abraham’s attainment of the state named by God in 17:1.

17:1 אני אל שדי התהלך לפני והיה תמים Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου· εὐαρέσται ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ καὶ γίνου ἄμεμπτος  
24:40 יהוה אשר התהלכתי לפניו Κύριος, ὃς εὐηρέστησα ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ

In effect, both parties to the covenant have finally done what they pledged.<sup>289</sup>

## 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

<sup>287</sup> *εὐηρέστησα* | For G’s translation of *הלך* (*hithpael*) and his usage of *εὐαρεστέω*, see note 147.

<sup>288</sup> 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 (*εὐάρεστος ὡς Θεῷ*) when he goes to his fathers. Similarly, Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo i in Abraham et Isaac* 230.8–11 says God was pleased (*ἡρέσθη*) 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 εὐρεθεὶς δόκιμος*).

<sup>289</sup> Josephus, *A.J.* 1.17.1 §256 claims that Abraham was full of virtue and honored by God at his death: *Τελευτᾷ δὲ καὶ Ἀβραμὸς μετ’ ὀλίγον, ἀνὴρ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἄκρος καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν σπουδῆς ἀξίως ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τιμημένος*.



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,<sup>290</sup> 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

---

<sup>290</sup> G's use of Greek ethical concepts here and in Noah's story stands out when one considers the fact that such terminology is not commonly used in the Septuagint (Eberhard Bons, "Ακακία and ἄκακος. Considerations on a Septuagint Term for 'Innocence'," 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], 491–501).

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*.<sup>1</sup> 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 (οἰκτρός/ἐλεεινός).<sup>2</sup> 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.”<sup>3</sup> The most convincing textual evidence that Scarlata adduces to support this claim is as follows:

- (i) G refers to Cain's הַנִּחֵם (“offering”) as “sacrifices” (θυσίαι) but Abel's as δῶρα (“gifts”) (4:4–5);<sup>4</sup>
- (ii) G uses tragic emotions to describe Cain's affective response to God not accepting his sacrifices: not only does Cain “grieve” (ἐλύπησεν [= לָרַחַם “got angry”]) (4:5), but God also

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> 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 δεινὰ ἢ ποῖα οἰκτρὰ φαίνεται τῶν συμπιπτόντων, λάβωμεν. ἀνάγκη δὲ ἢ φίλων εἶναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὰς τοιαύτας πράξεις ἢ ἐχθρῶν ἢ μηδετέρων. ἂν μὲν οὖν ἐχθρὸς ἐχθρόν, οὐδὲν ἐλεεινὸν οὔτε ποιῶν οὔτε μέλλον, πλὴν κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος· οὐδ' ἂν μηδετέρως ἔχοντες· ὅταν δ' ἐν ταῖς φιλίαις ἐγγένηται τὰ πάθη, οἷον ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν ἢ υἱὸς πατέρα ἢ μήτηρ υἱὸν ἢ υἱὸς μητέρα ἀποκτείνῃ ἢ μέλλῃ ἢ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον δοῦναι, ταῦτα ζητητέον.

<sup>3</sup> Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, 208.

<sup>4</sup> Scarlata, *Outside of Eden* 54–57, 209.

asks him why he is “deeply grieved” (περίλυπος [also = לַחֲרָה ל]) (4:6);<sup>5</sup>

(iii) G has God imply that Cain is culpable for his tragic mistake (ἁμαρτία) of sacrificial division (διαίρεω), i.e., implying that Cain knew how to divide his sacrifice properly but did not, since he translates God’s question הֲלוֹא אִם תֵּיטִיב שְׂאֵת וְאִם לֹא תֵיטִיב לִפְתַּח חֲטָאת רַבִּץ (“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”)<sup>6</sup> quite innovatively as οὐκ, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἡμάρτες; ἡσύχασον. (Is it not that, if you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, you have made a mistake? Calm down!) (4:7);<sup>7</sup>

(iv) G translates God’s curse that Cain will be “a fugitive and wander” (נֹעַד וְנָד) with tragic pathos as “groaning and trembling” (στένων καὶ τρέμων) (4:12, 14);<sup>8</sup>

and (v) G has Cain recognize not that his “punishment” (עֹנֶשׁ) is too great “to bear” (נִשְׂא), but that his “guilt” (αἰτία) too great for him “to be forgiven” (ἀφεθῆναι), which conveys tragic despair (4:13).<sup>9</sup>

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.<sup>10</sup> 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

<sup>5</sup> Scarlata, *Outside of Eden* 57–59, 209.

<sup>6</sup> Scarlata’s translation. For the textual and interpretive difficulties of the Hebrew, see *Outside of Eden*, 74–82.

<sup>7</sup> Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, 82–91, 209–210.

<sup>8</sup> Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, 140–142, 210.

<sup>9</sup> Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, 161–164, 210.

<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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).<sup>12</sup> 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,”<sup>13</sup> this

---

<sup>11</sup> 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).

<sup>12</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 12–13.

<sup>13</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 13.

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 [2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE] to Cassius Dio [3<sup>rd</sup> century CE]);<sup>14</sup> (ii) the Greek writers who composed some of their works in the tragic mode include Jews (e.g., 2–4 Maccabees, Josephus, and Philo);<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> Because Jay has produced this typology

---

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 107–177.

<sup>16</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 79–106.



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.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> 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:<sup>18</sup> 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).

---

<sup>18</sup> 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,<sup>19</sup> but also important differences: unlike Abel, Joseph is not actually murdered, and his tragic fate is inextricably linked to divine providence, and

---

<sup>19</sup> 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<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup>

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

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Aristotle's μεταβολή ("transformation") analyzed in §8.

<sup>21</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 79–83.

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.<sup>22</sup>

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

---

<sup>22</sup> 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” (*σημεῖα*), “memory” (*μνήμη*), and “deduction” (*συλλογισμός*). The worst kind is when the moments of recognition are “contrived by the poet” (*πεποιημέναι ὑπὸ 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.<sup>23</sup>

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

---

<sup>23</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 87–89; Aristotle, *Poetics* 1454b.19–1455a.21.

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.<sup>24</sup>

#### 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.<sup>25</sup>

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

---

<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, Celsus mocks the theatricality of the “recognition scene” (ἀναγνωρισμός), calling it “absurd” (ἄτοπος), though Origen cannot see why (Origen, *Cels.* 4.47; cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 289).

<sup>25</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 89–91.

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/οἶκτος), 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.<sup>26</sup>

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: אָהֲבָה (“love” [37:3, 4; 44:20]); רַחֲמִים (“love/mercy” [43:14, 30]); שִׂנְאָה (“hate” [37:4, 5, 8]); בָּכִית (“weeping” [37:35; 42:24; 43:30+; 45:2, 14[+], 15; 46:29; 50:1, 3, 4, 17]); אָבֵל (“mourning” [37:34, 35; 50:10, 11++]); יָגוֹן (“grief” [42:38; 44:31]); עֲצָב (“pain” [45:5]); חָרָה (“being angry” [39:19; 44:18; 45:5; 49:6]); אָץ (“anger” [39:19; 44:18; 49:6, 7]);

---

<sup>26</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 92–94.



קִצְף (“anger” [40:2; 41:10]); יִרְאָה (“fear” [42:18, 35; 43:18, 23; 46:3; 50:19, 21]); בְּהִלָּה (“horror” [45:3]); תְּהוֹמָה (“terror” [41:28]); פֶּעַם (“being disturbed” [41:8]); and תִּמְהוֹן (“bewilderment” [43:33]). 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.<sup>27</sup>

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 prophecies (38:27–30; 43:33–34; 48:8–22; 50:24–25) that all accurately predict future happenings.<sup>28</sup> Since God only acts from off and behind the stage, however, he never appears above it, so that Joseph's

---

<sup>27</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 94–105.

<sup>28</sup> In recounting the story of Moses and the exodus in the form of a Greek tragedy, Ezekiel the Tragedian invents a dream for Moses that foreshadows the drama's future development with some details taken from Joseph's tragic dreams, which serve a similar dramatic function in Joseph's story: *καὶ μοί τι πλῆθος ἀστέρων πρὸς γούνατα* // *ἐπιπτ'*, ἐγὼ δὲ πάντας ἡριθμησάμην (79–80 [fragment 6; Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.29.5]). On the fact that Jews took interest in tragedy in a later period, see also Let. Aris. 316; Tessa Rajak, "Translating the Septuagint for Ptolemy's Library: Myth and History," in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 184.

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.<sup>29</sup>

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

---

<sup>29</sup> 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 (דבתם) to their father (37:2); (ii) the fact that Jacob "loves" (אהב) Joseph "most of all his sons" (מכל בניו) 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" (זיספו עוד שנא 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

Κατῴκει δὲ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ γῇ, οὗ παρώκησεν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ, ἐν γῇ Χανάναν. 2 αὐται δὲ αἱ γενέσεις Ἰακώβ· Ἰωσήφ δέκα ἐπτά ἐτῶν ἦν ποιμαίνων μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ πρόβατα ὧν νέος, μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν Βάλλας καὶ μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ζέλφας τῶν γυναικῶν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ· κατήνεγκεν δὲ Ἰωσήφ ψόγον πονηρόν πρὸς Ἰσραὴλ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν. 3

ויבא | דבתם רעה | πατρός αὐτοῦ· κατήνεγκεν δὲ Ἰωσήφ ψόγον πονηρόν πρὸς Ἰσραὴλ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν. 3

ישראל | אהב Ἰακώβ<sup>30</sup> δὲ ἡγάπα τὸν Ἰωσήφ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι υἱὸς γήρους ἦν αὐτῷ·  
 אהב | כתנת פסים ἐποίησεν δὲ αὐτῷ χιτῶνα ποικίλον. 4 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ φιλεῖ  
 לשלם ἐκ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐμίσησαν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο λαλεῖν αὐτῷ οὐδὲν εἰρηνικόν.

G makes the first of these motivating factors sting by translating ויבא (“and [Joseph] brought”) more aggressively as κατήνεγκεν<sup>31</sup> (“and [Joseph] brought against”)<sup>32</sup> and דבתם רעה (“a bad report [?] about them”) forcefully as ψόγον<sup>33</sup> πονηρόν<sup>34</sup> (“vile invective”)<sup>35</sup> (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 ψόγος (“invective”), a genre

---

<sup>30</sup> Ἰακώβ | In Hebrew, Jacob is referred to by two names: יעקב (“Jacob”) and ישראל (“Israel”). Assuming that V read ישראל here, G has preferred to use the more usual name in Greek (i.e., Ἰακώβ), as also in 49:28. This is something of a puzzle, though, since G has used the name Ἰσραήλ 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 ישראל 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).

<sup>31</sup> κατήνεγκεν | For בוא in the *hiphil* (46), G typically uses ἄγω and cognates (26) or φέρω and cognates (17), but this is G’s only use of the particular compound καταφέρω in all of Genesis.

<sup>32</sup> The verb καταφέρω is used in forensic contexts (LSJ, s.v., “καταφέρω” A.IV), as is ψόγος. 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 κατα- of καταφέρω 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 κατα- prefix signifies “back,” i.e., “he brought back (from the fields)” (*Notes*, 613). Cf. Prestel and Schorch’s use of the verb “hinterbringen” (“bring back”) (“Genesis,” 226).

<sup>33</sup> ψόγον | Both כָּדַב and ψόγος are hapaxlegomena in Genesis.

<sup>34</sup> For the collocation of ψόγος and πονηρός, consider Plutarch, *Phoc.* 1.6: τοσοῦτον δὲ τῇ τύχῃ δοτέον ἀντιταπτομένη πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ἰσχύειν, ὅσον ἀντὶ τῆς ἀξίας τιμῆς καὶ χάριτος ἐνίοις ψόγους πονηροὺς καὶ διαβολὰς ἐπιφέρουσιν, τὴν πίστιν ἀσθενεστέραν ποιεῖν τῆς ἀρετῆς.

<sup>35</sup> LSJ, s.v. “ψόγος” A.II. Prestel and Schorch 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 ἐγκώμιον (“encomium”).<sup>36</sup> What is more, G connects Joseph’s powerful invective to Jacob’s gift of the special garment by translating the Hebrew ו that joins the two clauses with δέ instead of καί: Ἰακώβ δέ<sup>37</sup> ἡγάπα 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,<sup>38</sup> Joseph’s father does not find fault with him but instead makes him a “colorful/embroidered tunic”<sup>39</sup> (χιτῶνα ποικίλον [= פסים כנח “ornamented? sleeved? colorful? tunic”]), a garment fit for gods and kings.<sup>40</sup> Prejudicial or not, however, Jacob’s

---

<sup>36</sup> On the pairing of ψόγος and ἐγκώμιον 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 ἐστὶ λόγος ἐκθετικὸς τῶν προσόντων κακῶν. Cf. Theon, *Prog.* 9; Hermogenes, *Prog.* 8; Nicolaus, *Prog.* 8.

<sup>37</sup> δέ | For G’s use of δέ for disjunctive-ו, see §4.1.1.1.

<sup>38</sup> In fact, working with a text that read κατήνεγκαν, such that the brothers rail against Joseph, John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 61.1 (PG 54 525.55–526.7) takes this event as a sign of the brothers’ excessive vice (κακίας ὑπερβολή), as they attempt to shake (διασαλεῦσαι) their father’s love by fabricating (πλάττονται) lies (τὰ μὴ ὄντα) and slandering (διαβολή) their brother: “Ὅρα κακίας ὑπερβολήν· καὶ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγάπην διασαλεῦσαι ἐπεχείρουν, καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα πλάττονται κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, τοσοῦτο μόνον ἀνύοντες, ὅσον τὸν οἰκεῖον φθόνον κατὰδηλον ποιῆσαι. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι τοῦτο μόνον ἐκέρδαινον, τὸ φανεράν ἑαυτῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν λανθάνουσαν γνώμην, ὅρα τὸν πατέρα καὶ μετὰ τὴν παρ’ αὐτῶν διαβολὴν ἐξεχόμενον τοῦ παιδὸς, καὶ πάντων αὐτὸν προκρίνοντα. Ἰακώβ δέ, φησὶν, ἡγάπα τὸν Ἰωσήφ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι υἱὸς γήρως ἦν αὐτῷ. Ἐποίησε δὲ αὐτῷ χιτῶνα ποικίλον. Cf. Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 96; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Pent.* 288; Brayford, *Genesis*, 390: “Thus the brothers are portrayed as the tattletales.”

<sup>39</sup> LSJ, s.v. “ποικίλος;” BDAG, s.v. “ποικίλος.” While G’s influential interpretation of פסים 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 πολύτροπον). 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.

<sup>40</sup> 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” (κιθῶνες χειριδωτοὺς ποικίλους) (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 complexifies in Greek by translating אהב first in terms of ἀγάπη<sup>41</sup> (“love”)<sup>42</sup> (37:3) and then in terms of φιλία<sup>43</sup> (“friendship, affection”)<sup>44</sup> (37:4). Finally, by rendering וְלֹא יָכְלוּ דַּבְּרוּ לְשָׁלֵם (“and they could not greet him kindly”)<sup>45</sup> as καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο λαλεῖν αὐτῷ οὐδὲν εἰρηνικόν<sup>46</sup> (“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,<sup>47</sup> who feel both jealousy (ζηλῶ [= אגף])

---

*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” (πολυτελεῖς χιτῶνας καὶ τὰς ποικίλας ἀναξυρίδας); and in περὶ ἡδονῆς, 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” (ἐτρώφα), they bred (ἔτρεφεν) the “most magnanimous men” (μεγαλοψυχοτάτους ἄνδρας), who wore “purple clothes” (άλουργῇ ἱμάτια) and “colorful tunics” (ποικίλους χιτῶνας) (*Frag.* 55). Cf. also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.70.

<sup>41</sup> ἡγάπα | The verb ἀγαπάω is G’s regular equivalent for both the verb אהב (10/14) and the noun אהבה (1), and he does not use ἀγαπάω otherwise.

<sup>42</sup> LSJ, s.v. “ἀγαπή” A.I; *DGE*, s.v. “ἀγαπή” I.2.

<sup>43</sup> φιλεῖ | In contrast to ἀγαπάω, G less commonly uses φιλέω for אהב (4), and this is G’s only use of φιλέω in the sense of “love” with an animate object (the object is ἐδέσματα in 27:4, 9, 14). In the sense of “kiss,” however, G also uses (κατα)φιλέω to translate קָשַׁם (10/11).

<sup>44</sup> LSJ, s.v. “φιλία” A.I.1. Brayford says that G’s choice of φιλέω is “semantically deliberate,” arguing that—in contrast to ἀγαπέω—φιλέω conveys outward signs of affection (cf. its use as an equivalent of קָשַׁם [see note 43 above]) as well as preference. Cf. Muraoka, “Translation Techniques,” 16–17; Wevers, *Notes*, 613–614.

<sup>45</sup> HALOT, s.v. “פִּיֶּשׁ” 3.

<sup>46</sup> οὐδὲν εἰρηνικόν | G translates פִּיֶּשׁ (15) in a variety of ways, but most often as ὑγιαίνω (5), σωτηρία/σωτήριος (4), or εἰρήνη/εἰρηνικός (see also 15:15; 26:29). G also uses εἰρηνικός to translate פִּיֶּשׁ in 34:21, and as the regular equivalent of יָב 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.

<sup>47</sup> Harl, *La Genèse*, 259–260: “pacifique.” After asking the meaning of this expression (Τί ἐστίν, Οὐδὲν ἡδύναντο λαλεῖν αὐτῷ εἰρηνικόν;), John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 61.1 (PG 54 526.44–49) interprets εἰρηνικός politically: the brothers are “dominated by passion” (ἐκυρίευσεν αὐτῶν τὸ πάθος), “just like captives” (καθάπερ αἰχμάλωτοι) who are “living under its tyranny” (τυραννοῦμενοι). 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 [= אָנַשׁ]) (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 Ἰωσήφ ἐνύπνιον ἀπήγγειλεν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, 6 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς  
הנה אֲחֻשָׁא לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה  
נצבה | אלמתי תִּפְּדֶנּוּ, וְאֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה 7 ὥμην ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα ἐν μέσῳ  
אלמתי | תִּפְּדֶנּוּ, וְאֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה תִּפְּדֶנּוּ, וְאֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה  
ה | תִּפְּדֶנּוּ, וְאֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה מושל תמשל  
הנה אὐτοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ. 8 εἶπαν δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ ἀδελφοί Μη βασιλεύων βασιλεύσεις ἐφ’  
הנה אὐτοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ. 9 εἶδεν δὲ ἐνύπνιον ἕτερον καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτὸ τῷ  
הנה אὐτοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ. 10 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ  
בוא | ה אὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί τὸ ἐνύπνιον τοῦτο, ὃ ἐνυπνιάσθης· ἄρα γε ἐλθόντες ἐλευσόμεθα  
השתחוית לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה לָכֵן אֶתְּנֶנָּה  
שמר αὐτὸν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, ὃ δὲ πατήρ αὐτοῦ διετήρησεν τὸ ῥῆμα.

When Joseph tells his brothers the dream about the sheaves, which only involves him and them, G translates the pronominal suffix on אֶתְּנֶנָּה (“my sheaf”) more emphatically than

usual, by selecting the pronominal adjective ἐμός<sup>48</sup> (“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,<sup>49</sup> 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:<sup>50</sup>

37:8                      תַּמְלִיךְ תַּמְלִיךְ עָלֵינוּ    Μὴ βασιλεύων βασιλεύσεις ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς  
                               אם מִשׁוֹל תַּמְשֵׁל בָּנוּ        ἢ κυριεύων κυριεύσεις ἡμῶν;  
                               Will you really be king over us    You won’t reign over us as king  
                               or really rule over us?            or lord over us as lord, will you?

In addition, G translates מִשָּׁל (“rule”) more regally as κυριεύω (“be lord, dominate”),<sup>51</sup> also to ensure that the Greek reader does not miss the sarcasm—and irony—of the Hebrew question.<sup>52</sup> Then, when he represents Jacob’s reaction to Joseph’s second dream about the

<sup>48</sup> ἐμός | On G’s emphatic rendering of Hebrew pronominal suffixes with Greek possessive adjectives—which he always fronts—see §4.1.2.2.

<sup>49</sup> μή | For G’s contextual translation of the Hebrew question particle אִם, see §3.1.5.2.

<sup>50</sup> 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).

<sup>51</sup> 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).

<sup>52</sup> 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  $\text{אִם}$  quite suggestively as  $\text{ἄρα γε}$ <sup>53</sup> (“really truly?”):<sup>54</sup>

|                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 37: 10                                                                                                            | <p>הָבוּא נְבוּא      <math>\text{ἄρα γε ἔλθόντες}</math> ἐλευσόμεθα</p> <p>אֲנִי וְאִמִּי וְאֶחָיו      ἐγὼ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου</p> <p>לְהִשְׁתַּחוּת לְךָ אֶרְצָה      προσκυνῆσαι σοι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν;</p> |
| <p>Will we <u>really</u> come,</p> <p>your mothers, brothers, and I,</p> <p>to bow down to you on the ground?</p> | <p>Will we <u>really truly</u> come, <u>after we have come</u>,</p> <p>your mother, brothers, and I,</p> <p>to bow down to you on the ground?</p>                                                                        |

Even as G’s translation choice here also serves to convey the boldness—albeit the well-placed boldness!—of Joseph’s dream reports,<sup>55</sup> his use of the aorist participle  $\text{ἔλθόντες}$ <sup>56</sup> (“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.<sup>57</sup> What is more, G also signals the irony of this scene in a handful of other ways. To begin with, he

---

<sup>53</sup>  $\text{ἄρα γε}$  | 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  $\text{הֲאִם}$ .

<sup>54</sup> KG II §§508.12; 589.7; Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 46–47, 50. Wevers says that  $\text{ἄρα γε}$  in this verse conveys “sceptical impatience,” paraphrasing the question as of the type: “Surely you don’t mean to suggest that [...]” (*Notes*, 617).

<sup>55</sup> Philo, *Somn.* 2.7 says that Jacob’s question stems from “righteous anger” ( $\text{ὀργὴ δίκαια}$ ).

<sup>56</sup>  $\text{ἔλθόντες}$  | G rarely uses the aorist participle for the Hebrew infinitive absolute (see also 12:9; 26:28).

<sup>57</sup> 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 והנה (“and behold”) introducing each dream:

37:7 והנה אנחנו מאלמים אלמים בתוך השדה ὥμην ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα ἐν μέσῳ τῷ πεδίῳ

37:9 הנה חלמתי חלום עוד Ἴδού ἐνυπνιασάμην ἐνύπνιον ἕτερον,

והנה השמש והירח ὥσπερ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη

ואחד עשר כוכבים משתחווים לי καὶ ἑνδεκα ἀστέρες προσεκύνουν με.

In the first case, the first-person construction ὥμην<sup>58</sup> ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα (“I imagined we were binding sheaves”) directly assumes Joseph’s subjective perspective;<sup>59</sup> in the second, G’s use of ὥσπερ<sup>60</sup> (“as if”) suggests that the sun, moon, and stars are stand-ins for real

<sup>58</sup> ὥμην | As a rule, G translates הנה (129) as ἰδού (78) or omits it (15) (see §3.1.5.3). G only uses οἶμαι—as a match for הנה or otherwise—in the dream reports of Joseph’s story (see also 40:16; 41:1, 17).

<sup>59</sup> 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 οἶμαι: this (he says) is an “expression” (ἀνάφθεγμα) of a person who “is unclear” (ἀδηλοῦντος), “vacillates” (ἐνδοιάζοντος), “conceives dimly” (ἀμυδρῶς ὑπολαμβάνοντος), and “does not see firmly or distantly” (οὐ παγίως καὶ τηλαυγῶς ὁρῶντος); furthermore, this word befits “those who are just waking up from a deep sleep” (τοῖς γὰρ ἐκ βαθέος ὕπνου διανισταμένοις) and “those who are still dreaming” (ἔτι ὀνειρώττουσιν) (2.17–18). Wevers says that by ὥμην (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 הנה as οἶμαι and ὥσπερ (*Notes*, 675).

<sup>60</sup> ὥσπερ | G only translates הנה as ὥσπερ in dream reports (see also 41:18, 22; cf. 41:2 where והנה = καὶ ἰδού 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 כ (38:11). Wevers also finds G’s singular use of the middle voice ἐνυπνιασάμην (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.



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"<sup>65</sup> (διετήρησεν<sup>66</sup> [= שמר "kept"])<sup>67</sup> what Joseph said.<sup>68</sup> 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.

---

<sup>65</sup> LSJ, s.v. "διατηρέω" A.1; *DGE*, s.v. "διατηρέω" I.2; BDAG, s.v. "διατηρέω" 1 (on Luke 2:51).

<sup>66</sup> διετήρησεν | G normally uses φυλάσσω (8) or διαφυλάσσω (2) to translate שמר (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.

<sup>67</sup> HALOT, s.v. "שמר" qal 3.

<sup>68</sup> 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" (τί ἄρα ἀποβήσεται τὸ τέλος αὐτῆς). 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 ἀδελφῶν ὁ πατήρ, διὰ τοῦτο ἐπέτιμῃσε τῷ παιδί, καὶ διακρίνει καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ ὄναρ, καὶ στοχαζόμενος παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν αὐτῷ γεγενῆσθαι, διετήρει τὸ ῥῆμα. Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 2.2.3–2.2.4 §§13–17; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Pent.* 291.

## Genesis 37:18–20

ויראו | ויתנכלו προεῖδον δὲ αὐτὸν μακρόθεν πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσει αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπονηρεύοντο τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν. 19 εἶπαν δὲ ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Ἴδού ὁ ἐνυπνιαστής ἐκεῖνος ἔρχεται· 20 νῦν οὖν δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ῥίψωμεν αὐτὸν εἰς ἓνα τῶν λάκκων, καὶ ἐροῦμεν Θηρίον πονηρὸν ἀכלήσω αὐτόν· καὶ ὀψόμεθα, τί ἔσται τὰ ἐνύπνια αὐτοῦ.

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<sup>69</sup> (“see ahead”), which gives Joseph’s brothers ample time to make their evil plans:

37:18 ויתנכלו אתו להמיתו καὶ ἐπονηρεύοντο τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν  
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.<sup>70</sup> In addition, G coins the term ἐνυπνιαστής (“dreamer”)<sup>71</sup> as an apt representation<sup>72</sup> of the sarcastic Hebrew idiom בעל החלמות (“lord of dreams”) that Joseph’s brothers use to refer to him as he approaches (37:19), and he also makes use of the

<sup>69</sup> 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.

<sup>70</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 620.

<sup>71</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 12 says that Joseph’s brothers do not “address” (προσαγορεύειν) him “by name” (ὀνομασί) but called him ὄνειροπλήξ (“one who is startled by dreams”)—perhaps because he takes dreams too seriously—ἐνυπνιαστής (“dreamer”), and “other such names” (τοιαῦτα).

<sup>72</sup> 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<sup>73</sup> (“devour”) for the more general Hebrew אכל (“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,<sup>74</sup> 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                                                                                                                   | ויאמר יהודה אל אחיו<br>מה <u>בצע</u> כי נהרג את אחינו<br>וכסִינו את דמו                                                       | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ<br>Τί <u>χρήσιμον</u> , ἐὰν ἀποκτείνωμεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν<br>καὶ <u>κρύψωμεν</u> τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ; |
| And Judah said to his brothers,<br>“What <u>gain</u> is there if we kill our brother<br>and <u>cover up</u> his blood?” | Then Judah said to his brothers,<br>“What <u>advantage</u> is there, if we kill our brother<br>and <u>conceal</u> his blood?” |                                                                                                                                          |

<sup>73</sup> κατεσθίω | G usually represents אכל (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).

<sup>74</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 61.3 (PG 54 530.3–9) describes the brothers’ “savagery” (ὠμότης) and “inhumanity” (ἀπανθρωπία): “like some kind of fierce beasts” (καθάπερ τινὲς ἄγριοι θῆρες) “they pounce” (ἐπιπηδῶσι) 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” (θηρῶν δίκην ἐπιμεμανήκασι) due to their jealousy.

Two points are of interest in G’s translation of Judah’s proposal: (i) G represents **עֲצָֿ** (“[unjust] gain”) as *χρήσιμος*<sup>75</sup> (“advantage”) and (ii) **כסה** (“cover up”) as *κρύπτω*<sup>76</sup> (“hide, conceal”). With *χρήσιμος*, G does not explicitly convey the shady connotations of **עֲצָֿ**, 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?”<sup>77</sup> 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.<sup>78</sup> 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

---

<sup>75</sup> *χρήσιμος* | Both **עֲצָֿ** and *χρήσιμος* are hapaxlegomena in Genesis. Moreover, *χρήσιμος* does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch, and the equivalence between **עֲצָֿ** and *χρήσιμος* is unique in the Septuagint as a whole (Wevers, *Notes*, 624–625).

<sup>76</sup> *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., **חבא** (3/3), **סתר** (1/2), and **גנב** (1/12).

<sup>77</sup> Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991: 25–39.

<sup>78</sup> 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 συμβουλήν*). Cf. Philo, *Ios.* 16; Josephus, *A.J.* 2.3.3 §32.

pieces of silver”) for εἴκοσι χρυσῶν<sup>79</sup> (“twenty pieces of gold”).<sup>80</sup> 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.<sup>81</sup>

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:

---

<sup>79</sup> χρυσῶν | G regularly translates רֶבַעַ (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 כֶּהֱנִי (9), and G does not use these nouns for any other Hebrew term apart from the two exceptions noted here.

<sup>80</sup> 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 Schorch, “Genesis,” 227).

<sup>81</sup> As John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 61.4 (PG 54 530.33–34) exclaims: “What a lawless transaction! What a ruinous profit! What an unjust sale!” (Ὡ συναλλάγματος παρανόμου, ὦ κέρδους ὀλεθρίου, ὦ πράσεως ἀδικωτάτης).

## Genesis 37:29–30

והנה אין *ἀνέστρεψεν δὲ Ρουβὴν ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον, καὶ οὐχ ὁρᾷ* τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ, καὶ διέρρηξεν τὰ ἱμάτια  
 ילד *αὐτοῦ. 30 καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν* Τὸ *παιδάριον* οὐκ ἔστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ ποῦ  
 בא *πορεύσομαι ἔτι;*

To begin with, G uses the active historical present *οὐχ ὁρᾷ*<sup>82</sup> (“he did not see”) to translate the Hebrew negative existential construction in the clause *והנה אין* (“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” (*הילד*) is missing, which G translates as *παιδάριον*<sup>83</sup> (“little guy”),<sup>84</sup> capturing the fraternal affection of a caring, older brother with a guilty conscience.<sup>85</sup> Then, he dramatically exclaims *ואני אנה אני בא* (“Oh me! where am I to 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 ποῦ πορεύσομαι ἔτι* (“As for me, where else will I go”), supplying *ἔτι* (“else”) to convey the emphasis of the Hebrew anaphora.<sup>86</sup> But in both versions, this

<sup>82</sup> *ὁρᾷ* | On G’s use of the historical present to translate wayyiqtol with dramatic vividness, see §6.1.1.1.

<sup>83</sup> *παιδάριον* | G’s normal translation of *יָלֵד* (19) is *παιδίον* (12), although he also uses *παιδάριον* in 33:14 and 42:22 and to translate *נָעַר* (6: 22:5, 12; 43:8; 44:22, 30, 31).

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Muraoka, “Translation Techniques,” 18–19.

<sup>85</sup> 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.

<sup>86</sup> 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

|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ויטבולו                | Λαβόντες δὲ τὸν χιτῶνα τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ἔσφαξαν ἑριφὸν αἰγῶν <u>καὶ ἐμόλυναν</u> τὸν χιτῶνα τῷ αἵματι. <b>32</b> καὶ ἀπέστειλαν τὸν χιτῶνα τὸν ποικίλον καὶ εἰσήνεγκαν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ                  |
| ויכירה   הכר           | εἶπαν Τοῦτον εὕρομεν· <u>ἐπίγνωθι</u> εἰ χιτῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ σου ἐστὶν ἡ οὗ. <b>33</b> <u>καὶ ἐπέγνω</u> αὐτὸν καὶ                                                                                        |
| חיה   אכלתהו   טרף טרף | εἶπεν Χιτῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου ἐστὶν· <u>θηρίον</u> πονηρὸν <u>κατέφαγεν</u> αὐτόν, <u>θηρίον ἤρπασεν</u> τὸν Ἰωσήφ. <b>34</b> διέρρηξεν δὲ Ἰακώβ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπέθετο σάκκον ἐπὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, |
| ויתאבל                 | καὶ <u>ἐπένθει</u> τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας πολλὰς. <b>35</b> συνήχθησαν δὲ πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ                                                                                                 |
| לנחמו   וימאן להתנחם   | θυγατέρες, καὶ ἦλθον <u>παρακαλέσαι αὐτόν</u> , καὶ <u>οὐκ ἤθελεν παρακαλεῖσθαι</u> λέγων ὅτι                                                                                                        |
| אבל                    | Καταβήσομαι πρὸς τὸν υἱόν μου <u>πενθῶν</u> εἰς ἄδου. καὶ ἔκλαυσεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ.                                                                                                              |

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)<sup>87</sup> it (37:31). By using this ethically-charged term,<sup>88</sup> 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)<sup>89</sup> Joseph (37:33), which helps to explain his torn and blood-stained tunic. But, instead of assuming that a wild animal "tore" (טרף) him (i.e., his flesh), in Greek Jacob says

<sup>87</sup> μολύνω | Both טבל and μολύνω are hapaxlegomena in Genesis.

<sup>88</sup> LSJ, s.v. "μολύνω" A.I.1; BDAG, s.v. "μολύνω" 2; cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 627; Prestel and Schorch, "Genesis," 227.

<sup>89</sup> κατέφαγεν | See note 73 above.

that it “snatched Joseph away” (ἤρπασεν<sup>90</sup> 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<sup>91</sup>—and nicely explains why Joseph’s tunic could be found but not his body—G’s clever use of ἀρπάζω ironically discloses what actually happened to Joseph: he was not eaten but sold by his brothers and snatched away by traders.<sup>92</sup> 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 טרף (“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 αὐτόν, 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. πενθέω<sup>93</sup> [= אבל] in 37:34, 35).<sup>94</sup> This leads to G’s

<sup>90</sup> ἤρπασεν | G only translates טרף as ἀρπάζω here (but cf. ἄρπαξ in 49:27). In its other three occurrences, G uses θηρίον (37:33) and the cognate θηριόβρωτος γίνομαι (44:28+ [= טרף טרף]). While G does not use ἀρπάζω anywhere else in Genesis, he does use the compound διαρπάζω twice to represent בזז (34:27, 29).

<sup>91</sup> In noting the difference between טרף and ἀρπάζω, 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.

<sup>92</sup> 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 ἀληθῶς, καθάπερ θηρίοις περιπεσὼν, οὕτως ἀνηλεῶς ἅπαντα ὑπέμεινε.* Cf. Philo, *Somn.* 2.65–66.

<sup>93</sup> πενθέω | G uses πενθέω to translate the verb אבל (37:34), the cognate verbal adjective אָבֵל (37:35)—their only occurrences—and בכה (2/16: 23:2; 50:3). Similarly, G selects the noun πένθος for בְּכִית/בְּכִית (2: 35:8; 50:4) and אָבֵל (5: 27:41; 50:10, 11++). G does not use πενθέω/πένθος otherwise.

<sup>94</sup> 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 ὦ μοι (“Woe is me!”).

second tragic embellishment, which makes effective use of the aspectual distinctions of the Greek verbal system. Although G translates  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  (“comfort”) as  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  in both its occurrences here, he inflects it as aorist when Jacob’s children come “to comfort” ( $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ ) him, but as present when Jacob does not wish “to be comforted” ( $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ).<sup>95</sup> 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.<sup>96</sup>

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.

---

<sup>95</sup>  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$  ...  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  | For G’s control and contextually appropriate use of aspect on Greek infinitives, including a discussion of this example, see §6.1.1.7.

<sup>96</sup> 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” (παρέκβασις).<sup>97</sup> 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

---

<sup>97</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 62.1 (PG 54 533.1–5) says that “another narrative is interpolated in the middle (of Joseph’s story)” (ἐν μέσῳ ἑτέρα τις διήγησις παρέγκειται). Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra in Pent.* 320.54–55 describes this narrative as “the intervening account introduced on the side” (ἡ μεταξὺ παρεισκεκριμένη ἱστορία).



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)**

|                                      |             |                                     |                       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Sibling rivalry (Er/Onan)         | (38:9)      | Sibling rivalry (Joseph/brothers)   | (37:1–11)             |
| 2. Wicked sons (Er/Onan)             | (38:7, 8–9) | Wicked sons (Joseph's brothers)     | (37:18–34)            |
| 3. Innocent Tamar wronged            | (38:11)     | Innocent Joseph wronged             | (37:28, 36)           |
| 4. Mistake made out among flocks     | (38:12)     | Mistake made out among flocks       | (37:12–17)            |
| 5. Bereavement (Er/Onan)             | (38:7, 10)  | Bereavement (Joseph)                | (37:33)               |
| 6. Judah mourns for wife Shua        | (38:12)     | Jacob mourns for son Joseph         | (37:34–35)            |
| 7. Judah fears for youngest (Shelah) | (38:10)     | Jacob fears for youngest (Benjamin) | (42:4, 36–38)         |
| 8. Tamar conceals her identity       | (38:14–19)  | Joseph conceals his identity        | (chs. 42–45)          |
| 9. Tamar changes clothes             | (38:14, 19) | Joseph changes clothes              | (41:14, 42)           |
| 10. Judah pursues seductive woman    | (38:15–18)  | Joseph flees seductive woman        | (39:6–12)             |
| 11. Tamar's trick causes foreboding  | (38:20–23)  | Joseph's trick causes foreboding    | (42:21, 28; 44:16)    |
| 12. Dramatic recognition scene       | (38:24–26)  | Dramatic recognition scene          | (45:1–15)             |
| 13. Vindication of Tamar             | (38:26)     | Vindication of Joseph               | (45:4–7; 50:19–21)    |
| 14. Portentous birth                 | (38:27–30)  | Portentous dreams                   | (37:5–11; chs. 41–42) |

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.

## Genesis 38:12–15

Ἐπληθύνθησαν δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι καὶ ἀπέθανεν Σαύα ἡ γυνὴ Ἰούδα· καὶ παρακληθεὶς Ἰούδας ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τοὺς κείροντας τὰ πρόβατα αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς καὶ Ἰρᾶς ὁ ποιμὴν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ὀδολλαμίτης, εἰς Θαμνά. **13** καὶ ἀπηγγέλη Θαμάρ τῇ νύμφῃ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Ἰδοὺ ὁ πενθερός σου ἀναβαίνει εἰς Θαμνά. **14** καὶ περιελομένη τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς χηρέσεως ἄφ' ἑαυτῆς περιέβαλετο θερίστρω καὶ ἐκαλλωπίσατο, καὶ ἐκάθισεν πρὸς ταῖς πύλαις Αἰνάν, ἥ ἐστιν ἐν παρόδῳ Θαμνά· εἶδεν γὰρ ὅτι μέγας γέγονεν Σηλῶμ, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν αὐτῷ γυναικα. **15** καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν Ἰούδας ἔδοξεν αὐτὴν πόρνῃν εἶναι· κατεκαλύψατο γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνων αὐτήν.

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” (סור) her widow's clothes; (ii) she “covers” (כסה) her face with a “veil” (ציץ) (cf. 38:15); and (iii) she “wraps herself up” (התעלה), presumably in the flashy clothes of a prostitute.<sup>98</sup> 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) περιαιρέομαι<sup>99</sup> (“take off from around oneself”) and (ii) περιβάλλομαι<sup>100</sup> (“put around oneself”) convey the reflexive wrapping expressed by (iii) הָלַץ

<sup>98</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 638: “she wrapped herself ... presumably in garments more appropriate to a prostitute.”

<sup>99</sup> περιαιρέομαι | For the *hiphil* of סור (8), G only uses περιαιρέω in reference to Tamar (see also 41:42) and Joseph (41:42) (but cf. ἀφαιρέω 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).

<sup>100</sup> περιβάλλομαι | G also translates כסה (8) as περιβάλλω in 24:65, and he uses this verb for שָׁבַע in 28:20. For G's treatment of כסה more generally, see note 76 above.

in the *hithpael*, whether G understood this rare verb or not.<sup>101</sup> Yet, G’s use of *καλλωπίζομαι*<sup>102</sup> (“put on makeup”)<sup>103</sup> for *הָלַחַח* (“wrap oneself up”) and *θέριστρον*<sup>104</sup> (“light summer garment”)<sup>105</sup> for *הַגָּז* (“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

---

<sup>101</sup> Given the fact that *הָלַחַח* 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).

<sup>102</sup> *καλλωπίζομαι* | Both *הָלַחַח* and *καλλωπίζομαι* are hapaxlegomena in Genesis.

<sup>103</sup> 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 ἀπάτησιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὅσοι ἂν ἴδωσιν αὐτήν* (mentioned by Harl, *La Genèse*, 265). Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 638: “[G] tried to improve the picture of Thamar’s disguise as a woman of easy virtue.”

<sup>104</sup> *θέριστρον* | Apart from Tamar’s *θέριστρον* (see also 38:19), G also translates the other occurrence of *הַגָּז* 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*).

<sup>105</sup> 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” (*ἀσπάθης*) (J. J. Keaney, *Harpocration: Lexeis of the Ten Orators* [Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1991]: s.v., “*σείρινα*”). That a *θερίστριον*/*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 *θερίστριον*” (*καλὸν περιβεβλημένην θέριστρον*), but then she compares her to a “tortoise” (*χελώνη*) and shamelessly criticizes her “complexion” (*χρῶμα*), “hair” (*θρίχες*), excessive “(whitening) makeup” (*ψιμύθιον*), jewelry (*ἄλυσις* [“necklace”], *περισκελίδες* [“anklets”]), “feet” (*πόδες*), and “bad breath” (*βαρὺ προσπνεῖ*). Apparently, his bride’s *θερίστριον* 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 ἐταίρας λοιδοροῦσιν ὅτι καλλωπιζόμεθα* (“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, *Declamationes* 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<sup>106</sup> αὐτὴν πόρνην<sup>107</sup> εἶναι).

What is more, G even explicitly adds the tragic flourish that Judah “did not recognize her” (οὐκ ἐπέγνω αὐτήν)<sup>108</sup> without any apparent support from the Hebrew (38:15).<sup>109</sup>

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:

---

<sup>106</sup> ἔδοξεν | G only translates חשב (5) as δοκέω here, but he also uses δοκέω for חיה in 19:14. G’s choice of δοκέω accurately represents the meaning of חשב (“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).

<sup>107</sup> πόρνην | G levels the distinction in the Hebrew between זנה (“prostitute”) (38:15) and קדשה (“cult prostitute”) (38:21+, 22), which may further establish the effectiveness of Tamar’s disguise. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 642; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 229.

<sup>108</sup> καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω αὐτήν | 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” (Erzähllücke) (“Genesis,” 229).

<sup>109</sup> 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 והם לא הכירו 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.

38:23

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוּדָה תִּקַּח לָהּ      εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας Ἐχέτω αὐτά,  
 פֶּן נִהְיֶה לְבוֹז      ἀλλὰ μήποτε καταγελασθῶμεν.  
 הִנֵּה שְׁלַחְתִּי הַגִּידִי הַזֶּה      ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπέσταλκα τὸν ἔριφον τοῦτον,  
 וְאַתָּה לֹא מִצְאָתָהּ      σὺ δὲ οὐχ εὔρηκας.

And Judah said, “May she keep (them) to herself,      Then Judah said, “Let her have them!  
lest we become a derision!      But (I fear) we may be mocked.  
Behold! I sent this goat’s kid,      As for me, I have sent this goat’s kid;  
but you did not find her.      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 לָהּ (“to herself”) as αὐτά<sup>110</sup> (“them,” i.e., the tokens), as if it were the direct object of the verb; and (ii) by translating פֶּן (“lest”) expansively as ἀλλὰ μήποτε<sup>111</sup> (“but [I fear] that”), such that μήποτε 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 הִנֵּה (“behold!”)

<sup>110</sup> αὐτά | On the strong correlation between לָהּ and the dative case in G’s translation, see §3.1.1.1 and note 7 there.

<sup>111</sup> ἀλλὰ μήποτε | Typically, G translates פֶּן (18) as μήποτε (10), ἵνα μή (4), or μή (2), but nowhere else as ἀλλὰ μήποτε. 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 μὲν ... σὺ δέ<sup>112</sup> (“as for me, ... as for you, ...”), which (ii) also requires him to “supply” the emphatic first-person pronoun ἐγώ<sup>113</sup> in the first clause; and (iii) by translating the two qatal verbs with the Greek perfect indicative,<sup>114</sup> 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

זנתה | 'Εγένετο δὲ μετὰ τρίμηνον ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Ἰούδᾳ λέγοντες Ἐκπεπόρνευκεν Θαμάρ ἡ νύμφη σου, καὶ  
וַתִּשְׁרַף | וַתִּשְׁרַף | ἰδοὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει ἐκ πορνείας. εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας Ἐξαγάγετε αὐτήν, καὶ κατακαυθήτω. 25 αὕτη δὲ  
ἀγομένη ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τὸν πενθερὸν αὐτῆς λέγουσα Ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τίνος ταῦτά ἐστιν, ἐγὼ ἐν  
הכר | ויכר | γαστρὶ ἔχω. καὶ εἶπεν Ἐπίγνωθι, τίνος ὁ δακτύλιος καὶ ὁ ὀρμίσκος καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος αὐτή. 26 ἐπέγνω δὲ  
צדקה | Ἰούδας καὶ εἶπεν Δεδικαίωται Θαμάρ ἡ ἐγώ, οὗ εἶνεκεν οὐκ ἔδωκα αὐτήν Σηλὼμ τῷ υἱῷ μου. καὶ οὐ  
προσέθετο ἔτι τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτήν.

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 זנה and שרף, mean “prostitute oneself” and “burn,” respectively, but are stylistically and rhetorically more

<sup>112</sup> μὲν ... δέ | On G’s occasional use of this construction, see §4.1.1.1. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 644.

<sup>113</sup> ἐγώ | For other cases where G supplies a pronominal subject for emphasis, see §3.2.5.1.

<sup>114</sup> ἀπέσταλκα ... εὐρηκας | 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-:<sup>115</sup> thus, Judah demands that Tamar be “burned completely”<sup>116</sup> (κατακαυθήτω),<sup>117</sup> because of the fact that she has “(utterly) prostituted herself”<sup>118</sup> (ἐκπεπόρνευκεν).<sup>119</sup> In addition, G’s use of the perfect instead of the aorist to translate זנתה 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” (צדקה [תמר] ממני כי על כן לא נתתיה לשלה בני) with the Greek performative perfect indicative as δεδουαίωται.<sup>120</sup> Θαμὰρ ἡ ἐγώ (“[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

---

<sup>115</sup> On G’s penchant for compound verbs, especially those with intensive/perfective prefixes, see §5.2.2.5.

<sup>116</sup> LSJ, s.v. “κατακαίω” A.I.1.

<sup>117</sup> κατακαυθήτω | In its other occurrence, שרף 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.

<sup>118</sup> LSJ, s.v. “ἐκπορνεύω” A.1; DGE, s.v. “ἐκπορνεύω” I.1.

<sup>119</sup> ἐκπεπόρνευκεν | Both זנה and ἐκπορνεύω are hapaxlegomena in Genesis. But G translates the noun זנה with the cognate πόρνη (34:31; 38:15).

<sup>120</sup> δεδουαίωται | 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.





Τί διεκόπη διὰ σὲ φραγμός<sup>123</sup> (“Why was the barricade<sup>124</sup> burst through<sup>125</sup> by you?”)<sup>126</sup>

(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?”).<sup>127</sup> 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.<sup>128</sup>

### 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

---

<sup>123</sup> διεκόπη ... φραγμός | The common nouns פֶּרֶץ and φραγμός are hapaxlegomena in Genesis. G only uses the verb διακόπτω in this one instance, giving contextually appropriate translations of פֶּרֶץ in its other occurrences (28:14; 30:30, 43).

<sup>124</sup> While φραγμός denotes different types of fences or barriers generally, it is also specifically used of defensive structures (LSJ, s.v. “φραγμός” A.II.1). Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.142.7 tells of how the Athenian acropolis used to be “fenced in” (ἐπέφρακτο) by a “palisade” (ῥηχὴ): ἡ γὰρ ἀκρόπολις τὸ πάλαι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ῥηχὴ ἐπέφρακτο. Given the military connotation of διακόπτω (see note 125 below), the “fence” of the womb is presented metaphorically as a defensive structure that holds the two babies back.

<sup>125</sup> For the military usage, see LSJ, s.v. “διακόπτω” A.2; *DGE*, s.v. “διακόπτω” A.I.5. Of course, פֶּרֶץ is also used in this context (*HALOT*, s.v. “פֶּרֶץ” *qal* 1.b).

<sup>126</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 648; Harl, *La Genèse*, 267; Brayford, *Genesis*, 402.

<sup>127</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 62.2 (PG 54 534.60–535.38) takes this portentous birth as “a type of future events” (τύπος ... τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι), but he leaps much farther forward in the “narrative,” comparing the twins first to the Jews and the Church and then to the law and Christ. Cf. Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 98; Harl, *La Genèse*, 266.

<sup>128</sup> On this motif’s relevance in Genesis and its (especially Christian) reception, see Harl, *La Genèse*, 45–48.

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.<sup>129</sup> 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

---

<sup>129</sup> 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 οὗτος ἀθλητής ... ὑπέμεινε): despite his numerous “contests” (ἀγῶνες), “temptations” (πειρασμοί), and “shipwrecks” (ναυάγια), the “pilot” (κυβερνήτης) was not “thrown into the sea” (κατεποντίζετο), and even when “the storm grew more intense” (σφοδρότερου τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐπανισταμένου), he “sat at the rudder” (ἐπὶ τῶν οἰάκων καθήμενος) and “held the ship’s course” (τὴν ναῦν ἴθυνεν).

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 סָרִיס ("official,

adviser”)<sup>130</sup> by two different Greek words that denote “eunuch”<sup>131</sup> (σπάδων in 37:36 and εὐνοῦχος in 39:1),<sup>132</sup> thus insinuating that he was impotent to please a female partner; and (ii) by differentiating his translation of the adjective יָפֵי (“handsome”), rendering this term first as καλός (“handsome”) and then as ὡραῖος (“attractive”),<sup>133</sup> and also by supplying the adverb σφόδρα<sup>134</sup> (“very”) to modify the second of these.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> René Pétér-Contesse, “Was Potiphar a Eunuch?: (Genesis 37.36; 39.1),” *BT* 47 (1996): 142–146; *HALOT*, s.v. “סִרְיָה;” Brayford, *Genesis*, 396–397. Based on the contexts in which סִרְיָה is used in the Hebrew Bible as well as the probable etymological derivation from Akkadian ša rēši (“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 סִרְיָה, as is indicated by the lexica and the interpretations given by G’s readers (see note 131).

<sup>131</sup> 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,” *BIOCS* 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 παραλογώτατον). 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 ὦν ὁ ἀρχιμάγειρος γυναῖκα εἶχεν) and then making the initial concession that εὐνοῦχος is typically used synonymously with ἐκτομίας (“castrated male”), he explains this odd situation on the historical grounds that “eunuchs” often had wives “to attend to ‘internal’ affairs” (τῶν ἑνδον ἐπιμελουμένην πραγμάτων), i.e., housework.

<sup>132</sup> σπάδων, εὐνοῦχος | G always translates סִרְיָה as σπάδων (37:36) or εὐνοῦχος (3: 39:1; 40:2, 7) and does not use these Greek nouns otherwise.

<sup>133</sup> καλός ... ὡραῖος | Most often G translates יָפֵי (9) as καλός (6), but also as ὡραῖος in 29:17 (see note 135 below). The adjective καλός is G’s main equivalent for טוֹב (32/41), and G also uses it for טוֹבָה (1/2) and תָּמִיד (1). As for ὡραῖος, it also serves to translate טוֹב (1) and תָּמִיד (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).

<sup>134</sup> σφόδρα | For this and other “additions,” see §3.2.8.

<sup>135</sup> 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 (καλὴ τῇ ὄψει σφόδρα), since G differentiates his translation of יָפֵי 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).

39:6 ויהי יוסף יפה תאר ויפה מראה Καὶ ἦν Ἰωσήφ καλὸς τῷ εἶδει  
καὶ ὡραῖος τῇ ὄψει σφόδρα.

And Joseph was handsome in form And Joseph was handsome in form  
and handsome in appearance. and very attractive 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.<sup>136</sup>

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.<sup>137</sup> G develops his presentation of Potiphar's wife from her very introduction:

---

<sup>136</sup> According to Jos. Asen. 7.3, it was not just Potiphar's wife, but "all the wives and daughters of the Egyptians" (πάσαι αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ θυγατέρες τῶν Αἰγυπτίων), who, "when they saw Joseph, suffered greatly at his good looks" (ὡς ἑώρων τὸν Ἰωσήφ, κακῶς ἔπασχον ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλει αὐτοῦ).

<sup>137</sup> 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" (τίκτοντα τὸν ὄλεθρον), and "a violent storm" (χειμῶν ... 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 ἀναίδεια τῆς ἀκολάστου γυναικός) is itself "Satanic" (σατανικός): Ὅρα τὴν ἀναίδειαν τῆς ἀκολάστου γυναικός. Οὐχ ὅτι δέσποινα εἶναι ἐνομίζετο ἐν διανοίᾳ ἔλαβεν, οὐχ ὅτι οἰκέτης ἦν ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς εὐμορφίας ἀλοῦσα, καὶ τὸν ἐμπρησμὸν τὸν σατανικὸν δεξαμένη, ἐπιπηδᾷ ἐπεχειρεῖ λοιπὸν τῷ νεανίσκῳ, καὶ τὸν πονηρὸν τοῦτον λογισμὸν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ συνέχουσα, καιρὸν ἐπεζήτει καὶ ἐρμήϊαν τὴν δυναμένην αὐτῇ συμπρᾶξαι πρὸς τὴν παράνομον ταύτην ἐπιχείρησιν. 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.

39:7           ויהי אחר הדברים האלה   καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα  
                   וַתִּשָׂא אִשְׁתּוֹ אֶת עֵינֶיהָ אֶל יוֹסֵף   καὶ ἐπέβαλεν ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ  
                   אֶת עֵינֶיהָ אֶל יוֹסֵף   τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς ἐπὶ Ἰωσήφ  
                   And after these things,   And it happened after these things,  
                   his master's wife lifted up   his master's wife cast  
                   her eyes toward Joseph.   her eyes upon/against Joseph.

While the Hebrew text has Potiphar's wife "lifting up" (וַתִּשָׂא) her eyes "to" (אֶל) Joseph, i.e., "taking notice of him," G presents her "casting" (ἐπιβάλλω)<sup>138</sup> her eyes "upon" (ἐπὶ)<sup>139</sup> 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 refuses to let her have her way with him:<sup>140</sup>

39:12                                   וַתִּתְפַּשֵּׂהוּ בְּבגָדוֹ   καὶ ἐπεσπάσατο αὐτὸν τῶν ἱματίων  
                   And she grabbed him by his clothes.   And she drew him to herself by his clothes.

The action of Potiphar's wife is already violent in the Hebrew, as she invades Joseph's personal space by "grabbing"<sup>141</sup> (וַתִּתְפַּשֵּׂהוּ) him by his clothes, but G escalates the violence by using (i) the verb ἐπισπάω<sup>142</sup> ("draw in") to move her violation beyond grabbing to pulling

<sup>138</sup> ἐπιβάλλω | While G translates וַתִּשָׂא (48) with a range of Greek verbs, he only selects ἐπιβάλλω here. In four of its five other occurrences, G uses ἐπιβάλλω with χεῖρ as its object (22:12; 46:4, 18, 17; cf. also 2:21). This fits with G's more violent depiction of Potiphar's wife here, especially as she later casts her hands on Joseph, an act that G presents more aggressively in Greek. Wevers calls ἐπιβάλλω an "idiomatic" translation of וַתִּשָׂא, since G has represented the Hebrew expression contextually (*Notes*, 652–63).

<sup>139</sup> ἐπὶ | Though not without parallel, G does not commonly translate לְּ as ἐπὶ (19/514: 4:4+, 5+, 8; 14:3, 7; [22:3], 9, 12, 19; 24:20, 29, 42; 37:29; 39:7; 42:21; 43:30; 49:33). Obviously, G's choice of preposition is the result of his prior choice of verb (ἐπιβάλλω).

<sup>140</sup> Josephus, *A.J.* 2.4.5 §53 makes the violent eye-hand connection even tighter by having Potiphar's wife "throw her hands upon" (ἐπιβαλοῦσα τὰς χεῖρας) Joseph.

<sup>141</sup> HALOT, s.v. "תִּתְפַּשֵּׂהוּ" *qal* 1.a.

<sup>142</sup> ἐπισπάω | The verb תִּתְפַּשֵּׂהוּ only occurs here and in 4:21, where G represents it as καταδείκνυμι. G does not use the verb ἐπισπάω elsewhere. In fact, ἐπισπάω does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch, and the equivalence

and (ii) the middle voice as an indirect reflexive (“to herself”)<sup>143</sup> 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.<sup>144</sup>

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):

---

with שֶׁפָּח is unattested in the entire Septuagint (Wevers, *Notes*, 656). As Prestel and Schorch note, this unparalleled translation choice “is clearly intended to serve the sense of drama” (“soll offensichtlich der Dramatisierung dienen”) (“Genesis,” 230).

<sup>143</sup> On G’s deliberate use of the middle voice as an indirect reflexive, see §6.1.2.3.

<sup>144</sup> 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” (βία λοιπὸν προσπαθοῦσα ἐχρῆτο καὶ λαβομένη τῆς ἀμπεχόνης εὐτόνως ἄχρι τῆς εὐνῆς ἐπεσπάσατο ῥώμῃ κραταιοτέρᾳ). 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 μιαιῶς 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 κατωθούμενος), 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 ὅτι κατέλιπεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῆς καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω,  
 אקראי 14 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λέγουσα Ἴδετε, εἰσήγαγεν ἡμῖν παῖδα  
 אקראי | קנצ' עבראיון ἐμπαΐζειν ἡμῖν· εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς με λέγων Κοιμήθητι μετ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἐβόησα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. 15  
 אקראי ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτὸν ὅτι ὑψωσα τὴν φωνήν μου καὶ ἐβόησα, καταλιπὼν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐμοὶ  
 קנצ' ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω. 16 καὶ καταλιμπάνει τὰ ἱμάτια παρ' ἐαυτῇ, ἕως ἥλθεν ὁ κύριος εἰς τὸν οἶκον  
 αὐτοῦ. 17 καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα λέγουσα Εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς με ὁ παῖς ὁ Ἑβραῖος, ὃν  
 קנצ' εἰσήγαγες πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐμπαΐξαι μοι καὶ εἰπέν μοι Κοιμηθήσομαι μετὰ σοῦ. 18 ὡς δὲ ἤκουσεν ὅτι  
 אקראי ὑψωσα τὴν φωνήν μου καὶ ἐβόησα, κατέλιπεν τὰ ἱμάτια παρ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω.

When Joseph flees and his clothes are left behind in the hands of Potiphar's wife, she “calls” (אקרא [= καλέω])<sup>145</sup> her male household servants in so that she can accuse Joseph (and ultimately her husband) of bringing Joseph into the house to “mock” (קנצ [= ἐμπαΐζω])<sup>146</sup> 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 אקראי (“and I called/cried [out]”) as καὶ ἐβόησα<sup>147</sup> (“and I shouted”)<sup>148</sup> (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” (קנצ) them in safekeeping until her husband gets home (39:16). By (i) choosing to translate this verb rather anomalously as καταλιμπάνω/καταλείπω<sup>149</sup> (“leave [behind]”)—

<sup>145</sup> καλέω | This is G's regular match for אקרא (84/112).

<sup>146</sup> ἐμπαΐζω | Although G translates קנצ (11) twice as παίζω (21:9; 26:8), he only selects the compound ἐμπαΐζω here (39:14, 17), one important difference being a matter of playfulness and aggression, respectively.

<sup>147</sup> ἐβόησα | G only translates אקרא 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.

<sup>148</sup> LSJ, s.v. “βοάω” A.I.1; DGE, s.v. “βοάω” A.I.3.

<sup>149</sup> καταλιμπάνω | This bi-form of καταλείπω only occurs here. For the other two instances of קנצ in the *hiphil*, G uses τίθημι (2:15) or ἀφίημι (42:33), while καταλείπω (11) normally translates קנצ (7) or אקרא (3).

the same verb G uses to describe Joseph frantically “leaving” (עזב) 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<sup>150</sup> and ironically, since he has Potiphar’s wife perform the very act she charges against Joseph,<sup>151</sup> 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 לִצְחָק (“to mock”) aspectually when it is spoken to Potiphar instead of the household servants:

39:14 ראו הביא לנו איש עברי לִצְחָק בנו Ἰδετε, εἰσήγαγεν ἡμῖν παῖδα Ἑβραῖον ἐμπαίζειν ἡμῖν.

39:17 בא אלי העבד העברי Εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς με ὁ παῖς ὁ Ἑβραῖος,  
אשר הבאת לנו לִצְחָק בי ὃν εἰσήγαγες πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐμπαῖξαι μοι

In speaking to her servants, G has Potiphar’s wife use the present infinitive (ἐμπαίζειν) to describe the mockery<sup>152</sup> 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 (ἐμπαῖξαι), so that she accuses her husband of purchasing Joseph for the express purpose of bringing her

<sup>150</sup> 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.”

<sup>151</sup> 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 ἐσθῆς, ἣν προὔφερεν ἡ γυνὴ ὡς ἀπολειφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ νεανίσκου, πίστις ἦν βίας, οὐχ ἣν ἐκεῖνος εἰργάζετο, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἣν ὑπέμεινεν ἐκ τῆς γυναικός).

<sup>152</sup> While it is possible (as Harl, Wevers, and Brayford claim) that ἐμπαίζω has sexual connotations (*La Genèse*, 269; *Notes*, 657; *Genesis*, 406), this may be reading the context of קנא in 26:8 (Isaac and Rebecca)—where G uses the simplex παίζω—into this passage. See LSJ, s.v. “ἐμπαίζω” A.I.1; *DGE*, s.v. “ἐμπαίζω” I.2.

shame at this particular moment in this particular way.<sup>153</sup> 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.<sup>154</sup>

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

---

<sup>153</sup> ἐμπαίζειν ... ἐμπαίζαι | Concerning G’s deliberate selection of aspect on infinitives, including a discussion of this example, see §6.1.1.7 and also Wevers, *Notes*, 658; Brayford, *Genesis*, 406; *SSG* §28ha(i).

<sup>154</sup> John Chrysostom, *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 ὥσανεὶ ὑπεύθυνον τὰ μυρία ὑπομένοντα δεινά): Ἄλλ’ ὅρα μετὰ τοσαύτην νίκην, μετὰ τοσαύτην ἀνδρείαν, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν στεφανωθῆναι, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν ἀνακηρυχθῆναι, πάλιν ὥσανεὶ ὑπεύθυνον τὰ μυρία ὑπομένοντα δεινά.

but stylistically Hebrew fashion as καὶ ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ<sup>155</sup> (“and he grew angry with rage”). So, despite Joseph’s past performance, Potiphar “puts (him)” (יָנַח) in prison (39:20), but by using the verb ἐμβάλλω<sup>156</sup> (“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 οὐκ ἤθελεν, εἶπεν δὲ τῇ γυναικὶ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ Εἰ ὁ κύριός μου οὐ γινώσκει δι’ ἐμὲ οὐδὲν ἐν  
אֲנִי גִדּוּל | מִמֶּנִּי | תָּוֹ אוֹכַל אֹתוֹ וְכָל הַבָּיִת, כֹּסֶף אֲנִי מֵבִיא בְּיָדִי, וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאָל אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ, 9 καὶ οὐχ ὑπερέχει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ  
חֲשֹׁב | מִמֶּנִּי | תָּוֹ אוֹכַל אֹתוֹ וְכָל הַבָּיִת, כֹּסֶף אֲנִי מֵבִיא בְּיָדִי, וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאָל אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ, οὐθὲν ἐμοῦ οὐδὲ ὑπεξήρηται ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ οὐδὲν πλὴν σοῦ, διὰ τὸ σὲ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ εἶναι, καὶ πῶς  
בְּדַבָּרָה | מִמֶּנִּי | תָּוֹ אוֹכַל אֹתוֹ וְכָל הַבָּיִת, כֹּסֶף אֲנִי מֵבִיא בְּיָדִי, וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאָל אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ, ποιήσω τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο καὶ ἀμαρτήσομαι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ; 10 ἡνίκα δὲ ἐλάλει τῷ Ἰωσήφ  
עַמּוּ | מִמֶּנִּי | תָּוֹ אוֹכַל אֹתוֹ וְכָל הַבָּיִת, כֹּסֶף אֲנִי מֵבִיא בְּיָדִי, וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאָל אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ, ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουεν αὐτῇ καθεύδειν μετ’ αὐτῆς τοῦ συγγενέσθαι αὐτῇ.

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

<sup>155</sup> ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ | Where ὀργ alone means “anger,” G translates it as θυμός (27:45; 49:6, 7). In the two other occurrences of the phrase ὀργα, G represents it similarly as θυμῶ, but he provides no quantitative representation of ὀργ, unlike this case, where ὀργῇ 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).

<sup>156</sup> ἐμβάλλω | G only translates יָנַח (150) as ἐμβάλλω here. Most often, G uses δίδωμι and cognates (125) or τίθημι and cognates (14) for יָנַח. G also represents יָנַח (5: 31:34; 40:15; 43:22; 44:1, 2) and יָנַח (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:<sup>157</sup>

39:9                      איננו גדול בבית הזה ממני    καὶ οὐχ ὑπερέχει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ταύτῃ οὐθὲν ἐμοῦ  
                              ולא חשך ממני מאומה כי אם אותך    οὐδὲ ὑπεξήρηται ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ οὐδὲν πλὴν σοῦ

There is none greater in this household than I,    And nothing is above me in this household,  
 and he has withheld nothing from me but you    and he has taken nothing out from under me but you

By using the Greek verbs ὑπερέχω<sup>158</sup> (“be above, surpass”) and ὑπεξαιρέω<sup>159</sup> (“take out from under”), which have the contrasting verbal prefixes ὑπερ- (“above”) and ὑπο- (“below”), G transforms the everyone-and-everything merism (“none” [איננו] and “nothing” [לא מאומה]) into one of nothing-above-and-everything-below,<sup>160</sup> even as he binds the syntax of the two clauses together more tightly in Greek by translating ול as οὐδέ.<sup>161</sup> 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 טח with the Greek root ἀμαρτ-, his use of the verb

<sup>157</sup> As Wevers convincingly argues, G also highlights Joseph’s worthiness of such great responsibility in 39:4 by translating וישרת אתו (“and he served him”), which focuses on Joseph’s subservience, as εὐηρέσκει 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 טח as παρίστημι (40:4) and otherwise only uses the εὐαρεστέω for the *hithpael* of טח (see §5.2.2.3).

<sup>158</sup> ὑπερέχω | Typically, G translates the adjective ליד (34) as μέγας (25), πρέσβυς (4), or πολὺς (3), and the verb ליד (15) as μέγας + γίνομαι/εἰμί (5), μεγαλύνω (2), ὑψόω (4), or αὐξάνω (3). Only here does G select ὑπερέχω as an equivalent for ליד, although he also uses ὑπερέχω for טח (25:23) and the verb ליד (41:40).

<sup>159</sup> ὑπεξαιρέω | G regularly translates טח (4) as φείδομαι (3), and he does not use ὑπεξαιρέω otherwise. In fact, ὑπεξαιρέω is a Septuagint hapaxlegomenon—but one that “is exactly right for טח here” (Wevers, *Notes*, 653).

<sup>160</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 62.4 (PG 54 537.63–538.4) appropriates this merism for his own homily, as he alternates between what is “below/above” Joseph: Εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ, φησὶν, ὁ οἰκέτης, ὁ ξένος, ὁ αἰχμάλωτος, τοσαύτης ἀπήλαυσα παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἀδείας, [a] ὥς ἅπαντα ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρα εἶναι τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ [b] οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ὃ ὑπεξαιρεῖται τῆς χειρὸς μου, πλὴν σοῦ, ἀλλὰ [a] πᾶσι μὲν αὐτὸς ἐπὶ κείμαι, [b] μόνῃ δὲ σοὶ ὑποτέταγμαι, καὶ ἔξω τυγχάνεις τῆς ἐμῆς ἐξουσίας.

<sup>161</sup> 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.<sup>162</sup> In addition, G emphasizes Joseph’s faithful stewardship and loyalty also by translating שמע (“hear, listen to”) as ὑπακούω<sup>163</sup> (“obey”) in regard to Potiphar’s wife’s repeated attempts to seduce Joseph:

39:10                      ויהי כדברה אל יוסף יום יום      ἡνίκα δὲ ἐλάλει τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας,  
                                     ולא שמע אליה      καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουεν αὐτῇ  
                                     לשכב אצלה להיות עמה      καθεύδειν μετ’ αὐτῆς τοῦ συγγενέσθαι αὐτῇ.

And as often as she spoke to Joseph day after day,      And whenever she spoke to Joseph day after day,  
                                     he would not listen to her,      he would not obey her  
                                     to lie down beside her in order to be with her.      to sleep with 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” (ὑπεξαίρειώ) 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,

<sup>162</sup> 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: “Ἦιδει γὰρ πολλὴν αὐτῷ φέροντα τὸν ὄλεθρον·

<sup>163</sup> 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 שָׁמַע in 41:40 (see note 220 below).

negative afterlife for him. Nevertheless, the God-sent “fortune”<sup>164</sup> (τύχη, cf. ἐπιτυχάνω<sup>165</sup> [= צלח] in 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.<sup>166</sup>

According to G’s translation of וַיִּט אֵלָיו חֶסֶד (“and he extended steadfast love to him”) in 39:21, God “continued to pour down pity upon him” (κατέχεεν<sup>167</sup> αὐτοῦ ἔλεος<sup>168</sup>) 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).<sup>169</sup> 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

<sup>164</sup> LSJ, s.vv. “τύχη” A.II.1; “ἐπιτυχάνω” A.III.3. After asking about the meaning of Joseph’s “fortune” (τί ἐστιν, Ἐπιτυχάνων), John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 62.3 (PG 54 536.38–42) explains it as God’s persistent (πάντα ... πανταχοῦ) and transparent (φανερὰ) providence (κατευώδου ... προωδοποιεῖ): τί ἐστιν, Ἐπιτυχάνων. Πάντα αὐτῷ κατευώδου, πανταχοῦ προωδοποιεῖ αὐτῷ ἡ ἄνωθεν χάρις, καὶ οὕτω φανερά ᾗν ἡ ἐπανθοῦσα αὐτῷ χάρις, ὥς καὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀρχιμαγείρῳ κατὰ δῆλον τοῦτο γενέσθαι. Cf. Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 99; Harl, *La Genèse*, 267; Wevers, *Notes*, 649.

<sup>165</sup> ἐπιτυχάνω | G regularly translates חַלַּץ as εὐοδόω (6/7). The verb ἐπιτυχάνω only occurs here in Genesis.

<sup>166</sup> Jay, *The Tragic in Mark*, 82: “Above all, it is the word τύχη (‘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.”

<sup>167</sup> κατέχεεν | The match between חַסֶּד and καταχέω is singular, although G uses seven different Greek verbs to translate חַסֶּד (9). As for καταχέω, 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).

<sup>168</sup> ἔλεος | G translates חַסֶּד (12) as ἔλεος (6) or the similar term ἐλεημοσύνη (47:29) slightly more often than as δικαιοσύνη (5), and he only uses ἔλεος elsewhere to translate חַסֶּד (19:19)

<sup>169</sup> Asking what “poured down pity” means (τί ἐστι τὸ, Κατέχεεν 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” (πρὸς οἶκτον): τί ἐστι τὸ, Κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ ἔλεος; Πρὸς οἶκτον ἐπέκαμψε τὸν ἀρχιδεσμοφύλακα, καὶ πολλὴν περὶ αὐτὸν τὴν εὐνοίαν ἐπιδείξασθαι παρεσκεύασεν.

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

כפתרון    καὶ εἶδον ἀμφοτέροι ἐνύπνιον, ἑκάτερος ἐνύπνιον, ἐν μιᾷ νυκτὶ [-] ὄρασις τοῦ ἐνυπνίου αὐτοῦ,  
                  ὁ ἀρχιοινοχός καὶ ὁ ἀρχισιτοποιός, οἳ ἦσαν τῷ βασιλεῖ Αἰγύπτου, οἳ ὄντες ἐν τῷ  
                  δεσμωτηρίῳ. 6 εἰσῆλθεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ἰωσήφ τὸ πρῶν, καὶ εἶδεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἦσαν  
 זעפיים    τεταραγμένοι. 7 καὶ ἠρώτα τοὺς εὐνούχους Φαραώ, οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ παρὰ  
 רעים    τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ, λέγων Τί ὅτι τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν σχυθρῶπα σήμερον; 8 οἳ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ  
 לאלהים | הלוא | ופתר    Ἐνύπνιον εἶδομεν, καὶ ὁ συγκρίνων οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτό· εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἰωσήφ Οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ  
 נא | פתרנים    ἢ διασάφησις αὐτῶν ἐστίν; διηγήσασθε οὖν μοι.

This passage begins when the narrator informs us that the two men each had a dream:



40:5

ויהלמו חלום שניהם      καὶ εἶδον ἀμφότεροι ἐνύπνιον,  
 איש חלמו בלילה אחד      ἑάτερος ἐνύπνιον,  
 איש בפתרון חלמו      ἐν μιᾷ νυκτὶ ὄρασις τοῦ ἐνυπνίου αὐτοῦ

And both of them dreamed a dream,      And they both saw a dream,  
 each man his dream in a single night,      each man a dream,  
 each man according to the interpretation of his dream      in a single night (was) the vision of his dream

While the Hebrew has each of the two men dream “according to the interpretation of his dream” (איש בפתרון חלמו), G translates פתרון (“interpretation”) as ὄρασις<sup>170</sup> (“vision”) and also alters the syntax by leaving כ (“according to”) untranslated<sup>171</sup> 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.<sup>172</sup> 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”)<sup>173</sup> (25:6), and he asks them why their faces are רעים (“sad,” lit. “bad”)<sup>174</sup> (25:7). G substitutes these two feelings for more emotive

<sup>170</sup> ὄρασις | Elsewhere, G translates פתרון as διασάφησις (40:8) or σύγκαρσις (2: 40:12, [18]), and he leaves it “untranslated” in 41:11. G uses ὄρασις, in turn, in בָּאֵר לְחַי רָאִי (24:62; 25:11), for מְרָאָה (2:9), and for מַצָּפָה (31:49). For G’s regular translation of פתר as στυγερῶς, see note 184 below.

<sup>171</sup> This treatment of כ is unparalleled in Genesis (see §3.1.1.1).

<sup>172</sup> 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 Schorch 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.

<sup>173</sup> HALOT, s.v. “זער” II.

<sup>174</sup> HALOT, s.v. “רע” 9.

ones, however, having Joseph see them *τεταραγμένοι*<sup>175</sup> (“disturbed”)<sup>176</sup> and inquire as to why their faces are *σκυθρωπά*<sup>177</sup> (“gloomy”).<sup>178</sup> Just as G captures the anxious dejection of these two men in this way,<sup>179</sup> 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:

40:8                    *הלוא לאלהים פתרנים*    *Οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ διασάφησις αὐτῶν ἐστίν;*  
                               *ספרו נא לי*            *διηγέσασθε οὖν 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 *הלוא* by introducing it emphatically with *οὐχί*,<sup>180</sup> which also expects—or demands!—a positive response. Next, by interpreting the ם- 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

<sup>175</sup> *τεταραγμένοι* | The Hebrew verb *נָעַר* is a hapaxlegomenon in Genesis, and G uses *ταράσσω* to translate a range of other verbs, especially in the Joseph story: *פָּעַם* (41:8), *חָרַד* (42:28), *מָהַר* (43:30) (!), and *בָּהֵל* (45:3) (also *מָהַר* in 19:16). Although emotion was more directly in focus in the treatment of Gen 37, G’s interest in *ταραχή* (“being disturbed/confused”) and other tragic emotions can be observed in Gen 40–45, as well.

<sup>176</sup> LSJ, s.vv. “*ταράσσω*” A.I.2; “*ταραχή*” A.2.

<sup>177</sup> *σκυθρωπά* | G represents *עַר* (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.

<sup>178</sup> LSJ, s.v. “*σκυθρωπός*” A.I. As Harl says, G’s choice is “more specific” (“plus précis”) than the Hebrew term (*La Genèse*, 270).

<sup>179</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 89–90 says the two men were “full of anxiety and depression” (*συννοίας καὶ κατηφείας γέμοντας*), “were filled with distress and dismay” (*ἄσης καὶ ἀδημονίας πεπλήρωνται*), 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 ἔνδον ταραχὴν*) and “despondency” (*ἀθυμία*).

<sup>180</sup> *οὐχί* | Although G translates *לֹא* (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” (διασάφης) of the very dreams that have them fretting and dejected.<sup>181</sup> In addition, by translating the imperatival particle אֵן causally as οὕτως<sup>182</sup> (“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.<sup>183</sup> Finally, while G’s usual translation of פתר (“interpret, solve”) as συγκαρίνω<sup>184</sup> (“combine, compare”) and פתרון (“interpretation, solution, meaning”) as σύγκρισις<sup>185</sup> (“combination, comparison”) does not necessarily emphasize Joseph’s divine gift of dream interpretation any more than the Hebrew,<sup>186</sup> 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.<sup>187</sup> This is the divine power that

---

<sup>181</sup> 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., פתרנים] by ‘their clarification,’ hence interpretation, a reference specifically to the two dreams in the story.”

<sup>182</sup> οὕτως | Most often, G leaves אֵן “untranslated,” but when he represents it quantitatively, he selects from a range of Greek equivalents (see §3.1.5.1). G represents אֵן as οὕτως in a few other cases (3: 12:13; 16:2; 18:21) (cf. §8.3.1 and note 126). More often, G uses οὕτως as a translation of ו (25), especially in ועתה (see §4.1.1.1), or because he adds it (9) (see §3.2.3.1).

<sup>183</sup> Wevers finds Joseph’s choice of conjunction “a bit arrogant” (*Notes*, 667).

<sup>184</sup> συγκαρίνω | G represents פתר (9) as συγκαρίνω 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 συγκαρίνω otherwise.

<sup>185</sup> σύγκρισις | For G’s treatment of פתרון, see note 170 above.

<sup>186</sup> HALOT, s.v. “פתר” and “פתרון”; LSJ, s.v. “συγκαρίνω” and “σύγκρισις.”

<sup>187</sup> Neither συγκαρίνω 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 διασάφης (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 ראש ("head"), which figured positively into Joseph's explanation of the first dream: Pharaoh will "lift" (נשא) the cupbearer's "head" (ראש). 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:<sup>188</sup>

### Genesis 40:16–19

טוב | אף אני | και εἶδεν ὁ ἀρχισιτοποιὸς ὅτι ὀρθῶς συνέκρινεν, καὶ εἶπεν τῷ Ἰωσήφ Καγὼ εἶδον ἐνύπνιον,  
והנה | - | και ὥμην τρία κανᾶ χονδριτῶν αἶφειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς μου· 17 ἐν δὲ τῷ κανῶ τῷ ἐπάνω ἀπὸ πάντων  
אכל | τῶν γενῶν, ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς Φαραὼ ἐσθίει, ἔργον σιτοποιοῦ, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατήσθιεν  
αὐτὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανοῦ τοῦ ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς μου. 18 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωσήφ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Αὕτη ἡ

---

<sup>188</sup> According to John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 63.2 (PG 54 542.65–543.2), the baker thought that his dream also "portended something good for him" (χρηστόν τι αὐτῷ προμηνύειν). Cf. Philo, *Ios.* 93.

רש"י | ש"א | σύγκρισις αὐτοῦ· τὰ τρία κανᾶ τρεῖς ἡμέραι εἰσίν· 19 ἔτι τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀφελεῖ Φαραὼ τὴν κεφαλὴν  
 בשרך | σου | ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ κρεμάσει σε ἐπὶ ξύλου, καὶ φάγεται τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς σάρκας σου ἀπὸ σοῦ.

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”<sup>189</sup> (טוב), but rather “correctly” (ὀρθῶς).<sup>190</sup> 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 אֲנִי נָא forcefully as *κἀγώ*<sup>191</sup> (“I, too”) in the clause אֲנִי נָא בחלומי [ראיתי] (“I, too, saw in my dream”), 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*<sup>192</sup> into the next clause as a complementary infinitive of ᾤμην, which gives the baker a greater sense of agency:

<sup>189</sup> HALOT, s.v. “טוב 1” 2.

<sup>190</sup> ὀρθῶς | G usually translates טוב (41) as *καλός* (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.

<sup>191</sup> *κἀγώ* | For other rare cases of G’s emphatic use of *κἀγώ*, see §3.3.2.2.

<sup>192</sup> *αἴρειν* | G does not often add content words in translation (for examples, see §3.2.8).

And behold! There were three breadbaskets    And I imagined I was lifting three baskets of coarse meal loaves  
 on my head.    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” (αἶρειν) 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 אכל more violently with the animalistic verb κατεσθίω<sup>193</sup> (“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,<sup>194</sup> 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.<sup>195</sup>

<sup>193</sup> κατεσθίω | See note 73 above.

<sup>194</sup> 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.

<sup>195</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 672: “בשר 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: 6:7; 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:

40:13      בעוד שלשת ימים ישא פרעה את ראשך      ἔτι τρεῖς ἡμέραι καὶ μνησθήσεται Φαραὼ τῆς ἀρχῆς σου  
 40:19      בעוד שלשת ימים ישא פרעה את ראשך מעליך      ἔτι τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀφελεῖ Φαραὼ τὴν κεφαλὴν σου ἀπὸ σοῦ

In the Hebrew version, both interpretations begin with the exact same words בעוד שלשת ימים ישא פרעה את ראשך (“in yet three days Pharaoh will ‘lift’ your head”), but the baker’s pronouncement has the word מעליך (“from off of you”) appended, which radically alters the meaning of נשא (“lift”)<sup>196</sup> and the entire sentence: the baker will be decapitated. This wordplay is possible in Hebrew, because the phrase נשא ראש (“lift the head”), similar to the idiom נשא פנים (“lift the face”), means to “cheer,” “acquit,” or “favor” someone.<sup>197</sup> 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 נשא (“lift”) and its object ראש (“head”) in 40:13 according to this clause’s general sense in its immediate literary context as μνησθήσεται<sup>198</sup> Φαραὼ τῆς ἀρχῆς<sup>199</sup> σου (“Pharaoh will remember your position of authority”), although G no doubt justified his translation of ראש as ἀρχή by appealing to the fact that

<sup>196</sup> HALOT, s.v. “נשא” qal 18.a; Wevers, *Notes*, 672.

<sup>197</sup> HALOT, s.v. “נשא” qal 4.a; 6.a; Harl, *La Genèse*, 271: “te libérera.” Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 668.

<sup>198</sup> μνησθήσεται | G uses a large range of translation equivalents for the verb נשא (48) (cf. note 138 above), but he only selects μμνήσκειν here and in 40:20. Otherwise, G reserves μμνήσκειν for זכר (9/10) (cf. זכר translated by ἀναμνήσκω in 41:9).

<sup>199</sup> ἀρχῆς | G’s main equivalent for ראש (20) is κεφαλὴ (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: תְּחִלָּה (3); ראשית (3); מְשָׁלָה (2); ראשון (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); מִשְׁקָה (1); and כֶּן (1).

the Hebrew term—like ἀρχή—is also associated with superiority (“best”) and authority (“chief”).<sup>200</sup> 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” (μνήσθητί<sup>201</sup> [= זכרתני]) him at that time and “mention” (μνησθήσῃ περὶ [= הוצאתני]) him and his situation to Pharaoh,<sup>202</sup> thus taking “pity” (ἔλεος<sup>203</sup> [= דַּחַן “reciprocal kindness”])<sup>204</sup> 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.

---

<sup>200</sup> HALOT, s.v. “שָׂרָא” 8–9; LSJ, s.v. “ἀρχή” A.II; DGE, s.v. “ἀρχή” C. Brayford calls G’s translation “an interpretive, rather than literal, rendering” (*Genesis*, 409), but this does not apply to ἀρχή as much as to μνησθήσεται.

<sup>201</sup> μνήσθητί | For the close correspondence between זכר and μνησθαι, see note 198 above.

<sup>202</sup> Prestel and Schorch note that G “thus produces a new play on words by using the verb μιμνήσκω” (“Dabei erzeugt die Verwendung des Verbens μιμνήσκω ein neues Wortspiel”) (*Genesis*, 233).

<sup>203</sup> ἔλεος | See note 168 above.

<sup>204</sup> HALOT, s.v. “דַּחַן” 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" (ותפעם רוחו [= ἐταράχθη<sup>205</sup> ἡ ψυχὴ<sup>206</sup> 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 οἶμαι<sup>207</sup> ("I imagine") (41:1, 17) or ὥσπερ<sup>208</sup> ("as if") (41:2, 18, 22) instead of his more usual translation equivalent ἰδοὺ ("behold"):

|       |                          |                                             |
|-------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 41:1  | והנה עמד על היאר         | ὤξετο ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ               |
| 41:17 | הנני עמד על שפת היאר     | ὤμην ἐστάναι παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ     |
| 41:2  | ... והנה מן היאר עלת ... | καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ... |
| 41:18 | ... והנה מן היאר עלת ... | καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ...      |
| 41:22 | והנה שבע שבלים עלת       | καὶ ὥσπερ ἑπτὰ 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:

<sup>205</sup> ἐταράχθη | The verb פעם 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).

<sup>206</sup> ψυχὴ | G usually represents רִנָּה (11) as πνεῦμα (7), only here selecting ψυχὴ, his usual equivalent for the Hebrew noun נַפֶּשׁ (41/43). Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 678; Brayford, *Genesis*, 411.

<sup>207</sup> οἶμαι | See note 58 above.

<sup>208</sup> ὥσπερ | See note 60 above.

## Genesis 41:1–4 // 41:17–21 (dream about cows)

על ת | ותרענה | ותעמדנה | ותאכלנה  
 ὥς ἐτο ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, **2** καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ἑπτὰ βόες καλαὶ τῷ εἶδει καὶ ἐκλεκταὶ ταῖς σαρκίν, καὶ ἐβόσκοντο ἐν τῷ ἄχει· **3** ἄλλαι δὲ ἑπτὰ βόες ἀνέβαινον μετὰ ταύτας ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ αἰσχροὶ τῷ εἶδει καὶ λεπταὶ ταῖς σαρκίν, καὶ ἐνέμοντο παρὰ τὰς βόας παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ· **4** καὶ κατέφαγον αἱ ἑπτὰ βόες αἱ αἰσχροὶ καὶ λεπταὶ ταῖς σαρκίν τὰς ἑπτὰ βόας τὰς καλὰς τῷ εἶδει καὶ τὰς ἐκλεκτάς.

על ת | ותרענה | עלות | ותאכלנה | ותבאנה | ולא נודע  
**17** Ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ μου ὥμην ἐστάναι παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ, **18** καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ἑπτὰ βόες ἐκλεκταὶ ταῖς σαρκίν καὶ καλαὶ τῷ εἶδει, καὶ ἐνέμοντο ἐν τῷ ἄχει· **19** καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑπτὰ βόες ἔτεροι ἀνέβαινον ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ πονηραὶ καὶ αἰσχροὶ τῷ εἶδει καὶ λεπταὶ ταῖς σαρκίν, οἷας οὐκ εἶδον τοιαύτας ἐν ὅλῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ αἰσχροτέρας· **20** καὶ κατέφαγον αἱ ἑπτὰ βόες αἱ λεπταὶ καὶ αἰσχροὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ βόας τὰς πρώτας τὰς καλὰς καὶ ἐκλεκτάς, **21** καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὰς κοιλίας αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ διάδηλοι ἐγένοντο ὅτι εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὰς κοιλίας αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ ὄψεις αὐτῶν αἰσχροὶ καθὰ καὶ τὴν ἀρχήν.

## Genesis 41:5–7 // 41:22–24 (dream about ears of grain)

על ת | ותבלענה | צמחות | ותבלענה  
 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑπτὰ στάχυες ἀνέβαινον ἐν πυθμένι<sup>209</sup> ἐνὶ ἐκλεκτοῖ καὶ καλοῖ· **6** καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑπτὰ στάχυες λεπτοὶ καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι ἀνεφύοντο μετ’ αὐτούς· **7** καὶ κατέπιον οἱ ἑπτὰ στάχυες οἱ λεπτοὶ καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι τοὺς ἑπτὰ στάχους τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς καὶ τοὺς πλήρεις.

על ת | ותבלענה | צמחות | ותבלענה  
**22** καὶ ὥσπερ ἑπτὰ στάχυες ἀνέβαινον ἐν πυθμένι ἐνὶ πλήρεις καὶ καλοῖ· **23** ἄλλοι δὲ ἑπτὰ στάχυες λεπτοὶ καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι ἀνεφύοντο ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν· **24** καὶ κατέπιον οἱ ἑπτὰ στάχυες οἱ λεπτοὶ καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι τοὺς ἑπτὰ στάχους τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ τοὺς πλήρεις.

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” (καταπίνω) (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

<sup>209</sup> πυθμένι | G’s choice of πυθμήν (“stock, stem”) for גִּזְרִית (“tendrils”) in 40:10, 12 and for נֶגֶז (“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.<sup>210</sup> Furthermore, by using the similarly formed pair *κατεσθίω*<sup>211</sup> (lit. “eat down”) and *καταπίνω*<sup>212</sup> (lit. “drink down”) to translate the Hebrew verbs אכל (“eat”) and בלע (“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 צמחות אחריהן (“were sprouting up after them”) in the dream’s second telling as ἀνεφύοντο ἐχόμενοι<sup>213</sup> αὐτῶν (“were growing up clinging closely to<sup>214</sup> 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 [= אָפָה]) (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” (פֶּתֶר) Pharaoh’s dreams (41:8, 24), in this case G rejects his usual translation of συγκαρίνω

---

<sup>210</sup> 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.

<sup>211</sup> *κατεσθίω* | See note 73 above.

<sup>212</sup> *καταπίνω* | Both בלע and καταπίνω are restricted to this passage in Genesis.

<sup>213</sup> *ἐχόμενοι* | Usually, G translates אַחֵר as μετά (59), μετὰ 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.

<sup>214</sup> 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 ἀπαγγέλλω<sup>215</sup> (“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 פְּתִירוֹן (“interpretation”) as ὄρασις (“vision”) in the previous chapter (see above).<sup>216</sup> 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

ה    καὶ εἶπεν Φαραὼ πᾶσιν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ Μὴ εὐρήσομεν ἄνθρωπον τοιοῦτον, ὃς ἔχει πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐν  
 יִקְרִי    αὐτῷ; 39 εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ Ἐπειδὴ ἔδειξεν ὁ θεός σοι πάντα ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος  
 נבון וחכם כמוך    φρονιμώτερος καὶ συνετώτερός σου.

First, G uses μή<sup>217</sup> to introduce Pharaoh’s initial question כִּזָּה אִישׁ (‘‘will a man such as this be found?’’), thus making explicit in Greek the implicit doubt that Pharaoh has in Hebrew that any such man could be found.<sup>218</sup> Second, G renders the temporal preposition אַחֲרַי (‘‘after’’) causally as ἐπειδὴ<sup>219</sup> (‘‘since’’), which tightens the logical link between Pharaoh’s observation that God has shown so much to Joseph and his claim that Joseph is

<sup>215</sup> ἀπαγγέλλω | The equivalence of פִּתְרֵם and ἀπαγγέλλω is unique here. (For G’s usual rendering of פִּתְרֵם, see note 184 above.) Otherwise, G just uses ἀπαγγέλλω as his main match for נָגַד in the *hiphil* and *hophal* (21/36).

<sup>216</sup> 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’’ (εἰπεῖν) or even ‘‘open their mouths’’ (διᾶραι τὸ στόμα): ‘‘Ὅτε οὖν ἅπαντες οἱ σοφοὶ παραγενόμενοι οὐδὲν εἰπεῖν ἠδυνήθησαν, οὐδὲ διᾶραι τὸ στόμα ἔσχυσαν.’’ 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’’ (οὐδὲν ἐχόντων εἰπεῖν). 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).

<sup>217</sup> μή | See note 49 above.

<sup>218</sup> Brayford, *Genesis*, 415.

<sup>219</sup> ἐπειδὴ | G translates אַחֲרַי (85) causally just twice (cf. also ἐπεὶ in 46:30). On G’s usual treatment of אַחֲרַי, see note 213 above. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 693.

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:

רשׁ | יִשׁוּעַ | סὺ ἔσῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἴκου μου, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ στόματί σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαός μου· πλὴν τὸν θρόνον  
- | נְתַתִּי | אֲנִי | ὑπερέξω σου ἐγώ. 41 εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ Ἰδοὺ καθίστημί σε σήμερον ἐπὶ πάσης γῆς  
| וְיִתְּנִי | יוֹסֵף | Αἰγύπτου. 42 καὶ περιελόμενος Φαραὼ τὸν δακτύλιον ἀπὸ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ περιέθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ  
| וַיִּשֶׂא | בְּגָדֵי | τὴν χεῖρα Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτὸν στολὴν βυσσίνην, καὶ περιέθηκεν κλοιὸν χρυσοῦν περὶ τὸν  
| וַיַּרְא | אֲרָרָא | τράχηλον αὐτοῦ. 43 καὶ ἀνεβίβασεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα τὸ δεύτερον τῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκέρυξεν  
| וַנִּתֵּן | אֲבָרָהָם | ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ κῆρυξ. καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐφ' ὅλης γῆς Αἰγύπτου. 44 εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ  
| וַיִּשֶׂא | אֲרָרָא | Ἰωσήφ Ἐγὼ Φαραὼ· ἄνευ σοῦ οὐκ ἔξαρείῃ οὐθεις τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου.

<sup>220</sup> **ὕπακούσεται** | G usually translates ρῴ 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 performative,<sup>221</sup> especially in the presence of *σήμερον*,<sup>222</sup> a word G supplies in translation:

41:41                      ראה נִתַּחֵי אֶתְךָ    Ἴδού καθίστημί σε σήμερον  
                                  על כל ארץ מצרים    ἐπὶ πάσης γῆς Αἰγύπτου.  
                                  Look! I hereby set you    Behold! I hereby appoint you this day  
                                  over all the land of Egypt.    over all the land of Egypt.

Next, G constructs a novel stylistic symmetry with the verbs he selects to describe Pharaoh “taking off” (סור) his signet ring and “placing” (נִתַּחֵי) it on Joseph’s hand, using two verbs with the prefix *περι-*, so that Pharaoh, “having taking (his ring) off from around” (*περιελόμενος*)<sup>223</sup> his finger, then “put (it) around” (*περιέθηκεν*)<sup>224</sup> Joseph’s (41:42).<sup>225</sup> In addition, this scene now more closely resembles Tamar’s physical transformation, where she “took off” (*περιελομένη*) her widow’s apparel and “put on” (*περιεβάλετο*) her pretty summer dress (38:14).<sup>226</sup> 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 *θέριστρον* discussed

<sup>221</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 694: “In MT Pharaoh’s appointment is described as a *fait accompli*. [...] [G] stresses the fact that the appointment is taking place.”

<sup>222</sup> *σήμερον* | For other rare cases where G adds a content word in translation, see §3.2.8.

<sup>223</sup> *περιελόμενος* | See note 99 above.

<sup>224</sup> *περιέθηκεν* | For G’s more usual equivalents of נִתַּחֵי, see note 156 above. While G does use *τίθημι* and cognates to represent נִתַּחֵי, he selects the compound *περιτίθημι* only here. Otherwise, G only uses *περιτίθημι* as a rare match for שִׁים (2/48: 24:47; 41:42) and לָבַשׁ (1/6: 27:16).

<sup>225</sup> 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).

<sup>226</sup> 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)<sup>227</sup> (41:42). Finally, since he was apparently unfamiliar with the obscure term אֲבָרָךְ (“watch out!” [?] or “kneel!” [?]),<sup>228</sup> G interprets this according to the context, such that a “herald heralded” (ἐκήρυξεν ... κήρυξ) 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.<sup>229</sup>

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<sup>230</sup> 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

---

<sup>227</sup> **στολή** | G usually represents אֲבָרָךְ (14) as ἱμάτιον/ἱματισμός (12), but also as στολή in 27:15. G more often uses στολή to translate הָלַבַּשׁ (4/7), and once אֲבָרָךְ (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.

<sup>228</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “אֲבָרָךְ,” Harl, *La Genèse*, 275; Wevers, *Notes*, 695; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 236.

<sup>229</sup> In discussing Joseph’s reversal, John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 63.4 (PG 54 545.33–39) notes both its suddenness (ἄθροος, ἐξαίφνης) and its totality (from “prison” [δεσμωτήριον] to “highest honor” [τὴν ἀνωτάτω τιμὴν] and “adulterer” [μοιχός] to “rule of all Egypt” [τὴν ἀρχὴν πάσης Αἰγύπτου]): “Ὅρα πῶς ἄθροον ὁ δεσμώτης βασιλεὺς καθίσταται πάσης τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιμαγείρου εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον εἰσαχθεὶς, ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς αὐτὴν ἀνάγεται τὴν ἀνωτάτω τιμὴν· καὶ ὁ γενόμενος αὐτοῦ δεσπότης ἐξαίφνης ἑώρα, ὃν ὡς μοιχὸν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἐμβεβλήκει, τὴν ἀρχὴν πάσης Αἰγύπτου δεξάμενον. Cf. Philo, *Ios.* 123.

<sup>230</sup> 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 οὖν γίνεται δῆλος τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας ὁ 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



(42:1–4). 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:

42:7                      וירא יוסף את אחיו ויכבם    ἰδὼν δὲ Ἰωσήφ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπέγνω,  
                                  ויתנכר אליהם    καὶ ἡλλοτριῶτο ἀπ’ αὐτῶν  
                                  וידבר אתם קשות    καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς σκληρά

And Joseph saw his brothers and recognized them,    When Joseph saw his brothers, he recognized (them),  
                                  and he made himself unrecognizable to them,    and he estranged himself from them  
                                  and he spoke harsh words with them.    and 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 נָכַר (“foreigner”) and נָכְרִי (“foreign”), for which he uses the adjective ἀλλότριος (“foreign[er]”), which is itself cognate to the verb ἀλλοτριόω<sup>231</sup> (“make strange or foreign”).<sup>232</sup> 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,<sup>233</sup> and yet, because G also translates the Hebrew preposition אל (“to”) as ἀπό (“from”),<sup>234</sup> he subtly enhances

<sup>231</sup> ἀλλοτριόω | It all of its other occurrences in Genesis, נכר occurs in the *hiphil* and G translates it as ἐπιγινώσκω (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 נָכַר (3/4) and נָכְרִי (1) (cf. בן נכר = ἀλλογενῶν ἐθνῶν in 17:27).

<sup>232</sup> HALOT, s.v. “נכר” *hithpael* 2; LSJ, s.v. “ἀλλοτριόω” A.I.2; DGE, s.v. “ἀλλοτριόω” B.II.5.

<sup>233</sup> 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 ἥθος) that Joseph assumes.

<sup>234</sup> ἀπ’ | Of its 514 occurrences in Genesis, G only translates לְ as ἀπό here.

Joseph’s ironic hostility toward his brothers,<sup>235</sup> a point that is consistent with the fact that he proceeds to speak “harsh words” (σκληρά<sup>236</sup> [= קשות]) to them.<sup>237</sup>

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.

---

<sup>235</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 64.1 (PG 54 549.2–9) says that Joseph “wished to present himself to them as to foreigners” (ὡς ἀλλοτρίοις αὐτοῖς προσφέρεισθαι ἐβούλετο) 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).

<sup>236</sup> **σκληρά** | Generally, G represents the root קשׁ with the root σκληρ-: קשׁ (2) as σκληρός (here and 42:30), and קשׁ (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 קשׁ (21:11, 12), קשׁ (49:3+), and קשׁ (45:5 [= σκληρὸς φαίνομαι]).

<sup>237</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 64.2 (PG 54 549.18–19) judges that Joseph’s speech exhibits “great severity:” Διὸ 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 ἀλλοτρίωσις in Philo, *Ios.* 166), or both (Harl, *La Genèse*, 279).

## Genesis 42:9–16

לֹא | עָרוֹת | לְרֹאוֹת Κατάσκοποί ἐστε· κατανοῆσαι τὰ ἴχνη τῆς χώρας ἤκατε. **10** οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Οὐχί, κύριε· οἱ παῖδές σου  
כָּנִים ἤλθομεν πρίασθαι βρώματα· **11** πάντες ἐσμὲν υἱοὶ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου· εἰρηνικοί ἐσμεν, οὐκ εἰσὶν οἱ  
לֹא παῖδές σου κατάσκοποι. **12** εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἴχνη τῆς γῆς ἤλθατε ἰδεῖν. **13** οἱ δὲ  
עֲנִינוּ ἡμῶν σήμερον, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος οὐχ ὑπάρχει. **14** εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἰωσήφ Τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὃ εἶρηκα ὑμῖν  
אָמַר | חַי | תְּבַחְנוּ λέγων ὅτι Κατάσκοποι ἐστε· **15** ἐν τούτῳ φανεῖσθε· νῆ τὴν ὑγίειαν Φαραώ, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθητε  
וּבְחִנּוּ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑμῶν, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀπάχθητε ἕως τοῦ φανεῖσθαι τὰ ῥήματα ὑμῶν, εἰ ἀληθεύετε ἢ  
כִּי | חַי | οὐ· εἰ δὲ μή, νῆ τὴν ὑγίειαν Φαραώ, ἢ μὴν κατάσκοποι ἐστε.

G captures and cultivates G's harsh speech with several translation choices that he makes.

First, he translates Joseph's opening accusation that his brothers have come לְרֹאוֹת אֶת עָרוֹת (to see the vulnerability<sup>238</sup> of the land") as κατανοῆσαι<sup>239</sup> τὰ ἴχνη<sup>240</sup> τῆς χώρας ("to inspect<sup>241</sup> the footpaths of the land thoroughly"), which focuses not on Egypt's defensive weaknesses, but the intentionality and fastidiousness of Joseph's brothers in their alleged reconnaissance mission. However, G intensifies not just the content of Joseph's harsh words, but also his tone. For example, G translates Joseph's לֹא ("No") as οὐχί<sup>242</sup> ("No!") (42:12), but even more effective is the way he captures the solemnity of Joseph's two solemn oaths in Greek idiom:

<sup>238</sup> Lit. "nakedness" (*HALOT*, s.v. "עָרֶוֶת" 2). Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 708; Brayford, *Genesis*, 420; Prestel and Schorch, "Genesis," 238.

<sup>239</sup> κατανοῆσαι | G regularly translates רָאָה in the *qaʿl* with *ὁράω* and compounds (118/129), selecting the equivalent *κατανοέω* only here. G just uses *κατανοέω* once more (for כָּכָל in 3:6).

<sup>240</sup> ἴχνη | G usually translates עֲרֵוֹת (5) as γύμνωσις (3), but also as ἵχνος in 42:12. G does not use ἵχνος elsewhere.

<sup>241</sup> Lit. "observe well" or "learn" (LSJ, s.v. "κατανοέω" A.I.1; A.I.3). Cf. Prestel and Schorch's translation as "erkunden" ("explore") ("Genesis," 238).

<sup>242</sup> οὐχί | See note 180 above.

42:15                      חַי פַּרְעֹה אִם תִּצְאוּ מִזֶּה    נָה תִּהְיֶה יָגִיעַן פַּרְאֹה, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃτε ἐντεῦθεν,  
                                  כִּי אִם בָּבוֹא אַחִיכֶם הַקָּטָן הַנֶּה    ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν ὁ νεώτερος ἔλθῃ ὧδε.

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!            unless your younger brother comes here!

G does this by translating the idiom חַי פַּרְעֹה (“as Pharaoh lives”) expansively and idiomatically as נָה תִּהְיֶה יָגִיעַן<sup>243</sup> פַּרְאֹה (“by<sup>244</sup> Pharaoh’s health”) and also by selecting the more emphatic construction οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃτε<sup>245</sup> (“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:

42:16                      וְאִם לֹא חַי פַּרְעֹה בִּי מִרְגְּלִים אַתֶּם    ... εἰ δὲ μὴ, נָה תִּהְיֶה יָגִיעַן פַּרְאֹה, ἢ μὴν κατὰσκοποὶ ἐστε.  
 ... 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 נָה תִּהְיֶה יָגִיעַן פַּרְאֹה (“by Pharaoh’s health”) for חַי פַּרְעֹה (“as Pharaoh lives”), but he also translates the asseverative כִּי (“surely”) quite appropriately as ἢ μὴν<sup>246</sup> (“verily”),<sup>247</sup> which is reminiscent of God’s solemn oath to Abraham in Gen 22:17 (see §8.3.3).

<sup>243</sup> נָה תִּהְיֶה יָגִיעַן | According to its more typical usage, G regularly translates חַי (25) as ζῶν (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 נָה or the noun יָגִיעַ otherwise (but יָגִיעַ as a translation of שָׁלוֹם [5/15]).

<sup>244</sup> LSJ, s.v. “נָה,” Wevers, *Notes*, 710.

<sup>245</sup> οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃτε | 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).

<sup>246</sup> ἢ μὴν | Based on its other uses, G typically translates כִּי (293) as ὅτι (146), γάρ (89), or ἀλλά (11) (cf. §4.2.3). G only represents כִּי asseveratively as ἢ μὴν here and in 22:17, and he uses this particle combination nowhere else.

<sup>247</sup> 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 (οὐχί<sup>248</sup> [= אֵל]) the allegation of espionage, G has them say not that they are כֹּנִים ("honest")<sup>249</sup> but εἰρηνικοί<sup>250</sup> ("peaceful")<sup>251</sup> (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 εἰρηνικόν [= לִשְׁלָם]) 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" (וְהָאֲחֵר אֵינֶנּוּ) (42:13), G translates this as ὁ δὲ ἕτερος οὐχ ὑπάρχει<sup>252</sup> ("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 ἡ μὴν in solemn oaths, see LSJ, s.v. "ἡ" I.1; Mayser, *Grammatik*, II.3.146 (§164.14.2a); Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 350–351.

<sup>248</sup> οὐχί | See note 180 above.

<sup>249</sup> HALOT, s.v. "כֹּן" 1" 2.a.

<sup>250</sup> εἰρηνικοί | G consistently translates כֹּן (5) as εἰρηνικός. For G's other uses of εἰρηνικός, see note 46 above.

<sup>251</sup> 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.

<sup>252</sup> ὑπάρχει | Apart from the substantival participle ὑπάρχοντα, G only uses the verb ὑπαρχω here and in the parallel expression in 42:32 (cf. Harl, *La Genèse*, 279). Far more often G represents וָאֵל as οὐ/μὴ + εἶμι (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 ὑπρίσκειτο).

ὑπαρχος (“subordinate governor”),<sup>253</sup> and Joseph’s position fits this description, as he is second in power only to Pharaoh.<sup>254</sup> Third, G translates the *niphal* of בָּחַ (“be tested”) as φαίνομαι<sup>255</sup> (“appear, come to light”) (42:15) and its periphrastic equivalent φανερός 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:

#### Genesis 42:21

אשמים | אבל | אבִלִי | καὶ εἶπεν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Ναί· ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ γάρ ἐσμεν περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ  
 בהתחננו | ראינו | ἡμῶν, ὅτι ὑπερείδομεν τὴν θλίψιν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, ὅτε κατεδέετο ἡμῶν, καὶ οὐκ  
 שמענו | εἰσηκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ· ἕνεκεν τούτου ἐπῆλθεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἡ θλίψις αὕτη.

<sup>253</sup> The verb itself is used in the sense “to be ὑπαρχος” (LSJ, s.v. “ὑπάρχω” C; cf. LSJ, s.v. “ὑπαρχος” A.I). What is more, Philo repeatedly uses ὑπαρχος—among other terms—to refer to Joseph’s position, especially in relation to Pharaoh (*Ios.* 123, 157, 164, 248, 257).

<sup>254</sup> Earlier in 42:6, G describes Joseph as ἄρχων τῆς γῆς (“governor of the land”). Cf. 45:8.

<sup>255</sup> φαίνομαι ... φανερός γίνομαι | The Hebrew verb בָּחַ only occurs in these two verses in Genesis. Wevers judges this “not a bad translation” (*Notes*, 710). G mainly uses 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 אָבֶל (“truly”) as *ναί*<sup>256</sup> (“verily”),<sup>257</sup> which aptly captures the grave austerity of the confession that follows:

42:21                      אָבֶל אַשְׁמִים אֲנַחְנוּ עַל אֲחִינוּ    *Ναί· ἐν ἁμαρτία γάρ*<sup>258</sup> ἔσμεν περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν  
Truly! we are guilty in regard to our brother.    Verily! we are at fault in regard to brother.

What is more, G’s translation of אַשְׁמִים (“guilty”) as ἐν ἁμαρτία<sup>259</sup> (“at fault”) is decidedly tragic, since Joseph’s brothers recognize the tragic “mistake”<sup>260</sup> (ἁμαρτία) that they once made and now regret. Furthermore, G deepens their remorse in translation, as they acknowledge not “seeing” (רָאָה) but “ignoring” (ὑπεροράω<sup>261</sup> [lit. “overlook”]) their brother as “he repeatedly and earnestly begged” (κατεδέετο<sup>262</sup> [= התחננו “beg for mercy”]) them for

<sup>256</sup> *ναί* | Hebrew אָבֶל also occurs in 17:19, and there G also renders it as *ναί*, a word G does not use otherwise.

<sup>257</sup> LSJ, s.v. “*ναί*” A.I. As noted by Wevers, *ναί* expresses “strong asseveration” and so is “a good translation of אָבֶל” (*Notes*, 713).

<sup>258</sup> 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.

<sup>259</sup> ἐν ἁμαρτία | The adjective אַשְׁמִים is a hapaxlegomenon in Genesis. G normally associates the Hebrew root אָשַׁם with the Greek root ἁμαρτ-: אָשַׁם (8) = ἁμαρτάνω (6/7); אָשַׁם (4) = ἁμαρτία (2/6); ἁμαρτήμα (1/1); ἁμαρτάνω (1/7); אָשַׁם (1) = ἁμαρτωλός (1/1); אָשַׁם (1) = ἁμαρτία (1/6); אָשַׁם = ἁμαρτία (1/6). Only here and with נִיחַ in 15:16 does G use the Greek root ἁμαρτ- for a Hebrew word of a different root. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 713.

<sup>260</sup> Harl translates ἁμαρτία as “faute” (*La Genèse*, 62).

<sup>261</sup> ὑπεροράω | Though G commonly translates רָאָה with ὁράω and cognates (see notes 69 and 239 above), he only uses the compound ὑπεροράω here, for רָאָה or otherwise.

<sup>262</sup> κατεδέετο | Both the *hithpael* of נִחַ and the verb καταδέομαι only occur here in Genesis. In the *qal*, G consistently represents נִחַ as ἐλεέω, 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” (εἰσακούω<sup>263</sup> [= שמע]) him.<sup>264</sup> As a typical older brother, Reuben rubs their acknowledged mistake in their face with a sharp “Didn’t I tell you so:”

42:22 הלוא אמרתי אליכם לאמר *Οὐκ ἐλάλησα ὑμῖν λέγων*  
 אל תחטא בלד *Μὴ ἀδικήσητε τὸ παιδάριον;*  
 ולא שמעתם *καὶ οὐκ εἰσηκούσατέ μου.*

Did I not tell you, saying: Didn’t I 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 οὐκ<sup>265</sup> [= הלוא], which anticipates an affirmative response, (ii) characterize his brothers’ “sin” (חטא) as “injustice” (ἀδικία),<sup>266</sup> which is the consummation of all vice,<sup>267</sup> (iii) affectionally refer to his younger brother Joseph as παιδάριον<sup>268</sup> (“little guy”) (cf. 37:30), similar in this regard to תלך (“child”), and (iv) remind his brothers that they should not only have “listened to” Joseph begging for mercy,

<sup>263</sup> εἰσακούω | With one exception, G consistently translates שמע with ἀκούω and cognates (63/64), but the match εἰσακούω is relatively uncommon (5: 21:17; 34:17, 24; 42:21, 22). G does not use εἰσακούω otherwise.

<sup>264</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 64.2 (PG 54 550.9–44) says that Joseph’s brothers are plagued by “conscience” (τὸ συνειδός) and “become their own accusers” (αὐτοὺς ἑαυτῶν κατηγοροὺς γινομένους), and, now that the stupor of sin has worn off like wine, they are “coming to their senses” (εἰς αἴσθησιν ἐρχομένους), and they recognize the “inhumanity” (ἀπανθρωπία) and “brutality” (ὠμότης) of what they did to Joseph. Cf. *Hom. Gen.* 64.3 (PG 54 551.31–35); Philo, *Ios.* 171; Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 105.

<sup>265</sup> οὐκ | On G’s contextual interpretation of הֲ and Hebrew questions, see §3.1.5.2.

<sup>266</sup> ἀδικήσητε | For G’s regular treatment of the root חטא, see note 259 above. This is the only case where the Hebrew root חטא corresponds to the Greek root ἀδικ-, although G levels a strikingly large number of Hebrew roots, partially or in whole, by his wide use of the roots δικ- and ἀδικ- (see §5.2.2.6). Furthermore, this lexical equivalence is uncommon the Septuagint as a whole (Wevers, *Notes*, 714).

<sup>267</sup> For the ethical significance of ἀδικία and δικαιοσύνη, see §7.4.1 and especially note 75 there.

<sup>268</sup> παιδάριον | See note 83 above.



but also “listened to” (εἰσακούω) him cautioning them,<sup>269</sup> G causes the other brothers’ recognition of their mistake to smart with the pain of remorse from without as well as from within,<sup>270</sup> which feeds into both Joseph’s harmless revenge and the brothers’ heartfelt reversal.<sup>271</sup>

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<sup>272</sup> [= ῖλῃ]) (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

---

<sup>269</sup> 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 αὐτὸν ἀνείλετε).

<sup>270</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 64.3 (PG 54 550.60–63) notes the intensity of having both conscience and Reuben as accuser: Ἐννόησον ὅσον ἐστὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος κατηγορεῖσθαι, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν κατήγορον διηνεκῶς ἔχειν ἐπικείμενον, καταβοῶντα καὶ τὴν παρανομίαν ὑπομινύσκοντα.

<sup>271</sup> 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 αὐτοῖς τῆς μετανοίας, ἐξ ἧς ὄφελος οὐδὲν Ἰωσήπῳ γίνεται). Though Reuben is unaware of it, their delinquent “change of mind/heart” (μετάνοια; cf. μετάνοια in §108) does not come too late and provides great “benefit” (ὄφελος) not only to Joseph but to his entire family.

<sup>272</sup> λύπη | The Hebrew noun ῖלῃ occurs here and in 44:31, where G translates it as ὀδύνη. More often, G uses λύπη to translate לַיָּהּ (3: 3:16, 17; 5:29) and לַיָּהּ (3:16) (cf. לַיָּהּ = λυπέω in 45:5), but he also uses λύπη for לַיָּהּ (44:29) and λυπέω for לַיָּהּ (4:5).

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

הנער    εἶπεν δὲ Ἰούδας πρὸς Ἰσραὴλ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἀπόστειλον τὸ παιδάριον μετ’ ἐμοῦ, καὶ  
           ἀναστάντες πορευσόμεθα, ἵνα ζῶμεν καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ σὺ καὶ ἡ ἀποσκευὴ  
 אנכי אערבנו | תבקשנו    ἡμῶν. 9 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκδέχομαι αὐτόν, ἐκ χειρός μου ζήτησον αὐτόν· ἐὰν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτόν πρὸς σέ  
 וחטאתי    καὶ στήσω αὐτόν ἐναντίον σου, ἡμαρτηκῶς ἔσομαι εἰς σέ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας.

To begin with, G has Judah use παιδάριον<sup>273</sup> (“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., נָעַר (“boy”) and יָלֵד (“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 אנכי אערבנו (“I will stand surety for him”) as ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκδέχομαι<sup>274</sup> αὐτόν (“But as for me, I hereby accept responsibility<sup>275</sup> for him”) (43:9), rendering the Hebrew yiqtol with the Greek performative present and supplying the Greek conjunction δέ<sup>276</sup> to throw the independent personal pronoun into greater relief: Judah takes on this burden

<sup>273</sup> παιδάριον | See note 83 above.

<sup>274</sup> ἐκδέχομαι | In Genesis, the Hebrew verb עָרַב 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.

<sup>275</sup> Ἐκδέχομαι in the sense “take responsibility for” or “stand surety for” is non-Classical but clearly attested by 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE papyri and confirmed by the cognate ἐκδοχή (“[giving of] surety”) (Lee, *Lexical Study*, 59–60; Harl, *La Genèse*, 283; Wevers, *Notes*, 726).

<sup>276</sup> δέ | 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 δέ to represent disjunctive syntax, especially to emphasize a subject pronoun, see §4.1.1.1.

alone. Moreover, G renders the yiqtol תבקשו (“you may seek him”) imperatively as ζήτησον<sup>277</sup> αὐτόν (“seek him!”), thus imparting Judah’s commitment with greater confidence.<sup>278</sup> In addition, by using the Greek future perfect periphrastic construction ἡμαρτηκώς ἔσομαι<sup>279</sup> (“I will be at fault”) to translate the weqatal וְאָשׁוּמָה (“I will be culpable”), G accurately represents the stative and enduring nature of Judah’s pledge.<sup>280</sup> 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 γάρ, καθὰ ἡτέκνωνμαι, ἡτέκνωνμαι (“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” (συκοφαντῆσαι<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>277</sup> ζήτησον | G does not commonly represent the Hebrew yiqtol with the Greek imperative, but for other examples see §6.1.1.2.

<sup>278</sup> Wevers calls this aorist imperative “somewhat more forceful” than the Hebrew yiqtol (*Notes*, 726).

<sup>279</sup> 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.

<sup>280</sup> 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).’”

<sup>281</sup> συκοφαντῆσαι | The *hithpaal* of לָלַח and συκοφαντέω are only found here in Genesis. G consistently represents the *qal* of לָלַח as ἀποκυλίω (3: 29:3, [8]; 43:18), and he does not use ἀποκυλίω otherwise.

[= התגלל “fall upon, attack”])<sup>282</sup> (43:18) 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<sup>283</sup> coinage” (τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν εὐδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχω<sup>284</sup> [= בא אלַי “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<sup>285</sup> [= לַשָּׁלוֹם]) (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:

---

<sup>282</sup> HALOT, s.v. “הִתְגַּלֵּל” *hithpolel* 1; Harl, *La Genèse*, 284; Wevers, *Notes*, 731.

<sup>283</sup> LSJ, s.v. “εὐδοκιμέω” A.I.3; Lee, *Lexical Study*, 61–62; Harl, *La Genèse*, 284–285; Wevers, *Notes*, 733–734; Prestel and Schorch, “Genesis,” 241.

<sup>284</sup> εὐδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχω | Both Hebrew and Greek expressions occur only here in Genesis, and G does not use *εὐδοκιμέω* otherwise, or *ἀπέχω* in the sense “receive” (for the sense “be far away” [= *hiphil*], see 44:4).

<sup>285</sup> Πῶς ἔχετε | For G’s usual treatment of *שָׁלוֹם*, see note 46 above. G only uses the idiom *πῶς ἔχετε* here.

## Genesis 44:4–5

οπηλῶ Τί ὅτι ἀνταπεδώκατε πονηρὰ ἀντὶ καλῶν; ἴνα τί ἐκλέψατέ μου τὸ κόνδυ τὸ ἀργυροῦν; **5** οὐ τοῦτό  
 οπηρη ἐστίν, ἐν ᾧ πίνει ὁ κύριός μου; αὐτὸς δὲ οἰωνισμῷ οἰωνίζεται ἐν αὐτῷ. πονηρὰ συντετέλεσθε,  
 οπηῶν ἃ πεποιήκατε.

First, G translates שָׁלַם (“return, repay”) in the accusation לָמָּה שָׁלַמְתָּם רָעָה תַּחַת טוֹבָה (“Why have you returned evil for good?”) with the doubly compound ἀνταποδίδωμι<sup>286</sup> (“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.<sup>287</sup> 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 הרעתם אשר עשיתם πονηρὰ συντετέλεσθε, ἃ πεποιήκατε.

You have done evil in what you have done. You have completed the evils you have done.

By (i) using the Greek perfect *πεποιήκατε*<sup>288</sup> (“you have done”) for the Hebrew qatal עשיתם (“you did/have done”) and (ii) selecting the humorously ambiguous periphrastic translation *πονηρὰ συντετέλεσθε*<sup>289</sup> (“you have completed the evils”) for הרעתם (“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

<sup>286</sup> *ἀνταποδίδωμι* | The verb *עָנָה* occurs only here in Genesis, but the verbal adjective *עָנָה* occurs three times, and G represents it differently on each occasion: *ἀναπληρώω* (**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 *hiphil* of *עָנָה* (**50:15**) (cf. also *ἀνταπόδομα* [= *עָנָה*] there).

<sup>287</sup> 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 εὐδοεῖ κακία, λανθάνειν δ’ αἰεὶ τεχνάζουσα καταφωράται).

<sup>288</sup> **πεποιήκατε** | On G's use of the perfect indicative for qatal, especially in speech, see §6.1.1.5.

<sup>289</sup> **πονηρὰ συντελέσθε** | The adjective *πονηρός* serves as G's main semantic match for *עָרַע* (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 *עָרַע* (15) and *עָרַר* (3) (see note 297 below). Usually, G uses the verb *συντελέω* to represent the verbal root *כלה* or the noun *כלה*.

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 γένοιτο<sup>290</sup> [= חִלְלָה]) (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<sup>291</sup> [= עוֹן]) 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<sup>292</sup> [= בִּי]) 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).<sup>293</sup> 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 (= נַעַר) again in reference to Benjamin (44:22), as well as the perfect ἐκδέδεκται (= עָרַב) and the perfect periphrasis ἡμαρτηκὼς ἔσομαι (= יַחַטָּאתִי) in relation to Judah’s pledge to serve as surety for his brother

---

<sup>290</sup> μὴ γένοιτο | The Hebrew interjection חִלְלָה 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.

<sup>291</sup> ἀδικία | The Hebrew noun נִזְּעַ occurs four times, and G translates it differently in each case: also as αἰτία (4:13); ἁμαρτία (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 נִזְּעַ and ἀδικία becomes more common in later Septuagintal texts (Wevers, *Notes*, 747).

<sup>292</sup> δέομαι | The self-imprecation בִּי 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 נֶאֱלָא in 19:18 and to translate עָתָר in 25:21.

<sup>293</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 64.6 (PG 54 555.45–46) finds Judah’s appeal ironic, at least where he mentions Joseph’s death: Ἐννόει μοι ἐνταῦθα, τίς ἦν ταῦτα ἀκούων 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

εἶπεν δὲ ὁ παῖς σου ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς Ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε ὅτι δύο ἔτεκέν μοι ἡ γυνή· 28 καὶ  
 ואמר | עד הנה | ἐξῆλθεν ὁ εἷς ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, καὶ εἶπατε ὅτι θηριόβρωτος γέγονεν, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον αὐτὸν ἔτι καὶ νῦν· 29 ἐὰν  
 רעה | γῆρας μετὰ λύπης εἰς ἄδου.  
 οὖν λάβητε καὶ τοῦτον ἐκ προσώπου μου καὶ συμβῇ αὐτῷ μαλακία ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καὶ κατὰξετέ μου τὸ

First, by switching the person of ואמר (“and I said”) into the second person as καὶ εἶπατε<sup>294</sup> (“and you [pl.] said”), G has Judah take responsibility for tricking their father into thinking that Joseph was devoured by a wild animal.<sup>295</sup> 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 ἔτι καὶ νῦν<sup>296</sup> (“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

<sup>294</sup> εἶπατε | For rare cases where G alters a verb’s grammatical person such as here, see §6.1.2.1.

<sup>295</sup> Wevers, Notes, 751: “[G] puts the blame more directly on the brothers εἶπατε: it was you who spoke.” Cf. Prestel and Schorch, “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.

<sup>296</sup> ἔτι καὶ νῦν | G usually translates עד (67) as ἕως (52) (actually ἕως πρὸς in 38:1). The expression ἔτι καὶ νῦν is unique in Genesis, as a representation of עד הנה or otherwise.

translation of גע (‘‘grief,’’ lit. ‘‘evil’’) as λύπη<sup>297</sup> (‘‘grief’’), the same tragic emotion G had Jacob voice in 42:38 (= גִּיל). Furthermore, G translates גִּיל (‘‘agony’’) in the parallel formulation of 44:31 not as he did there, but as ὀδύνη<sup>298</sup> (‘‘pain’’),<sup>299</sup> such that Judah understands that if Benjamin does not return home, their father will die from both ‘‘grief’’ (λύπη) and ‘‘pain’’ (ὀδύνη).<sup>300</sup>

Overcome with emotion at Judah’s reversal,<sup>301</sup> 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<sup>302</sup> moment when Joseph finally ‘‘reveals himself’’

---

<sup>297</sup> λύπη | G usually represents גע (10) as κακός (3: 19:19; 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.

<sup>298</sup> ὀδύνη | G only translates גִּיל (2) as ὀδύνη here (for λύπη in 42:38, see note 272 above). G also uses ὀδύνη in his aetiological translation of the name יוֹנָתָן as Ὀδύνης μου (35:18) (cf. §5.2.2.1).

<sup>299</sup> 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).

<sup>300</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 217–219, 228–229.

<sup>301</sup> 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 ἀδελφὸν 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 ἀδελφοῦ 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’’ (εὐνοία) toward Benjamin exceed his expectations based on ‘‘the things you plotted against me’’ (τῶν περὶ ἐμὲ βεβουλευμένων): τῆς μὲν ἀρετῆς ὑμᾶς καὶ τῆς εὐνοίας τῆς περὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν ἐπαινῶ καὶ κρείττονας ἢ προσεδόκων ἐκ τῶν περὶ ἐμὲ βεβουλευμένων εὕρισκω ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσας ἐπὶ πείρᾳ τῆς ὑμετέρας φιλαδελφίας.

<sup>302</sup> Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 108 uses the language of stagecraft to describe Joseph’s final recognition scene, first asking why he constructed the ‘‘drama’’ (δρᾶμα) of putting his divination cup in Benjamin’s sack, and then



(ἀναγνωρίζομαι<sup>303</sup> [= *חַדַּח* *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).<sup>304</sup> 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

תַּעֲצֹבוּ    καὶ εἶπεν Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, ὃν ἀπέδοσθε εἰς Αἴγυπτον. 5    νῦν οὖν μὴ λυπεῖσθε μηδὲ  
יַחַר בְּעֵינֵיכֶם    σκληρὸν ὑμῖν φανήτω ὅτι ἀπέδοσθέ με ὧδε· εἰς γὰρ ζωὴν ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ θεὸς ἔμπροσθεν ὑμῶν·

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” (λύπη<sup>305</sup> [= *צַב* “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” (ρίψας τὸ προσωπεῖον) and “showed his brotherly face” (τὸ ἀδελφικὸν ἐπέδειξε πρόσωπον). Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 2.6.9 §160 φέρειν ὑπόκρισιν (“keep up the act”).

<sup>303</sup> ἀναγνωρίζομαι | Both the *hithpael* of *חַדַּח* and the verb ἀναγνωρίζομαι only occur here in Genesis. For *חַדַּח* 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).

<sup>304</sup> Wevers suggests that G “heightens the dramatic tension” by omitting מפני in translating כִּי נִבְהִלּוּ מִפְּנֵי as ἐταράχθησαν γάρ (*Notes*, 757).

<sup>305</sup> λύπη | The verbal root *צַב* 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 נִצְבָּה (3) and צָבָה (1) with λύπη or λυπέω (see note 272 above).

them not to find their actions “harsh” (σκληρός<sup>306</sup> [= 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

---

<sup>306</sup> σκληρός | G more typically represents חרה with λύπη and cognates (3: 4:5, 6; 34:7), θυμός (3: 30:2; 39:19; 44:18), or ὀργίζω (31:36). The translation of אל יחר בעיני as Μὴ βαρέως φέρε (31:35) is the closest parallel. For G’s regular association of the roots σκληρ- and קשה, 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” (םטש) (50:15);<sup>307</sup> (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 [= םלש]), just as Joseph’s brothers now worry that he will “repay (them) in exchange” (ἀνταπόδομα ἀνταποδῶ [both = שוב]) for all the evils they committed against him;<sup>308</sup> (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 [= תאשׁתׁת])<sup>309</sup> of “injustice” (ἀδικία [= גשׁף]) 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

---

<sup>307</sup> μνησικαχήση | G only uses the verb μνησικακέω here, and G translates םטש 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).

<sup>308</sup> ἀνταπόδομα ἀνταποδῶ | G does use the singly compound cognate ἀποδίδωμι to translate the *hiphil* of שוב 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.

<sup>309</sup> 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” (ὕμεῖς ἐβουλεύσασθε κατ’ ἐμοῦ εἰς πονηρά), “but God made plans on my behalf for good” (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς ἀγαθά). Here, G reinforces the balanced antithesis of the Hebrew by (i) translating disjunctive-ו appropriately as δέ;<sup>310</sup> (ii) supplying the preposition περὶ in the second clause to balance κατά in the first;<sup>311</sup> and (iii) by representing רעה (“evil”) in the first clause as εἰς πονηρά (“for evil”) by analogy to לטובה (“for good”) in the second.<sup>312</sup> 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” (αἰτία) too great for him “to be forgiven” (ἀφεθῆναι), 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.<sup>313</sup> Furthermore, by casting the Joseph story and the end of Genesis in a tragic light, G anticipates the stories

---

<sup>310</sup> δέ | On this frequent use of δέ, see §4.1.1.1.

<sup>311</sup> περὶ | G does not commonly supply the preposition περὶ (3/35), but cf. 19:21; 40:14. For other residual cases where G adds a preposition, see §3.2.4.5.

<sup>312</sup> εἰς | in comparison to περὶ, G adds εἰς in more cases (33/321), but at the same rate (cf. note 311 above).

<sup>313</sup> 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.

## 10 CONCLUSION

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 τυχῶν ἀνὴρ), since he was able to comprehend and express (ἐχώρησε ἀξέφηνεν) the power of the divine (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν) aptly (κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν), 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.”<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Subl.* 9.9: ταύτη καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν ἀνὴρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐχώρησε ἀξέφηνεν, εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράψας τῶν νόμων “εἶπεν ὁ Θεός”, φησί, —τί; “γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο.”

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> including those

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> In contrast, BdA first produces a literal translation of the Greek in terms of its own textual division, grammar, lexicon, and style,<sup>7</sup> and only then considers revising it in light of its divergence from the Hebrew, its reception history, and French style.<sup>8</sup>

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.

<sup>6</sup> 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).

<sup>7</sup> Marguerite Harl, “La Bible d’Alexandrie. I. The Translation Principles,” in *X Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. Bernard Taylor (Atlanta, SBL Press: 2001), 183–184.

<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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

---

<sup>9</sup> 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).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the reasoned critique of the interlinear paradigm in Jan Joosten, "Reflections on the 'Interlinear Paradigm' in Septuagintal Studies," in *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and J. Jokiranta, JSJSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

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 τυχῶν ἀνὴρ). 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)<sup>11</sup> and to the Greek Pentateuch (by Alexandrian Jews).<sup>12</sup> In general, the

---

<sup>11</sup> 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).

<sup>12</sup> 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 ζήτηματα 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.<sup>13</sup> 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 *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

---

and *Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* [London: Routledge, 2003], 29).

<sup>13</sup> 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, *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.<sup>14</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup> 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

---

<sup>14</sup> *QG* 2.9 (Yonge, 817–818).

<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> 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

---

<sup>16</sup> See van der Louw, "Did the Septuagint Translators Really Intend," 449–466.

<sup>17</sup> Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise."

account for certain mistakes and infelicities in their translations, common examples being the retention of apodotic-*ı* (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.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Anneli Aejmelaesus 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-*ı*] 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.”

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.<sup>19</sup> 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' ἡ οὗτοι ἄνδρες ἐλέους,<br>ὧν αἱ δικαιοσύναι οὐκ ἐπελήσθησαν,         | 10 But these were <u>men of mercy</u> ,<br>whose <u>acts of justice</u> have not been forgotten;              |
| 11 μετὰ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν διαμενεῖ,<br>ἀγαθὴ κληρονομία ἔκγονα αὐτῶν,      | 11 with their offspring it will long remain,<br>their descendants will be a good inheritance.                 |
| 12 ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν<br>καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν δι' αὐτούς, | 12 Their offspring <u>have continued in the covenants</u> ,<br>and their children for their sake.             |
| 13 ἕως αἰῶνος μενεῖ σπέρμα αὐτῶν,<br>καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται,    | 13 Their offspring will remain forever,<br>and <u>their glory will never be wiped away</u> .                  |
| 14 τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐτάφη,<br>καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ζῇ εἰς γενεάς,     | 14 Their bodies were buried in peace,<br>and their names live for generations.                                |
| 15 σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγῶνται λαοί,<br>καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον ἐξαγγέλλει ἐκκλησία.      | 15 <u>Peoples will tell the stories of their wisdom</u> ,<br><u>and the assembly proclaims their praise</u> . |

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.

---

<sup>19</sup> 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 ἐκ πελάγους μεγάλα σαλεύοντες κυβερνῆται, οἷς οὐκ ἡπειρος, οὐκ ὄρος, οὐ βουνὸς, οὐ σκόπελοι τινες τὴν χέρσον σημαίνουσι, πρὸς τινὰς ἀστέρας ἀποβλέποντες, καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνους τὸ σκάφος ῥυθμίζοντες ἀναυάγητοι διαμένουσιν· οἱ δὲ γε τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μαθηταὶ οἱ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τοῦ βίου τούτου τυγχάνοντες, οὐ πρὸς ἀστέρας τινὰς ἀποβλέποντες, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας τὸ ὄνομα τῆς διανοίας τείνοντες, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων ἵχνεσι πόθῳ ψυχῆς ἀκολουθοῦντες, εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λιμένα τῆς βασιλείας 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)

| Ref                | Vorlage                                   | G                                                                      | Harm.            |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1:7                | ויבדל [אלהים]                             | καὶ διεχώρισεν [ὁ θεός]                                                | 1:4              |
| 2:24 <sup>SP</sup> | והיו [שניהם] לבשר אחד                     | καὶ ἔσονται [οἱ δύο] εἰς σάρκα μίαν                                    | 2:25             |
| 3:1                | ויאמר [הנחש] אל האשה                      | καὶ εἶπεν [ὁ ὄφις] τῇ γυναικί                                          | 3:1              |
| 9                  | ויאמר לו [אדם] איכה                       | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ [Ἀδὰμ] ποῦ εἶ                                           | 3:9              |
| 10                 | ויאמר [לו]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                                       |                  |
| 11                 | ויאמר [לו]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                                       |                  |
| 4:10               | ויאמר [אלהים]                             | καὶ εἶπεν [ὁ θεός]                                                     |                  |
| 9:12               | ויאמר אלהים [אל נח]                       | καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεός [πρὸς Νῶε]                                     | 9:8              |
| 12:7 <sup>SP</sup> | ויאמר [לו]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                                       | context          |
| 7                  | ויבן שם [אברם] מזבח                       | καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν ἐκεῖ [Ἀβράμ] θυσιαστήριον                               |                  |
| 11                 | ויהי כאשר הקריב [אברם] לבוא מצרימה        | ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἤγγισεν [Ἀβράμ] εἰσελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον                |                  |
| 11                 | ויאמר [אברם]                              | εἶπεν [Ἀβράμ]                                                          |                  |
| 15:5               | ויאמר [לו]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                                       |                  |
| 6                  | והאמן [אברם] ביהוה                        | καὶ ἐπίστευσεν [Ἀβράμ] τῷ θεῷ                                          |                  |
| 16:8               | ויאמר [לה מלאך יהוה]                      | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου]                                      | 16:7, 9          |
| 13                 | ותקרא [הגר] שם יהוה                       | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν [Ἀγάρ] τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου                                    |                  |
| 15                 | אשר ילדה [לו] הגר                         | ὃν ἔτεκεν [αὐτῷ] Ἀγάρ                                                  | 16:1, 16; passim |
| 17:19              | ויאמר אלהים [אל אברם]                     | εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεός [πρὸς Ἀβραάμ]                                          |                  |
| 18:6               | ויאמר [לה]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῇ]                                                       |                  |
| 19:3               | ומצות אפה [להם]                           | καὶ ἄζύμους ἔπεψεν [αὐτοῖς]                                            | 19:3             |
| 7                  | ויאמר [אלהם]                              | εἶπεν δὲ [πρὸς αὐτούς]                                                 |                  |
| 29                 | בהפך [יהוה] את הערים                      | ἐν τῷ καταστρέψαι [κύριον] τὰς πόλεις                                  |                  |
| 20:5               | והיא גם הוא אמרה [לי]                     | καὶ αὐτῇ [μοι] εἶπεν                                                   |                  |
| 15                 | ויאמר אבימלך [אל אברהם]                   | καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβιμέλεχ [τῷ Ἀβραάμ]                                         |                  |
| 21:9               | ותרא שרה את בן הגר ... מצחק [את יצחק בנה] | ἰδοῦσα δὲ Σάρρα τὸν υἱὸν Ἀγάρ ... παίζοντα [μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς] | 26:8             |
| 26                 | ויאמר [אליו] אבימלך                       | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] Ἀβιμέλεχ                                              | context          |
| 30 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויאמר [אברהם]                             | καὶ εἶπεν [Ἀβραάμ]                                                     | context          |
| 33 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויטע [אברהם] אשל                          | καὶ ἐφύτευσεν [Ἀβραάμ] ἄρουραν                                         | context          |



| Ref              | Vorlage                          | G                                                             | Harm.       |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 22:11            | ויאמר [אליו]                     | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                              |             |
| 23:8             | וידבר אתם [אברהם]                | καὶ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς [Ἀβραάμ]                             |             |
| 24:7             | לד[ו]לזרעך אתן את הארץ הזאת      | [Σοὶ] δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην [καὶ] τῷ σπέρματί σου               | 26:3; 35:12 |
| 14               | ואמרה [אלי]                      | καὶ εἶπη [μοι]                                                | 24:44       |
| 31               | ויאמר [אליו]                     | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                              | context     |
| 25:26            | בלדת אתם [רבקה]                  | ὅτε ἔτεκεν αὐτοὺς [Ῥεβέκκα]                                   |             |
| 31               | ויאמר יעקב [אל עשו]              | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰακώβ [τῷ Ἡσαὺ]                                      |             |
| 33               | ויאמר [אליו] יעקב                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] Ἰακώβ                                        |             |
| 33               | וימכר [עשו] את בכרתו ליעקב       | ἀπέδοτο δὲ [Ἡσαὺ] τὰ πρωτοτόκια τῷ Ἰακώβ                      |             |
| 26:9             | ויאמר [אליו]                     | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                              |             |
| 10               | ויאמר [אליו] אבימלך              | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] Ἀβιμέλεχ                                      | context     |
| 27:10            | בעבר אשר יברכך [אביך] לפני מותו  | ὅπως εὐλογήσῃ σε [ὁ πατήρ σου] πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν        |             |
| 33               | מי אפוא (הוא) הצד [לי] ציד       | Τίς οὖν (-) ὁ θηρεύσας [μοι] θήραν                            | 27:3, 5, 33 |
| 35               | ויאמר [אליו]                     | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ]                                               |             |
| 36               | ויאמר [עשו לאביו]                | καὶ εἶπεν [Ἡσαὺ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ]                               | 27:34       |
| 36               | הלא אצלתי לך ברכה [אבי]          | Οὐχ ὑπελίπω μοι εὐλογίαν [πάτερ]                              | 27:34       |
| 28:19            | ויקרא [יעקב] את שם המקום ההוא    | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν [Ἰακώβ] τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου               |             |
| 29:7             | ויאמר [יעקב]                     | καὶ εἶπεν [Ἰακώβ]                                             |             |
| 19               | ויאמר [אליו] לבן                 | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] Λαβάν                                         |             |
| 23               | ויקח [לבן] את לאה בתו            | καὶ λαβὼν [Λαβάν] Λείαν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ                    |             |
| 23 <sup>SP</sup> | ויבא אליה [יעקב]                 | καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὴν [Ἰακώβ]                               | context     |
| 25               | ויאמר [יעקב] אל לבן              | εἶπεν δὲ [Ἰακώβ] τῷ Λαβάν                                     |             |
| 28               | ויתן לו [לבן] את רחל בתו לו לאשה | καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ [Λαβάν] Ῥαχήλ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ γυναῖκα |             |
| 32               | ותלד בן [ליעקב]                  | καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν [τῷ Ἰακώβ]                                    | passim      |
| 33               | ותהר עוד [לאה]                   | καὶ συνέλαβεν πάλιν [Λεία]                                    |             |
| 33               | ותלד בן [שני] ליעקב              | καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν [(δεύτερον) τῷ Ἰακώβ]                         |             |
| 30:3             | ותאמר [אל יעקב]                  | εἶπεν δὲ [τῷ Ἰακώβ]                                           |             |
| 4                | ותתן לו את בלהה שפחתה [לו] לאשה  | καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Βάλλαν τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτῆς [αὐτῷ] γυναῖκα     | 16:3; 29:28 |
| 23               | ותלד [ליעקב] בן                  | ἔτεκεν [τῷ Ἰακώβ] υἱόν                                        | 30:5        |
| 23               | ותאמר [רחל]                      | εἶπεν δὲ [Ῥαχήλ]                                              |             |
| 29               | ויאמר אליו [יעקב]                | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ [Ἰακώβ]                                         |             |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                     | G                                                                | Harm.   |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 31                  | ויאמר [אליו לבן]                            | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] Λαβάν                                           |         |
| 31                  | ויאמר [אליו] יעקב                           | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] Ἰακώβ                                            |         |
| 34                  | ויאמר [אליו] לבן                            | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] Λαβάν                                            |         |
| 37                  | ויפצל בהן [יעקב] פצלות לבנות                | καὶ ἐλέπισεν αὐτὰς [Ἰακώβ] λεπίσματα λευκά                       |         |
| 31:1                | וישמע [יעקב] את דברי בני לבן                | Ἦκουσεν δὲ [Ἰακώβ] τὰ ῥήματα τῶν υἱῶν Λαβάν                      |         |
| 38                  | זה [לי] עשרים שנה                           | ταῦτά [μοι] εἴκοσι ἔτη                                           | 31:41   |
| 41                  | זה לי עשרים שנה [אנכי] בביתך עבדתך          | ταῦτά μοι εἴκοσι ἔτη [ἐγώ] εἰμι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου<br>ἐδούλευσά σοι | 31:38   |
| 46                  | ויאמר [אליו] לבן                            | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] Λαβάν                                           |         |
| 32:5                | למצא [עבדך] חן בעיניך                       | ἵνα εὕρῃ [ὁ παῖς σου] χάριν ἐναντίον σου                         | 19:19   |
| 8                   | ויאמר [יעקב]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [Ἰακώβ]                                                |         |
| 26                  | ויאמר [אליו]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                                 | 32:28   |
| 28                  | ויאמר [אליו]                                | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ]                                                  | 32:28   |
| 33:1                | ויחץ [יעקב] את הילדים                       | καὶ ἐπιδιείλεν [Ἰακώβ] τὰ παιδιά                                 |         |
| 8                   | למצא [עבדך] חן בעיני אדני                   | ἵνα εὕρῃ [ὁ παῖς σου] χάριν ἐναντίον σου κύριε                   | 19:19   |
| 34:5                | כי טמא [בן חמור] את דינה בתו                | ὅτι ἐμίανεν [ὁ υἱὸς Ἑμμώρ] Δίναν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ              | 34:2    |
| 13                  | וידברו [אליהם]                              | καὶ ἐλάλησαν [αὐτοῖς]                                            |         |
| 14                  | ויאמרו אליהם [שמעון ולוי אחי דינה ובני לאה] | καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς [Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Δίνας υἱοὶ Λεῖας]   | 34:25   |
| 35:5                | ויסעו [ישראל]                               | καὶ ἐξῆρεν [Ἰσραήλ]                                              |         |
| 9 <sup>sp</sup>     | ויברך אתו [אלהים]                           | καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτὸν [ὁ θεός]                                     | 35:9    |
| 16                  | ויסעו [יעקב] מבית אל                        | Ἀπάρας δὲ [Ἰακώβ] ἐκ Βαιθῆλ                                      |         |
| 37:14               | ויאמר לו [ישראל]                            | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ [Ἰσραήλ]                                           |         |
| 17                  | ויאמר [אליו] האיש                           | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] ὁ ἄνθρωπος                                       |         |
| 38:16               | ויאמר [אליה]                                | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῇ]                                                 |         |
| 26                  | צדקה [תמר] ממני                             | Δεδικαίωται [Θαμάρ] ἢ ἐγώ                                        |         |
| 39:11 <sup>sp</sup> | ויהי כהיום הזה ויבא [יוסף] הביתה            | ἐγενετο δὲ τοιαύτη τις ἡμέρα εἰσῆλθεν [Ἰωσήφ] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν     | context |
| 40:18               | ויען יוסף ויאמר [אליו]                      | ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωσήφ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ]                                 |         |
| 41:26               | חלום [פרעה] אחד הוא                         | τὸ ἐνύπνιον [Φαραώ] ἓν ἐστίν                                     | 41:25   |
| 42:24               | ויסב מעליהם ויבך [יוסף]                     | ἀποστραφεὶς δὲ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔκλαυσεν [Ἰωσήφ]                        |         |
| 43:7                | כי יאמר [אלינו]                             | εἰ ἔρεῖ [ἡμῖν]                                                   | 42:33   |
| 23                  | ויאמר [אליהם]                               | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτοῖς]                                                | context |
| 27                  | ויאמר [אליהם]                               | καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτοῖς]                                               | 14:19   |

| Ref             | Vorlage                        | G                                                   | Harm.                   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 28              | ויקדו וישתחו [לו]              | καὶ κύψαντες προσεκύνησαν [αὐτῷ]                    | 43:26                   |
| 44:1            | ויצו [יוסף] את אשר על ביתו     | Καὶ ἐνετείλατο [Ἰωσήφ] τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ |                         |
| 17              | ויאמר [יוסף]                   | εἶπεν δὲ [Ἰωσήφ]                                    |                         |
| 20              | וילד זקנים קטן [לו]            | καὶ παῖδιον γήρως νεώτερον [αὐτῷ]                   | 37:3                    |
| 25              | ויאמר [אלינו] אבינו            | εἶπεν δὲ [ἡμῖν] ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν                        | 43:2                    |
| 46:33           | ואמר [אליכם]                   | καὶ εἶπη [ὑμῖν]                                     | 47:3                    |
| 47:16           | ויאמר [אליהם] יוסף             | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτοῖς] Ἰωσήφ                             |                         |
| 20              | כי מכרו מצרים איש שדהו [לפרעה] | ἀπέδοντο γὰρ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν [τῷ Φαραῷ]  | 47:20                   |
| 22              | רק אדמת הכהנים לא קנה [יוסף]   | χωρὶς τῆς γῆς τῶν ἱερέων μόνον οὐκ ἐκτήσατο [Ἰωσήφ] |                         |
| 48:4            | ונתתי [לך] את הארץ הזאת        | καὶ δώσω [σοι] τὴν γῆν ταύτην                       | 17:8; 26:3; 28:4; 35:12 |
| 8 <sup>sp</sup> | מי [לך] אלה                    | Τίνες [σοι] οὗτοι                                   |                         |
| 9               | ויאמר [יעקב]                   | καὶ εἶπεν [Ἰακώβ]                                   |                         |
| 12              | וישתחו [לו] לאפיו ארצה         | καὶ προσεκύνησαν [αὐτῷ] ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς    | passim                  |
| 13              | ויגש [אתם] אליו                | ἤγγισεν [αὐτοὺς] αὐτῷ                               | 48:10                   |
| 17              | ויתמך [יוסף] יד אביו           | καὶ ἀντελάβετο [Ἰωσήφ] τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ  |                         |
| 50:24           | אשר נשבע [אלהים לאבותינו]      | ἦν ὥμοσεν [ὁ θεὸς τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν]               |                         |

### Plus: expanded participant (36)

| Ref                | Vorlage                                   | G                                                               | Harm. |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 4:25               | וידע אדם עוד את [חוה] אשתו                | Ἔγνω δὲ Ἀδὰμ [Εὐάν] τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ                           | 4:1   |
| 6:1                | ויוולד נח [שלשה בנים] את שם את חם ואת יפת | καὶ ἐγέννησεν Νῶε [τρεῖς υἱούς] τὸν Σὴμ τὸν Χάμ τὸν Ἰάφεθ       | 6:10  |
| 14:14              | כי נשבה [לוט] אחיו                        | ὅτι ἡχμαλωτεύθη [Λῶτ] ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ                           | 14:16 |
| 18:17              | המכסה אני מאברהם [עבדי] אשר אני עשה       | Μὴ κρύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ [τοῦ παιδός μου] ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ             | 26:24 |
| 21:8 <sup>sp</sup> | ביום הגמל את יצחק [בנו]                   | ἥ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπεγαλακτίσθη Ἰσαὰκ [ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ]                      | 21:6  |
| 22:1               | ויאמר אליו אברהם [אברהם]                  | καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Ἀβραάμ [Ἀβραάμ]                            | 22:11 |
| 13                 | ויעלה לעלה תחת [יצחק] בנו                 | καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτόν εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἀντὶ [Ἰσαὰκ] τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ |       |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                     | G                                                                          | Harm.   |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 24:3                | אשר לא תקח אשה לבני [ליצחק]<br>מבנות הכנעני | ἵνα μὴ λάβῃς γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου [Ἰσαὰκ] ἀπὸ τῶν<br>θυγατέρων τῶν Χαναναίων | 24:4    |
| 7                   | ולקחת אשה לבני [ליצחק] משם                  | καὶ λήμψῃ γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου [Ἰσαὰκ] ἐκεῖθεν                               |         |
| 14 <sup>sp</sup>    | כי עשית חסד עם אדני [אברהם]                 | ὅτι ἐποίησας ἔλεος τῷ κυρίῳ μου [Ἀβραάμ]                                   | context |
| 60                  | ויברכו את רבקה [אחתם]                       | καὶ εὐλόγησαν Ῥεβέκκαν [τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν]                                 | 24:59   |
| 67                  | וינחם יצחק אחרי [שרה] אמו                   | καὶ παρεκλήθη Ἰσαὰκ περὶ [Σάρρας] τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ                         | context |
| 25:5 <sup>sp</sup>  | ויתן אברהם את כל אשר לו ליצחק<br>[בנו]      | Ἐδωκεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ Ἰσαὰκ [τῷ<br>υἱῷ αὐτοῦ]          | 21:6    |
| 21                  | ויעתר יצחק ליהוה לנכח [רבקה]<br>אשתו        | ἐδεῖτο δὲ Ἰσαὰκ κυρίου περὶ [Ῥεβέκκας] τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ                  |         |
| 26:5 <sup>sp</sup>  | עקב אשר שמע אברהם [אביך] בקלי               | ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπήκουσεν Ἀβραάμ [ὁ πατήρ σου] τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς                      | 26:3    |
| 7                   | וישאלו אנשי המקום ל[רבקה] אשתו              | Ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου [περὶ Ῥεβέκκας] τῆς<br>γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ    | 25:21   |
| 18                  | אחרי מות אברהם [אביו]                       | μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν Ἀβραάμ [τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ]                                |         |
| 27:30               | כאשר כלה יצחק לברך את יעקב<br>[בנו]         | μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι Ἰσαὰκ εὐλογοῦντα Ἰακώβ [τὸν υἱὸν<br>αὐτοῦ]               |         |
| 34                  | כשמע עשו את דברי [יצחק] אביו                | ἤνικα ἤκουσεν Ἡσαὺ τὰ ῥήματα [Ἰσαὰκ] τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ                      |         |
| 28:4 <sup>sp</sup>  | ויתן לך את ברכת אברהם [אבי]                 | καὶ δῶך σοι τὴν εὐλογίαν Ἀβραάμ [τοῦ πατρὸς μου]                           | 26:3    |
| 29:9                | ורחל [בת לבן] באה                           | καὶ Ῥαχὴλ [ἡ θυγάτηρ Λαβὰν] ἤρχετο                                         |         |
| 30:5                | ותהר בלהה [שפחת רחל]                        | καὶ συνέλαβεν Βάλλα [ἡ παιδίσκη Ῥαχὴλ]                                     | 30:7    |
| 31:22               | ויגד ללבן [הארמי]                           | ἀνηγγέλη δὲ Λαβὰν [τῷ Σύρῳ]                                                | 21:20   |
| 32                  | כי רחל [אשתו] גנבתם                         | ὅτι Ῥαχὴλ [ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ] ἔκλεψεν αὐτούς                                    |         |
| 32:5                | ואשלחה להגיד לאדני [לעשו]                   | καὶ ἀπέστειλα ἀναγγεῖλαι τῷ κυρίῳ μου [Ἡσαὺ]                               | 32:5    |
| 33:1                | והנה עשו [אחיו] בא                          | καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἡσαὺ [ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ] ἐρχόμενος                                  |         |
| 34:27               | העיר אשר טמאו [דינה] אחותם                  | τὴν πόλιν ἐν ἣ ἑμίαναν [Δίναν] τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν                           |         |
| 35:7                | בברחו מפני [עשו] אחיו                       | ἐν τῷ ἀποδιδράσκειν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ προσώπου [Ἡσαὺ] τοῦ<br>ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ         |         |
| 36:39               | וימלך תחתיו הדר [בן בדד]                    | καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Ἀδὰδ [υἱὸς Βαράδ]                               | 36:35   |
| 37:2                | ויבא יוסף את דבתם רעה אל<br>[ישראל] אביהם   | κατήνεγκεν δὲ Ἰωσήφ ψόγον πονηρὸν πρὸς [Ἰσραήλ] τὸν<br>πατέρα αὐτῶν        |         |
| 38:13 <sup>sp</sup> | ויגד לתמר [כלתו]                            | καὶ ἀπηγγέλη Θαμάρ [τῇ νύμφῃ αὐτοῦ]                                        | 38:11   |
| 40:17               | מכל מאכל [המלך] פרעה                        | ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν γενῶν ὧν [ὁ βασιλεὺς] Φαραὼ ἐσθίει                          |         |
| 43:16               | וירא יוסף אתם [ו]את בנימין [אחיו]           | εἶδεν δὲ Ἰωσήφ αὐτούς [καὶ] τὸν Βενιαμὴν [τὸν ἀδελφὸν<br>αὐτοῦ]            | 43:29   |
| 45:21               | על פי פרעה [המלך]                           | κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ Φαραὼ [τοῦ βασιλέως]                                  |         |
| 26                  | עוד [בגד] יוסף חי                           | [Ὁ υἱός σου] Ἰωσήφ ζῇ                                                      |         |

| Ref                | Vorlage           | G                            | Harm.   |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------|
| 48:7 <sup>SP</sup> | מתה עלי רחל [אמד] | ἀπέθανεν Ῥαχὴλ [ἡ μήτηρ σου] | context |

Plus: 1 (45)

| Ref                 | Vorlage              | G                                                |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1:11 <sup>SP</sup>  | [ו] עץ פרי           | [καὶ] ξύλον κάρπιμον                             |
| 26 <sup>SP</sup>    | בצלמנו [ו] כדמותנו   | κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν [καὶ] καθ' ὁμοίωσιν         |
| 3:16 <sup>SP</sup>  | [ו] אל האשה          | [καὶ] τῇ γυναικί                                 |
| 5:3 <sup>SP</sup>   | בדמותו [ו] כצלמו     | κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ [καὶ] κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ |
| 6:4 <sup>SP</sup>   | [ו] הנפלים           | οἱ [δὲ] γίγαντες                                 |
| 15 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] חמשים אמה        | [καὶ] πεντήκοντα πήγχεων                         |
| 19 <sup>SP</sup>    | ומכל החי [ו] מכל בשר | καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων [καὶ] ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκός |
| 20 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] מכל רמש          | [καὶ] ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν                     |
| 8:17 <sup>SP</sup>  | [ו] כל החיה          | [καὶ] πάντα τὰ θηρία                             |
| 19 <sup>SP</sup>    | אתו [ו] כל החיה      | μετ' αὐτοῦ [καὶ] πάντα τὰ θηρία                  |
| 9:2 <sup>SP</sup>   | [ו] בכל אשר תרמש     | [καὶ] ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα                     |
| 7 <sup>SP</sup>     | ורבו [ו] שרצו        | καὶ πληθύνεσθε [καὶ] πληρώσατε                   |
| 10 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] בבהמה            | [καὶ] ἀπὸ κτηνῶν                                 |
| 11:26 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו] את נחור          | [καὶ] τὸν Ναχὼρ                                  |
| 27 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] את נחור          | [καὶ] τὸν Ναχὼρ                                  |
| 14:2 <sup>SP</sup>  | [ו] שנאב             | [καὶ] Σενναὰρ                                    |
| 17:4 <sup>SP</sup>  | [ו] אני              | [Καὶ] ἐγώ                                        |
| 16 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] מלכי עמים        | [καὶ] βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν                             |
| 19 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] לזרעו            | [καὶ] τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ                          |
| 18:5 <sup>SP</sup>  | [ו] אחר              | [καὶ] μετὰ τοῦτο                                 |
| 20:16 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו] לכל אשר אתך      | [καὶ] πάσαις ταῖς μετὰ σοῦ                       |
| 21:23 <sup>SP</sup> | ולנכדי [ו] כחסד      | τὸ ὄνομά μου [ἀλλὰ] κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην         |
| 24:21 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו] מחריש            | [καὶ] παρεσιώπα                                  |
| 55 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו] אחר              | [καὶ] μετὰ ταῦτα                                 |
| 31:36 <sup>SP</sup> | מה פשעי [ו] מה חטאתי | Τί τὸ ἀδίκημά μου [καὶ] τί τὸ ἀμάρτημά μου       |
| 37 <sup>SP</sup>    | אחרי [ו] כי מששת     | ὀπίσω μου [καὶ] ὅτι ἠρεύνησας                    |
| 34:27 <sup>SP</sup> | ויצאו [ו] בני יעקב   | καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ [δὲ] υἱοὶ Ἰακώβ                   |
| 35:24 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו] בני רחל          | υἱοὶ [δὲ] Ῥαχὴλ                                  |
| 36:10 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו] אלה              | [καὶ] ταῦτα                                      |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                              | G |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 20 <sup>SP</sup>    | אלה[ו] Oὗτοι [δὲ]                                    |   |
| 27 <sup>SP</sup>    | אלה[ו] οὗτοι [δὲ]                                    |   |
| 28 <sup>SP</sup>    | אלה[ו] οὗτοι [δὲ]                                    |   |
| 37:27 <sup>SP</sup> | אחינו [ו]בשרנו ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν [καὶ] σὰρξ ἡμῶν          |   |
| 41:23 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו]שדפות קדים [καὶ] ἀνεμόφθοροι                      |   |
| 27 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו]שדפות הקדים [καὶ] ἀνεμόφθοροι                     |   |
| 34 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו]יעשה [καὶ] ποιησάτω                               |   |
| 55 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו]אשר [καὶ] ὁ ἐάν                                   |   |
| 42:19 <sup>SP</sup> | לכו [ו]הביאו βαδίσατε [καὶ] ἀπαγάγετε                |   |
| 43:16 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו]את בנימין [καὶ] τὸν Βενιαμὶν                      |   |
| 44:16 <sup>SP</sup> | לאדני [ו]מה נדבר τῷ κυρίῳ [ἢ] τί λαλήσωμεν           |   |
| 16 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו]האלהים ὁ [δὲ] θεὸς                                |   |
| 46:16 <sup>SP</sup> | וחגי [ו]שוני καὶ Ἀγγίς [καὶ] Σαυνίς                  |   |
| 19 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ו]בני רחל υἱοὶ [δὲ] Παχὴλ                           |   |
| 49:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | נפשי [ו]בקהלם ἡ ψυχὴ μου [καὶ] ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν |   |
| 50:20 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו]אלהים ὁ [δὲ] θεὸς                                 |   |

#### Plus: כל (35)

| Ref   | Vorlage                                                                                  | G | Harm.         |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| 2:20  | ול[כל] עוף השמים καὶ [πᾶσιν] τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ                                  |   | 2:19          |
| 6:20  | מ[כל] העוף למינהו ἀπὸ [πάντων] τῶν ὀρνέων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος                        |   | 8:20          |
| 20    | ומ[כל] הבהמה למינה καὶ ἀπὸ [πάντων] τῶν κτηνῶν κατὰ γένος                                |   | 8:20          |
| 7:20  | ויכסו [כל] ההרים καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν [πάντα] τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά                                  |   | 7:19          |
| 23    | אשר על פני [כל] האדמה ὁ ἦν ἐπὶ προσώπου [πάσης] τῆς γῆς                                  |   | 7:3; 8:9      |
| 8:9   | כי מים על [כל] פני כל הארץ ὅτι ὕδωρ ἦν ἐπὶ [παντί] προσώπω πάσης τῆς γῆς                 |   | 41:56         |
| 9:11  | לשחת [כל] הארץ τοῦ καταφθεῖραι [πᾶσαν] τὴν γῆν                                           |   | 6:17;<br>9:15 |
| 11:1  | ויהי כל הארץ שפה אחת ודברים אחדים [לכלם] Καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἓν καὶ φωνὴ μία [πᾶσιν] |   | 11:6          |
| 12:5  | ואת [כל] הנפש אשר עשו בחר καὶ [πᾶσαν] ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτήσαντο ἐν Χαρράν                       |   | passim        |
| 18:19 | את [כל] אשר דבר עליו [πάντα] ὅσα ἐλάλησεν πρὸς αὐτόν                                     |   | 28:15<br>(G)  |
| 24    | ולא תשא ל[כל ה]מקום οὐκ ἀνήσεις [πάντα τὸν] τόπον                                        |   | 18:26         |
| 19:25 | ו[כל] צמח האדמה καὶ [πάντα] τὰ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐκ τῆς γῆς                                    |   | context       |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                        | G                                                                                   | Harm.        |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 29                  | בשחת אלהים את [כל] ערי הככר                    | ἐν τῷ ἐκτρίψαι τὸν θεὸν [πάσας] τὰς πόλεις τῆς περιόικου                            |              |
| 20:8 <sup>sp</sup>  | וייראו [כל] האנשים מאד                         | ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ [πάντες] οἱ ἄνθρωποι σφόδρα                                           |              |
| 24:22               | ויהי כאשר כלו [כל] הגמלים<br>לשתות             | ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἐπαύσαντο [πᾶσαι] αἱ κάμηλοι πίνουσai                              |              |
| 26:11               | [כל] הנגע באיש הזה ובאשתו מות<br>יומת          | [Πᾶς] ὁ ἀπτόμενος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου ἢ τῆς γυναικὸς<br>αὐτοῦ θανάτῳ ἔνοχος ἔσται   |              |
| 28:15               | עד אשר אם עשיתי את [כל] אשר<br>דברתי לך        | ἕως τοῦ ποιῆσαί με [πάντα] ὅσα ἐλάλησά σοι                                          | 18:19<br>(G) |
| 30:32               | כל שֶׁהוּא חוס בכשבים ו[כל] טלוא<br>ונקד בעזים | πᾶν πρόβατον φαῖδον ἐν τοῖς ἀρνάσιν καὶ [πᾶν] διάλευκον<br>καὶ ῥαντὸν ἐν ταῖς αἰξίν |              |
| 31:9                | ויצל אלהים את [כל] מקנה אביכם                  | καὶ ἀφείλατο ὁ θεὸς [πάντα] τὰ κτήνη τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν                                | 31:18        |
| 23                  | ויקה את [כל] אחיו עמו                          | καὶ παραλαβὼν [πάντας] τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ                              | passim       |
| 32:23 <sup>sp</sup> | ויעבר את [כל] אשר לו                           | καὶ διεβίβασεν [πάντα] τὰ αὐτοῦ                                                     | 31:21        |
| 34:30               | להבאישני ב[כל] ישב הארץ                        | ὥστε πονηρόν με εἶναι [πᾶσιν] τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν γῆν                              |              |
| 36:6                | ואת [כל] מקנהו                                 | καὶ [πάντα] τὰ ὑπάρχοντα                                                            | 31:18        |
| 41:30               | ב[כל] ארץ מצרים                                | ἐν [ὅλῃ] γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ                                                                 | 41:29        |
| 38                  | ויאמר פרעה אל [כל] עבדיו                       | καὶ εἶπεν Φαραὼ [πᾶσιν] τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ                                           | 40:20        |
| 56                  | וישבר ל[כל] מצרים                              | καὶ ἐπώλει [πᾶσιν] τοῖς Αἰγυπτίους                                                  | 41:55        |
| 45:2                | וישמעו [כל] מצרים                              | ἤκουσαν δὲ [πάντες] οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι                                                    | 47:15        |
| 18                  | ואתנה לכם את טוב [כל] (ארץ)<br>מצרים           | καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν [πάντων] τῶν ἀγαθῶν (-) Αἰγύπτου                                      | 45:20        |
| 23                  | מטוב [כל] מצרים                                | ἀπὸ [πάντων] τῶν ἀγαθῶν Αἰγύπτου                                                    | 45:18        |
| 46:6                | ואת [כל] רכושם אשר רכשו בארץ                   | καὶ [πᾶσαν] τὴν κτήσιν ἣν ἐκτήσαντο ἐν γῇ Χανάαν                                    | 31:18        |
| 47:14               | ויבא יוסף את [כל] הכסף ביתה<br>פרעה            | καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν Ἰωσήφ [πᾶν] τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὸν οἶκον<br>Φαραὼ                       | ibid.        |
| 23                  | ויאמר יוסף אל [כל] העם                         | εἶπεν δὲ Ἰωσήφ [πᾶσιν] τοῖς Αἰγυπτίους                                              | 47:15        |
| 24                  | ול[כל] אשר בבתיכם                              | καὶ [πᾶσιν] τοῖς ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις ὑμῶν                                                |              |
| 50:8                | ו[כל] בית אביו                                 | καὶ [πᾶσα] ἡ οἰκία ἡ πατρικὴ αὐτοῦ                                                  | ibid.        |
| 22                  | ו[כל] בית אביו                                 | καὶ [πᾶσα] ἡ πανοικία τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ                                              | 50:8         |

#### Plus: speech formula (7)

| Ref   | Vorlage                | G                                           | Harm. |
|-------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| 4:25  | ותקרא את שמו שת [לאמר] | καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Σῆθ [λέγουσα] |       |
| 17:17 | ויאמר בלבו [לאמר]      | καὶ εἶπεν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ [λέγων]             |       |

| Ref   | Vorlage                          | G                                                  | Harm. |
|-------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 18:9  | [ויען] ויאמר                     | ὁ [δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς] εἶπεν                            | 18:27 |
| 23:10 | [וואמר] ויען עפרון החתי את אברהם | ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἐφρών ὁ Χετταῖος πρὸς Ἀβραάμ [εἶπεν] |       |
| 41:17 | [לאמר] וידבר פרעה אל יוסף        | ἐλάλησεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ [λέγων]                 |       |
| 43:5  | [לאמר] כי האיש אמר אלינו         | ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος εἶπεν ἡμῖν [λέγων]                  |       |
| 50:24 | [לאמר] ויאמר יוסף אל אחיו        | καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωσήφ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ [λέγων]        |       |

### Plus: other (255)

| Ref              | Vorlage                                                                         | G                                                                                                                                                         | Harm.                |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1:6              | [ויהי כן] בין מים למים                                                          | ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος καὶ ὕδατος [καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως]                                                                                                           | 1:9, 11, 15, 24      |
| 8                | [וירא אלהים כי טוב] לרקיע שמים                                                  | τὸ στερέωμα οὐρανόν [καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν]                                                                                                          | 1:10, 12, 18, 21, 25 |
| 9                | ויהי כן [ויקוו המים מתחת השמים אל מקויהם ותרא היבשה]                            | καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως [καὶ συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ὥφθη ἡ ξηρά]                                                    | 1:9                  |
| 11               | [למינהו] דשא עשב מזריע זרע                                                      | βοτάνην χόρτου σπείρον σπέρμα [κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα]                                                                                             | 1:12                 |
| 12               | [פרי] עשה פרי                                                                   | καὶ ξύλον [κάρπιμον] ποιοῦν καρπὸν                                                                                                                        | 1:11                 |
| 12               | [על הארץ] אשר זרעו בו למינהו                                                    | οὗ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ γένος [ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς]                                                                                                       | 1:11                 |
| 14 <sup>sp</sup> | [להאיר על הארץ] יהי מארת ...                                                    | Γενηθῆτωσαν φωστῆρες ... [εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς]                                                                                                             | 1:15                 |
| 20               | [ויהי כן] על פני רקיע השמים                                                     | κατὰ τὸ στερέωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως]                                                                                                          | 1:15, 24             |
| 28               | ורדו בדגת הים ובעוף השמים ובכל [הבהמה] ובכל הארץ ובכל הרמש [הרמש] הרמשת על הארץ | καὶ ἄρχετε τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάντων [τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν] τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς | 1:26                 |
| 30               | [רמש] רומש על הארץ ולכל                                                         | καὶ παντὶ [ἐρπετῷ] ἔρποντι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς                                                                                                                    | 1:26                 |
| 2:4              | [זה] [ספר] תולדות השמים והארץ                                                   | (Αὕτη) [ἡ βίβλος] γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς                                                                                                                | 5:1                  |
| 15               | [אשר יצר] את האדם                                                               | τὸν ἄνθρωπον [ὃν ἔπλασεν]                                                                                                                                 | 2:8                  |
| 19 <sup>sp</sup> | [עוד] מן האדמה ויצר יהוה אלהים                                                  | καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς [ἔτι] ἐκ τῆς γῆς                                                                                                                       |                      |
| 23 <sup>sp</sup> | [ה] לקחה זאת כי מאיש                                                            | ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς [αὐτῆς] ἐλήμφθη                                                                                                                         |                      |
| 3:10             | את קלך שמעתי [מתהלך] בגן                                                        | Τὴν φωνήν σου ἤκουσα [περιπατοῦντος] ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ                                                                                                      | 3:8                  |
| 24               | ויגרש את האדם וישכן מקדם לגן עדן [וישם] את הכרבים                               | καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ κατώκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς [καὶ ἔταξεν] τὰ χερουβὶμ                                                     |                      |



| Ref               | Vorlage                                                         | G                                                                                               | Harm.                                  |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 4:8 <sup>SP</sup> | ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו [נלכה<br>[השדה]                           | καὶ εἶπεν Κάιν πρὸς Ἀβελ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ<br>[Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον]                         |                                        |
| 25                | [ותהר] ותלד בן                                                  | [καὶ συλλαβοῦσα] ἔτεκεν υἱὸν                                                                    | 4:1                                    |
| 5:27              | כל ימי מתושלח [אשר חי]                                          | πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι Μαθουσάλα [ἃς ἔζησεν]                                                           | 5:5                                    |
| 6:19              | [ומכל הבהמה ומכל הרמש] ומכל<br>החי                              | [καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν<br>ἐρπετῶν] καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων             | 8:17                                   |
| 19                | [שנים] שנים                                                     | δύο [δύο]                                                                                       | 7:9, 15                                |
| 20                | מכל רמש [הרמש על] האדמה                                         | καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν [τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ] τῆς<br>γῆς                                        | 1:26                                   |
| 20                | [שנים] שנים                                                     | δύο [δύο]                                                                                       | 7:9, 15                                |
| 20                | יבאו אליך להחיות [אתך זכר<br>ונקבה]                             | εἰσελεύσονται πρὸς σὲ τρέφεσθαι [μετὰ σοῦ ἄρσεν καὶ<br>θῆλυ]                                    | 6:19                                   |
| 7:2 <sup>SP</sup> | [שנים] שנים                                                     | δύο [δύο]                                                                                       | 7:9,15                                 |
| 3 <sup>SP</sup>   | גם מעוף השמים [הטהור] שבעה<br>שבעה                              | ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [τῶν καθαρῶν] ἑπτὰ<br>ἑπτὰ                                         | 7:2                                    |
| 3                 | זכר ונקבה [ומהעוף אשר לא טהור<br>שנים שנים זכר ונקבה] לחיות זרע | ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ [καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν μὴ<br>καθαρῶν δύο δύο ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ] διαθρέψαι σπέρμα | 7:2                                    |
| 8 <sup>SP</sup>   | ו[מ]כל אשר רמש על האדמה                                         | καὶ [ἀπὸ] πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς                                                    |                                        |
| 16                | ויסגר יהוה בעדו [את התבה]                                       | καὶ ἔκλεισεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ [τὴν<br>κιβωτόν]                                        | context                                |
| 17                | ארבעים יום [וארבעים לילה]                                       | τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας [καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας]                                                   | 7:4, 12                                |
| 20                | ויכסו [כל] ההרים [הגבהים]                                       | καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν πάντα τὰ ὄρη [τὰ ὑψηλά]                                                          | 7:19                                   |
| 8:1               | ואת כל הבהמה [ואת כל הרמש]<br>ואת כל הרמש]                      | καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν [καὶ πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν<br>καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν]                       | 8:19                                   |
| 7                 | וישלח את הערב [לראות הקלו<br>המים]                              | καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν κόρακα [τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ<br>ὔδωρ]                                   | 8:8                                    |
| 12                | [ויסף (-)] שלח                                                  | [πάλιν] ἐξαπέστειλεν                                                                            | 8:10                                   |
| 13                | באחת ויש מאות שנה [לחיי נח]                                     | ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ καὶ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει [ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τοῦ Νῶε]                                              | 7:11                                   |
| 13                | את מכסה התבה [אשר עשה]                                          | τὴν στέγην τῆς κιβωτοῦ [ἣν ἐποίησεν]                                                            | 8:6                                    |
| 13                | והנה חרבו [המים מעל] פני<br>האדמה                               | ὅτι ἐξέλιπεν [τὸ ὔδωρ ἀπὸ] προσώπου τῆς γῆς                                                     | 8:8                                    |
| 19                | כל [רמש] רמש על הארץ                                            | καὶ πᾶν [ἐρπετόν] κινούμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς                                                        | 1:28 (LXX),<br>30 (LXX);<br>7:14; 8:17 |
| 21                | כי יצר לב האדם [רק] רע                                          | ὅτι ἔγκειται ἡ διάνοια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ἐπιμελῶς] ἐπὶ<br>τὰ πονηρὰ                                 | 6:5                                    |

| Ref                | Vorlage                                                                                                                                                 | G                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Harm.                       |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 21                 | ולא אסף עוד להכות את כל [בשר] חי                                                                                                                        | οὐ προσθήσω οὐν ἔτι πατάξαι πᾶσαν [σάρκα] ζῶσαν                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 6:19; 7:21                  |
| 9:1                | ומלאו את הארץ [וכבשה]                                                                                                                                   | καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν [καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 1:28                        |
| 11                 | ולא יהיה עוד מבול [מים] לשחת [כל] הארץ                                                                                                                  | καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι κατακλυσμὸς [ὑδατος] τοῦ καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν                                                                                                                                                                               | 6:17                        |
| 14                 | [ה]קשת[י]                                                                                                                                               | τὸ τόξον [μου]                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 9:13                        |
| 10:2               | ויון [ואלישה] ותבל                                                                                                                                      | καὶ Ἰωὺαν [καὶ Ἑλισὰ] καὶ Θοβέλ                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 10:2                        |
| 22                 | וארם [וקינן]                                                                                                                                            | καὶ Ἀράμ [καὶ Καϊνάν]                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                             |
| 24                 | וארפכשד ילד [את קינן וקינן ילד] את שלח                                                                                                                  | καὶ Ἀρφαξὰδ ἐγέννησεν [τὸν Καϊνάν καὶ Καϊνάν ἐγέννησεν] τὸν Σάλα                                                                                                                                                                                   |                             |
| 32 <sup>SP</sup>   | מאלה נפרדו [אי] הגוים בארץ                                                                                                                              | ἀπὸ τούτων διεσπάρησαν [νησοι] τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς                                                                                                                                                                                               | 10:5                        |
| 11:8 <sup>SP</sup> | ויחדלו לבנת העיר [ואת המגדל]                                                                                                                            | καὶ ἐπαύσαντο οἰκοδομοῦντες τὴν πόλιν [καὶ τὸν πύργον]                                                                                                                                                                                             | 11:5                        |
| 11 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 13                 | ויחי ארפכשד אחרי הולידו [את קינן שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה ויולד בנים ובנות וימת ויחי קינן שלשים שנה ומאת שנה ויולד את שלח ויהי קינן אחרי הולידו] את שלח | καὶ ἔζησεν Ἀρφαξὰδ μετὰ τὸ γεννηῖσθαι αὐτὸν [τὸν Καϊνάν ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν Καὶ ἔζησεν Καϊνάν ἔτη ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σάλα καὶ ἔζησεν Καϊνάν μετὰ τὸ γεννηῖσθαι αὐτὸν] τὸν Σάλα |                             |
| 13 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 15 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 17 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 19 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 21 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 23 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 25 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויולד בנים ובנות [וימת]                                                                                                                                 | καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας [καὶ ἀπέθανεν]                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31 |
| 32                 | ימי תרח [בחרן]                                                                                                                                          | αἱ ἡμέραι Θάρα [ἐν Χαρρὰν]                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 11:32                       |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                | G                                                                        | Harm.      |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 12:6                | ויעבר אברם בארץ [לארכה]                | καὶ διώδυσεν Ἀβράμ τὴν γῆν [εἰς τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς]                          | 13:17      |
| 8                   | ויט [שם] אהלה                          | καὶ ἔσθησεν [ἐκεῖ] τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ                                      |            |
| 19                  | הנה אשתך [לפניך]                       | ἰδοὺ ἡ γυνή σου [ἐναντίον σου]                                           | 24:51      |
| 20 <sup>SP</sup>    | ואת אשתו ואת כל אשר לו [ולוט עמו]      | καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἦν αὐτῷ [καὶ Λῶτ μετ' αὐτοῦ]         | 13:1       |
| 13:9                | הלא [הנה] כל הארץ לפניך                | οὐκ [ἰδοὺ] πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον σου ἐστίν                                  |            |
| 14:10 <sup>SP</sup> | וינסו מלך סדם ו[מלך] עמרה              | ἔφυγεν δὲ βασιλεὺς Σοδόμων καὶ [βασιλεὺς] Γομόρρας                       | context    |
| 14                  | וירדף [אחריהם] עד דן                   | καὶ κατεδίωξεν [ὀπίσω αὐτῶν] ἕως Δάν                                     |            |
| 16                  | וישב את כל (ה)רכש [סדם]                | καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν πᾶσαν τὴν ἵππον [Σοδόμων]                                 |            |
| 15:13               | וענו אתם [והרעו אתם]                   | καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτούς [καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς]                         | Deut 26:6  |
| 14                  | ואחרי כן יצאו [הנה]                    | μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται [ὧδε]                                         | 15:16      |
| 21 <sup>SP</sup>    | ואת הכנעני [ואת החוי] ואת הגרשני       | καὶ τοὺς Χαναναίους [καὶ τοὺς Εὐαίους] καὶ τοὺς Γεργεσαίους              | Exod 23:23 |
| 17:10               | ובין זרעך אחריו [לדרתם]                | καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματός σου μετὰ σέ [εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν]           | 17:7, 9    |
| 12                  | יליד בית[ך]                            | ὁ οἰκογενὴς τῆς οἰκίας [σου]                                             | 17:3       |
| 14 <sup>SP</sup>    | אשר לא ימול את בשר ערלתו [ביום השמיני] | ὅς οὐ περιτμηθήσεται τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ [τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ] | Lev 12:3   |
| 19 <sup>SP</sup>    | אבל [הנה] שרה אשתך ילדת לך בן          | Ναί [ἰδοὺ] Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου τέξεται σοι υἱόν                             | 18:10      |
| 20                  | ולישמעאל [הנה] שמעתך                   | περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαήλ [ἰδοὺ] ἐπήκουσά σου                                       |            |
| 18:5                | [ו]אחר תעברו [לדרככם]                  | [καὶ] μετὰ τοῦτο παρελεύσεσθε [εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῶν]                        | 19:2       |
| 13                  | למה זה צחקה שרה [בקרבך]                | Τί ὅτι ἐγέλασεν Σάρρα [ἐν ἑαυτῇ]                                         | 18:12      |
| 14                  | למועד [הזה] אשוב אליך                  | εἰς τὸν καιρὸν [τοῦτον] ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σέ                                | 17:21      |
| 16                  | וישקפו על פני סדם [ועמרה]              | κατέβλεψαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Σοδόμων [καὶ Γομόρρας]                           | 18:20      |
| 23                  | האף תספה צדיק עם רשע [והיה כצדיק כרשע] | Μὴ συναπολέσης δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσεβοῦς [καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής]    | 18:25      |
| 19:10               | ואת (ה)דלת [הבית] סגרו                 | καὶ τὴν θύραν [τοῦ οἴκου] ἀπέκλεισαν                                     | context    |
| 12 <sup>SP</sup>    | הוצא מן המקום [הזה]                    | ἐξάγαγε ἐκ τοῦ τόπου [τούτου]                                            | 19:13      |
| 15                  | קום קח ... [וצא] פן                    | Ἀναστὰς λάβε ... [καὶ ἔξελθε] ἵνα μὴ                                     |            |
| 15                  | פן תספה [גם אתה]                       | ἵνα μὴ [καὶ σὺ] συναπόλη                                                 |            |
| 30 <sup>SP</sup>    | ושתי בנתי [עמו]                        | καὶ αἱ δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ [μετ' αὐτοῦ]                                  | 19:30      |
| 33                  | ותשכב את אביה [בלילה]                  | ἐκοιμήθη μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς [τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην]                       | 19:33      |

| Ref                | Vorlage                                                      | G                                                                                                                       | Harm.                                      |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 20:2               | אחתי הוא [כי ירא לאמר אשתי<br>היא פן יהרגוהו אנשי העיר עליה] | Ἀδελφή μου ἐστὶν [ἐφοβήθη γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι Γυνή μου<br>ἐστὶν μήποτε ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς<br>πόλεως δι' αὐτήν] | 26:7                                       |
| 9                  | מה [זאת] עשית                                                | Τί [τοῦτο] ἐποίησας                                                                                                     | 3:13; 12:18;<br>26:10; 29:25               |
| 14 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויקח אבימלך [אלף כסף] צאן ובקר                               | ἔλαβεν δὲ Ἀβιμέλεχ [χίλια δίδραχμα] πρόβατα καὶ<br>μόσχους                                                              | 20:16                                      |
| 21:12              | אל ירע [הדבר] בעיניך                                         | Μὴ σκληρὸν ἔστω [τὸ ῥῆμα] ἐναντίον σου                                                                                  | 21:11                                      |
| 13 <sup>SP</sup>   | לגוי [גדול] אשימנו                                           | εἰς ἔθνος [μέγα] ποιήσω αὐτόν                                                                                           | 21:18                                      |
| 16                 | ותשב מנגד[ו] ותשא                                            | καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἀπέναντι [αὐτοῦ] ἀναβοήσαν δὲ τὸ<br>παιδίον                                                                |                                            |
| 17                 | וישמע אלהים את קול הנער<br>[באשר הוא שם]                     | εἰσήκουσεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδίου [ἐκ τοῦ<br>τόπου οὗ ἦν]                                                      | 21:17                                      |
| 19                 | ותרא באר מים [חיים]                                          | καὶ εἶδεν φρέαρ ὕδατος [ζώντος]                                                                                         | 26:19                                      |
| 22                 | אבימלך [ואחוזת מרעהו] ופיכל שר<br>צבאו                       | Ἀβιμέλεχ [καὶ Ὁχοζᾶθ ὁ νυμφαγωγὸς αὐτοῦ] καὶ<br>Φιχὼλ ὁ ἀρχιστράτηγος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ                                | 26:26                                      |
| 29                 | מה הנה שבע כבשת [הצאן] האלה                                  | Τί εἰσιν αἱ ἐπτά ἀμνάδες [τῶν προβάτων] τούτων                                                                          | 21:28                                      |
| 30                 | את שבע [ה] כבשת [האלה] תקח                                   | [Τὰς] ἐπτά ἀμνάδας [ταύτας] λήμψῃ                                                                                       | 21:29                                      |
| 31                 | על כן קרא [את שם] (ה)מקום<br>ההוא                            | διὰ τοῦτο ἐπωνόμασεν [τὸ ὄνομα] (τοῦ) τόπου<br>ἐκείνου Φρέαρ ὀρκισμοῦ                                                   | 22:14; 28:19;<br>32:3, 31;<br>33:17; 35:15 |
| 32                 | אבימלך [ואחוזת מרעהו] ופיכל שר<br>צבאו                       | Ἀβιμέλεχ [καὶ Ὁχοζᾶθ ὁ νυμφαγωγὸς αὐτοῦ] καὶ<br>Φιχὼλ ὁ ἀρχιστράτηγος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ                                | 26:26                                      |
| 22:3               | ויקם וילך [ויבא] אל המקום                                    | ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη [καὶ ἦλθεν] ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον                                                                              | 22:9                                       |
| 16 <sup>SP</sup>   | ולא חשכת את בנך את יחידך<br>[ממני]                           | καὶ οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ [δι' ἐμέ]                                                                      | 22:12                                      |
| 23                 | אלה [בנים אשר] ילדה מלכה                                     | οὗτοι [υἱοί οὗς] ἔτεκεν Μελχᾶ                                                                                           |                                            |
| 23:2 <sup>SP</sup> | בקרית ארבע [אל עמק] הוא חברון                                | ἐν πόλει Ἀρβόκ [ἣ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ κοιλώματι] αὕτη ἐστὶν<br>Χεβρών                                                           |                                            |
| 6                  | מקבר מתך [שמה]                                               | τοῦ θάψαι τὸν νεκρόν σου [ἐκεῖ]                                                                                         | 23:13                                      |
| 24:4               | כי אל ארצי ואל מולדתי תלך [ואל<br>משפחתי]                    | ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν γῆν μου οὗ ἐγενόμην πορεύσῃ [καὶ εἰς<br>τὴν φυλὴν μου]                                                     | 24:38                                      |
| 4                  | ולקחת אשה לבני ליצחק [משם]                                   | καὶ λήμψῃ γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου Ἰσαὰκ [ἐκεῖθεν]                                                                            | 24:7                                       |
| 7                  | יהוה אלהי השמים [ואלהי הארץ]                                 | κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς γῆς]                                                                          | 24:3                                       |
| 8                  | ואם לא תאבה האשה ללכת אחרוך<br>[אל הארץ הזאת]                | ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλῃ ἡ γυνὴ πορευθῆναι μετὰ σοῦ [εἰς τὴν<br>γῆν ταύτην]                                                       | 24:5                                       |

| Ref                | Vorlage                                         | G                                                                                                      | Harm.                                                                    |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 14                 | שתה וגם גמליך אשקה [עד אם כלו<br>לשתת]          | Πίε καὶ τὰς καμήλους σου ποτιῶ [ἕως ἂν παύσωνται<br>πίνουσαι]                                          | 24:19                                                                    |
| 15 <sup>SP</sup>   | טרם כלה לדבר [אל לבו]                           | πρὸ τοῦ αὐτὸν συντελέσαι λαλοῦντα [ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ]                                                      | 24:45                                                                    |
| 23                 | [וישאל אתה] ויאמר                               | [καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὴν] καὶ εἶπεν                                                                       | 24:47                                                                    |
| 38                 | ולקחת אשה לבני [משם]                            | καὶ λήμψῃ γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου [ἐκεῖθεν]                                                                 | 24:7                                                                     |
| 43                 | על עין המים [ובנות אנשי העיר<br>יצאת לשאב מים]  | ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος [αἱ δὲ θυγατέρες τῶν<br>ἀνθρώπων τῆς πόλεως ἐξελεύσονται ὑδρεύσασθαι<br>ὕδωρ] | 24:13                                                                    |
| 44                 | לבן אדני [ובה אדע כי עשית חסד<br>עם אדני אברהם] | τῷ ἑαυτοῦ θεράποντι Ἰσαάκ [καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γνῶσομαι<br>ὅτι πεποίηκας ἔλεος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Ἀβραάμ]           | 24:14                                                                    |
| 45                 | [ויהי] אני טרם אכלה לדבר                        | [καὶ ἐγένετο] πρὸ τοῦ συντελέσαι με λαλοῦντα                                                           | 24:15                                                                    |
| 54                 | שלחני [ואלכה] לאדני                             | Ἐκπέμψατέ με [ἵνα ἀπέλθω] πρὸς τὸν κύριόν μου                                                          | 24:56                                                                    |
| 62 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויצחק בא [במדבר]                                | Ἰσαάκ δὲ ἐπορεύετο [διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου]                                                                    |                                                                          |
| 25:3               | את שבא [ואת תימן] ואת דדן                       | τὸν Σαβᾶν [καὶ τὸν Θαιμᾶν] καὶ τὸν Δαιδᾶν                                                              |                                                                          |
| 3                  | ובני דדן היו [רעואל ואדבאל<br>אשורם]            | υἱοὶ δὲ Δαιδᾶν ἐγένοντο [Ῥαγουήλ καὶ Ναβδεήλ καὶ<br>Ἀσσουριεῖμ]                                        |                                                                          |
| 8 <sup>SP</sup>    | [ימים] זקן ושבע                                 | πρεσβύτης καὶ πλήρης [ἡμερῶν]                                                                          | 35:29                                                                    |
| 10                 | השדה [והמערה] אשר קנה<br>אברהם                  | τὸν ἀγρὸν [καὶ τὸ σπήλαιον] ὃ ἐκτήσατο Ἀβραάμ                                                          | 25:9; 23:20                                                              |
| 28 <sup>SP</sup>   | כי ציד[ו] בפיו                                  | ὅτι ἡ θήρα [αὐτοῦ] βρώσῃς αὐτῷ                                                                         |                                                                          |
| 26:7 <sup>SP</sup> | אשתי [היא]                                      | Γυνή μου [ἐστίν]                                                                                       | 12:19; 20:2                                                              |
| 19                 | ויחפרו עבדי יצחק בנחל [גרר]                     | καὶ ὥρυξαν οἱ παῖδες Ἰσαάκ ἐν τῇ φάραγγι<br>[Γεράρων]                                                  | 26:17                                                                    |
| 21                 | [ויעתק משם] ויחפרו באר אחרת                     | [ἀπάρας δὲ ἐκεῖθεν] ὥρυξεν φρέαρ ἕτερον                                                                | 26:22                                                                    |
| 33                 | על כן [קרא] שם העיר באר שבע                     | διὰ τοῦτο [ἐκάλεσεν] ὄνομα τῇ πόλει φρέαρ ὄρκου                                                        | 11:9; 16:14;<br>19:22; 21:31;<br>25:30; 29:34;<br>31:48; 33:17;<br>50:11 |
| 27:6               | ורבקה אמרה אל יעקב בנה [הקטן]                   | Ῥεβέκκα δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς Ἰακώβ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς [τὸν<br>ἐλάσσων]                                            | 27:15                                                                    |
| 27 <sup>SP</sup>   | כריח שדה [מלא] אשר ברכו יהוה                    | ὡς ὁσμὴ ἀγροῦ [πλήρους] ὃν εὐλόγησεν κύριος                                                            |                                                                          |
| 34 <sup>SP</sup>   | גם ברוך יהיה [ויהי] כשמע עשו                    | καὶ εὐλογημένος ἔστω [ἐγένετο δὲ] ἡνίκα ἤκουσεν<br>Ἡσαὺ                                                |                                                                          |
| 43                 | וקום ברח לך [פדנה ארם]                          | καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπόδραθι [εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν]                                                            | 28:2                                                                     |
| 46                 | מפני בנות [בני] חת                              | διὰ τὰς θυγατέρας [τῶν υἱῶν] Χέτ                                                                       | 25:10                                                                    |

| Ref              | Vorlage                                                         | G                                                                                                           | Harm.       |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 28:13            | ואלהי יצחק [אל תירא]                                            | καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαάκ [μὴ φοβοῦ]                                                                                 | 26:24       |
| 15               | ושמרתיו [בדרך] בכל אשר תלך                                      | διαφυλάσσω σε [ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ] πάσῃ οὗ ἐὰν πορευθῇς                                                              | 28:20       |
| 29:1             | וילך ארצה בני קדם [אל לבן בן בתואל הארמי אחי רבקה אם יעקב ועשו] | ἐπορεύθη εἰς γῆν ἀνατολῶν [πρὸς Λαβὰν τὸν υἱὸν Βαθουῆλ τοῦ Σύρου ἀδελφὸν δὲ Ῥεβέκκας μητρὸς Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἡσαύ] | 28:5        |
| 9                | כי רעה הוא [את הצאן אשר לאביה]                                  | αὕτη γὰρ ἔβροσκειν [τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς]                                                            | 29:9; 37:12 |
| 12               | ותרץ ותגד לאביה [כדברים האלה]                                   | καὶ δραμοῦσα ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῆς [κατὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα]                                               | 24:28       |
| 33               | ותהר עוד [לאה] ותלד בן [שני]                                    | καὶ συνέλαβεν ἄλιν [Λεία] καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν [δεύτερον]                                                        | 30:7, 12    |
| 30:10            | [ויבא אליה יעקב ותהר] ותלד זלפה                                 | [εἰσῆλθεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν Ἰακώβ καὶ συνέλαβεν] Ζέλφα                                                          | 30:4-5      |
| 12               | [ותהר] ותלד זלפה שפחת לאה                                       | [καὶ συνέλαβεν] Ζέλφα ἡ παιδίσκη Λείας καὶ ἔτεκεν                                                           | 30:7        |
| 20               | [עתה] הפעם יזבילני אישי                                         | ἐν τῷ [νῦν] καιρῷ αἰρετιεῖ με ὁ ἀνὴρ μου                                                                    | 29:34       |
| 43               | ויהי לו צאן רבות [ובקר] ושפחות ועבדים                           | καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῷ κτήνη πολλὰ [καὶ βόες] καὶ παῖδες καὶ παιδίσκαι                                            | 32:8        |
| 31:10            | והנה העתדים [והאילים] העלים                                     | καὶ ἰδοὺ οἱ τράγοι [καὶ οἱ κριοὶ] ἀναβαίνοντες ἦσαν                                                         | 31:38       |
| 10               | על הצאן [והעזים]                                                | ἐπὶ τὰ πρόβατα [καὶ τὰς αἴγας]                                                                              | 31:38       |
| 12               | וראה [כל] העתדים [והאילים] העלים                                | καὶ ἴδε (-) τοὺς τράγους [καὶ τοὺς κριούς] ἀναβαίνοντας                                                     | 31:38       |
| 12               | על הצאן [והעזים]                                                | ἐπὶ τὰ πρόβατα [καὶ τὰς αἴγας]                                                                              | 31:38       |
| 13               | אנכי האל [הנראה אליך] בית אל                                    | ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ θεὸς [ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι] ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ                                                                 | 35:1        |
| 13               | ושב אל ארץ מולדתך [ואהיה עמך]                                   | ἄπελθε εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς γενέσεώς σου [καὶ ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ]                                                   | 31:3        |
| 15 <sup>sp</sup> | הלוא [כ]נכריות נחשבנו לו                                        | οὐχ [ὡς] αἱ ἀλλότριαι λελογίσμεθα αὐτῷ                                                                      |             |
| 16               | כי כל העשר [והכבוד] אשר הציל אלהים מאבינו                       | πάντα τὸν πλοῦτον [καὶ τὴν δόξαν] ἣν ἀφείλατο ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν                                        | 31:1        |
| 18               | ואת כל רכשו אשר רכש (מקנה קנינו אשר רכש) בפדן ארם [וכל אשר לו]  | καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποσκευὴν αὐτοῦ ἣν περιποιήσατο ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ [καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ]                        | 31:21       |
| 31               | פן תגזל את בנותיך מעמי [וכל אשר לי]                             | Μήποτε ἀφέλῃς τὰς θυγατέρας σου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ [καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμά]                                                 | 31:21       |
| 32               | וקח לך [ולא הכיר מאומה עמו ויאמר יעקב]                          | καὶ λάβε [καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω παρ' αὐτῷ οὐθέν καὶ εἶπεν Ἰακώβ]                                                   |             |
| 33 <sup>sp</sup> | ויבא לבן [ויחפש]                                                | εἰσελθὼν δὲ Λαβὰν [ἠρעύνησεν]                                                                               | 31:35       |

| Ref              | Vorlage                                    | G                                                                         | Harm.                              |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 44               | [ראה אין איש עמנו]                         | ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ [Ἰδοὺ οὐθεις μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστιν]        |                                    |
| 46               | ויאכלו [וישתו] שם                          | καὶ ἔφαγον [καὶ ἔπιον] ἐκεῖ                                               | 24:54; 25:34;<br>26:30; 27:25      |
| 48               | [הזאת] ועדה המצבה                          | καὶ μαρτυρεῖ ἡ στήλη [αὕτη]                                               | 31:52                              |
| 50               | [ראה] אין איש עמנו                         | [ὅρα] οὐθεις μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστιν                                              | 31:50                              |
| 54               | [וישתו] ויאכלו (לחם)                       | καὶ ἔφαγον [καὶ ἔπιον]                                                    | 24:54; 25:34;<br>26:30; 27:25      |
| 32:1             | [וישא עיניו וירא מחנה אלהים חנה] ויפגעו בו | [καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἶδεν παρεμβολὴν θεοῦ παρεμβεβληκυῖαν] καὶ συνήντησαν αὐτῷ | 33:1; 32:3                         |
| 19               | ויצו [את הראשון] גם את השני                | καὶ ἐνετείλατο [τῷ πρώτῳ] καὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ                                  | 32:18                              |
| 20 <sup>sp</sup> | הנה עבדך יעקב [בא] אחרינו                  | Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς σου Ἰακώβ [παραγίνεται] ὀπίσω ἡμῶν                            |                                    |
| 28               | [יהיה שמך] כי אם ישראל                     | ἀλλὰ Ἰσραὴλ [ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου]                                          | 32:29; 35:10                       |
| 30               | ויקרא יעקב שם המקום [ההוא]                 | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἰακώβ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου [ἐκείνου]                           | 21:31; 22:14;<br>28:19; 32:3       |
| 33:2             | וישם את [שתי] השפחות                       | καὶ ἐποίησεν τὰς [δύο] παιδίσκας                                          | 33:1                               |
| 8                | מי [אלה] לך                                | τί [ταῦτά] σοί ἐστιν                                                      | 33:5                               |
| 17               | ויבן לו [שם] בית                           | καὶ ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ [ἐκεῖ] οἰκίαν                                          |                                    |
| 17               | על כן קרא שם המקום [ההוא] סכות             | διὰ τοῦτο ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου [ἐκείνου] Σκηναί                    | 21:31; 22:14;<br>28:19; 32:3       |
| 34:10            | והארץ [הנה רחבת ידים] תהיה לפניכם          | καὶ ἡ γῆ [ἰδοὺ πλατεῖα] ἐναντίον ὑμῶν                                     | 34:21                              |
| 15               | [וישבנו אתכם] בזאת נאות לכם                | ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθησόμεθα ὑμῖν [καὶ κατοικήσομεν ἐν ὑμῖν]                    | 34:16                              |
| 16               | ואת בנתיכם נקח לנו [לנשים]                 | καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων ὑμῶν λημψόμεθα ἡμῖν [γυναῖκας]                      | 34:21                              |
| 19               | [הזה] לעשות הדבר                           | ποιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα [τοῦτο]                                                   | 34:19                              |
| 23               | אך [בזאת] נאותה להם                        | μόνον [ἐν τούτῳ] ὁμοιωθῶμεν αὐτοῖς                                        | 34:15, 22                          |
| 24               | וימלו [את בשר ערלתם] כל זכר                | καὶ περιετέμοντο [τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν] πᾶς ἄρσεν              | 17:14                              |
| 29               | ויבזו [ואת אשר בעיר] ואת כל אשר בבית       | καὶ διήρπασαν [ὅσα τε ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει] καὶ ὅσα ἦν ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις          | 34:28                              |
| 35:1             | קום עלה [מקום] בית אל                      | Ἀναστὰς ἀνάβηθι [εἰς τὸν τόπον] Βαιθήλ                                    | 35:7, 15;<br>28:19; 12:6;<br>28:18 |
| 3                | [ושמרני] ויהי עמדי                         | ὅς ἔγινε μετ' ἐμοῦ [καὶ διέσωσέν με]                                      | 28:20                              |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                                    | G                                                                                                             | Harm.                         |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4                   | ויטמן אתם יעקב תחת האלה אשר<br>עם שכם [ויאבדם עד היום הזה] | καὶ κατέκρυψεν αὐτὰ Ἰακώβ ὑπὸ τὴν τερέμινθον τὴν<br>ἐν Σικίμοις [καὶ ἀπώλεσεν αὐτὰ ἕως τῆς σήμερον<br>ἡμέρας] | Deut 11:4                     |
| 7                   | ויקרא [את שם ה] מקום אל בית אל                             | καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου Βαιθήλ                                                                        | 35:15                         |
| 9                   | וירא אלהים אל יעקב עוד [בלוּז]                             | ᾿Ωφθη δὲ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ ἔτι [ἐν Λοῦζα]                                                                          | 48:3                          |
| 12                  | אתן את הארץ [הזאת]                                         | δώσω τὴν γῆν [ταύτην]                                                                                         | 12:7; 15:7, 18;<br>24:7; 48:4 |
| 21                  | וישמע ישראל [וירע בעיניו]                                  | καὶ ἤκουσεν Ἰσραήλ [καὶ πονηρὸν ἐφάνη ἐναντίον<br>αὐτοῦ]                                                      |                               |
| 27                  | הוא חברון [בארץ כנען]                                      | αὕτη ἐστὶν Χεβρών [ἐν γῇ Χανάαν]                                                                              | 23:2                          |
| 28                  | ימי יצחק [אשר חי]                                          | αἱ ἡμέραι Ἰσαάκ [ἃς ἔζησεν]                                                                                   | 5:5                           |
| 36:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | וילך (מן) ארץ [כנען]                                       | καὶ ἐπορεύθη (ἐκ) γῆς [Χανάαν]                                                                                |                               |
| 40                  | למקמתם [בארצתם]                                            | κατὰ τόπον αὐτῶν [ἐν ταῖς χώραις αὐτῶν]                                                                       | 10:20, 31                     |
| 37:17 <sup>SP</sup> | שמעתי[ם] אמרים                                             | ἤκουσα γὰρ [αὐτῶν] λεγόντων                                                                                   |                               |
| 33 <sup>SP</sup>    | כתנת בני [היא]                                             | Χιτῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου [ἐστίν]                                                                                    |                               |
| 39:4 <sup>SP</sup>  | וכל [אשר] יש לו נתן בידו                                   | καὶ πάντα [ὅσα] ἦν αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν διὰ χειρὸς Ἰωσήφ                                                               |                               |
| 8 <sup>SP</sup>     | בבית[ו] וכל                                                | ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ [αὐτοῦ] καὶ πάντα                                                                                  |                               |
| 13 <sup>SP</sup>    | וינס [ויצא] החוצה                                          | καὶ ἔφυγεν [καὶ ἐξῆλθεν] ἔξω                                                                                  | 39:12                         |
| 17                  | לצחק בי [ויאמר אלי לשכב עמך]                               | ἐμπαῖξάι μοι [καὶ εἰπέν μοι Κοιμηθήσομαι μετὰ σοῦ]                                                            | 39:12, 14                     |
| 18                  | ויהי [כשמעו כי] (-)הרימי קולי                              | [ὥς] δὲ [ἤκουσεν ὅτι] ὑψωσα τὴν φωνήν μου                                                                     | 39:15                         |
| 18                  | וינס [ויצא] החוצה                                          | καὶ ἔφυγεν [καὶ ἐξῆλθεν] ἔξω                                                                                  | 39:12                         |
| 23                  | אין שר בית הסהר ראה [אתו] את<br>כל מאומה                   | οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου γινώσκων<br>[δι' αὐτὸν] οὐθέν                                         | 39:6, 8                       |
| 23                  | ואשר הוא עשה יהוה מצליח [בידו]                             | καὶ ὅσα αὐτὸς ἐποίει κύριος εὐώδου [ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν<br>αὐτοῦ]                                                  | 29:3                          |
| 40:16               | אף אני [ראיתי] בחלומי                                      | Κἀγὼ [εἶδον] ἐνύπνιον                                                                                         | 41:22                         |
| 17                  | ועוף [השמים]                                               | τὰ πετεινὰ [τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]                                                                                      | 1:26, 28, 30                  |
| 19                  | (ה)עוף [השמים]                                             | τὰ ὄρνεα [τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]                                                                                        | 1:26, 28, 30                  |
| 41:4                | [שבע] הפרות רעות המראה                                     | αἱ [ἐπτὰ] βόες αἱ αἰσχυραὶ                                                                                    | 41:3                          |
| 7                   | [שבע] השבלים                                               | οἱ [ἐπτὰ] στάχυες οἱ λεπτοὶ                                                                                   | 41:27                         |
| 7                   | [שדפות הקדים]                                              | οἱ λεπτοὶ [καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι]                                                                                   | 41:27                         |
| 16 <sup>SP</sup>    | בלעדי אלהים [לא] יענה את שלום<br>פרעה                      | Ἄνευ τοῦ θεοῦ [οὐκ] ἀποκριθήσεται τὸ σωτήριον<br>Φαραώ                                                        |                               |
| 19                  | עלות אחריהן [מן היאר]                                      | ἀνέβαινον ὀπίσω αὐτῶν [ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ]                                                                        | 41:18                         |
| 20                  | [שבע] הפרות הרקות והרעות                                   | αἱ [ἐπτὰ] βόες αἱ λεπταὶ καὶ αἰσχυραὶ                                                                         | 41:3                          |



| Ref              | Vorlage                                                        | G                                                                                   | Harm.                      |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 20               | שבע הפרות הראשנות [הטבות<br>ו]הבריאות                          | τὰς ἐπτὰ βόας τὰς πρώτας [τὰς καλὰς καὶ] ἐκλεκτάς                                   | 41:5                       |
| 21               | ואיקץ [ואישן]                                                  | ἐξεγερθεὶς δὲ [ἐκοιμήθην]                                                           | 41:5                       |
| 23               | והנה שבע שבלים [אחרות]                                         | [ἄλλοι] δὲ ἐπτὰ στάχυες                                                             | 41:3                       |
| 24               | [שבע] השבלים                                                   | οἱ [ἐπτὰ] στάχυες                                                                   | 41:5, 6, 22, 23,<br>26, 27 |
| 24               | [שדפות הקדים]                                                  | οἱ λεπτοὶ [καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι]                                                         | 41:27                      |
| 24               | הטבות [והמלאות]                                                | τοὺς καλοὺς [καὶ τοὺς πλήρεις]                                                      | 41:22                      |
| 35 <sup>SP</sup> | [שבע] השנים הטבת הבאת האלה                                     | τῶν [ἐπτὰ] ἐτῶν τῶν ἐρχομένων τῶν καλῶν τούτων                                      | 41:29                      |
| 39               | אין [איש] נבון וחכם כמוד                                       | οὐκ ἔστιν [ἄνθρωπος] φρονιμώτερος καὶ συνετώτερός<br>σου                            | 41:33                      |
| 48 <sup>SP</sup> | שבע שנים אשר הי(ה) [השבע]<br>בארץ מצרים                        | τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐτῶν ἐν οἷς ἦν [ἡ εὐθηνία] ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου                                  | 41:53                      |
| 50               | [שבע] שנת הרעב                                                 | τὰ [ἐπτὰ] ἔτη τοῦ λιμοῦ                                                             | 41:54                      |
| 42:2             | ושברו לנו [מעט אכל]                                            | καὶ πρίασθε ἡμῖν [μικρὰ βρώματα]                                                    | 43:2                       |
| 27               | וירא את [צור] כספו                                             | εἶδεν [τὸν δεσμὸν] τοῦ ἀργυρίου αὐτοῦ                                               | 42:35                      |
| 28 <sup>SP</sup> | וגם הנה [הוא] באמתחתו                                          | καὶ ἰδοὺ [τοῦτο] ἐν τῷ μαρσίππῳ μου                                                 | 42:27                      |
| 30               | ויתן אתנו [אל משמר]                                            | καὶ ἔθετο ἡμᾶς [ἐν φυλακῇ]                                                          | 42:17                      |
| 33               | ואת [שבר] רעבון בתיכם קחו ולכו                                 | [τὸν] δὲ [ἀγορασμὸν] τῆς σιτοδοσίας τοῦ οἴκου ὑμῶν<br>λαβόντες ἀπέλθατε             | 42:19                      |
| 43:3             | אחכם [הקטן]                                                    | ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν [ὁ νεώτερος]                                                         | 42:15, 20, 34              |
| 5                | ואם אינך משלח [את אחינו אתנו]                                  | εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀποστέλλεις [τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑμῶν μεθ' ἡμῶν]                                   | 43:4                       |
| 5                | אחכם [הקטן]                                                    | ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν [ὁ νεώτερος]                                                         | 42:15, 20, 34              |
| 26               | ושתחו לו [אפים] ארצה                                           | καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ [ἐπὶ πρόσωπον] ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν                                    | 42:6                       |
| 28 <sup>SP</sup> | [ו]יאמר ברוך האיש ההוא לאלהים<br>ויקדו וישתחו                  | [καὶ εἶπεν Εὐλογητὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ θεῷ] καὶ<br>κύψαντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ   |                            |
| 44:4             | למה שלמתם רעה תחת טובה<br>[למה זה גנבתם את גביעי גביע<br>הכסף] | Τί ὅτι ἀνταπεδώκατε πονηρὰ ἀντὶ καλῶν [ἵνα τί<br>ἐκλέψατέ μου τὸ κόνδυ τὸ ἀργυροῦν] | 44:2                       |
| 9                | אשר ימצא [הגביע] אתו מעבדיך                                    | παρ' ᾧ ἂν εὐρεθῇ [τὸ κόνδυ] τῶν παίδων σου                                          | 44:12                      |
| 13               | ויעמס[ו] איש [אמתחתו] על חמרו                                  | καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἕκαστος [τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ] ἐπὶ τὸν<br>ὄνον αὐτοῦ                    | context                    |
| 17               | מעשות [הדבר ה](זה)                                             | ποιῆσαι [τὸ ῥῆμα] τοῦτο                                                             | 44:7                       |
| 29               | וקרהו אסון [בדרך]                                              | καὶ συμβῇ αὐτῷ μαλακία [ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ]                                                  | 42:38                      |
| 31 <sup>SP</sup> | כי אין הנער [אתנו]                                             | μὴ ὦν τὸ παιδάριον [μεθ' ἡμῶν]                                                      | 44:30                      |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                                                                                                      | G                                                                                                                                                                                           | Harm.  |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 32                  | אם לא אביאנו אליך [והצגתיו לפניך]                                                                                            | Ἐὰν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτὸν πρὸς σέ [καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου]                                                                                                                                   | 43:9   |
| 45:9                | שמני אלהים לאדון לכל [ארץ] מצרים                                                                                             | Ἐποίησέν με ὁ θεὸς κύριον πάσης [γῆς] Αἰγύπτου                                                                                                                                              | passim |
| 14                  | ויבך [עליו]                                                                                                                  | ἔκλαυσεν [ἐπ' αὐτῷ]                                                                                                                                                                         | 45:15  |
| 46:20               | ואת אפרים [ויוולד למנשה אשר ילדה לו הפילגש הארמית את מכיר ומכיר הוליד את גלעד ובני אפרים אחי מנשה שותלח ותחן ובני שותלח ערן] | καὶ τὸν Ἐφραίμ [ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Μανασσὴ οὗς ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ ἡ παλλακὴ ἡ Σύρα τὸν Μαχὶρ Μαχὶρ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Γαλαὰδ υἱοὶ δὲ Ἐφραίμ ἀδελφοῦ Μανασσὴ Σουθάλααμ καὶ Τάαμ υἱοὶ δὲ Σουθάλααμ Ἐδέμ] |        |
| 21                  | [ויוולד לבלע] גרא ונעמן                                                                                                      | [ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Βάλα] Γηρὰ καὶ Νοεμὰν                                                                                                                                                     |        |
| 21                  | וחפים [וגרא הוליד את] (ו)ארד                                                                                                 | καὶ Ὀφίμ [Γηρὰ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν] Ἄραδ                                                                                                                                                       |        |
| 27                  | ב[ארץ] מצרים                                                                                                                 | ἐν [γῇ] Αἰγύπτῳ                                                                                                                                                                             | passim |
| 47:5                | [ויאמר פרעה אל יוסף] ישבו                                                                                                    | [εἶπεν δὲ Φαραὼ τῷ Ἰωσήφ] Κατοικεῖτωσαν                                                                                                                                                     | 47:5   |
| 5                   | מקנה על אשר לי [ויבאו מצרימה אל יוסף יעקב ובניו וישמע פרעה מלך מצרים]                                                        | ἄρχοντας τῶν ἐμῶν κτηνῶν. [Ἦλθον δὲ εἰς Αἴγυπτον πρὸς Ἰωσήφ Ἰακώβ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤκουσεν Φαραὼ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου]                                                                    | 47:5   |
| 6                   | [הנה] ארץ מצרים לפניך הוא                                                                                                    | [ἰδοὺ] ἡ γῇ Αἰγύπτου ἐναντίον σου ἐστίν                                                                                                                                                     |        |
| 9                   | ימי שני [חיי] מגורי                                                                                                          | Αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν [τῆς ζωῆς μου] ἃς παροικῶ                                                                                                                                                | 47:8   |
| 14                  | בשבר אשר הם שברים [ויכלכל אתם]                                                                                               | τοῦ σίτου οὗ ἡγόραζον [καὶ ἐσιτομέτρει αὐτοῖς]                                                                                                                                              | 47:12  |
| 16 <sup>SP</sup>    | ואתנה לכם [לחם]                                                                                                              | καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν [ἄρτους]                                                                                                                                                                      | 47:15  |
| 19                  | גם אדמתנו [תשם]                                                                                                              | καὶ ἡ γῇ [ἐρημωθῇ]                                                                                                                                                                          | 47:19  |
| 19                  | ותן זרע [ונזרע] ונחיה                                                                                                        | δὸς σπέρμα [ἵνα σπείρωμεν] καὶ ζῶμεν                                                                                                                                                        | 47:23  |
| 24 <sup>SP</sup>    | [בתבואתה]                                                                                                                    | τὰ γενήματα [αὐτῆς]                                                                                                                                                                         |        |
| 48:1                | ויקח את שני בניו עמו את מנשה ואת אפרים [ויבא אל יעקב]                                                                        | καὶ ἀναλαβὼν τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ τὸν Μανασσὴ καὶ τὸν Ἐφραίμ [ἦλθεν πρὸς Ἰακώβ]                                                                                                             | 48:2   |
| 7 <sup>SP</sup>     | [מפדן] [ארם]                                                                                                                 | ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας [τῆς Συρίας]                                                                                                                                                                |        |
| 14                  | וישלח ישראל את [יד] ימינו                                                                                                    | ἐκτείνας δὲ Ἰσραὴλ [τὴν χεῖρα] τὴν δεξιάν                                                                                                                                                   | 48:17  |
| 16 <sup>SP</sup>    | יברך את הנערים [האלה]                                                                                                        | εὐλογῆσαι τὰ παῖδια [ταῦτα]                                                                                                                                                                 |        |
| 21                  | והשיב אתכם [אלהים מן הארץ הזאת] אל ארץ אבותיכם                                                                               | καὶ ἀποστρέψει ὑμᾶς [ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ταύτης] εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν                                                                                                                 | 50:24  |
| 49:25 <sup>SP</sup> | [אל] שדי                                                                                                                     | [ὁ θεὸς] ὁ ἐμός                                                                                                                                                                             |        |
| 26 <sup>SP</sup>    | ברכת אביך [ואמד]                                                                                                             | εὐλογίας πατρός σου [καὶ μητρός σου]                                                                                                                                                        |        |
| 50:12               | כאשר צום [ויקברו אתו שם]                                                                                                     | καθὼς ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς [καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ]                                                                                                                                             | 49:29  |
| 22                  | הוא [ואחיו]                                                                                                                  | αὐτὸς [καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ]                                                                                                                                                                | 47:12  |

| Ref              | Vorlage                    | G                                                 | Harm.      |
|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 25 <sup>SP</sup> | והעלתם את עצמתי מזה [אתכם] | καὶ συνανοίσετε τὰ ὀστέα μου ἐντεῦθεν [μεθ' ὑμῶν] | Exod 13:19 |

### Minus: implied participant (17)

| Ref   | Vorlage                 | G                                          | Harm.   |
|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1:28  | ויאמר (להם אלהים)       | λέγων (-)                                  | 9:1     |
| 15:5  | ויאמר (לו)              | καὶ εἶπεν (-)                              |         |
| 20:3  | ויאמר (לו)              | καὶ εἶπεν (-)                              | context |
| 27:1  | ויאמר (אליו)            | καὶ εἶπεν (-)                              |         |
| 27:34 | ויאמר (לאביו)           | καὶ εἶπεν (-)                              | context |
| 28:1  | ויאמר (לו)              | λέγων (-)                                  |         |
| 29:12 | ויגד (יעקב) לרחל        | καὶ ἀνήγγειλεν (-) τῇ Παχὴλ                | context |
| 30:40 | בצאן (לבן)              | ἐν τοῖς ἀμνοῖς (-)                         | 30:40   |
| 34:11 | ואשר תאמרו (אלי) אתן    | καὶ ὁ ἐὰν εἴπητε (-) δώσομεν               | context |
| 35:29 | ויגוע (יצחק) וימת       | καὶ ἐκλιπὼν (-) ἀπέθανεν                   | context |
| 40:9  | ויאמר (לו)              | καὶ εἶπεν (-)                              | context |
| 40:11 | ואשחט אתם אל כוס (פרעה) | καὶ ἐξέθλιψα αὐτὴν εἰς τὸ ποτήριον (-)     | 40:11   |
| 42:4  | לא שלח (יעקב) את אחיו   | οὐκ ἀπέστειλεν (-) μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ  |         |
| 42:10 | ויאמרו (אליו)           | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν (-)                            | context |
| 42:18 | ויאמר אלהם (יוסף)       | Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς (-)                        | context |
| 45:1  | בהתודע (יוסף) אל אחיו   | ἡνίκα ἀνεγνωρίζετο (-) τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ |         |
| 48:19 | וימאן (אביו)            | καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν (-)                       |         |

### Minus: expanded participant (5)

| Ref   | Vorlage                              | G                                                    | Harm.      |
|-------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 21:4  | וימל אברהם את יצחק (בנו)             | περιέτεμεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ (-)                   | 21:5       |
| 24:67 | ויבאה יצחק האהלה (שרה) אמו           | εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Ἰσαὰκ εἰς τὸν οἶκον (-) τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ | context    |
| 25:12 | אשר ילדה הגר (המצרית) שפחת שרה       | ὃν ἔτεκεν Ἀγάρ (-) ἡ παιδίσκη Σάρρας                 | 16:3; 21:9 |
| 26:15 | אשר חפרו עבדי אביו בימי (אברהם) אביו | ἃ ὥρυξαν οἱ παῖδες (-) τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ              | context    |
| 36:18 | אלה אלופי אהליבמה (בת ענה אשת עשו)   | οὗτοι ἡγεμόνες Ὀλιβεμᾶς (-)                          |            |

Minus: ו (21)

| Ref                 | Vorlage                    | G                                           |
|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 5:7 <sup>SP</sup>   | שבע שנים (ו) שמנה מאות שנה | ἑτη ἑπτακόσια (-) ἑπτὰ                      |
| 7:13 <sup>SP</sup>  | שם (ו) חם ויפת             | Σήμ (-) Χάμ Ἰάφεθ                           |
| 7:13 <sup>SP</sup>  | שם (ו) חם ויפת             | Σήμ (-) Χάμ Ἰάφεθ                           |
| 8:22 <sup>SP</sup>  | (ו) קר וחם                 | ψυχος καὶ καῦμα (-)                         |
| 8:22 <sup>SP</sup>  | (ו) קיץ וחרף               | θέρος καὶ ἔαρ (-)                           |
| 8:22 <sup>SP</sup>  | (ו) יום ולילה              | ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα (-)                        |
| 9:18 <sup>SP</sup>  | שם (ו) חם ויפת             | Σήμ (-) Χάμ Ἰάφεθ                           |
| 9:19 <sup>SP</sup>  | (ו) מאלה נפצה              | ἀπὸ τούτων διεσπάρησαν (-)                  |
| 10:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | כוש ומצרים (ו) פוט וכנען   | Χοὺς καὶ Μεσράιμ (-) Φοῦδ καὶ Χανάαν        |
| 10:32 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) מאלה נפרדו             | ἀπὸ τούτων διεσπάρησαν (-)                  |
| 14:23 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) אם אקח                 | λήμψομαι (-)                                |
| 24:35 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) גמלים וחמרים           | καμήλους καὶ ὄνους (-)                      |
| 31:38 <sup>SP</sup> | לא שכלו (ו) אילי צאנך      | οὐκ ἡτεκνώθησαν (-) κριοὺς τῶν προβάτων σου |
| 34:21 <sup>SP</sup> | אתנו (ו) ישובו בארץ        | μεθ' ἡμῶν (-) οἰκείτωσαν                    |
| 36:24 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) איה וענה               | Ἄιὲ καὶ Ὠνάν (-)                            |
| 37:27 <sup>SP</sup> | לכו (ו) נמכרנו             | δεῦτε (-) ἀποδώμεθα                         |
| 45:10 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) צאנך ובקרך             | τὰ πρόβατά σου καὶ αἱ βόες σου (-)          |
| 46:9 <sup>SP</sup>  | (ו) חצרון                  | Ἀσρών (-)                                   |
| 47:21 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) עד קצהו                | ἕως τῶν ἄκρων (-)                           |
| 49:25 <sup>SP</sup> | (ו) את [אל] שדי            | [-] [ὁ θεός] ὁ ἐμός (-)                     |
| 50:20 <sup>SP</sup> | אני (ו) אתם חשבתם          | ἐγὼ (-) ὑμεῖς ἐβουλεύσασθε                  |

Minus: כל (12)

| Ref   | Vorlage                | G                                          |
|-------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 7:2   | מ(כל) הבהמה הטהורה     | ἀπὸ δὲ (-) τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καθαρῶν          |
| 7:19  | אשר תחת (כל) השמים     | ἅ ἧν ὑποκάτω (-) τοῦ οὐρανοῦ               |
| 19:28 | ועל (כל) פני ארץ הככר  | καὶ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (-) τῆς γῆς τῆς περιχώρου |
| 23:17 | ב(כל) גבלו סביב        | ἐν (-) τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτοῦ κύκλῳ             |
| 24:36 | ויתן לו את (כל) אשר לו | καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ (-) ὅσα ἧν αὐτῷ            |
| 30:32 | אעבר ב(כל) צאנך היום   | παρελθάτω (-) τὰ πρόβατά σου σήμερον       |

| Ref   | Vorlage                                  | G                                                                |
|-------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 31:12 | וראה (כל) העתדים [והאילים] העלים על הצאן | ἴδε (-) τοὺς τράγους καὶ τοὺς κριοὺς ἀναβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὰ πρόβατα |
| 34:23 | ו(כל) בהמתם                              | καὶ (-) τὰ τετράποδα                                             |
| 35:4  | ויתנו אל יעקב את (כל) אלהי הנכר          | καὶ ἔδωκαν τῷ Ἰακώβ (-) τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς ἄλλοτρίους               |
| 37:35 | ויקמו כל בניו ו(כל) בנתיו לנחמו          | πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ (-) αἱ θυγατέρες                        |
| 41:30 | ונשכח (כל) השבע ב[כל] ארץ מצרים          | καὶ ἐπιλήσονται (-) τῆς πλησμονῆς ἐν ὅλῃ γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ              |
| 50:14 | הוא ואחיו ו(כל) העלים אתו                | αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ (-) οἱ συναναβάντες               |

### Minus: other (46)

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                   | G                                             | Harm.          |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1:7                 | אשר מעל לרקיע (ויהי כן)                   | τοῦ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος (-)                 | 1:6, 9, 11, 15 |
| 1:27                | בצלם אלהים ברא אתו (בצלמו)                | (-) κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν           | 1:12           |
| 1:29                | פרי (עץ) זרע זרע                          | καρπὸν (-) σπέρματος σπορίμου                 | 1:29           |
| 2:14                | ו(שם) הנהר השלישי                         | καὶ (-) ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ τρίτος                    | 2:13           |
| 2:15                | וינחהו בגן (עדן)                          | καὶ ἔθετο αὐτόν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ (-)           | 2:8            |
| 3:6                 | ונחמד (העץ) להשכיל                        | καὶ ὥραϊόν (-) ἐστὶν τοῦ κατανοῆσαι           | 3:6            |
| 4:26                | ולשת (גם הוא) ילד בן                      | καὶ τῷ Σήθ (-) ἐγένετο υἱός                   | 4:22           |
| 7:14                | למינהו (כל צפור כל כנף)                   | κατὰ γένος (-)                                |                |
| 8:17                | הוצא אתך (ושרצו בארץ)                     | ἐξάγαγε μετὰ σεαυτοῦ (-)                      | 1:20; 9:7      |
| 9:5                 | ומיד (האדם מיד) איש אחיו                  | καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς (-) ἀνθρώπου ἀδελφοῦ            |                |
| 9:10                | מכל יצאי התבה (לכל חית הארץ)              | ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐξεληθόντων ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ (-) | 9:2, 10        |
| 10:28               | ו(את עובל) ואת אבימאל                     | (-) καὶ Ἀβιμεῆλ                               |                |
| 18:4                | יקח נא (מעט) מים                          | λημφθῆτω δὴ (-) ὕδωρ                          | 24:17          |
| 18:19 <sup>SP</sup> | כי ידעתי(ו)                               | ᾗδεν γὰρ (-)                                  |                |
| 19:3                | ויפצר בס (מאד)                            | καὶ κατεβιάζετο αὐτοῦς (-)                    | 19:9           |
| 19:16               | בחמלת יהוה עליו (ויצאהו וינחהו מחוץ לעיר) | ἐν τῷ φείσασθαι κύριον αὐτοῦ (-)              | 19:17          |
| 22:2                | והעלהו (שם) לעלה                          | καὶ ἀνένεγκε αὐτόν (-) εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν        |                |
| 24:43               | והיה העלמה (היצאת לשאב)                   | καὶ ἔσται ἡ παρθένος (-)                      | 24:13          |
| 26:28               | בינותינו (בינינו) ובינדך                  | ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν (-) καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ          | 26:28          |
| 27:33 <sup>SP</sup> | מי אפוא (הוא) הצד [לי] ציד                | Τίς οὖν (-) ὁ θηρεύσας [μοι] θήραν            |                |
| 27:44               | (עד אשר תשוב חמת אחיד) עד שוב             | (-) ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι                        | 27:45          |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                                 | G                                               | Harm.     |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 30:32               | כל שֶׁה (נקד וטלוא וכל שֶׁה) חום        | πᾶν πρόβατον (-) φαιδὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀρνάσιν καὶ πᾶν |           |
| 30:38               | (ויחמנה) בבאן לשתות                     | (-) ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πιεῖν                 | 30:39     |
| 31:18               | אשר רכש (מקנה קנינו אשר רכש) בפדן ארם   | ἣν περιποιήσατο (-) ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ           |           |
| 31:26               | (ותגנב את לבבי) ותנהג                   | (-) καὶ ἀπήγαγες                                | 31:20     |
| 31:31               | כי (יראתי כי) אמרתי                     | (-) Εἶπα γάρ                                    |           |
| 31:39 <sup>SP</sup> | מידי (תבקשנה)                           | παρ' ἐμαυτοῦ (-)                                |           |
| 31:52               | אם אני לא אעבר אליך (את הגל הזה)        | ἐάν τε γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ διαβῶ πρὸς σέ (-)             | 31:52     |
| 31:54               | (לאכל לחם) ויאכלו                       | (-) καὶ ἔφαγον                                  | 31:54     |
| 31:54               | (לחם) ויאכלו (לחם)                      | καὶ ἔφαγον (-)                                  | 31:54     |
| 32:8                | (והגמלים) ואת הבקר                      | καὶ τὰ πρόβατα (-)                              | 32:16     |
| 34:15               | (אך) בזאת נאות לכם                      | (-) ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθησόμεθα ὑμῖν                 | 34:22     |
| 34:24               | כל זכר (כל יצאי שער עירו)               | πᾶς ἄρσην (-)                                   |           |
| 36:31               | ב(ארץ) אדום                             | ἐν (-) Ἐδῶμ                                     | 35:16     |
| 39:3                | (בידו) יהוה מצליח                       | κύριος εὐοδοῖ (-)                               | cf. 39:23 |
| 41:27               | (והרעות) הרקות                          | αἱ λεπταὶ (-)                                   | 41:20     |
| 42:2                | (משם) ושברו לנו                         | καὶ πρίασθε ἡμῖν (-)                            | context   |
| 42:13               | שנים עשר עבדיך אחים אנחנו (בני איש אחד) | Δώδεκά ἐσμεν οἱ παῖδές σου ἀδελφοὶ (-)          | 42:11     |
| 43:24               | (ויבא האיש את האנשים ביתה יוסף) ויתן    | (-) καὶ ἤνεγκεν                                 | 43:17     |
| 45:18               | את טוב (ארץ) מצרים                      | τῶν ἀγαθῶν (-) Αἰγύπτου                         | 45:20     |
| 45:20               | כי טוב כל (ארץ) מצרים                   | τὰ γὰρ πάντα ἀγαθὰ (-) Αἰγύπτου                 | 45:18     |
| 48:5                | ב(ארץ) מצרים                            | ἐν (-) Αἰγύπτῳ                                  | 46:20     |
| 49:30               | במערר (אשר בשדה) המכפלה                 | ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ (-) τῷ διπλῷ                      | 49:29     |
| 50:5                | לאמר (הנה אנכי מת)                      | λέγων (-)                                       | 48:21     |
| 50:13               | במערר (שדה) המכפלה                      | εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον (-) τὸ διπλοῦν                  | 23:19     |
| 50:14               | לקבר (את אביו אחרי קברו) את אביו        | θάψαι (-) τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ                      |           |

## Difference (69)

| Ref               | Vorlage          | G                     | Harm. |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------|
|                   | ביום ה>שביעי<    |                       |       |
| 2:2 <sup>SP</sup> | ביום ה>ששי<      | ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ <ἑκτῇ> |       |
|                   | <אלה> [-] תולדות |                       |       |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                     | G                              | Harm.  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| 2:4                 | <זה> [ספר] תולדות           | <Αὔτη> [ἡ βίβλος] γενέσεως     |        |
|                     | ויאכל<-> ותפקחנה            |                                |        |
| 3:6 <sup>SP</sup>   | ויאכל<ו> ותפקחנה            | καὶ ἔφαγ<ον> καὶ διηνοίχθησαν  |        |
|                     | <איש> ו<אשתו>               |                                |        |
| 7:2 <sup>SP</sup>   | <זכר> ו<נקבה>               | <ἄρσεν> καὶ <θῆλυ>             | 7:3, 9 |
|                     | <איש> ו<אשתו>               |                                |        |
| 7:2 <sup>SP</sup>   | <זכר> ו<נקבה>               | <ἄρσεν> καὶ <θῆλυ>             | 7:3, 9 |
|                     | ודדנים                      |                                |        |
| 10:4 <sup>SP</sup>  | ורודנים                     | Ῥόδιοι                         |        |
| 11:12 <sup>SP</sup> | שנה חמש ושלישים [ומאת] שנה  | ἔτη [ἐκατὸν] τριάκοντα πέντε   |        |
|                     | שלח                         |                                |        |
| 11:12               | קינן                        | Καινάν                         |        |
|                     | שלישים שנה                  |                                |        |
| 11:14 <sup>SP</sup> | שלישים [שנה ומאת] שנה       | ἔτη [ἐκατὸν] τριάκοντα         |        |
|                     | ארבע ושלישים [-] שנה        |                                |        |
| 11:16 <sup>SP</sup> | שנה ארבע ושלישים [ומאת] שנה | ἔτη [ἐκατὸν] τριάκοντα τέσσαρα |        |
|                     | שלישים שנה                  |                                |        |
| 11:18 <sup>SP</sup> | שלישים [שנה ומאת] שנה       | ἔτη [ἐκατὸν] τριάκοντα         |        |
|                     | שתיים ושלישים שנה           |                                |        |
| 11:20 <sup>SP</sup> | שתיים ושלישים [ומאת] שנה    | ἔτη [ἐκατὸν] τριάκοντα δύο     |        |
|                     | שלישים שנה                  |                                |        |
| 11:22 <sup>SP</sup> | שלישים [שנה ומאת] שנה       | ἔτη [ἐκατὸν] τριάκοντα         |        |
|                     | תשע ו<עשרים> שנה            |                                |        |
| 11:24 <sup>SP</sup> | תשע ו<שבעים> שנה            | ἔτη <ἐβδομήκοντα> ἐννέα        |        |
|                     | ויצא<ו> אתם                 |                                |        |
| 11:31 <sup>SP</sup> | ויוצ<י> א אתם               | καὶ ἐξ<ήγαγεν> αὐτοὺς          |        |
|                     | ומקלל<->ך                   |                                |        |
| 12:3 <sup>SP</sup>  | מקלל<י>ך                    | τ<οὺς> καταρωμέν<ους> σε       |        |
|                     | ויברכה<ו>                   |                                |        |
| 14:19 <sup>SP</sup> | ויברך <את אברם>             | καὶ εὐλόγησεν <τὸν Ἀβρὰμ>      |        |
|                     | ואת הצפר<->                 |                                |        |
| 15:10 <sup>SP</sup> | ואת הצפור<ים>               | τ<ᾱ> δὲ ὄρνε<α>                |        |
|                     | ביד<->ך                     |                                |        |
| 16:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | ביד<י>ך                     | ἐν τ<αῖς> χερ<σίν> σου         |        |
|                     | לא <אעשה>                   |                                |        |

| Ref                 | Vorlage                  | G                           | Harm. |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| 18:29 <sup>SP</sup> | לֹא <אֶשְׁחִית>          | Οὐ μὴ <ἀπολέσω>             |       |
|                     | לֹא <אֶעֱשֶׂה>           |                             |       |
| 18:30 <sup>SP</sup> | לֹא <אֶשְׁחִית>          | Οὐ μὴ <ἀπολέσω>             |       |
|                     | הִתְעַו <ו> אֲתִי        |                             |       |
| 20:13 <sup>SP</sup> | אֲתִי הִתְעַו <ה> אֲתִי  | ἐξήγαγ<έν> με               |       |
|                     | אֲחֵר                    |                             |       |
| 22:13 <sup>SP</sup> | אֶחָד                    | εἷς                         |       |
|                     | לֹו                      |                             |       |
| 23:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | לֹא                      | Μή                          |       |
|                     | לֹו                      |                             |       |
| 23:15 <sup>SP</sup> | לֹא                      | Οὐχί                        |       |
|                     | וַיֹּאמֶר <->            |                             |       |
| 24:33 <sup>SP</sup> | וַיֹּאמֶר <ו>            | καὶ εἶπ<αν>                 |       |
|                     | אֲחֵרִי זִקְנַת <ה>      |                             |       |
| 24:36 <sup>SP</sup> | אֲחֵרִי זִקְנַת <ו>      | μετὰ τὸ γηρᾶσαι <αὐτόν>     |       |
|                     | <בִּימִי> אֲבֵרָהֶם      |                             |       |
| 26:18 <sup>SP</sup> | <עֲבַדִּי> אֲבֵרָהֶם     | <οἱ παῖδες> Ἀβραάμ          |       |
|                     | בֵּת אֵילָן <חֲתִי>      |                             |       |
| 26:34 <sup>SP</sup> | בֵּת אֵילָן <חֲוִי>      | θυγατέρα Αἰλῶν τοῦ <Εὐαίου> |       |
|                     | כָּל <עֲדָרִים>          |                             |       |
| 29:8 <sup>SP</sup>  | כָּל <רְעִים>            | πάντας τοὺς <ποιμένας>      |       |
|                     | וַנִּתְּנָה לְךָ         |                             |       |
| 29:27 <sup>SP</sup> | וַאֲתָן <לך>             | καὶ δώ<σω> σοι              |       |
|                     | בֵּין <ו>                |                             |       |
| 30:36 <sup>SP</sup> | בֵּין <ם>                | ἀνὰ μέσον <αὐτῶν>           |       |
|                     | <אֵל> עֶקֶד              |                             |       |
| 30:40 <sup>SP</sup> | <אֵיל> עֶקֶד             | <κρίον> διάλεικον           |       |
|                     | לַעֲשׂוֹת עִם <כֶּם> רַע |                             |       |
| 31:29 <sup>SP</sup> | לַעֲשׂוֹת עִם <ך> רַע    | κακοποιῆσαί σ<ε>            |       |
|                     | אֲבִי <כֶם>              |                             |       |
| 31:29 <sup>SP</sup> | אֲבִי <ך>                | τοῦ πατρός <σου>            |       |
|                     | אֲשֶׁר הִבֵּאת <-> לְךָ  |                             |       |
| 33:11 <sup>SP</sup> | אֲשֶׁר הִבֵּאת <י> לְךָ  | ἄς <ἡνεγκά> σοι             |       |
|                     | לְרֹגֶל <מִלֹּאכָה>      |                             |       |
| 33:14 <sup>SP</sup> | לְרֹגֶל <מִהֲלָכָה>      | κατὰ σχολήν τῆς <πορεύσεως> |       |
|                     | טִמָּא <->               |                             |       |



| Ref                 | Vorlage                                                       | G | Harm. |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---|-------|
| 34:13 <sup>SP</sup> | טמא <ו> ἐμίαν<αν>                                             |   |       |
|                     | <ל>עם אחד                                                     |   |       |
| 34:16 <sup>SP</sup> | <כ>עם אחד <ὡς> γένος ἐν                                       |   |       |
|                     | יעש <ה>                                                       |   |       |
| 34:31 <sup>SP</sup> | יעש <ו> χρήσ<ονται>                                           |   |       |
|                     | ענה <בת> צבעון                                                |   |       |
| 36:2 <sup>SP</sup>  | ענה <בן> צבעון Ἀνὰ τοῦ <υἱοῦ> Σεβεγών                         |   |       |
|                     | <אל> ארץ                                                      |   |       |
| 36:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | <מ> ארץ <ἐκ> γῆς                                              |   |       |
|                     | ענה <בת> צבעון                                                |   |       |
| 36:14 <sup>SP</sup> | ענה <בן> צבעון Ἀνὰ τοῦ <υἱοῦ> Σεβεγών                         |   |       |
|                     | מכל <אחיו>                                                    |   |       |
| 37:4 <sup>SP</sup>  | מכל <בניו> ἐκ πάντων τῶν <υἱῶν> αὐτοῦ                         |   |       |
|                     | את אנשי מקמ <ה>                                               |   |       |
| 38:21 <sup>SP</sup> | את אנשי <ה> מקם τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐκ <τοῦ> τόπου               |   | 38:22 |
|                     | והפתיל <ים>                                                   |   |       |
| 38:25 <sup>SP</sup> | והפתיל <-> καὶ <ὁ> ὀρμισκ<ος>                                 |   |       |
|                     | בעיני <ו>                                                     |   |       |
| 39:4 <sup>SP</sup>  | בעיני <אדניו> ἐναντίον [τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ]                     |   |       |
|                     | ויקרא <ו>                                                     |   |       |
| 41:43 <sup>SP</sup> | ויקרא <-> καὶ ἐκήρυξ<εν>                                      |   |       |
|                     | שבע שני השבע אשר הי <ה>                                       |   |       |
| 41:53 <sup>SP</sup> | שבע שני השבע אשר הי <ו> τὰ ἐπτα ἔτη τῆς εὐθηνίας ἃ ἐγέν<οντο> |   |       |
|                     | וכל הארץ <-> באו                                              |   |       |
| 41:57 <sup>SP</sup> | וכל הארץ <ות> באו καὶ πᾶσ<αι> <αῖ> <χῶραι> ἦλθον              |   |       |
|                     | את אחיכם <אחר>                                                |   |       |
| 43:14 <sup>SP</sup> | את אחיכם <האחד> τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑμῶν <τὸν ἕνα>                    |   |       |
|                     | אב <י> כם                                                     |   |       |
| 43:23 <sup>SP</sup> | אב <ותי> כם τ<ὼν> πατέρ<ων> ὑμῶν                              |   |       |
|                     | ומת <->                                                       |   |       |
| 44:9 <sup>SP</sup>  | ומת <י> ἀποθνησκ<έτω>                                         |   |       |
|                     | ויעמס <->                                                     |   |       |
| 44:13 <sup>SP</sup> | ויעמס <ו> καὶ ἐπέθηκ<αν> ἕκαστος                              |   |       |
|                     | אבי <->                                                       |   |       |
| 44:24 <sup>SP</sup> | אבי <נו> πατέρα δὲ <ἡμῶν>                                     |   |       |
|                     | ועיני <-> כם אל תחס                                           |   |       |

| Ref                 | Vorlage          | G                                  | Harm. |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 45:20 <sup>SP</sup> | ועינ'י כם אל תחס | καὶ μὴ φείσησθε τ<οῖς> ὀφθαλμ<οῖς> |       |
|                     | <ויוב>           |                                    |       |
| 46:13 <sup>SP</sup> | <ישוב> ו         | καὶ <Ἰασοῦβ>                       |       |
|                     | ע<ר> י           |                                    |       |
| 46:16 <sup>SP</sup> | ע<ד> י           | Ἀη<δ> ἰς                           |       |
|                     | אשר ילד<->       |                                    |       |
| 46:22 <sup>SP</sup> | אשר ילד<ה>       | ο<ῦς> ἔτε<κεν>                     |       |
|                     | אל אחי<ו>        |                                    |       |
| 47:3 <sup>SP</sup>  | אל אחי <יוסף>    | τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς <Ἰωσήφ>              |       |
|                     | העבי<ר>          |                                    |       |
| 47:21 <sup>SP</sup> | העבי<ד>          | <κατεδουλώσατο>                    |       |
|                     | ל<ערים>          |                                    |       |
| 47:21 <sup>SP</sup> | ל<עבדים>         | εἰς <παῖδας>                       |       |
|                     | פחז<->           |                                    |       |
| 49:4 <sup>SP</sup>  | פחז<ת>           | ἐξύβρισ<ας>                        |       |
|                     | כל<י>            |                                    |       |
| 49:5 <sup>SP</sup>  | כל<ו>            | <συνετέλεσαν>                      |       |
|                     | תחד              |                                    |       |
| 49:6 <sup>SP</sup>  | יחר              | ἐρείσαι                            |       |
|                     | יד<-> יד         |                                    |       |
| 49:8 <sup>SP</sup>  | יד<י> יד         | <αἰ> χεῖρ<ές> σου                  |       |
|                     | בנ<ות צעדה>      |                                    |       |
| 49:22 <sup>SP</sup> | בנ<י צעירי>      | υἱός <μου νεώτατος>                |       |
|                     | ו<רבו>           |                                    |       |
| 49:23 <sup>SP</sup> | ו<יריבהו>        | <ἐλοιδορουν>                       |       |
|                     | ה<ו> רי עד תאות  |                                    |       |
| 49:26 <sup>SP</sup> | ה<-> רי עד תאות  | <ὀρέων> μονίμων καὶ ἐπ' εὐλογίαις  |       |

## 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

- |    |                 |                                                              |
|----|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | אֲבִידָע        | Ἀβιρά (1/1): 25:4.                                           |
| 2  | אֲבִימֶלֶךְ     | Ἀβιμελῆλ (1/1): 10:28.                                       |
| 3  | אֲבֵל מִצְרַיִם | πένθος + Αἴγυπτος (1/1): 50:11.                              |
| 4  | אֶדֶד           | Ἄωδ (1/1): 46:10.                                            |
| 5  | אִזְגָל         | Αἰζήλ (1/1): 10:27.                                          |
| 6  | אֹנָם           | Ὠνάμ (1/1): 36:23.                                           |
| 7  | אוֹפִיר         | Οὐφίρ (1/1): 10:29.                                          |
| 8  | אֶחֱי           | Ἀγχίς (1/1): 46:21.                                          |
| 9  | אֵיה            | Αἰέ (1/1): 36:24.                                            |
| 10 | אֵיל פֶּאֶרֶן   | τερέμινθος + Φαράν (1/1): 14:6.                              |
| 11 | אֵימִים         | Ὀμμαῖος (1/1): 14:5.                                         |
| 12 | אֶכָד           | Ἀρχάδ (1/1): 10:10.                                          |
| 13 | אֶלְדָּעָה      | Ἐλραγά (1/1): 25:4.                                          |
| 14 | אֶלָה           | Ἠλᾶς (1/1): 36:41.                                           |
| 15 | אֶלֹן           | Ἀλλών (1/1): 46:14.                                          |
| 16 | אֶלִיעֶזֶר      | Ἐλιέζερ (1/1): 15:2.                                         |
| 17 | אֶלְמוֹדָד      | Ἐλμωδάδ (1/1): 10:26.                                        |
| 18 | אֶפְרָת         | ἱππόδρομος (1/2): 48:7. Cf. ἱππόδρομος used for אֶפְרָת (1). |
| 19 | אֶצְבוֹן        | Θασοβάν (1/1): 46:16.                                        |

- 20 אַראַלי Ἀροηλῖς (1/1): 46:16.
- 21 אַרד Ἀραδ (1/1): 46:21.
- 22 אַרדִי Ἀράδιον (1/1): 10:18.
- 23 אַרודִי Ἀροηδῖς (1/1): 46:16.
- 24 אַרד Ὀρεχ (1/1): 10:10.
- 25 אַרם נְהָרִים Μεσσοποταμία (1/13): 24:10. Cf. Μεσσοποταμία used for אַרם פֶּדֶן (11); פֶּדֶן (1).
- 26 אַרן Ἀράμ (1/3): 36:28. Cf. Ἀράμ used for אַרם (2).
- 27 אַררט Ἀραράτ (1/1): 8:4.
- 28 אַשְׁבֵּל Ἀσβήλ (1/1): 46:21.
- 29 אַשְׁבֵּן Ἀσβάν (1/1): 36:26.
- 30 אַשּׁוּרִים Ἀσσυριεῖμ (1/1): 25:3.
- 31 אַשְׁכַּנִּז Ἀσχανάζ (1/1): 10:3.
- 32 בְּאֵרִי Βεήρ (1/1): 26:34.
- 33 בּוּז Βαύξ (1/1): 22:21.
- 34 בְּכַר Χόβωρ (1/1): 46:21.
- 35 בְּלֶהֶן Βαλαάν (1/1): 36:27.
- 36 בֶּן־אוּנִי υῖός + ὀδύνη + ἐγώ (1/1): 35:18.
- 37 בֶּן־עַמִּי υῖός + γένος + ἐγώ (1/1): 19:38.
- 38 בְּעוֹר Βεώρ (1/1): 36:32.
- 39 בְּצֶרֶה Βοσόρρα (1/1): 36:33.
- 40 בְּרַד Βάραδ (1/1): 16:14.
- 41 בְּרַע Βάρα (1/1): 14:2.
- 42 בְּרֶשַׁע Βαρσά (1/1): 14:2.
- 43 גּוּנִי Γωυνί (1/1): 46:24.
- 44 גַּחַם Γάαμ (1/1): 22:24.
- 45 גִּיחֹן Γηών (1/1): 2:13.
- 46 גִּרְשׁוֹן Γηρσών (1/1): 46:11.
- 47 גִּתֵּר Γάθερ (1/1): 10:23.
- 48 דְּבוּרָה Δεββωρά (1/1): 35:8.
- 49 דּוּמָה Ἰδουμά (1/1): 25:14.
- 50 דְּנֶהֱבָה Δεννάβα (1/1): 36:32.

- 51 דְּקֶלָּה Δεκλά (1/1): 10:27.
- 52 הַדּוֹרָם Ὀδορρά (1/1): 10:27.
- 53 הַדֵּר Ἀδάδ (1/3): 36:39. Cf. Ἀδάδ used for דִּדָּד (2).
- 54 הַיָּמָם Αἰμάν (1/1): 36:22.
- 55 הֵם αὐτός (1/1,600): 14:5.
- 56 זִוְיִים ἔθνος + ἰσχυρός (1/1): 14:5.
- 57 זִמְרֵן Ζεμβράν (1/1): 25:2.
- 58 זִעֲוֹן Ζουκάμ (1/1): 36:27.
- 59 חֶבֶר Χόβορ (1/1): 46:17.
- 60 חֲגִי Ἀγγίς (1/1): 46:16.
- 61 חֲדָד Χοδδάδ (1/1): 25:15.
- 62 חֲדָקֶל Τίγρις (1/1): 2:14.
- 63 חֻבָּה Χωβά (1/1): 14:15.
- 64 חוּל Οὐλ (1/1): 10:23.
- 65 חֻזֵּי Ἀζαῦ (1/1): 22:22.
- 66 חֲמִידֵן Ἀμαδά (1/1): 36:26.
- 67 חֲמוּל Ἰεμουήλ (1/2): 46:12. Cf. Ἰεμουήλ used for יְמוּאֵל (1).
- 68 חֲמַתִּי Ἀμαθί (1/1): 10:18.
- 69 חֲנוּךְ Ἐνώχ (1/11): 4:17. Cf. Ἐνώχ used for חֲנוּךְ (10).
- 70 חֲפִים Ὀφίμ (1/1): 46:21.
- 71 חֲצִצְוֹן תְּמָר Ἀσασάν + Θαμάρ\_2 (1/1): 14:7.
- 72 חֲצִרְמוֹת Ἀσαρμώθ (1/1): 10:26.
- 73 חֲרִי Χορρί (1/3): 36:22. Cf. Χορρί used for חֲרִי (2).
- 74 חֲשִׁים Ἀσόμ (1/3): 46:23. Cf. Ἀσόμ used for חֲשִׁים (2).
- 75 טָבַח Τάβεχ (1/1): 22:24.
- 76 יָבֵל Ἰωβέλ (1/1): 4:20.
- 77 יָבַק Ἰαβόκ (1/1): 32:23.
- 78 יָגַר שְׁהִדּוּתָא βουνός + ὁ + μαρτυρία (1/1): 31:47.
- 79 יִדְלָף Ἰελδάφ (1/1): 22:22.
- 80 יְהוּדִית Ἰουδίν (1/1): 26:34.
- 81 יֹבָב Ἰωβάβ (1/3): 10:29. Cf. Ἰωβάβ used for יֹבָב (2).

|     |                |                                                           |
|-----|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 82  | יֹבֵל          | Ἰουβάλ (1/1): 4:21.                                       |
| 83  | יִהְיֶה־לָּאֵל | Ἀλογήλ (1/1): 46:14.                                      |
| 84  | יִהְיֶה־לָּאֵל | Ἰασιήλ (1/1): 46:24.                                      |
| 85  | יִטּוּר        | Ἰετούρ (1/1): 25:15.                                      |
| 86  | יָכִין         | Ἰαχίν (1/1): 46:10.                                       |
| 87  | יִמּוּאֵל      | Ἰεμουήλ (1/2): 46:10. Cf. Ἰεμουήλ used for יִמּוּיָה (1). |
| 88  | יָמִין         | Ἰαμίν (1/2): 46:10. Cf. Ἰαμίν used for יָמִם (1).         |
| 89  | יִמְנָה        | Ἰεμνά (1/1): 46:17.                                       |
| 90  | יִסְכָּה       | Ἰεσχά (1/1): 11:29.                                       |
| 91  | יִצָּר         | Ἰσσααρ (1/1): 46:24.                                      |
| 92  | יָרַח          | Ἰάραχ (1/1): 10:26.                                       |
| 93  | יִשְׁבֶּק      | Ἰεσβόκ (1/1): 25:2.                                       |
| 94  | יָשׁוּב        | Ἰασούβ (1/1): [46:13].                                    |
| 95  | יִשְׁוּהָ      | Ἰεσουά (1/1): 46:17.                                      |
| 96  | יִשְׁוִי       | Ἰεούλ (1/1): 46:17.                                       |
| 97  | יִתְרֹן        | Ἰεθράν (1/1): 36:26.                                      |
| 98  | יִתְתֶּה       | Ἰεθέρ (1/1): 36:40.                                       |
| 99  | כְּזִיב        | Χασβί (1/1): 38:5.                                        |
| 100 | כְּלָנָה       | Χαλαννή (1/1): 10:10.                                     |
| 101 | כְּסָלְחִים    | Χασλωνείμ (1/1): 10:14.                                   |
| 102 | כְּפִתְרִי     | Καφθοριείμ (1/1): 10:14.                                  |
| 103 | כְּרָמִי       | Χαρμί (1/1): 46:9.                                        |
| 104 | כָּרֶן         | Χαρράν (1/9): 36:26. Cf. Χαρράν used for קָרֶן (8).       |
| 105 | כְּשָׁד        | Χάσαδ (1/1): 22:22.                                       |
| 106 | כְּתִיִּים     | Κίτιος (1/1): 10:4.                                       |
| 107 | לְאָמִים       | Λωμειίμ (1/1): 25:3.                                      |
| 108 | לְהָבִים       | Λαβειίμ (1/1): 10:13.                                     |
| 109 | לְטוּשִׁים     | Λατουσειίμ (1/1): 25:3.                                   |
| 110 | לְשַׁע         | Λασά (1/1): 10:19.                                        |
| 111 | מִבְּצָר       | Μαζάρ (1/1): 36:42.                                       |
| 112 | מִבְּשָׁם      | Μασσάμ (1/1): 25:13.                                      |

- 113 מגדיאל Μεγεδιήλ (1/1): 36:43.
- 114 מגדל-עדן πύργος + Γάδερ (1/1): 35:21.
- 115 מגג Μαγώγ (1/1): 10:2.
- 116 מדי Μαδαί (1/1): 10:2.
- 117 מדן Μαδάν (1/1): 25:2.
- 118 מהיטבאל Μετεβεήλ (1/1): 36:39.
- 119 מורה ύψηλός (1/4): 12:6. Cf. ύψηλός used for מרה (2); מריה (1).
- 120 מלהת Μαελέθ (1/1): 28:9.
- 121 מחנים παρεμβολή (1/10): 32:3. Cf. παρεμβολή used for מחנה (9).
- 122 מטריד Ματραίθ (1/1): 36:39.
- 123 מי זהב Μαιζοόβ (1/1): 36:39.
- 124 מלכישדק Μελχισέδεκ (1/1): 14:18.
- 125 מלכיאל Μελχινήλ (1/1): 46:17.
- 126 מנחת Μανάχαθ (1/1): 36:23.
- 127 מעכה Μωχά (1/1): 22:24.
- 128 מפים Μαμφίν (1/1): 46:21.
- 129 מצפה ὄρασις (1/5): 31:49. Cf. ὄρασις used for מצפה (2); מראה (1); פתרון (1).
- 130 מריה ύψηλός (1/4): 22:2. Cf. ύψηλός used for מרה (2); מורה (1).
- 131 מררי Μεραρί (1/1): 46:11.
- 132 מוש Μόσοχ (1/2): 10:23. Cf. Μόσοχ used for מוש (1).
- 133 משא Μασσή (1/2): 10:30. Cf. Μασσή used for משא (1).
- 134 מושף Μόσοχ (1/2): 10:2. Cf. Μόσοχ used for מוש (1).
- 135 משמע Μασμά (1/1): 25:14.
- 136 משא Μασσή (1/2): 25:14. Cf. Μασσή used for משא (1).
- 137 משרקה Μασέκκα (1/1): 36:36.
- 138 ניד Ναίδ (1/1): 4:16.
- 139 נעמה Νοεμά (1/1): 4:22.
- 140 נעמן Νοεμάν (1/1): 46:21.
- 141 נפיש Ναφές (1/1): 25:15.
- 142 נפתחים Νεφθαλιείμ (1/1): 10:13.
- 143 סבא Σαβά (1/3): 10:7. Cf. Σαβά used for סבא (2).

- 144 סבתא Σαβαθά (1/1): 10:7.
- 145 סבתכא Σαβακαθά (1/1): 10:7.
- 146 סיני Ἀσενναῖος (1/1): 10:17.
- 147 ספר εἰς + Σωφήρα (1/1): 10:30.
- 148 סרד Σέρεδ (1/1): 46:14.
- 149 עדי Ἀηδῖς (1/1): [46:16].
- 150 עזית Γεθθαίμ (1/1): 36:35.
- 151 עזה Γάζα (1/1): 10:19.
- 152 עיבל Γαιβήλ (1/1): 36:23.
- 153 עין מושפט πηγὴ + κρίσις (1/1): 14:7.
- 154 עיפה Γαιφάρ (1/1): 25:4.
- 155 עירם Ζαφωίν (1/1): 36:43.
- 156 עלון Γωλά (1/1): 36:40.
- 157 עלון Γολών (1/1): 36:23.
- 158 עמון Ἀμμανίτης (1/1): [בן + עמון] (1): 19:38.
- 159 עמלקי Ἀμαλήκ (1/3): 14:7. Cf. Ἀμαλήκ used for עמלק (2).
- 160 ענמים Ἐνεμετιείμ (1/1): 10:13.
- 161 עפר Ἀφερ (1/1): 25:4.
- 162 עקן Ἰωυκάμ (1/1): 36:27.
- 163 ערן Ἐδέμ (1/1): [46:20].
- 164 ערקאי Ἀρουκαῖος (1/1): 10:17.
- 165 עשתרת קרנים Ἀσταρώθ + Καρνάιν (1/1): 14:5.
- 166 עשק ἀδικία (1/7): 26:20. Cf. ἀδικία used for עשק (3); עשק (2); עין (1).
- 167 פארן Φαράν (1/2): 21:21. Cf. Φαράν used for פארן (1).
- 168 פדן Μεσοποταμία (1/13): 48:7. Cf. Μεσοποταμία used for פדן (11); ארם נהרין (1).
- 169 פזה Φουά (1/1): 46:13.
- 170 פוט Φούδ (1/1): 10:6.
- 171 פינן Φινών (1/1): 36:41.
- 172 פישון Φισών (1/1): 2:11.
- 173 פלדש Φαλδās (1/1): 22:22.
- 174 פלוא Φαλλού (1/1): 46:9.



- 175 פְּנוֹאֵל εἶδος + θεός (1/2): 32:32. Cf. εἶδος + θεός used for פְּנִיאל (1).
- 176 פְּנִיאל εἶδος + θεός (1/2): 32:31. Cf. εἶδος + θεός used for פְּנוֹאֵל (1).
- 177 פֶּעוּ Φόγωρ (1/1): 36:39.
- 178 פִּתְרִסִּי Πατροσωνιείμ (1/1): 10:14.
- 179 צָמְרִי Σαμαραῖος (1/1): 10:18.
- 180 צַפְיוֹן Σαφών (1/1): 46:16.
- 181 צַפְנִת פֶּעֻנָּח Ψονθομφανήχ (1/1): 41:45.
- 182 קְדָמָה Κέδμα (1/1): 25:15.
- 183 קְדַמְנִי Κεδμωναῖος (1/1): 15:19.
- 184 קֶדָר Κηδάρ (1/1): 25:13.
- 185 קֶהֶת Καάθ (1/1): 46:11.
- 186 קִינִי Κεναῖος (1/1): 15:19.
- 187 קְמוּאֵל Καμουήλ (1/1): 22:21.
- 188 קְנִזִּי Κενεζαῖος (1/1): 15:19.
- 189 קְרִיתִים πόλις (1/59): 14:5. Cf. πόλις used for עִיר (48); אֹזֶן (3); שַׁעַר (2); קְרִית אֲרָבֶעַ (2); גֶּשֶׁן (2); רְחֵבֶת עִיר (1).
- 190 רְאוּמָה Ῥεημά (1/1): 22:24.
- 191 רֹאשׁ Ῥώς (1/1): 46:21.
- 192 רֹדְנִים Ῥόδιος (1/1): [10:4].
- 193 רְחֵבֶת עִיר Ῥοωβώθ + πόλις (1/1): 10:11.
- 194 רִיפָּת Ῥιφάθ (1/1): 10:3.
- 195 רֶסֶן Δάσεμ (1/1): 10:12.
- 196 רַעְמֶסֶס Ῥαμεσσή (1/2): 47:11. Cf. Ῥαμεσσή used for גֶּשֶׁן (1).
- 197 שְׁבָעָה ὄρκος (1/12): 26:33. Cf. ὄρκος used for בָּאֵר שְׁבָעַ (9); שְׁבוּעָה (2).
- 198 שָׁוָה Σαυή (1/2): 14:17. Cf. Σαυή used for שָׁוָה (1).
- 199 שׁוּה Σωύε (1/1): 25:2.
- 200 שׁוּנִי Σαυνίς (1/1): 46:16.
- 201 שִׁלָּה ἀπόκειμαι + αὐτός (1/1): 49:10.
- 202 שִׁלְם Συλλήμ (1/1): 46:24.
- 203 שִׁלְם Σαλήμ (1/2): 14:18. Cf. Σαλήμ used for שִׁלְם (1).
- 204 שָׁלָף Σάλεφ (1/1): 10:26.

- 205 שְׁמֹאבֶּר Συμόβορ (1/1): 14:2.
- 206 שְׁמֹרֶן Ζαμβράμ (1/1): 46:13.
- 207 שְׁנָאב Σενναάρ (1/5): 14:2. Cf. Σενναάρ used for שְׁנָעַר (4).
- 208 שָׁפּו Σώφ (1/1): 36:23.
- 209 שְׁטָנָה ἐχθρία (1/1): 26:21.
- 210 שָׂרָה Σάρα (1/18): 46:17. Cf. Σάρα used for שָׂרִי (17).
- 211 תִּבְלָל Θοβέλ (1/3): 10:2. Cf. Θοβέλ used for תִּבְלָל קִין (2).
- 212 תּוֹגְרָמָה Θοργαμά (1/1): 10:3.
- 213 תּוֹלָע Θωλά (1/1): 46:13.
- 214 תָּחַן Τάαμ (1/1): [46:20].
- 215 תָּחַשׁ Τόχος (1/1): 22:24.
- 216 תִּימָנִי Θαιμάν (1/6): 25:15. Cf. Θαιμάν used for תִּימָן (4); תִּימָנִי (1).
- 217 תִּימָנִי Θαιμάν (1/6): 36:34. Cf. Θαιμάν used for תִּימָן (4); תִּימָנִי (1).
- 218 תִּירָס Θירás (1/1): 10:2.
- 219 תִּרְשִׁישׁ Θαρσίς (1/1): 10:4.

## Consistent

- 1 אֲבִימֶלֶךְ (24) Ἀβιμέλεχ (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 אֲבָרָם (64) Ἀβράμ (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. Ἀβράμ used for אֲבָרָם (1).
- 3 אֲדָבָאֵל (2) Ναβδεήλ (2/2): [25:3], 13.
- 4 אֲדָמָה (3) Ἀδαμά (3/3): 10:19; 14:2, 8.
- 5 אֲהִלִּיבָמָה (7) Ὀλιβεμά (7/7): 36:2, 5, 14, 18+, 25, 41.
- 6 אֲוָמָר (2) Ὠμάρ (2/2): 36:11, 15.
- 7 אֲוִן (3) ἤλιος + πόλις (3/3): 41:45, 50; 46:20.
- 8 אֲוִנָּן (5) Αὐνάν (5/7): 38:4, 8, 9; 46:12+. Cf. Αὐνάν used for אֲוִנָּר (2).
- 9 אֲוִר (3) χώρα (3/9): 11:28, 31; 15:7. Cf. χώρα used for אֲוִרָץ (5); אֲוִדָה (1).
- 10 אֲחִזָּה (3) Ὀχοζάθ (3/3): [21:22], [32]; 26:26.
- 11 אִילֹן (2) Αἰλὼν (2/2): 26:34; 36:2.
- 12 אֵלִיפָז (7) Ἐλιφάζ (7/7): 36:4, 10, 11, 12+, 15, 16.

- 13 אֱלִישָׁה (2) Ἐλισά (2/2): [10:2], 4.
- 14 אֶלְסָר (2) Ἑλλασάρ (2/2): 14:1, 9.
- 15 אַמְרָפֶל (2) Ἀμαρφάλ (2/2): 14:1, 9.
- 16 אֲנוֹשׁ (6) Ἐνώς (6/6): 4:26; 5:6, 7, 9, 10, 11.
- 17 אֶסְנָת (3) Ἀσεννέθ (3/3): 41:45, 50; 46:20.
- 18 אֶפְרַיִם (12) Ἐφραίμ (12/12): 41:52; 46:20[+]; 48:1, 5, 13, 14, 17+, 20+; 50:23.
- 19 אֶפְרָתָה (3) Ἐφράθα (3/3): 35:16, 19; 48:7.
- 20 אֶצָר (3) Ἀσάρ (3/3): 36:21, 27, 30.
- 21 אֶרִיּוֹחַ (2) Ἀριώχ (2/2): 14:1, 9.
- 22 אֶרְמִי (8) Σύρος (8/9): 25:20+; 28:5; [29:1]; 31:20, [22], 24; [46:20]. Cf. Σύρος used for אֶרְמִי (1).
- 23 אֶרְפַּכְשָׁד (6) Ἀρφαξάδ (6/6): 10:22, 24; 11:10, 11, 12, 13.
- 24 אֶשְׁכּוֹל (2) Ἐσχώλ (2/2): 14:13, 24.
- 25 אֶשֶׁר (4) Ἀσήρ (4/4): 30:13; 35:26; 46:17; 49:20.
- 26 בָּדָד (2) Βαράδ (2/2): 36:35, [39].
- 27 בֵּית לָחֶם (2) Βηθλέεμ (2/2): 35:19; 48:7.
- 28 בִּלְהָה (9) Βάλλα (9/9): 29:29; 30:3, 4, 5, 7; 35:22, 25; 37:2; 46:25.
- 29 בָּלַע (4) Βάλα (4/6): 36:32, 33; 46:21[+]. Cf. Βάλα used for בָּלַע (2).
- 30 בָּלַע (2) Βάλα (2/6): 14:2, 8. Cf. Βάλα used for בָּלַע (4).
- 31 בְּנִימִן (17) Βενιαμίν (17/17): 35:18, 24; 42:4, 36; 43:14, 15, 16, 29, 34; 44:12; 45:12, 14+, 22; 46:19, 21; 49:27.
- 32 בַּעַל הַקֶּן (2) Βαλαεννών (2/2): 36:38, 39.
- 33 בַּרְיָעָה (2) Βαριά (2/2): 46:17+.
- 34 בַּשֶּׁמֶת (6) Βασεμμάθ (6/6): 26:34; 36:3, 4, 10, 13, 17.
- 35 בַּתוּאֵל (10) Βαθουήλ (10/10): 22:22, 23; 24:15, 24, 47, 50; 25:20; 28:2, 5; [29:1].
- 36 גָּד (4) Γάδ (4/4): 30:11; 35:26; 46:16; 49:19.
- 37 גּוֹיִם (2) ἔθνος (2/37): 14:1, 9. Cf. ἔθνος used for גּוֹי (25); עַם (5); זִוְיִים (1); נְשִׂיא (1); אֶמָּה (1); שָׁם (1).
- 38 גִּלְעָד (5) Γαλαάδ (5/5): 31:21, 23, 25; 37:25; [46:20].
- 39 גָּמֶר (2) Γάμερ (2/2): 10:2, 3.
- 40 גַּתְעֹם (2) Γοθόμ (2/2): 36:11, 16.
- 41 גִּרְאָה (2) Γηρά (2/2): 46:21[+].

- 42 גֶּרְגָּשִׁי (2) Γεργεσαῖος (2/2): 10:16; 15:21.
- 43 גֶּרֶן הָאֶטָד (2) ἄλων + Ἀτάδ (2/2): 50:10, 11.
- 44 דִּינָה (10) Δίνα (10/10): 30:21; 34:1, 3, 5, 13, [14], 25, 26, [27]; 46:15.
- 45 דִּישֹׁן (3) Δησών (3/4): 36:21, 25, 30. Cf. Δησών used for דִּישֹׁן (1).
- 46 דְּמִשְׁק (2) Δαμασκός (2/2): 14:15; 15:2.
- 47 דָּן (6) Δάν (6/6): 14:14; 30:6; 35:25; 46:23; 49:16, 17.
- 48 הֶבֶל (8) Ἀβελ (8/8): 4:2+, 4+, 8+, 9, 25.
- 49 הֶגֶר (13) Ἀγάρ (13/13): 16:1, 3, 4, 8, [13], 15+, 16; 21:9, 14, 17+; 25:12.
- 50 הֶדָד (2) Ἀδὰδ (2/3): 36:35, 36. Cf. Ἀδὰδ used for הֶדָד (1).
- 51 הֶרֶן (6) Ἀρράν (6/6): 11:26, 27+, 28, 29, 31.
- 52 זְבוּלֹן (4) Ζαβουλών (4/4): 30:20; 35:23; 46:14; 49:13.
- 53 זֶלְפָּה (7) Ζέλφα (7/7): 29:24; 30:9, 10, 12; 35:26; 37:2; 46:18.
- 54 חֶבְרֹן (5) Χεβρών (5/5): 13:18; 23:2, 19; 35:27; 37:14.
- 55 חוּשִׁם (2) Ἀσόμ (2/3): 36:34, 35. Cf. Ἀσόμ used for חוּשִׁם (1).
- 56 חִירָה (2) Ἰρᾶς (2/2): 38:1, 12.
- 57 חָם (9) Χάμ (9/9): 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:18+, 22; 10:1, 6, 20.
- 58 חֲמֹור (12) Ἑμμώρ (12/12): 33:19; 34:2, 4, [5], 6, 8, 13, 18+, 20, 24, 26.
- 59 חֲנוּךְ (10) Ἐνώχ (10/11): 4:17, 18; 5:18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24; 25:4; 46:9. Cf. Ἐνώχ used for חֲנוּךְ (1).
- 60 חֲצֹרֹן (2) Ἀσρών (2/2): 46:9, 12.
- 61 חֲתִי (8) Χετταῖος (8/9): 15:20; 23:10; 25:9; 26:34; 36:2; 49:29, 30; 50:13. Cf. Χετταῖος used for חֲתִי (1).
- 62 יָאֵר (7) ποταμός (7/16): 41:1, 2, 3+, 17, 18, [19]. Cf. ποταμός used for יָאֵר (9).
- 63 יְבוּסִי (2) Ἰεβουσαῖος (2/2): 10:16; 15:21.
- 64 יְהוּדָה (28) Ἰούδας (28/28): 29:35; 35:23; 37:26; 38:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12+, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24+, 26; 43:3, 8; 44:14, 16, 18; 46:12, 28; 49:8, 9, 10.
- 65 יֹזָבֵב (2) Ἰωβάβ (2/3): 36:33, 34. Cf. Ἰωβάβ used for יֹזָבֵב (1).
- 66 יֶזֶן (2) Ἰωσάν (2/2): 10:2, 4.
- 67 יְעֹשִׁי (3) Ἰεούς (3/3): 36:5, 14, 18.
- 68 יַעֲלָם (3) Ἰεγλόμ (3/3): 36:5, 14, 18.
- 69 יָפֶת (9) Ἰάφεθ (9/9): 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:18, 23, 27; 10:1, 2, 21.
- 70 יַצְחָק (84) Ἰσαάκ (84/86): 17:19, 21; 21:3, 4, 5, 8, [9], 10, 12; 22:2, 3, 6, 7, 9, [13]; [24:3], 4, [7], 14, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67+; 25:5, 6, 9, 11+, 19+, 20, 21, 26, 28; 26:1, 6, 8, 9+, 12, 16, 17, 18,

19, 20, 25, 27, 31, 32, 35; **27:1**, 5, 20, 21, 22, 26, 30+, 32, 33, [34], 37, 39, 46; **28:1**, 5, 6, 8, 13; **31:18**, 42, 53; **32:10**; **35:12**, 27+, 28; **46:1**; **48:15**, 16; **49:31**; **50:24**.

- 71 יְקָטָן (3) Ἰεκτάν (3/3): **10:25**, 26, 29.
- 72 יְקָשָׁן (2) Ἰεξάν (2/2): **25:2**, 3.
- 73 יָרֵד (5) Ἰάρεδ (5/5): **5:15**, 16, 18, 19, 20.
- 74 יָרֵדָן (5) Ἰορδάνης (5/5): **13:10**, 11; **32:11**; **50:10**, 11.
- 75 יִשְׁמַעֵאל (17) Ἰσμαήλ (17/17): **16:11**, 15, 16; **17:18**, 20, 23, 25, 26; **25:9**, 12, 13+, 16, 17; **28:9+**; **36:3**.
- 76 יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִי (4) Ἰσμαηλίτης (4/4): **37:25**, 27, 28; **39:1**.
- 77 יִשְׁשַׁכָּר (4) Ἰσσαχάρ (4/4): **30:18**; **35:23**; **46:13**; **49:14**.
- 78 כְּדָרְלִעְמוֹר (5) Χοδολλογόμορ (5/5): **14:1**, 4, 5, 9, 17.
- 79 כָּלַח (2) Κάλαχ (2/2): **10:11**, 12.
- 80 כַּשְׁדִּים (3) Χαλδαῖος (3/3): **11:28**, 31; **15:7**.
- 81 לָאֵה (35) Λεία (35/36): **29:16**, 17, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, [33]; **30:9**, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14+, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20; **31:4**, 14, 33+; **33:1**, 2, 7; **34:1**, [14]; **35:23**, 26; **46:15**, 18; **49:31**.
- 82 לָבָן (58) Λαβάν (58/58): **24:29+**, 50; **25:20**; **27:43**; **28:2**, 5; [29:1], 5, [9], 10++, 13+, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, [23], 24, 25, 26, [28], 29; **30:25**, 27, [31], 34, 36, 40, 42; **31:1**, 2, 12, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25+, 26, 31, 33, 34, 36+, 43, 47, 48, 51; **32:1+**, 5; **46:18**, 25.
- 83 לֹדֶד (2) Λούδ (2/2): **10:13**, 22.
- 84 לוֹט (32) Λώτ (32/32): **11:27**, 31; **12:4**, 5, [20]; **13:1**, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11+, 12, 14; **14:12**, [14], 16; **19:1+**, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 23, 29+, 30, 36.
- 85 לוֹטָן (4) Λωτάν (4/4): **36:20**, 22+, 29.
- 86 לוֹי (7) Λεuí (7/7): **29:34**; [34:14], 25, 30; **35:23**; **46:11**; **49:5**.
- 87 לָמֶךְ (10) Λάμεχ (10/10): **4:18**, 19, 23+, 24; **5:25**, 26, 28, 30, 31.
- 88 מִדֵּן (3) Μαδιάμ (3/3): **25:2**, 4; **36:35**.
- 89 מִדְיָנִי (2) Μαδιηναῖος (2/2): **37:28**, 36.
- 90 מַהֲלֵלֶיאל (5) Μαλελεήλ (5/5): **5:12**, 13, 15, 16, 17.
- 91 מִזָּה (2) Μοζέ (2/2): **36:13**, 17.
- 92 מַחֲוִיָּאל (2) Μαιήλ (2/2): **4:18+**.
- 93 מַכִּיר (3) Μαχίρ (3/3): [46:20][+]; **50:23**.
- 94 מַכְפֵּלָה (6) διπλοῦς (6/7): **23:9**, 17, 19; **25:9**; **49:30**; **50:13**. Cf. διπλοῦς used for מִשְׁנֶה (1).
- 95 מִלְכָּה (7) Μελχά (7/7): **11:29+**; **22:20**, 23; **24:15**, 24, 47.

- 96 מִמְרָא (8) Μαμβρή (8/10): **13:18; 18:1; 23:17, 19; 25:9; 35:27; 49:30; 50:13**. Cf. Μαμβρή used for מִמְרָא (2).
- 97 מִמְרָא (2) Μαμβρή (2/10): **14:13, 24**. Cf. Μαμβρή used for מִמְרָא (8).
- 98 מְנִשָּׁה (13) Μανασσή (12/12): **41:51; 46:20[+][+]; 48:1, 5, 13, 14, 17, 20+; 50:23**.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **48:14**).
- 99 מִצְרִי (10) Αἰγύπτιος (10/20): **12:12, 14; 16:1, 3; 21:9; 39:1, 2, 5; 43:32+**. Cf. Αἰγύπτιος used for מִצְרַיִם (9); עַם (1).
- 100 מְתוּשָׁאֵל (2) Μαθουσαλά (2/2): **4:18+**.
- 101 מְתוּשָׁלַח (5) Μαθουσάλα (5/5): **5:21, 22, 25, 26, 27**.
- 102 נְבִיֹּחַ (3) Ναβαιώθ (3/3): **25:13; 28:9; 36:3**.
- 103 נָחוֹר (16) Ναχώρ (16/16): **11:22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29+; 22:20, 23; 24:10, 15, 24, 47; 29:5; 31:53**.
- 104 נַחַת (2) Νάχοθ (2/2): **36:13, 17**.
- 105 נִינְוָה (2) Νινευή (2/2): **10:11, 12**.
- 106 נִמְרֹד (2) Νεβρώδ (2/2): **10:8, 9**.
- 107 נִפְתָּלִי (4) Νεφθαλί (4/4): **30:8; 35:25; 46:24; 49:21**.
- 108 עֶבֶר (7) Ἑβερ (7/7): **10:21, 24, 25; 11:14, 15, 16, 17**.
- 109 עָדָה (8) Ἀδά (8/8): **4:19, 20, 23; 36:2, 4, 10, 12, 16**.
- 110 עֲדֻלְמִי (3) Ὀδολλαμίτης (3/3): **38:1, 12, 20**.
- 111 עֵי (2) Ἀγγαί (2/2): [עֵי + הַ] (2): **12:8; 13:3**.
- 112 עֵילָם (3) Αἰλάμ (3/3): **10:22; 14:1, 9**.
- 113 עֵינַיִם (2) Αἰνάν (2/2): **38:14, 21**.
- 114 עִידָד (2) Γαιδάδ (2/2): **4:18+**.
- 115 עֶכְבֹּר (2) Ἀχοβώρ (2/2): **36:38, 39**.
- 116 עֶמְלֶק (2) Ἀμαλήκ (2/3): **36:12, 16**. Cf. Ἀμαλήκ used for עֶמְלֶקֶי (1).
- 117 עֶמְרָה (10) Γόμορρα (10/10): **10:19; 13:10; 14:2, 8, 10, 11; [18:16], 20; 19:24, 28**.
- 118 עֲנָר (2) Αὐνάν (2/7): **14:13, 24**. Cf. Αὐνάν used for עֲנָן (5).
- 119 עֶפְרָן (12) Ἐφρών (12/12): **23:8, 10+, 13, 14, 16+, 17; 25:9; 49:29, 30; 50:13**.
- 120 עֵר (5) Ἡρ (5/5): **38:3, 6, 7; 46:12+**.
- 121 עֶשָׂו (81) Ἡσαύ (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**.

|     |                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 122 | פּוֹטִי פֶּרַע | (3) Πετεφρῆς (3/5): 41:45, 50; 46:20. Cf. Πετεφρῆς used for פּוֹטִיפֶּר (2).                                                                                                                                   |
| 123 | פּוֹטִיפֶּר    | (2) Πετεφρῆς (2/5): 37:36; 39:1. Cf. Πετεφρῆς used for פֶּרַע פּוֹטִי (3).                                                                                                                                     |
| 124 | פִּיכֹל        | (3) Φιχόλ (3/3): 21:22, 32; 26:26.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 125 | פֶּלֶג         | (5) Φάλεκ (5/5): 10:25; 11:16, 17, 18, 19.                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 126 | פֶּרִיז        | (3) Φερεζαῖος (3/3): 13:7; 15:20; 34:30.                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 127 | פֶּרֶץ         | (3) Φάρες (3/3): 38:29; 46:12+.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 128 | פֶּרַת         | (2) Εὐφράτης (2/2): 2:14; 15:18.                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 129 | צְבֹאִים       | (3) Σεβωίμ (3/3): 10:19; 14:2, 8.                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 130 | צִבְעֹן        | (6) Σεβεγών (6/6): 36:2, 14, 20, 24+, 29.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 131 | צָחַר          | (3) Σάαρ (3/3): 23:8; 25:9; 46:10.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 132 | צִידֹן         | (3) Σιδών (3/3): 10:15, 19; 49:13.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 133 | צֵלָה          | (3) Σελλά (3/3): 4:19, 22, 23.                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 134 | צָפֹ           | (2) Σωφάρ (2/2): 36:11, 15.                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 135 | קִדְשׁ         | (3) Καδής (3/3): 14:7; 16:14; 20:1.                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 136 | קִטּוּרָה      | (2) Χεττούρα (2/2): 25:1, 4.                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 137 | קַיִן          | (16) Κάιν (16/16): 4:1, 2, 3, 5+, 6, 8+, 9, 13, 15+, 16, 17, 24, 25.                                                                                                                                           |
| 138 | קַיִן          | (12) Καινάν (12/12): 5:9, 10, 12, 13, 14; [10:22], [24][+]; [11:12], [13][+][+].                                                                                                                               |
| 139 | קִנִּז         | (3) Κενέζ (3/3): 36:11, 15, 42.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 140 | קֹרֶחַ         | (4) Κόρε (4/4): 36:5, 14, 16, 18.                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 141 | רְאוּבֵן       | (13) Ρουβήν (13/13): 29:32; 30:14; 35:22, 23; 37:21, 22, 29; 42:22, 37; 46:8, 9; 48:5; 49:3.                                                                                                                   |
| 142 | רִבְקָה        | (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.                               |
| 143 | רַחֵל          | (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. |
| 144 | רָעוּ          | (4) Ραγού (4/4): 11:18, 19, 20, 21.                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 145 | רְעוּאֵל       | (6) Ραγούήλ (6/6): [25:3]; 36:4, 10, 13, 17+.                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 146 | רְעֻמָּה       | (2) Ρεγμά (2/2): 10:7+.                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 147 | שָׂאוּל        | (3) Σαούλ (3/3): 36:37, 38; 46:10.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 148 | שׁוּבָל        | (3) Σωβάλ (3/3): 36:20, 23, 29.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 149 | שׁוּעַ         | (2) Σαύα (2/2): 38:2, 12.                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 150 | שׁוּר          | (3) Σούρ (3/3): 16:7; 20:1; 25:18.                                                                                                                                                                             |

- 151 שותלח (2) Σουθάλααμ (2/2): [46:20][+].
- 152 שָׁכַם (12) Συχέμ (12/16): 33:19; 34:2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 24, 26+. Cf. Συχέμ used for שָׁכַם (4).
- 153 שָׁלַח (5) Σηλώμ (5/5): 38:5, 11, 14, 26; 46:12.
- 154 שָׁלַח (6) Σάλα (6/6): 10:24+; [11:13]+, 14, 15.
- 155 שָׁם (14) Σήμ (14/14): 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:18, 23, 26, 27; 10:1, 21, 22, 31; 11:10+, 11.
- 156 שָׁמָּה (2) Σομέ (2/2): 36:13, 17.
- 157 שְׁמֵעוֹן (11) Συμεών (11/11): 29:33; [34:14], 25, 30; 35:23; 42:24, 36; 43:23; 46:10; 48:5; 49:5.
- 158 שְׁנָעַר (4) Σενναάρ (4/5): 10:10; 11:2; 14:1, 9. Cf. Σενναάρ used for שְׁנָעַר (1).
- 159 שֵׁת (7) Σήθ (7/7): 4:25, 26; 5:3, 4, 6, 7, 8.
- 160 שָׁדִים (3) ἄλυκός (3/3): 14:3, 8, 10.
- 161 שְׁמָלָה (2) Σαμαλά (2/2): 36:36, 37.
- 162 שָׂרָה (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).
- 163 שָׁרוּג (4) Σερούχ (4/4): 11:20, 21, 22, 23.
- 164 שָׂרִי (17) Σάρα (17/18): 11:29, 30, 31; 12:5, 11, 17; 16:1, 2+, 3, 5, 6+, 8+; 17:15+. Cf. Σάρα used for שָׂרִי (1).
- 165 תִּדְעַל (2) Θαργάλ (2/2): 14:1, 9.
- 166 תּוֹבֵל קֶן (2) Θοβέλ (2/3): 4:22+. Cf. Θοβέλ used for תּוֹבֵל (1).
- 167 תִּימָן (4) Θαιμάν (4/6): [25:3]; 36:11, 15, 42. Cf. Θαιμάν used for תִּימָן (1); תִּימָנִי (1).
- 168 תִּמְנָע (3) Θαμνά (3/6): 36:12, 22, 40. Cf. Θαμνά used for תִּמְנָה (3).
- 169 תִּמָּר (6) Θαμάρ (6/6): 38:6, 11+, 13, 24, [26].
- 170 תָּרַח (9) Θάρα (9/9): 11:24, 25, 26, 27+, 28, 31, 32+.

## Main

- 1 אֲבִרְהָם (140) Ἀβραάμ (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.  
αὐτός (1/1,600): 25:6.



- 2 אָדוּם (13) Ἐδῶμ (12/13): **25:30; 32:4; 36:1**, 8, 9, 17, 19, 21, 31, 32, 43+. Cf. Ἐδῶμ used for עֶדֶי (1).  
Ἰδομαία (1/1): **36:16**.
- 3 אָדָם (9) Ἀδάμ (8/26): **2:20**; [3:9], 17, 21; **4:25; 5:3**, 4, 5. Cf. Ἀδάμ used for אָדָם (18).  
ἄνθρωπος (1/96): **5:1**. Cf. ἄνθρωπος used for אִישׁ (69); אָדָם (25); בָּשָׂר (1).
- 4 אָמֹרִי (6) Ἀμορραῖος (5/5): **10:16; 14:7; 15:16**, 21; **48:22**.  
Ἄμορις (1/1): **14:13**.
- 5 אָשּׁוּר (4) Ἀσσούρ (2/2): **10:11**, 22.  
Ἀσσύριος (1/2): **2:14**.  
πρός + Ἀσσύριος (1/1): **25:18**.
- 6 בָּאֵר לְחַי רֵאִי (3) φρέαρ + ὄρασις (2/2): **24:62; 25:11**.  
φρέαρ + ὄς + ἐνώπιον + ὁράω (1/1): **16:14**.
- 7 בָּאֵר שְׁבַע (11) φρέαρ + ὄρκος (8/8): **21:14**, 33; **22:19+**; **26:23**, 33; **28:10; 46:5**.  
φρέαρ + ὀρκισμός (2/2): **21:31**, 32.  
ἐπί + φρέαρ + ὄρκος (1/1): **46:1**.
- 8 בָּבֶל (2) Βαβυλών (1/1): **10:10**.  
σύγχυσις (1/1): **11:9**.
- 9 בֵּית-אֵל (13) Βαιθήλ (11/11): **12:8+**; **13:3+**; **35:1**, 3, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16.  
οἶκος + θεός (1/1): **28:19**.  
τόπος + θεός (1/1): **31:13**.
- 10 גִּלְעָד (2) βουνός + μάρτυς (1/1): **31:47**.  
βουνός + μαρτυρέω (1/1): **31:48**.
- 11 גֶּרָר (9) Γέραρα (7/10): **20:1**, 2; **26:6**, 17, [19], 20, 26. Cf. Γέραρα used for פְּלִשְׁתִּי (1).  
εἰς + Γέραρα (2/2): **10:19; 26:1**.
- 12 גִּזְזִין (10) Γέσεμ (5/7): **47:1**, 4, 6, 27; **50:8**.  
Γέσεμ + Ἀραβία (2/2): **45:10; 46:34**.  
κατά + ἡρώς + πόλις (2/2): **46:28**, 29.  
Ῥαμεσσή (1/2): **46:28**. Cf. Ῥαμεσσή used for מִצְרַיִם (1).
- 13 דִּישׁוֹן (4) Ῥισών (3/3): **36:21**, 28, 30.  
Δησών (1/4): **36:26**. Cf. Δησών used for דִּישׁוֹן (3).
- 14 דִּתָּן (2) Δωθάϊμ (1/2): **37:17**.  
εἰς + Δωθάϊμ (1/1): **37:17**.
- 15 חֲוָה (3) Εὐά (2/2): **4:1**, [25].  
ζωή (1/23): **3:20**. Cf. ζωή used for חַי (20); חַי (1); מְחִיָּה (1).
- 16 חַיִּי (5) Εὐαῖος (4/4): **10:17**; [15:21]; [26:34]; **36:2**.

- Xopraïos* (1/4): **34:2**. Cf. *Xopraïos* used for חֲרִי (3).
- 17 חֲרִי (5) *Xopraïos* (3/4): **14:6; 36:20**, 21. Cf. *Xopraïos* used for חֲרִי (1).  
*Xopri* (2/3): **36:29**, 30. Cf. *Xopri* used for חֲרִי (1).
- 18 חֲרִי (8) *Xappán* (6/9): **11:31**, [32]+; **12:4**, 5; **29:4**. Cf. *Xappán* used for חֲרִי (1).  
*εἰς* + *Xappán* (2/2): **27:43; 28:10**.
- 19 חֲרִי (13) *Χέτ* (11/11): **23:3**, 5, 7, 10+, 16, 18, 20; **25:10; 27:46; 49:32**.  
*Χετταῖος* (1/9): **10:15**. Cf. *Χετταῖος* used for חֲרִי (8).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **27:46**).
- 20 יהוה (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 אֲדֹנָי (78); אֱלֹהִים (7); גִּבּוֹר (2); בָּעַל (1).  
*κύριος* + *ὁ* + *θεός* (16/21): **4:6**, 15+, 26; **5:29; 6:3**, 5, 8; **7:1**, 5, 16; **8:21+**; **10:9; 11:9; 16:7**. Cf. *κύριος* + *ὁ* + *θεός* used for אֱלֹהִים (5).  
*θεός* (33/281): **4:1**, 4, 9, 16; **6:6**, 7; **8:20; 12:17; 13:10+**, 13, 14; **15:4**, 6, 7; **16:5; 18:1**, 14; **25:21; 30:24**, 27; **31:49; 38:7**, 10.; [יהוה + אֱלֹהִים] (8): **2:4**, 5, 7, 9, 19, 21; **3:13**, 22.; [יהוה + אֱל] (1): **14:22**. Cf. *θεός* used for אֱלֹהִים (211); אֱל (15); בֵּית-אֱל (2); פְּנִימָא (1); פְּנוּמָא (1).  
*δεσπότης* (1/2): [יהוה + יְיָ + אֲדֹנָי] (1): **15:2**. Cf. *δεσπότης* used for אֲדֹנָי (1).
- 21 יוֹסֵף (162) *Ἰωσήφ* (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. *Ἰωσήφ* used for יוֹ (4); פְּרָעָה (1).  
*αὐτός* (1/1,600): **48:15**.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **41:45**).
- 22 יַעֲקֹב (198) *Ἰακώβ* (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 יַ (2); לְאִשָּׁי (2).  
 Ἰσραήλ (1/42): **35:5**. Cf. Ἰσραήλ used for לְאִשָּׁי (41).  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **42:1**).
- 23**      לְאִשָּׁי      (46) Ἰσραήλ (41/42): **32:29**, 33; **33:20**; **34:7**; [35:5], 10, 22+; **36:31**; [37:2], 13, [14]; **42:5**; **43:6**, 8, 11; **45:21**, 28; **46:1**, 2, 5, 8, 29, 30; **47:27**, 29, 31; **48:2**, 8, 11, 13+, 14, 20, 21; **49:2**, 7, 16, 24; **50:2**, 25. Cf. Ἰσραήλ used for בְּכָרִי (1).  
 Ἰακώβ (2/200): **37:3**; **49:28**. Cf. Ἰακώβ used for בְּכָרִי (196); יַ (2).  
 αὐτός (1/1,600): **48:10**.  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: **35:10**, 21).
- 24**      כּוּשׁ      (4) Χούς (3/3): **10:6**, 7, 8.  
 Αἰθιοπία (1/1): **2:13**.
- 25**      בְּנֵי      (48) Χανάαν (47/48): **9:18**, 22, 25, 26, 27; **10:6**, 15; **11:31**; **12:5+**; **13:12**; **16:3**; **17:8**; **23:2**, 19; **28:1**, 6, 8; **31:18**; **33:18**; **35:6**, [27]; **36:5**, 6[+]; **37:1**; **42:5**, 7, 13, 29, 32; **44:8**; **45:17**, 25; **46:6**, 12, 31; **47:1**, 4, 13, 14, 15; **48:3**, 7; **49:30**; **50:5**, 13. Cf. Χανάαν used for בְּנֵי (1).  
 Χαναναῖος (1/10): **36:2**. Cf. Χαναναῖος used for בְּנֵי (9).
- 26**      בְּנֵי      (11) Χαναναῖος (9/10): **10:18**, 19; **12:6**; **13:7**; **15:21**; **24:3**, 37; **34:30**; **38:2**. Cf. Χαναναῖος used for בְּנֵי (1).  
 Χανανῖτις (1/1): **46:10**.  
 Χανάαν (1/48): **50:11**. Cf. Χανάαν used for בְּנֵי (47).
- 27**      לֹחַ      (4) Λοῦζα (2/3): [35:9]; **48:3**.  
 Οὐλαμλούζ (1/1): [לֹחַ + מְלֹחַ] (1): **28:19**.  
 εἰς + Λοῦζα (1/1): **35:6**.
- 28**      מִוָּאב      (3) Μωάβ (2/2): **19:37**; **36:35**.  
 Μωαβίτης (1/1): **19:37**.
- 29**      מִצְרַיִם      (90) Αἴγυπτος (58/78): **13:1**, 10; **15:18**; **21:21**; **25:18**; **37:36**; **40:1+**, 5; **41:8**, 19, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, 41, 43, 44, 46+, 48, 53, 54, 55; **42:1**, 2, 3; **43:2**, 15; **45:8**, 9, 13, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26; **46:20**, 27; **47:6**[+], 11, 13, 14, 15, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30; **48:5**; **50:3**, 7, 22, 26. Cf. Αἴγυπτος used for מִצְרַיִם לְבָרִי (1).  
 εἰς + Αἴγυπτος (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 מִצְרַיִם (10); עַם (1).  
 Μεσράιμ (2/2): **10:6**, 13.  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: **41:45**, 56).

- 30 נָח (43) Nῶε (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. Nῶε used for יֵר (1).  
αὐτός (1/1,600): **7**:9.
- 31 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.  
εἰς + Σόδομα (2/2): **18**:22; **19**:1.  
Σοδομίτης (1/1): [סְדֹם + אִישׁ] (1): **19**:4.
- 32 סְכָנֹת (2) σκηνή (1/17): **33**:17. Cf. σκηνή used for אֹהֶל (13); קֶצֶר (1); סֶכֶד (1).  
εἰς + σκηνή (1/1): **33**:17.
- 33 עֲבָרִי (6) Ἐβραῖος (5/5): **39**:14, 17; **40**:15; **41**:12; **43**:32.  
περατή (1/1): **14**:13.
- 34 עֵדֶן (5) Ἔδεμ (3/3): **2**:8, 10; **4**:16.  
τρυφή (2/3): **3**:23, 24. Cf. τρυφή used for מְעֻדָּנִים (1).
- 35 עֵנָה (8) Ἀνά (6/6): **36**:2, 14, 20, 25+, 29.  
Ὠνᾶς (2/2): **36**:24+.
- 36 פְּדֹן אֲרָם (11) Μεσοποταμία (2/13): **25**:20; **31**:18. Cf. Μεσοποταμία used for אֲרָם נְהָרִים (1); פְּדֹן (1).  
εἰς + Μεσοποταμία (4/4): [27:43]; **28**:2, 5, 7.  
Μεσοποταμία + Συρία (4/4): **33**:18; **35**:9, 26; **46**:15.  
εἰς + Μεσοποταμία + Συρία (1/1): **28**:6.
- 37 פְּלִשְׁתִּי (8) Φυλιστιείμ (7/7): **10**:14; **21**:32, 34; **26**:1, 14, 15, 18.  
Γέραρα (1/10): **26**:8. Cf. Γέραρα used for גֶּרָר (9).
- 38 פְּרָעָה (97) Φαραώ (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.  
σύ + εἰμί + μετά + Φαραώ (1/1): [פְּרָעָה + כִּי + הָיָה + כִּמּוֹ] (1): **44**:18.  
Ἰωσήφ (1/165): **46**:5. Cf. Ἰωσήφ used for יוֹסֵף (160); יֵר (4).  
αὐτός (1/1,600): **47**:10.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **41**:33).
- 39 צֶעֶר (7) Σήγωρ (5/6): **14**:2, 8; **19**:22, 30+.  
εἰς + Σήγωρ (1/1): **19**:23.  
Ζόγορα (1/1): **13**:10.
- 40 רְחוֹבוֹת (2) Ῥωβώθ (1/2): **36**:37. Cf. Ῥωβώθ used for רְחוֹבֵי עִיר (1).  
εὐρυχωρία (1/1): **26**:22.
- 41 רַפָּאִים (2) Ῥαφαῖν (1/1): **15**:20.

- γίγας (1/6): **14:5**. Cf. γίγας used for גִּבּוֹר (4); נְפִילִים (1).
- 42 שָׂכָם (6) Συχέμ (3/16): **12:6; 37:12, 13**. Cf. Συχέμ used for שָׂכָם (12).  
Σίκιμα (2/4): **33:18; 35:4**. Cf. Σίκιμα used for שָׂכָם (1).  
εἰς + Συχέμ (1/1): **37:14**.
- 43 שְׁעִיר (9) Σηίρ (6/8): **14:6; 32:4; 36:8, 9, 20, 21**.  
εἰς + Σηίρ (2/2): **33:14, 16**.  
Ἐδώμ (1/13): **36:30**. Cf. Ἐδώμ used for שְׁעִיר (12).
- 44 תְּמִנָּה (3) Θαμνά (1/6): **38:14**. Cf. Θαμνά used for תְּמִנָּה (3).  
εἰς + Θαμνά (2/2): **38:12, 13**.

## No main

- 1 אָרָם (4) Ἀράμ (2/3): **10:22, 23**. Cf. Ἀράμ used for אָרָם (1).  
Σύρος (1/9): **22:21**. Cf. Σύρος used for אָרָם (8).  
Συρία (1/6): **[48:7]**. Cf. Συρία used for אָרָם (5).
- 2 דָּדָן (3) Δαδάν (1/1): **10:7**.  
Δαιδάν (2/2): **25:3+**.
- 3 זָרַח (5) Ζάρε (2/2): **36:13, 17**.  
Ζάρα (3/3): **36:33; 38:30; 46:12**.
- 4 חוּלָה (4) Εύιλάτ (2/2): **2:11; 25:18**.  
Εύιλά (2/2): **10:7, 29**.
- 5 נֶגֶב (3) ἔρημος (1/11): **13:3**. Cf. ἔρημος used for נֶגֶב (8).  
λίψ (2/4): **20:1; 24:62**. Cf. λίψ used for נֶגֶב (1).
- 6 עֹץ (3) ὠς (2/2): **10:23; 36:28**.  
ὠξ (1/1): **22:21**.
- 7 קְרִית אֲרָבַע (2) πόλις + Ἀρβόκ (1/1): **23:2**.  
πόλις + ὁ + πεδῖον (1/1): **35:27**.
- 8 שָׂבָא (3) Σαβά (2/3): **10:7; 25:3**. Cf. Σαβά used for שָׂבָא (1).  
Σαβεῦ (1/1): **10:28**.
- 9 שָׂדֵי (6) σύ (2/750): **17:1; 35:11**.  
ἐγώ (3/840): **28:3; 43:14; 48:3**.  
ἐμός (1/11): **49:25**. Cf. ἐμός used for שָׂדֵי (10).

## Common nouns

### Hapaxlegomena

- 1 אָבִיר δυνάστης (1/2): 49:24. Cf. δυνάστης used for בֵּית (1).
- 2 אֵד πηγῇ (1/13): 2:6. Cf. πηγῇ used for עֵין (9); מַעְיֵן (2); עֵין מְשַׁפֵּט (1).
- 3 אֲדָרַת δορά (1/1): 25:25.
- 4 אֲהָבָה ἀγαπάω (1/11): 29:20. Cf. ἀγαπάω used for אֶהֱבֵה (10).
- 5 אֵן τέκνον (1/21): 49:3. Cf. τέκνον used for בֶּן (18); יָלֵד (2).
- 6 אֲחֹר εἰς + ὁ + ὀπίσω (1/2): 49:17.
- 7 אַחַר καί + γάρ + ἐνώπιον + ὁράω (1/1): [אָחַר + רֹאֶה + הֵלֵם + גַּם + הֵן] (1): 16:13.
- 8 אַחֲרִית ἔσχατος (1/2): 49:1. Cf. ἔσχατος used for אַחֲרוֹן (1).
- 9 אֵיבָה ἔχθρα (1/1): 3:15.
- 10 אֵילָה στέλεχος (1/1): 49:21.
- 11 אִימָה φόβος (1/5): 15:12. Cf. φόβος used for פָּחַד (2); חַת (1); חֲתָה (1).
- 12 אֵל ἰσχύω (1/1): [אֵל + יֵשׁ + אֵל] (1): 31:29.
- 13 אֵלָה τερέμινθος (1/3): 35:4. Cf. τερέμινθος used for אֵיל פְּאֶרֶן (1); בְּטָנָה (1).
- 14 אֵלְמָנָה χήρα (1/1): 38:11.
- 15 אָמָה ἔθνος (1/37): 25:16. Cf. ἔθνος used for גּוֹי (25); עַם (5); גּוֹיִם (2); זִוְזִים (1); נְשִׂיא (1); שָׁם (1).
- 16 אָמָר γένημα (1/3): 49:21. Cf. γένημα used for תְּבוּאָה (1).
- 17 אֲמָרָה λόγος (1/3): 4:23. Cf. λόγος used for דְּבָר (2).
- 18 אָנִיָּה πλοῖον (1/1): 49:13.
- 19 אָסִיר ἀπάγω (1/6): 39:22. Cf. ἀπάγω used for נָהַג (2); אָסַר (2); בּוֹא (1).
- 20 אָפָר σποδός (1/1): 18:27.
- 21 אָרֹן σορός (1/1): 50:26.
- 22 אֲרָחָה ὁδοιπόρος (1/1): 37:25.
- 23 אֲשָׁבּוּל βότρυς (1/1): 40:10.
- 24 אֲשָׁל ἄρουρα (1/1): 21:33.
- 25 אֲשָׁם ἄγνοια (1/1): 26:10.
- 26 אֲשָׁר μακάριος (1/1): 30:13.
- 27 בְּדִלְחָ ἀνθραξ (1/1): 2:12.

- 28 בֹּהו *ἀκατασκευάστος* (1/1): 1:2.
- 29 בּוּז *καταγελᾶω* (1/1): [היה + ל' + בּוּז] (1): 38:23.
- 30 בָּטָח *ἀσφαλῶς* (1/1): 34:25.
- 31 בָּטָנָה *τερέμινθος* (1/3): 43:11. Cf. *τερέμινθος* used for אֵיל פֶּאֶרֶן (1); אֵלָה (1).
- 32 בָּכוֹת *πένθος* (1/7): 35:8. Cf. *πένθος* used for אֲבֵל (4); בְּכִית (1); אֲבֵל מִצְרַיִם (1).
- 33 בָּכִי *κλαυθμός* (1/2): 45:2.
- 34 בְּכִית *πένθος* (1/7): 50:4. Cf. *πένθος* used for אֲבֵל (4); בָּכוֹת (1); אֲבֵל מִצְרַיִם (1).
- 35 בָּעִיר *πορεῖον* (1/1): 45:17.
- 36 בָּצַע *χρήσιμος* (1/1): 37:26.
- 37 בָּקַע *δραχμή* (1/1): 24:22.
- 38 בִּקְעָה *πεδίον* (1/19): 11:2. Cf. *πεδίον* used for שְׂדֵה (16); עֵמֶק (1); קְרִית אֶרֶבֶעַ (1).
- 39 בְּרִזָּל *σίδηρος* (1/1): 4:22.
- 40 בְּתוּלָה *παρθένος* (1/7): 24:16. Cf. *παρθένος* used for נַעֲרָה (5); עֵלְמָה (1).
- 41 בְּתָר *αὐτός* (1/1,600): [אִישׁ + בְּתָר + ו'] (1): 15:10.
- 42 גְּבַעָה *θίς* (1/1): 49:26.
- 43 גָּד *τύχη* (1/1): 30:11.
- 44 גְּדוּד *πειρατήριον* (1/1): 49:19.
- 45 גִּזְלָה *περιστερά* (1/6): 15:9. Cf. *περιστερά* used for יוֹנָה (5).
- 46 גְּוִיָּה *σῶμα* (1/5): 47:18. Cf. *σῶμα* used for פֶּגֶר (1); חֵיל (1); נֶפֶשׁ (1); טַף (1).
- 47 גּוֹר *σκύμνος* (1/2): 49:9. Cf. *σκύμνος* used for לְבִיא (1).
- 48 גִּזְרָה *διχοτόμημα* (1/2): 15:17.
- 49 גִּחְזָה *στῆθος* (1/1): 3:14.
- 50 גִּפְרָה *τετράγωνος* (1/1): 6:14.
- 51 גִּפְרִית *θειον* (1/1): 19:24.
- 52 גִּרָם *ἐπιθυμέω* (1/2): 49:14. Cf. *ἐπιθυμέω* used for כֶּסֶף (1).
- 53 דְּבָה *ψόγος* (1/1): 37:2.
- 54 דְּבֶשׁ *μέλι* (1/1): 43:11.
- 55 דָּג *ἰχθύς* (1/3): 9:2. Cf. *ἰχθύς* used for דָּגָה (2).
- 56 דְּרִידָר *τρίβολος* (1/1): 3:18.
- 57 הֶפְכָּה *καταστροφή* (1/1): 19:29.
- 58 הֶרֶן *στεναγμός* (1/1): 3:16.

- 59 וָלֵד τεκνοποιέω (1/3): [וָלֵד + ה־ + לֵ] (1): 11:30. Cf. τεκνοποιέω used for בנה (2).
- 60 זָאב λύκος (1/1): 49:27.
- 61 זָבַד δῶρον (1/12): 30:20. Cf. δῶρον used for מְנַחֶה (10); מָגֵד (1).
- 62 זַיִת ἐλαία (1/1): 8:11.
- 63 זָמְרָה καρπός (1/9): 43:11. Cf. καρπός used for פְּרִי (8).
- 64 זְנוּנִים πορνεία (1/1): 38:24.
- 65 זָעָה ἰδρώς (1/1): 3:19.
- 66 זָעָקָה κραυγή (1/3): 18:20. Cf. κραυγή used for צָעָקָה (2).
- 67 זָקַן γῆρας (1/10): 48:10. Cf. γῆρας used for שִׁיבָה (5); זָקֵנִים (4).
- 68 זָקְנָה γηράσκω (1/4): [24:36]. Cf. γηράσκω used for זָקַן (3).
- 69 זָרֹעַ νεῦρον (1/3): 49:24. Cf. νεῦρον used for גֵּיד (2).
- 70 חֲבוּרָה μώλωψ (1/1): 4:23.
- 71 חֲגוּרָה περίζωμα (1/1): 3:7.
- 72 חָדָר εἰς + ταμιεῖον (1/1): 43:30.
- 73 חוּט σπαρτίον (1/1): 14:23.
- 74 חוֹתֶם δακτύλιος (1/3): 38:18. Cf. δακτύλιος used for חֲתָמָה (1); טַבַּעַת (1).
- 75 חָטָא ἁμαρτία (1/6): 41:9. Cf. ἁμαρτία used for חַטָּאת (2); עוֹן (1); חֲטָאָה (1); אָשָׁם (1).
- 76 חֲטָאָה ἁμαρτία (1/6): 20:9. Cf. ἁμαρτία used for חַטָּאת (2); עוֹן (1); חֲטָאָה (1); אָשָׁם (1).
- 77 חָטָה πυρός (1/1): 30:14.
- 78 חֵיק κόλπος (1/1): 16:5.
- 79 חֲלָצִים ὀσφύς (1/2): 35:11. Cf. ὀσφύς used for מִתְּנִיָּם (1).
- 80 חֲלָקָה γυμνός (1/5): 27:16. Cf. γυμνός used for עִירֹם (3); עָרוֹם (1).
- 81 חֲלָקָה μερίς (1/7): 33:19. Cf. μερίς used for חֶלֶק (3); מִשְׁאַת (3).
- 82 חֲמָאָה βούτυρον (1/1): 18:8.
- 83 חֲמָדוֹת καλός (1/41): 27:15. Cf. καλός used for טוֹב (32); יָפֶה (6); טוֹבָה (1); חֲמוּר (1).
- 84 חֲמָלָה φείδομαι (1/5): 19:16. Cf. φείδομαι used for חָשָׁךְ (3); חוּס (1).
- 85 חֲמָר πηλός (1/1): 11:3.
- 86 חֲמָשׁ ἀποπεμπτόω (1/2): 47:26. Cf. ἀποπεμπτόω used for חֲמָשׁ (1).
- 87 חֲנֻטִים ταφή (1/1): 50:3.
- 88 חֲנִידָה ἴδιος (1/3): 14:14. Cf. ἴδιος used for יָדוֹ (1).
- 89 חֵץ τόξευμα (1/1): 49:23.



- 90 חָצַר σκηνή (1/17): 25:16. Cf. σκηνή used for לָהָל (13); סָכַח (2); סָכָה (1).
- 91 חָקָה δικαίωμα (1/1): 26:5.
- 92 חָרַב καῦμα (1/2): 31:40. Cf. καῦμα used for חָם (1).
- 93 חָרַבָּה ξηρός (1/4): 7:22. Cf. ξηρός used for יָבֵשׁ (3).
- 94 חָרַדָּה ἔκστασις (1/3): 27:33. Cf. ἔκστασις used for תַּרְדֵּמָה (2).
- 95 חָרַי χονδρίτης (1/1): 40:16.
- 96 חָרִישׁ ἀροτρίασις (1/1): 45:6.
- 97 חָרַי ἔαρ (1/1): 8:22.
- 98 חָשְׁכָה σκοτεινός (1/1): 15:12.
- 99 חָת φόβος (1/5): 9:2. Cf. φόβος used for פָּחַד (2); אֵימָה (1); חֲתָה (1).
- 100 חָתָה φόβος (1/5): 35:5. Cf. φόβος used for פָּחַד (2); חָת (1); אֵימָה (1).
- 101 חָתָמָה δακτύλιος (1/3): 38:25. Cf. δακτύλιος used for חֹתֶם (1); טַבַּעַת (1).
- 102 חָבַח θύμα (1/1): 43:16.
- 103 חָבַעַת δακτύλιος (1/3): 41:42. Cf. δακτύλιος used for חֹתֶם (1); חָתָמָה (1).
- 104 חָרָה ἔπαυλις (1/1): 25:16.
- 105 חָט σῶμα (1/5): 47:12. Cf. σῶμα used for פָּגַר (1); חֵיל (1); נָפֶשׁ (1); גּוּיָה (1).
- 106 חָרַב βλαστός (1/2): 49:9. Cf. βλαστός used for גָּן (1).
- 107 חָרַפָּה θηριάλωτος (1/1): 31:39.
- 108 חָרַי κόπος (1/1): 31:42.
- 109 חָלָה παῖς (1/95): 34:4. Cf. παῖς used for עֶבֶד (85); נָעַר (4); נַעֲרָה (3); אִישׁ (1); גְּעוּרִים (1).
- 110 חָמָם Ἰαμίν (1/2): 36:24. Cf. Ἰαμίν used for יָמִין (1).
- 111 חָצוּעַ στρωμνή (1/1): 49:4.
- 112 חָקָה προσδοκία (1/1): 49:10.
- 113 חָרָא θεοσέβεια (1/1): [אֱלֹהִים + יָרָא] (1): 20:11.
- 114 חָרַח σελήνη (1/1): 37:9.
- 115 חָרָה παρατείνω (1/1): [יָרָה + ו] (1): 49:13.
- 116 חָשׂוּעָה σωτηρία (1/4): 49:18. Cf. σωτηρία used for שְׁלֹום (3).
- 117 חָבֵשׁ κάμινος (1/1): 19:28.
- 118 חָנָף πτερωτός (1/1): 1:21.
- 119 חָסָא θρόνος (1/1): 41:40.
- 120 חָסוּת τιμή (1/2): 20:16. Cf. τιμή used for כְּסָף (1).

- 121 כָּפֶר ἄσφαλτος (1/3): 6:14. Cf. ἄσφαλτος used for כָּפֶר (2).
- 122 כָּר σάγμα (1/1): 31:34.
- 123 כְּרוּב χερούβ (1/1): 3:24.
- 124 כָּרֶם ἀμπελών (1/1): 9:20.
- 125 לְבוּשׁ στολή (1/7): 49:11. Cf. στολή used for הַלְמָשׁ (4); בִּגְדִי (2).
- 126 לְבִיא σκύμνος (1/2): 49:9. Cf. σκύμνος used for גֹּרֵר (1).
- 127 לְבָנָה στυράκινος (1/1): 30:37.
- 128 לְהֵט φλόγινος (1/1): 3:24.
- 129 לֵחַ καρύινος (1/1): 30:37.
- 130 לְפִיד λαμπάς (1/1): 15:17.
- 131 מְבַהֵר ἐκλεκτός (1/7): 23:6. Cf. ἐκλεκτός used for מְבַהֵר (6).
- 132 מָגֵד δῶρον (1/12): 24:53. Cf. δῶρον used for מְנַחֵם (10); יָבֵד (1).
- 133 מָגֵן ὑπερασπίζω (1/1): 15:1.
- 134 מֶהֱרָ φερνή (1/1): [מֶהֱרָ + י] (1): 34:12.
- 135 מוֹרָא τρόμος (1/1): 9:2.
- 136 מוֹזֵן “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 45:23).
- 137 מְחַזֵּק ὄραμα (1/2): 15:1. Cf. ὄραμα used for מְחַזֵּק (1).
- 138 מְחִיָּה ζωή (1/23): 45:5. Cf. ζωή used for חַיִּי (20); חַיִּי (1); חַיָּה (1).
- 139 מְחַרֵּץ ἐπαύριον (1/1): 19:34.
- 140 מְחַשְׁבָּה διανοέομαι (1/3): 6:5.
- 141 מְחַשֵּׁב περισύρω (1/1): 30:37.
- 142 מְטַמֵּן θησαυρός (1/1): 43:23.
- 143 מְכַסֶּה στέγη (1/2): 8:13. Cf. στέγη used for מְכַסֶּה (1).
- 144 מְכַרָּה ἐκ + αἵρεσις (1/1): 49:5.
- 145 מְלֵא πλῆθος (1/8): 48:19. Cf. πλῆθος used for מְלֵא (5); מְלֵא (1).
- 146 מְלִיץ ἐρμηνευτής (1/1): 42:23.
- 147 מְנוּחָה ἀνάπαυσις (1/2): 8:9. Cf. ἀνάπαυσις used for מְנוּחָה (1).
- 148 מְנוּחָה ἀνάπαυσις (1/2): 49:15. Cf. ἀνάπαυσις used for מְנוּחָה (1).
- 149 מֵס ἀνήρ (1/51): 49:15. Cf. ἀνήρ used for מֵס (48); מְנַפֵּץ (1); מְנַעֵל (1).
- 150 מְסַע ὅθεν + ἔρχομαι (1/1): [וֹ + מְסַע + לֵ] (1): 13:3.
- 151 מְסַפֵּד κοπετός (1/1): 50:10.

- 152 מַעְבָּר διάβασις (1/1): 32:23.
- 153 מַעֲדָנִים τρυφή (1/3): 49:20. Cf. τρυφή used for עֲדָן (2).
- 154 מַעֲשֹׂר δέκατος (1/3): 14:20. Cf. δέκατος used for עֲשִׂירִי (1); עֶשֶׂר (1).
- 155 מִצָּה ἄζυμος (1/1): 19:3.
- 156 מִצְוָה ἐντολή (1/1): 26:5.
- 157 מִרְאָה ὄραμα (1/2): 46:2. Cf. ὄραμα used for מִחְזָה (1).
- 158 מִרְהָ ἐρίζω (1/1): [מִרְהָ + רוּחַ] (1): 26:35.
- 159 מִרְיָה μάχη (1/2): 13:8. Cf. μάχη used for רִיב (1).
- 160 מִרְעָה νομή (1/1): 47:4.
- 161 מִשְׁנָה ἀγνόημα (1/1): 43:12.
- 162 מִשְׁכָּב κοίτη (1/1): 49:4.
- 163 מִשְׁמֶרֶת πρόσταγμα (1/3): 26:5. Cf. πρόσταγμα used for דְּבַר (1); חֵק (1).
- 164 מִשְׁפָּתִים κληῖρος (1/2): 49:14. Cf. κληῖρος used for נַחֲלָה (1).
- 165 מִשְׁק Μάσεκ (1/1): 15:2.
- 166 מֵת ὀλιγοστός (1/1): 34:30.
- 167 מִתֵּן φερνή (1/1): [מִתֵּן + יָ + מִהָר] (1): 34:12.
- 168 מִתְּנָה δόμα (1/2): 25:6. Cf. δόμα used for חֵק (1).
- 169 מִתְּנִים ὁσφύς (1/2): 37:34. Cf. ὁσφύς used for קְלָצִים (1).
- 170 נֶאֱמַר λέγω (1/622): 22:16. Cf. λέγω used for אָמַר (604); דִּבֶּר (10); קָרָא (1); פָּה (1); דְּבַר (1).
- 171 נְבִיא προφήτης (1/1): 20:7.
- 172 נְבִלָה ἀσχήμων (1/1): 34:7.
- 173 נִגַּע ἐτασμός (1/1): 12:17.
- 174 נִזִּיר ὄς + ἡγέομαι (1/1): 49:26.
- 175 נִחְשָׁת χαλκός (1/1): 4:22.
- 176 נִחוּחַ εὐωδία (1/1): 8:21.
- 177 נִין σπέρμα (1/60): 21:23. Cf. σπέρμα used for זֶרַע (58); זָרַע (1).
- 178 נִכְדָּה ὄνομα (1/112): 21:23. Cf. ὄνομα used for שֵׁם (110); שִׁמְעַ (1).
- 179 נִסְדָּה σπονδή (1/1): 35:14.
- 180 נִעַל ὑπόδημα (1/1): 14:23.
- 181 נִפְלִים γίγας (1/6): 6:4. Cf. γίγας used for גִּבּוֹר (4); רִפְאִים (1).
- 182 נִפְתּוּלִים συλλαμβάνω + ἐγώ (1/1): 30:8.

- 183 בַּי בλαστός (1/2): 40:10. Cf. βλαστός used for בַּי (1).
- 184 נָצִיב στήλη (1/12): 19:26. Cf. στήλη used for מַצְבֵּה (11).
- 185 נִקְיֹן δικαιοσύνη (1/10): 20:5. Cf. δικαιοσύνη used for דִּקְיָה (5); דִּקְיָה (3); תִּמְאָה (1).
- 186 מֶטְרוֹν μέτρον (1/1): 18:6.
- 187 פִּטּוֹן φυτόν + σαβέκ (1/1): 22:13.
- 188 בִּוּלֵה βουλή (1/1): 49:6.
- 189 סִבּוֹלֵה περιβολή (1/1): 49:11.
- 190 סִכְנֵה σκηνή (1/17): 33:17. Cf. σκηνή used for לִהְיֶה (13); סִכּוֹת (2); סִכְנֵה (1).
- 191 סִלְמֵה κλῖμαξ (1/1): 28:12.
- 192 סִלְמֵה σεμίδαλις (1/1): [סִלְמֵה + סִלְמֵה] (1): 18:6.
- 193 סִנְיֹרִים ἀορασία (1/1): 19:11.
- 194 סִבְדֵּה γεώργιον (1/1): 26:14.
- 195 סִבְרֵה μῆγιν (1/1): 49:7.
- 196 סִבְרֵה ἐγκρυφίας (1/1): 18:6.
- 197 סִבְרֵה δάμαλις (1/1): 15:9.
- 198 עֵד ἔτι (1/50): 49:27. Cf. ἔτι used for עֵד (41); עֵד (1).
- 199 עֵדָה ἕως + נִינ (1/1): 18:12.
- 200 עֵדָה φακός (1/1): 25:34.
- 201 עֵבֶה κιθάρα (1/2): 4:21. Cf. κιθάρα used for כִּנּוֹר (1).
- 202 עֵבֶה αὐθάδης (1/2): 49:3.
- 203 עֵשֶׁה ἄσημος (1/1): 30:42.
- 204 עֵשֶׁה ὄρνεον (1/6): 15:11. Cf. ὄρνεον used for עֵשֶׁה (4); עֵשֶׁה (1).
- 205 עֵר πῶλος (1/3): 32:16. Cf. πῶλος used for עֵר (1); בֵּן (1).
- 206 עֵר πῶλος (1/3): 49:11. Cf. πῶλος used for עֵר (1); בֵּן (1).
- 207 עֵל ζυγός (1/1): 27:40.
- 208 עֵלֶה φλόξ (1/2): 15:17. Cf. φλόξ used for קִיטּוֹר (1).
- 209 עֵלְמֵה παρθένος (1/7): 24:43. Cf. παρθένος used for נַעֲרָה (5); בְּתוּלָה (1).
- 210 עֵמֶל πόνος (1/2): 41:51. Cf. πόνος used for כָּאֵב (1).
- 211 עֵצֶה λύπη (1/6): 3:16. Cf. λύπη used for עֵצֶה (3); יָגוֹן (1); רָעָה (1).
- 212 עֵרֶב κόραξ (1/1): 8:7.
- 213 עֵרְמוֹן πλάτανος (1/1): 30:37.

- 214 עָרַב נῶτον (1/2): 49:8. Cf. נῶτον used for עָרַב (1).
- 215 עָשָׂן καπνίζω (1/1): 15:17.
- 216 עָשָׂר πλοῦτος (1/1): 31:16.
- 217 עָשָׂר δέκα (1/25): 24:55.
- 218 עָשָׂר σῶμα (1/5): 15:11. Cf. σῶμα used for עָשָׂר (1); עָשָׂר (1); עָשָׂר (1); עָשָׂר (1).
- 219 עָשָׂר ἀνασφάζω (1/1): 14:13.
- 220 עָשָׂר λέπισμα (1/1): 30:37.
- 221 עָשָׂר τραῦμα (1/1): 4:23.
- 222 עָשָׂר φυλάσσω (1/9): 41:36. Cf. φυλάσσω used for עָשָׂר (8).
- 223 עָשָׂר τοπάρχης (1/1): 41:34.
- 224 עָשָׂר ταῦρος (1/2): 32:16. Cf. ταῦρος used for עָשָׂר (1).
- 225 עָשָׂר ἄγροικος (1/2): 16:12.
- 226 עָשָׂר φραγμός (1/1): 38:29.
- 227 עָשָׂר ἱππεύς (1/2): 50:9. Cf. ἱππεύς used for עָשָׂר (1).
- 228 עָשָׂר “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 18:5).
- 229 עָשָׂר πλάγιος (1/1): 6:16.
- 230 עָשָׂר ἐπισυνάγω (1/2): 6:16. Cf. ἐπισυνάγω used for עָשָׂר (1).
- 231 עָשָׂר γέλω (1/1): 21:6.
- 232 עָשָׂר στέγη (1/2): 19:8. Cf. στέγη used for עָשָׂר (1).
- 233 עָשָׂר ἀνατέλλω (1/4): 19:25. Cf. ἀνατέλλω used for עָשָׂר (2); עָשָׂר (1).
- 234 עָשָׂר “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:23).
- 235 עָשָׂר νεότης (1/3): 43:33. Cf. νεότης used for עָשָׂר (1); עָשָׂר (1).
- 236 עָשָׂר ὄρνειν (1/6): [15:10]. Cf. ὄρνειν used for עָשָׂר (4); עָשָׂר (1).
- 237 עָשָׂר ἐχθρός (1/2): 14:20. Cf. ἐχθρός used for עָשָׂר (1).
- 238 עָשָׂר κορυφή (1/1): 49:26.
- 239 עָשָׂר ὕψος (1/1): 6:15.
- 240 עָשָׂר ἄκανθα (1/1): 3:18.
- 241 עָשָׂר δοκός (1/1): 19:8.
- 242 עָשָׂר θέρος (1/1): 8:22.
- 243 עָשָׂר σεμίδαλις (1/1): [עָשָׂר + עָשָׂר] (1): 18:6.
- 244 עָשָׂר δράγμα (1/5): 41:47. Cf. δράγμα used for עָשָׂר (4).

- 245 קון νοσσία (1/1): 6:14.
- 246 קר ψῦχος (1/1): 8:22.
- 247 קרח παγετός (1/1): 31:40.
- 248 קרן κέρας (1/1): 22:13.
- 249 קשת τοξότης (1/1): [רבה + קשת] (1): 21:20.
- 250 קשיטה ἄμνός (1/4): 33:19. Cf. ἄμνός used for קָשֶׁב (1); צֹאן (1); מִנָּה (1).
- 251 רָאִי ἐφοράω + ἐγώ (1/1): 16:13.
- 252 רבִּיד κλοιός (1/1): 41:42.
- 253 רִּוּחַ διάστημα (1/1): 32:17.
- 254 רחב πλατύς (1/3): 19:2.
- 255 ריב μάχη (1/2): 13:7. Cf. μάχη used for מְרִיבָה (1).
- 256 רֶכֶב ἄρμα (1/3): 50:9. Cf. ἄρμα used for מְרִכְבָּה (2).
- 257 רֵעַ αἰσχρός (1/6): [רֵעַ + לְ] (1): 41:19. Cf. αἰσχρός used for רֵעַ (4).
- 258 רִצּוֹן ἐπιθυμία (1/2): 49:6. Cf. ἐπιθυμία used for כֶּסֶף (1).
- 259 שְׁאֲרִית κατάλειμμα (1/1): 45:7.
- 260 שֵׁד μαστός (1/1): 49:25.
- 261 שֶׁמֶם πράσινος (1/1): 2:12.
- 262 שָׁוָה Σαυή (1/2): 14:5. Cf. Σαυή used for שָׁוָה (1).
- 263 שׁוּר ἀναστρέφω (1/9): 49:22. Cf. ἀναστρέφω used for שׁוּב (7); בּוֹא (1).
- 264 שִׁיר μουσική (1/1): 31:27.
- 265 שָׁלָל τροφή (1/1): 49:27.
- 266 שְׁלֵשִׁים τρίτος + γενεά (1/1): 50:23.
- 267 שִׁמְעָה ὄνομα (1/112): 29:13. Cf. ὄνομα used for שִׁם (110); נִכְדָּה (1).
- 268 שֵׁן ὀδούς (1/1): 49:12.
- 269 שִׁעָר κριθή (1/1): 26:12.
- 270 שְׁפִיפֹן ἐνκάθηναι (1/1): 49:17.
- 271 שִׁפְרָה κάλλος (1/1): 49:21.
- 272 שִׁקָד κάρυον (1/1): 43:11.
- 273 שִׁשׁ βύσσινος (1/1): 41:42.
- 274 שְׂאֵת φέρω (1/16): 49:3. Cf. φέρω used for בּוֹא (8); לָקַח (1); נָשָׂא (1); יָרַד (1); נָתַן (1); יָהֵב (1).
- 275 שְׁמָחָה εὐφροσύνη (1/1): 31:27.

- 276 שְׁעִיר ἔριφος (1/6): 37:31. Cf. ἔριφος used for יָדִי (5).
- 277 שְׁעָר δασύς (1/3): 25:25. Cf. δασύς used for שְׁעִיר (2).
- 278 שְׂרֹוֹד σφαιρωτήρ (1/1): 14:23.
- 279 שְׂרָפָה πῦρ (1/5): 11:3. Cf. πῦρ used for שָׂא (4).
- 280 שְׂרָקָה ἔλιξ (1/1): 49:11.
- 281 תְּאֲנָה συαῖ (1/1): 3:7.
- 282 תְּבוּאָה γένημα (1/3): [47:24]. Cf. γένημα used for אֶמָר (1).
- 283 תְּהוּ ἀόρατος (1/1): 1:2.
- 284 תְּרוּר τρυγών (1/1): 15:9.
- 285 תְּרוּרָה νόμιμος (1/1): 26:5.
- 286 תּוֹשֵׁב παρεπίδημος (1/1): 23:4.
- 287 תְּלִי φάρετρα (1/1): 27:3.
- 288 תְּנוּר κλίβανος (1/1): 15:17.
- 289 תְּנִין κῆτος (1/1): 1:21.
- 290 תָּף τύμπανον (1/1): 31:27.

## Consistent

- 1 אָבֶל πένθος (4/7): 27:41; 50:10, 11+. Cf. πένθος used for בְּבוֹת (1); בְּבִית (1); אָבֶל מְצָרִים (1).
- 2 אָדוֹת περί (3/35): [עַל + אָדוֹת] (3): 21:11, 25; 26:32.
- 3 אָדָמָה 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 אָרֶץ (307); עֶפְרַי (5); שְׂדֵה (4); תְּהוֹם (1).
- 4 אֹרֶן φῶς (6/6): 1:3+, 4+, 5, 18.
- 5 אוֹת σημείον (6/6): 1:14; 4:15; 9:12, 13, 17; 17:11.
- 6 אָחוּ ἄχι (2/2): 41:2, 18.
- 7 אָחוֹת ἀδελφή (25/25): 4:22; 12:13, 19; 20:2, 5, 12; 24:30+, 59, [60]++; 25:20; 26:7, 9; 28:9; 29:13; 30:1, 8; 34:13, 14, 27, 31; 36:3, 22; 46:17.
- 8 אִי νῆσος (2/2): 10:5, [32].
- 9 אִיל κρίος (8/8): 15:9; 22:13+; [30:40]; [31:10], [12], 38; 32:15.
- 10 אֵל θεός (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[+].; [אֵל + אֱלֹהִים] (2): 33:20; 46:3.; [אֵל + יְהוָה] (1): 14:22. Cf. θεός used for אֱלֹהִים (211); יְהוָה (40); בֵּית־אֵל (2); פְּנִיָּאֵל (1); פְּנוּאֵל (1).

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 35:7).

- 11 אֱלֹן (4) δρῦς (4/4): 12:6; 13:18; 14:13; 18:1.
- 12 אֱלֹן (2) βάλανος (2/2): 35:8+.
- 13 אֶלְמָה (4) δράγμα (4/5): 37:7+++ Cf. δράγμα used for קֶמֶץ (1).
- 14 אֶלְמָנוֹת (2) χηρεία (2/2): 38:14, 19.
- 15 אָמָה (7) παιδίσκη (7/36): 20:17; 21:10+, 12, 13; 30:3; 31:33. Cf. παιδίσκη used for שִׁפְחָה (29).
- 16 אָמָה (5) πῆχυς (5/5): 6:15++, 16; 7:20.
- 17 אֶמְתַּחַת (16) μάρσιππος (16/17): 42:27, 28; 43:12, 18, 21+, 22, 23; 44:1+, 2, 8, 11+, 12, [13]. Cf. μάρσιππος used for פֶּשֶׁק (1).
- 18 אֶרְבָּה (2) καταρράκτης (2/2): 7:11; 8:2.
- 19 אֶרְיָה (2) λέων (2/2): 49:9+.
- 20 אֶרֶךְ (3) μῆκος (3/3): 6:15; [12:6]; 13:17.
- 21 אֶשׁ (4) πῦρ (4/5): 15:17; 19:24; 22:6, 7. Cf. πῦρ used for שִׁרְפָּה (1).
- 22 בָּאָר (23) φρέαρ (23/37): 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 שִׁבְעָה (11); בָּאָר לְחַי רִאִי (3).
- 23 בָּכָר (16) πρωτότοκος (15/16): 4:4; 10:15; 22:21; 25:13; 27:19, 32; 35:23; 36:15; 38:6, 7; 41:51; 43:33; 46:8; 48:18; 49:3. Cf. πρωτότοκος used for רִאשֹׁן (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 48:14).
- 24 בָּר (5) σῖτος (4/13): 41:35, 49; 42:3, 25. Cf. σῖτος used for שִׁבְרָה (5); דָּגָן (2); לֶחֶם (2).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 45:23).
- 25 גָּבֹול (3) ὄριον (3/3): 10:19; 23:17; 47:21.
- 26 גָּבִיעַ (8) κόνδυ (6/7): 44:2, [4], [9], 12, 16, 17.  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 44:2, [4]).
- 27 גָּבִיר (2) κύριος (2/221): 27:29, 37. Cf. κύριος used for יְהוָה (133); אֲדֹנָי (78); אֱלֹהִים (7); בָּעַל (1).
- 28 גְּבִירָה (3) κυρία (3/3): 16:4, 8, 9.
- 29 גָּדִי (5) ἔριφος (5/6): 27:9, 16; 38:17, 20, 23. Cf. ἔριφος used for שְׁעִיר (1).
- 30 גֹּי (25) ἔθνος (25/37): 10:5+, 20, 31, 32+; 12:2; 15:14; 17:4, 5, 6, 16, 20; 18:18+; 20:4; 21:13, 18; 22:18; 25:23; 26:4; 35:11+; 46:3; 48:19. Cf. ἔθνος used for עַם (5); גֹּיִם (2); זֻזִּים (1); נְשִׂיאָה (1); אָמָה (1); שָׂם (1).
- 31 גֵּיד (2) νεῦρον (2/3): 32:33+. Cf. νεῦρον used for יָרֹעַ (1).
- 32 גָּל (6) βουνός (6/9): 31:46+, 48, 51, 52+. Cf. βουνός used for גִּלְעָד (2); יָגֵר שְׁהֲדוּתָא (1).
- 33 גָּמָל (24) κάμηλος (24/24): 12:16; 24:10+, 11, 14, 19, 20, 22, 30, 31, 32+, 35, 44, 46+, 61, 63, 64; 30:43; 31:17, 34; 32:16; 37:25.



|    |          |                                                                                                                                             |
|----|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 34 | גַּן     | (14) παράδεισος (14/14): 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16; 3:1, 2, 3, 8+, 10, 23, 24; 13:10.                                                              |
| 35 | גֶּפֶן   | (3) ἄμπελος (3/3): 40:9, 10; 49:11.                                                                                                         |
| 36 | גֵּר     | (2) πάροικος (2/2): 15:13; 23:4.                                                                                                            |
| 37 | גֶּשֶׁם  | (2) ὑετός (2/3): 7:12; 8:2. Cf. ὑετός used for מֶטֶר (1).                                                                                   |
| 38 | דָּגָה   | (2) ἰχθύς (2/3): 1:26, 28. Cf. ἰχθύς used for דָּג (1).                                                                                     |
| 39 | דָּגָן   | (2) σῖτος (2/13): 27:28, 37. Cf. σῖτος used for שֶׁבֶר (5); בֵּר (4); לֶחֶם (2).                                                            |
| 40 | דּוֹר    | (8) γενεά (8/12): 6:9; 7:1; 9:12; 15:16; 17:7, 9, [10], 12. Cf. γενεά used for מוֹלָדֶת (2); תּוֹלְדוֹת (1); שְׁלֵשִׁים (1).                |
| 41 | דָּלַת   | (3) θύρα (3/9): 19:6, 9, 10. Cf. θύρα used for פֶּתַח (6).                                                                                  |
| 42 | דָּם     | (11) αἷμα (11/11): 4:10, 11; 9:4, 5, 6+; 37:22, 26, 31; 42:22; 49:11.                                                                       |
| 43 | דֶּשֶׁא  | (2) βοτάνη (2/2): 1:11, 12.                                                                                                                 |
| 44 | זָבַח    | (2) θυσία (2/4): 31:54; 46:1. Cf. θυσία used for מִנְחָה (2).                                                                               |
| 45 | זָנָה    | (2) πόρνη (2/5): 34:31; 38:15. Cf. πόρνη used for קִדְּשׁ (3).                                                                              |
| 46 | זִקְנִים | (4) γῆρας (4/10): 21:2, 7; 37:3; 44:20. Cf. γῆρας used for שִׁיבָה (5); זָקֵן (1).                                                          |
| 47 | חֹל      | (3) ἄμμος (3/6): 22:17; 32:13; 41:49. Cf. ἄμμος used for עָפָר (3).                                                                         |
| 48 | חִיָּה   | (17) θηρίον (17/19): 1:24, 25, 30; 2:19, 20; 3:1, 14; 7:14, 21; 8:1, 17, 19; 9:2, 5, 10; 37:20, 33. Cf. θηρίον used for חַי (1); טָרֶף (1). |
| 49 | חֶלֶב    | (2) γάλα (2/2): 18:8; 49:12.                                                                                                                |
| 50 | חֲלוֹן   | (2) θυρίς (2/2): 8:6; 26:8.                                                                                                                 |
| 51 | חֶלֶק    | (3) μερίς (3/7): 14:24+; 31:14. Cf. μερίς used for מְשָׁחָה (3); חֶלְקָה (1).                                                               |
| 52 | חָם      | (2) πενθερός (2/2): 38:13, 25.                                                                                                              |
| 53 | חֲמָר    | (2) ἄσφαλτος (2/3): 11:3; 14:10. Cf. ἄσφαλτος used for כֶּפֶר (1).                                                                          |
| 54 | חֲמָת    | (3) ἀσκός (3/3): 21:14, 15, 19.                                                                                                             |
| 55 | חֲרָטָם  | (2) ἐξηγητήης (2/2): 41:8, 24.                                                                                                              |
| 56 | חֲרָפָה  | (2) ὄνειδος (2/2): 30:23; 34:14.                                                                                                            |
| 57 | חֲשָׁךְ  | (4) σκότος (4/4): 1:2, 4, 5, 18.                                                                                                            |
| 58 | חֲתָן    | (3) γαμβρός (3/3): 19:12, 14+.                                                                                                              |
| 59 | טוֹב     | (4) ἀγαθός (4/8): 24:10; 45:18, 20, 23. Cf. ἀγαθός used for מִיטָב (2); טוֹב (1); טוֹבָה (1).                                               |
| 60 | טָל      | (2) δρόσος (2/2): 27:28, 39.                                                                                                                |
| 61 | יִבְשָׁה | (3) ξηρός (3/4): 1:9[+], 10. Cf. ξηρός used for חֲרָבָה (1).                                                                                |
| 62 | יוֹנָה   | (5) περιστέρα (5/6): 8:8, 9, 10, 11, 12. Cf. περιστέρα used for גּוֹלָל (1).                                                                |

- 63 יין (10) οἶνος (10/12): 9:21, 24; 14:18; 19:32, 33, 34, 35; 27:25; 49:11, 12. Cf. οἶνος used for תִּירוֹשׁ (2).
- 64 יֵלִיד (5) οἰκογενής (5/7): 17:12, 13.; [יֵלִיד + בֵּית] (3): 14:14; 17:23, 27. Cf. οἰκογενής used for בֵּית (1).
- 65 יִמִּין (7) δεξιός (7/8): 13:9; 24:49; 48:13+, 14, 17, 18. Cf. δεξιός used for יָמֵן (1).
- 66 יָרֵךְ (9) μηρός (9/11): 24:2, 9; 32:26+, 32, 33+; 46:26; 47:29. Cf. μηρός used for רֶגֶל (1); בֶּרֶךְ (1).
- 67 יָתֵר (2) σκληρός (2/7): 49:3+. Cf. σκληρός used for רַעַע (2); קָשָׁה (2); חָרָה (1).
- 68 כְּבֶרֶה (2) χαβραθα (2/2): 35:16; 48:7.
- 69 כְּבֶשֶׂה (3) ἀμνάς (3/4): 21:28, 29, 30. Cf. ἀμνάς used for מִנָּה (1).
- 70 כַּד (9) ὑδρία (9/9): 24:14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 43, 45, 46.
- 71 כֹּהֵן (7) ἱερεύς (7/7): 14:18; 41:45, 50; 46:20; 47:22+, 26.
- 72 כּוֹכַב (5) ἀστήρ (5/5): 1:16; 15:5; 22:17; 26:4; 37:9.
- 73 כּוֹס (5) ποτήριον (5/5): 40:11+, 13, 21.
- 74 כֹּחַ (3) ἰσχύς (3/3): 4:12; 31:6; 49:3.
- 75 כֶּלֶה (5) νύμφη (5/5): 11:31; 38:11, [13], 16, 24.
- 76 כְּתָנִת (9) χιτών (8/8): 3:21; 37:3, 23, 31+, 32+, 33.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.7.3 (1: 37:23).
- 77 לֵבָב (2) καρδία (2/5): 20:5, 6. Cf. καρδία used for לֵב (3).
- 78 לְבָנָה (2) πλίνθος (2/2): 11:3+.
- 79 לֵט (2) στακτή (2/2): 37:25; 43:11.
- 80 לִזְלָה (27) νύξ (27/27): 1:5, 14, 16, 18; 7:4, 12, [17]; 8:22; 14:15; 19:5, 33[+], 34, 35; 20:3; 26:24; 30:15, 16; 31:24, 39, 40; 32:14, 22, 23; 40:5; 41:11; 46:2.
- 81 לְשׁוֹן (3) γλῶσσα (3/4): 10:5, 20, 31. Cf. γλῶσσα used for שִׁפָּה (1).
- 82 מֵאֲכָלִת (2) μάχαιρα (2/7): 22:6, 10. Cf. μάχαιρα used for חֶרֶב (5).
- 83 מְבוֹל (12) κατακλυσμός (12/12): 6:17; 7:6, 7, 10, 17; 9:11+, 15, 28; 10:1, 32; 11:10.
- 84 מְגִדֵּל (3) πύργος (3/4): 11:4, 5, [8]. Cf. πύργος used for מִגְדָּל־עֶדֶר (1).
- 85 מְדַבֵּר (8) ἔρημος (8/11): 14:6; 16:7; 21:14, 20, 21; [24:62]; 36:24; 37:22. Cf. ἔρημος used for נֶגֶב (3).
- 86 מוֹעֵד (4) καιρός (4/13): 1:14; 17:21; 18:14; 21:2. Cf. καιρός used for עֵת (3); עֶצֶם (2); פֶּעַם (2); קֵץ (1); כָּל (1).
- 87 מִזְבֵּחַ (13) θυσιαστήριον (13/13): 8:20+; 12:7, 8; 13:4, 18; 22:9+; 26:25; 33:20; 35:1, 3, 7.
- 88 מִחְנֵה (9) παρεμβολή (9/10): [32:2], 3, 8, 9+, 11, 22; 33:8; 50:9. Cf. παρεμβολή used for מִחְנֵיִם (1).
- 89 מִטָּה (2) ῥάβδος (2/11): 38:18, 25. Cf. ῥάβδος used for מַקֵּל (7); צֶאֱן (1); מִטָּה (1).

- 90 מִטָּעַם (6) ἔδεσμα (6/6): 27:4, 7, 9, 14, 17, 31.
- 91 מִיטָב (2) ἀγαθός (2/8): 47:6, 11. Cf. ἀγαθός used for טוב (4); טוב (1); טוֹבָה (1).
- 92 מִים (59) ὕδωρ (59/59): 1:2, 6++, 7+, 9[+], 10, 20, 21, 22; 6:17; 7:6, 7, 10, 17, 18+, 19, 20, 24; 8:1, 3+, 5, [7]+, 8, 9, 11, 13[+]; 9:11[+], 15; 16:7; 18:4; 21:14, 15, 19+, 25; 24:11, 13+, 17, 32, 43[+]; 26:18, 19, 20, 32; 30:38; 37:24; 43:24; 49:4.
- 93 מִין (18) γένος (18/27): [1:11]+, 12+, 21+, 24+, 25++; 6:20++; 7:14++++. Cf. γένος used for עַם (6); מִשְׁפָּחָה (1); בְּנֵי-עַמִּי (1); מִאֲכָל (1).
- 94 מִלְאָה (18) ἄγγελος (18/19): 16:7, [8], 9, 10, 11; 19:1, 15; 21:17; 22:11, 15; 24:7, 40; 28:12; 31:11; 32:2, 4, 7; 48:16. Cf. ἄγγελος used for אִישׁ (1).
- 95 מִלְכָּה (4) ἔργον (4/11): 2:2+, 3; 39:11. Cf. ἔργον used for מַעֲשֶׂה (5); עֲבוּר (2).
- 96 מְלוֹן (2) καταλύω (2/7): 42:27; 43:21. Cf. καταλύω used for לִין (4); חָנָה (1).
- 97 מִלֵּחַ (2) ἄλς (2/2): 14:3; 19:26.
- 98 מִלְחָמָה (2) πόλεμος (2/2): 14:2, 8.
- 99 מִמְלָכָה (2) βασιλεία (2/3): 10:10; 20:9. Cf. βασιλεία used for יוֹם (1).
- 100 מִמְשָׁלָה (2) ἀρχή (2/16): 1:16+. Cf. ἀρχή used for רֹאשׁ (4); רִאשִׁית (3); תְּחִלָּה (3); רִאשׁוֹן (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); מִשְׁקָה (1); כֶּן (1).
- 101 מִסְפָּא (4) χόρτασμα (4/4): 24:25, 32; 42:27; 43:24.
- 102 מִסְפָּר (2) ἀριθμός (2/2): 34:30; 41:49.
- 103 מִעֵין (2) πηγῇ (2/13): 7:11; 8:2. Cf. πηγῇ used for עֵין (9); אֵד (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); עֵין מִשְׁפָּט (1).
- 104 מִעֶרְהָ (12) σπήλαιον (12/15): 19:30; 23:9, 11, 17, 19, 20; 25:9, [10]; 49:29, 30, 32; 50:13. Cf. σπήλαιον used for הַדֵּשׁ (2).
- 105 מִצְבָּה (11) στήλη (11/12): 28:18, 22; 31:13, 45, 51, 52+; 35:14+, 20+. Cf. στήλη used for נֶצִיב (1).
- 106 מִצָּעַר (2) μικρός (2/12): 19:20+. Cf. μικρός used for מְעַט (8); קָטָן (2).
- 107 מִקָּל (7) ῥάβδος (7/11): 30:37+, 38, 39, 41+; 32:11. Cf. ῥάβδος used for מִטָּה (2); צֶאֱן (1); מִטָּה (1).
- 108 מִרְאשׁוֹת (2) κεφαλή (2/16): 28:11, 18. Cf. κεφαλή used for רֹאשׁ (14).
- 109 מִרְכָּבָה (2) ἄρμα (2/3): 41:43; 46:29. Cf. ἄρμα used for רֶכֶב (1).
- 110 מִרְמָה (2) δόλος (2/2): 27:35; 34:13.
- 111 מִרְעַ (3) νυμφαγωγός (3/3): [21:22], [32]; 26:26.
- 112 מִשְׁמֶר (7) φυλακή (7/7): 40:3, 4, 7; 41:10; 42:17, [30].; [בֵּית + מִשְׁמֶר] (1): 42:19.
- 113 מִשְׁאָת (3) μερίς (3/7): 43:34++. Cf. μερίς used for חֶלֶק (3); חֶלְקָה (1).
- 114 מִשְׁכָּרְהָ (3) μισθός (3/11): 29:15; 31:7, 41. Cf. μισθός used for שֶׁכָּר (7).
- 115 גִּדְרִי (2) εὐχή (2/2): 28:20; 31:13.

|     |            |                                                                                                           |
|-----|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 116 | נְהַר      | (9) ποταμός (9/16): 2:10, 13, 14+; 15:18++; 31:21; 36:37. Cf. ποταμός used for נְהַר (7).                 |
| 117 | נִזְד      | (2) ἔψεμα (2/3): 25:29, 34. Cf. ἔψεμα used for נִזְד (1).                                                 |
| 118 | נִזֵּם     | (4) ἐνώτιον (4/4): 24:22, 30, 47; 35:4.                                                                   |
| 119 | נִחַש      | (7) ὄφεις (7/7): 3:1[+], 2, 4, 13, 14; 49:17.                                                             |
| 120 | נִכְאָת    | (2) θυμίαμα (2/2): 37:25; 43:11.                                                                          |
| 121 | נִמְכָּה   | (10) θῆλυς (10/10): 1:27; 5:2; 6:19, [20]; [7:2][+], 3[+], 9, 16.                                         |
| 122 | נִשָּׂה    | (2) ναρκάω (2/3): 32:33+. Cf. ναρκάω used for נִשָּׂה (1).                                                |
| 123 | נִשְׁמָה   | (2) πνοή (2/2): 2:7.; [נִשְׁמָה + רוּחַ] (1): 7:22.                                                       |
| 124 | סוס        | (2) ἵππος (2/5): 47:17; 49:17. Cf. ἵππος used for סוס (3).                                                |
| 125 | סָל        | (4) κάνεον (4/4): 40:16, 17+, 18.                                                                         |
| 126 | סִפָּר     | (2) βίβλος (2/2): [2:4]; 5:1.                                                                             |
| 127 | עֶבֶר      | (2) πέραν (2/2): [עֶבֶר + בָּ] (2): 50:10, 11.                                                            |
| 128 | עֲנָלָה    | (4) ἄμαξα (4/4): 45:19, 21, 27; 46:5.                                                                     |
| 129 | עֲזָר      | (2) βοηθός (2/2): 2:18, 20.                                                                               |
| 130 | עָל        | (2) ἄνωθεν (2/3): [עָל + מִן] (2): 27:39; 49:25.                                                          |
| 131 | עָלָה      | (2) φύλλον (2/2): 3:7; 8:11.                                                                              |
| 132 | עָלָה      | (7) ὀλοκάρπωσις (7/7): 8:20; 22:2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 13.                                                        |
| 133 | עֲנַב      | (3) σταφυλή (3/3): 40:10, 11; 49:11.                                                                      |
| 134 | עָנִי      | (4) ταπείνωσις (4/4): 16:11; 29:32; 31:42; 41:52.                                                         |
| 135 | עָנָן      | (4) νεφέλη (4/4): 9:13, 14+, 16.                                                                          |
| 136 | עֲצָבֹן    | (3) λύπη (3/6): 3:16, 17; 5:29. Cf. λύπη used for עֲצָב (1); יָגֹן (1); רָעָה (1).                        |
| 137 | עֲרִבֹן    | (3) ἀρραβών (3/3): 38:17, 18, 20.                                                                         |
| 138 | עָרְלָה    | (7) ἀκροβυστία (7/7): 17:11, 14, 24, 25; 34:14, [24].; [עָרְלָה + רָשָׁע] (1): 17:23.                     |
| 139 | עֲשָׂב     | (7) χόρτος (7/7): 1:11, 12, 29, 30; 2:5; 3:18; 9:3.                                                       |
| 140 | עֲתוּד     | (2) τράγος (2/4): 31:10, 12. Cf. τράγος used for עֲתוּד (2).                                              |
| 141 | פָּחַד     | (2) φόβος (2/5): 31:42, 53. Cf. φόβος used for פָּחַד (1); אִימָה (1); חֲתָה (1).                         |
| 142 | פִּלְגָּשׁ | (5) παλλακή (5/5): 22:24; 25:6; 35:22; 36:12; [46:20].                                                    |
| 143 | פֶּס       | (3) ποικίλος (3/10): 37:3, 23, 32. Cf. ποικίλος used for פֶּס (5); חוּם (1).                              |
| 144 | פָּרָה     | (12) βοῦς (12/25): 32:16; 41:2, 3+, 4+, 18, 19, 20+, 26, 27. Cf. βοῦς used for פָּרָה (12); שׁוֹר (1).    |
| 145 | פִּתְלִי   | (2) ὀρμίσκος (2/2): 38:18, [25].                                                                          |
| 146 | פִּדְקָה   | (3) δικαιοσύνη (3/10): 15:6; 18:19; 30:33. Cf. δικαιοσύνη used for פִּדְקָה (5); נִקְיוֹן (1); אֲמָת (1). |

- 147 צהרים (2) μεσημβρία (2/3): 43:16, 25.
- 148 צלם (4) εικών (4/5): 1:26, 27; 5:3; 9:6. Cf. εικών used for תמונת (1).
- 149 צלע (2) πλευρά (2/2): 2:21, 22.
- 150 צמיד (3) ψέλιον (3/3): 24:22, 30, 47.
- 151 צעיף (3) θέριστρον (3/3): 24:65; 38:14, 19.
- 152 צרה (3) θλίψις (3/3): 35:3; 42:21+.
- 153 צרור (3) δεσμός (3/3): [42:27], 35+.
- 154 צרי (2) ρητίνη (2/2): 37:25; 43:11.
- 155 קדים (5) ἀνεμόφθορος (5/5): [קדים + ה + שדף] (3): [41:7], [24], 27.; [שדף + קדים] (2): 41:6, 23.
- 156 קדמה (2) κατέναντι (2/3): 2:14; 4:16.
- 157 קול (25) φωνή (23/27): 3:8, 10, 17; 4:10, 23; 16:2; 21:12, 17+; 22:18; 26:5; 27:13, 22+, 38, 43; 29:11; 30:6; 39:14, 15, 18; 45:2, 16. Cf. φωνή used for דבר (2); שפה (1); צעקה (1). “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 21:16; 27:8).
- 158 קללה (2) κατάρα (2/2): 27:12, 13.
- 159 קנה (2) πυθμήν (2/4): 41:5, 22. Cf. πυθμήν used for שריץ (2).
- 160 קשת (7) τόξον (7/7): 9:13, [14], 16; 21:16; 27:3; 48:22; 49:24.
- 161 ראשית (3) ἀρχή (3/16): 1:1; 10:10; 49:3. Cf. ἀρχή used for ראש (4); תחלה (3); ממשלה (2); ראשון (1); משפט (1); משקה (1); בן (1).
- 162 רהט (2) ληνός (2/2): 30:38, 41.
- 163 רחב (2) πλάτος (2/6): 6:15; 13:17. Cf. πλάτος used for רב (4).
- 164 רחל (2) πρόβατον (2/59): 31:38; 32:15. Cf. πρόβατον used for צאן (54); שן (3).
- 165 רחם (4) μήτρα (4/4): 20:18; 29:31; 30:22; 49:25.
- 166 ריח (4) ὀσμή (4/4): 8:21; 27:27++.
- 167 רעב (24) λιμός (23/23): 12:10+; 26:1+; 41:27, 30+, 31, 36+, 50, 54+, 56, 57; 42:5; 43:1; 45:6, 11; 47:4, 13+, 20. “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:56).
- 168 רעבון (2) σιτοδοσία (2/2): 42:33.; [רעבון + בית] (1): 42:19.
- 169 רקיע (9) στερέωμα (9/9): 1:6, 7++, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20.
- 170 שאול (4) εἰς + ἄδης (4/4): 37:35; 42:38; 44:29, 31.
- 171 שבוע (2) ἑβδομος (2/8): 29:27, 28. Cf. ἑβδομος used for שבועי (3); שבע (3).
- 172 שבועה (2) ὄρκος (2/12): 24:8; 26:3. Cf. ὄρκος used for באר שבע (9); שבעה (1).
- 173 שבלת (10) στάχυς (10/10): 41:5, 6, 7+, 22, 23, 24+, 26, 27.

- 174      פִּתְּ      (2) πίστης (2/2): 27:28, 39.
- 175      פִּתְּ      (2) ἔλαιον (2/2): 28:18; 35:14.
- 176      שֶׁמֶשׁ      (6) ἥλιος (6/9): 15:12, 17; 19:23; 28:11; 32:32; 37:9. Cf. ἥλιος used for פֶּה (3).
- 177      שְׁנָה      (2) ὕπνος (2/10): 28:16; 31:40. Cf. ὕπνος used for שְׁנָה (8).
- 178      שְׁנִי      (2) κόκκινος (2/2): 38:28, 30.
- 179      שִׁפְחָה      (29) παιδίσκη (29/36): 12:16; 16:1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8; 20:14; 24:35; 25:12; 29:24+, 29+; 30:4, [5], 7, 9, 10, 12, 18, 43; 32:6, 23; 33:1, 2, 6; 35:25, 26. Cf. παιδίσκη used for שִׁפְחָה (7).
- 180      שֶׁקֶל      (2) δίδραχμον (2/4): 23:15, 16. Cf. δίδραχμον used for שֶׁקֶל (2).
- 181      שִׁקְתָּ      (2) ποτιστήριον (2/2): 24:20; 30:38.
- 182      שָׁרַץ      (2) ἔρπετον (2/18): 1:20; 7:21. Cf. ἔρπετον used for שָׁרַץ (14); רמש (2).
- 183      שֶׁה      (3) πρόβατον (3/59): 22:7, 8; 30:32. Cf. πρόβατον used for שֶׁה (54); רֶחֶל (2).
- 184      שִׁיבָה      (5) γῆρας (5/10): 15:15; 25:8; 42:38; 44:29, 31. Cf. γῆρας used for שִׁיבָה (4); זָקֵן (1).
- 185      שָׁכַר      (7) μισθός (7/11): 15:1; 30:18, 28, 32, 33; 31:8+. Cf. μισθός used for שָׁכַר (3).
- 186      שְׂמָאֵל      (6) ἀριστερός (6/7): 13:9; 14:15; 24:49; 48:13+, 14. Cf. ἀριστερός used for שְׂמָאֵל (1).
- 187      שָׁרִיג      (2) πυθμήν (2/4): 40:10, 12. Cf. πυθμήν used for שָׁרִיג (2).
- 188      תֶּאֱרָא      (4) εἶδος (4/9): 29:17; 39:6; 41:18, 19. Cf. εἶδος used for תֶּאֱרָא (3); פְּנִימָא (1); פְּנוּמָא (1).
- 189      תִּבְּהָ      (27) κιβωτός (26/27): 6:14+, 15, 16, 18, 19; 7:1, 7, 9, 13, 15, [16], 17, 18, 23; 8:1, 4, 6, 9+, 10, 13, 16, 19; 9:10, 18. Cf. κιβωτός used for תִּבְּהָ (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 6:16).
- 190      תִּבְּוֶן      (2) ἄχυρον (2/2): 24:25, 32.
- 191      תּוֹאֲמָם      (2) δίδυμος (2/2): 25:24; 38:27.
- 192      תּוֹעֲבָה      (2) βδέλυγμα (2/2): 43:32; 46:34.
- 193      תִּירוֹשׁ      (2) οἶνος (2/12): 27:28, 37. Cf. οἶνος used for תִּירוֹשׁ (10).
- 194      תִּישׁ      (2) τράγος (2/4): 30:35; 32:15. Cf. τράγος used for תִּישׁ (2).
- 195      תִּם      (2) καθαρός (2/12): 20:5, 6. Cf. καθαρός used for תִּם (8); נָקִי (1); נָקִי (1).
- 196      תִּרְדָּמָה      (2) ἔκστασις (2/3): 2:21; 15:12. Cf. ἔκστασις used for תִּרְדָּמָה (1).
- 197      תִּרְפִּים      (3) εἶδωλον (3/3): 31:19, 34, 35.
- 198      תִּשְׁוִיקָה      (2) ἀποστροφή (2/2): 3:16; 4:7.

## Main

- 1      אָב      (213) πατήρ (209/214): 2:24; 4:20; 9:18, 22+, 23+; 10:21; 11:28, 29+; 12:1; 15:15; 17:4, 5; 19:31, 32+, 33+, 34+, 35, 36, 37, 38; 20:12, 13; 22:7+, 21; 24:7, 23, 38, 40; 26:3, [5],

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**:9[+], 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 י״ (1); אב (1); אב (1).

πατρικός (1/1): **50**:8.

καταδείκνυμι (1/1): [אב + בל + פש] (1): **4**:21.

“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: **31**:53; **46**:31).

- 2**    אב    (15) λίθος (13/13): **2**:12; **11**:3; **28**:11, 18, 22; **29**:2, 3+, 8, 10; **31**:45, 46+.  
λίθινος (1/1): **35**:14.  
κατισχύω (1/1): [אב + רע] (1): **49**:24.
- 3**    יד    (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 יהוה (133); אלהים (7); אביר (2); אב (1).  
δεσπότης (2/2): **15**:8.; [יהוה + י״ + יד] (1): **15**:2.  
ἐάντοῦ + θεράπων + Ἰσαάκ (1/1): [י״ + יד + אב] (1): **24**:44.  
σύ (1/750): **44**:18.
- 4**    יד    (7) οὐς (5/5): **20**:8; **23**:13, 16; **35**:4; **50**:4.  
ἀκούω (1/47): [יד + אב] (1): **23**:10. Cf. ἀκούω used for שמע (46).  
ἐναντίον (1/76): [יד + אב] (1): **44**:18.
- 5**    אב    (183) ἀδελφός (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, 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, 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**:1, 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. ἀδελφός used for אב (1).  
πλησίον (1/3): **26**:31. Cf. πλησίον used for אב (2).  
πρός + ἀλλήλων (1/1): [י״ + אב + אב + אב] (1): **42**:28.  
αὐτός (1/1,600): [אב + אב] (1): **50**:17.  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: **37**:9; **50**:18).

- 6 אָחֲזָה (9) *κατῆσιν* (6/9): 23:4, 9, 20; 36:43; 49:30; 50:13. Cf. *κατῆσιν* used for מִקְנָה (1); רְכוּשׁ (1); מִקְנָה (1).  
*κατάσχεσις* (3/3): 17:8; 47:11; 48:4.
- 7 אָכַל (17) *βρῶμα* (16/17): 14:11; 41:35+, 36, 48++; [42:2], 7, 10; 43:2, 4, 20, 22; 44:1, 25. Cf. *βρῶμα* used for מִאֲכָל (1).  
*βρῶσις* (1/8): 47:24. Cf. *βρῶσις* used for אָכַל (3); מִאֲכָל (2); אָכַל (1).
- 8 אֱלֹהִים (227) *θεός* (216/281): 1:1, 2, 3, 4+, 5, 6, 7[+], 8[+], 9, 10+, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21+, 22, 24, 25+, 26, 27+, 28, 29, 31; 2:2, 3+, 8, 15, 16, 18, 22; 3:1+, 3, 5+, 8+, 9, 14, 21, 23; [4:10], 25; 5:1+, 22, 24+; 6:2, 4, 9, 11, 13; 7:9, 16; 8:1+; 9:1, 6, 8, 17, 26, 27; 17:3, 7, 8, 9, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23; 19:29+; 20:3, 6, 13, 17+; 21:4, 12, 17++, 19, 20, 22, 23; 22:1, 3, 8, 9, 12; 23:6; 24:3+, 7[+], 12, 27, 42, 48; 25:11; 26:24; 27:20, 28; 28:4, 12, 13+, 17, 21, 22; 30:2, 6, 8, 17, 18, 20, 22+, 23; 31:5, 7, 9, 11, 16+, 24, 29, 30, 32, 42+, 50, 53+; [32:2]+, 3, 10+, 29, 31; 33:5, 10, 11; 35:1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9[+], 10, 11, 13, 15; 39:9; 40:8; 41:16, 25, 28, 32+, 38, 39, 51, 52; 42:18, 28; 43:23+, [28], 29; 44:16; 45:5, 7, 8, 9; 46:1, 2; 48:9, 11, 15+, 20, 21[+]; 50:17, 19, 20, 24[+], 25.; [יהוה + אֱלֹהִים] (8): 2:4, 5, 7, 9, 19, 21; 3:13, 22.; [אֱלֹהִים + אֱלֹהִים] (2): 33:20; 46:3. Cf. *θεός* used for יהוה (40); אֱלֹהִים (15); בֵּית־אֱלֹהִים (2); פְּנִיָּאֵל (1); פְּנִיָּאֵל (1).  
*κύριος* + *ὁ* + *θεός* (5/21): 6:12, 22; 8:15; 9:12; 28:20. Cf. *κύριος* + *ὁ* + *θεός* used for יהוה (16).  
*κύριος* (2/221): 21:2, 6. Cf. *κύριος* used for יהוה (133); אֱדֹן (78); גְּבִיר (2); בַּעַל (1).  
*ἐγώ* (1/840): 9:16.  
*θεοσέβεια* (1/1): [יִרְאָה + אֱלֹהִים] (1): 20:11.  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 31:42, 53).
- 9 אֱלֹהִים (43) *ἡγεμών* (42/42): 36:15++++, 16+++ , 17++++, 18+++ , 19, 21, 29++++, 30++++, 40++++, 41++ , 42++ , 43++ .  
*ἡγεμονία* (1/1): 36:30.
- 10 אִם (29) *μήτηρ* (27/27): 2:24; 3:20; 20:12; 21:21; 24:28, 53, 55, 67+; 27:11, 13, 14+; 28:2+, 5, 7; [29:1], 10++ ; 30:14; 32:12; 37:10; 44:20; [48:7]; [49:26].  
*δωμομήτριος* (1/1): [וְ + אִם + בַּיִת] (1): 43:29.  
*πατήρ* (1/214): 27:29. Cf. *πατήρ* used for אָב (209); וְ (1); אָב (1).
- 11 אֲמָתִי (6) *ἀλήθεια* (4/4): 24:27, 48; 32:11; 47:29.  
*ἀληθεύω* (1/2): [אֲמָתִי + אֱלֹהִים] (1): 42:16. Cf. *ἀληθεύω* used for יָכַח (1).  
*δικαιοσύνη* (1/10): 24:49. Cf. *δικαιοσύνη* used for דִּקְדָּקָה (5); צִדְקָה (3); נִקְיִי (1).
- 12 יִסְדָּה (3) *μαλακία* (2/2): 42:4; 44:29.  
*μαλακίζομαι* (1/1): 42:38.
- 13 אָרַח (2) *τρίβος* (1/1): 49:17.  
*ὁ* + *γυναικεῖος* (1/1): [אֲרָחָה + אֱלֹהִים] (1): 18:11.



- 14 אָרץ (315) γῆ (284/360): 1:1, 2, 10, 11+, 12[+], [14], 15, 17, 20, 22, 24+, 25, 26+, 28[+], 29, 30+; 2:1, 4+, 5+, 6, 11, 12, 13; 4:12, 14, 16; 6:4, 5, 6, 11+, 12+, 13+, 17+; 7:3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 17+, 18, 19, 21+, 23, 24; 8:1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17+, 19, 22; 9:1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19; 10:5, 8, 10, 11, 25, 32; 11:1, 2, 4, 8, 9+, 28; 12:1+, 6+, 7, 10+; 13:6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16+, 17; 14:19, 22; 15:7, 13, 18; 16:3; 17:8+; 18:18, 25; 19:23, 28+, 31+; 20:15; 21:21, 23, 32, 34; 22:2, 18; 23:2, 7, 12, 13, 15, 19; 24:3, 4, 5+, [7]++, [8], 37, 62; 25:6; 26:1, 2, 3+, 4+, 12, 22; 27:28, 39, 46; 28:4, 13, 14; 30:25; 31:3, 13+; 32:10; 33:18; 34:2, 10, 21+, 30; 35:6, 12+, 16, 22, [27]; 36:5, 6+, 7, 16, 17, 20, 21, 30, 34, 43; 37:1+; 40:15; 41:19, 29, 30+, 31, 33, 34+, 36++, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54+, 55, 56, 57; 42:5, 6+, 7, 12, 13, 30+, 32, 33, 34; 43:1, 11; 44:8; 45:6, 7, 8, [9], 10, 18, 19, 25, 26; 46:6, 12, 20, [27], 31, 34; 47:1+, 4++, 6++, 11++, 13++, 14+, 15+, 20, 27+, 28; 48:3, 4, 7+, 16, [21]+; 49:15, 30; 50:5, 7, 8, 11, 24+. Cf. γῆ used for אֲדָמָה (43); עֶפְרַיִם (5); הַשָּׂדֶה (4); הָהוּם (1).  
εἰς + γῆ (11/11): 11:31; 12:5+; 20:1; 29:1; 31:18; 32:4; 42:29; 45:17; 46:28; 50:13.  
ἐπί + γῆ (11/11): 18:2; 19:1; 24:52; 33:3; 37:10; 38:9; 42:6; 43:26; 44:11, 14; 48:12.  
ἐν + γῆ (1/1): 28:12.  
χώρα (5/9): 10:20, 31; [36:40]; [41:57]; 42:9. Cf. χώρα used for אֹרֶר (3); הַשָּׂדֶה (1).  
ἐγγχώριος (1/1): 34:1.  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 41:45, 56).
- 15 אִשָּׁה (152) γυνή (150/151): 2:22, 23, 24, 25; 3:1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13+, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21; 4:1, 17, 19, 23+, 25; 6:2, 18+; 7:7+, 13+; 8:16+, 18+; 11:29++, 31; 12:5, 11+, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19+, 20; 13:1; 14:16; 16:1, 3+; 17:15, 19; 18:9, 10; 19:15, 16, 26; 20:2[+], 3, 7, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18; 21:21; 23:19; 24:3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 15, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 51, 67; 25:1, 10, 20, 21+; 26:7+, 8, 9, 10, 11, 34; 27:46; 28:1, 2, 6+, 9+; 29:21, 28; 30:4, 9, 26; 31:17, [32], 35, 50; 32:23; 33:5; 34:4, 8, 12, [16], 21, 29; 36:2, 6, 10+, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 39; 37:2; 38:6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 20; 39:7, 8, 9, 19; 41:45; 44:27; 45:19; 46:5, 19, 26; 49:31+. Cf. γυνή used for חַתָּה (1).  
ὁ + γυναικεῖος (1/1): [אִשָּׁה + חַתָּה + אֶרֶץ] (1): 18:11.  
αὐτός (1/1,600): 12:15.
- 16 בָּנָד (14) ἱμάτιον (11/14): 27:27; 28:20; 37:29; 38:14, 19; 39:12+, 13, 15, 16, 18. Cf. ἱμάτιον used for שִׁמְלָה (3).  
ἱματισμός (1/1): 24:53.  
στολή (2/7): 27:15; 41:42. Cf. στολή used for שִׁמְלָה (4); לְבוּשׁ (1).
- 17 בָּד (14) μόνος (8/18): [וְ + בָּד + לְ] (5): 2:18; 32:25; 42:38; 43:32; 44:20.; [וְ + בָּד + לְ] (2): 21:28, 29.; [וְ + בָּד + לְ] (1): 47:26. Cf. μόνος used for אֶחָד (4); יָחַד (2).  
κατά + μόνος (1/1): [וְ + בָּד + לְ] (1): 32:17.  
κατά (3/94): [בָּד + לְ] (3): 30:40; 43:32+.  
χωρίς (2/4): [בָּד + לְ + מִן] (2): 26:1; 46:26.

- 18 בְּהֶמָּה (23) κτῆνος (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. κτῆνος used for מִקְנֶה (16); צֶאֱן (7); רֶמֶשׂ (1).  
τετράπους (2/2): 1:24; 34:23.
- 19 בֹּרַר (9) λάκκος (7/8): 37:20, 22, 24, 28, 29+; 40:15.  
εἰς + λάκκος (1/1): 37:24.  
ὀχύρωμα (1/4): 41:14. Cf. ὀχύρωμα used for בֵּית (1).
- 20 בֵּית (109) οἶκος (55/70): 7:1; 12:1, 15, 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. οἶκος used for אֵתָה (9); בֵּית־אֵל (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 אֵתָה (1); הָט (1).  
οἰκογενής (5/7): 15:2.; [בֵּית + יָלִיד] (3): 14:14; 17:23, 27.; [בֵּית + בֶּן] (1): 15:3. Cf. οἰκογενής used for יָלִיד (2).  
εἰς + οἶκος (5/6): 19:10; 28:2; 43:17, 26; 47:14.  
εἰς + οἰκία (4/4): 24:32; 39:11; 43:16, 26.  
πανοικία (2/2): 50:8, 22.  
παρά (3/52): 24:23; 40:3, 7.  
ὁ + δεσμωτήριον (3/3): [בֵּית + הָ + סֶהֱר] (3): 39:22; 40:3, 5.  
ὁ + ὀχύρωμα (2/2): [בֵּית + הָ + סֶהֱר] (2): 39:20+.  
ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ (2/2): [שֶׁר + בֵּית + הָ + סֶהֱר] (2): 39:21, 22.  
πρός (1/253): 44:14.  
δυναστής (1/2): 50:4. Cf. δυναστής used for אֶבְיָר (1).  
ὑπάρχω (1/17): 45:18. Cf. ὑπάρχω used for מִקְנֶה (5); רִכּוּשׁ (4); לְ (2); מִיִּנְקָת (1); קִנְיִן (1); יֵשׁ (1).  
υἱός (1/341): 45:11. Cf. υἱός used for בֶּן (327); יָלִיד (4); בְּרָעַמִי (1); יָלִיד (1); בְּרָאוּנִי (1); בַּת (1); שִׁבְט (1).  
ἔσωθεν (1/1): [בֵּית + מֶן] (1): 6:14.  
ἔσω (1/1): [בֵּית + בָּ] (1): 39:11.  
σιτοδοσία (1/2): [בֵּית + רָעֲבֹן] (1): 42:19. Cf. σιτοδοσία used for רָעֲבֹן (1).  
φυλακή (1/7): [בֵּית + מִשְׁמֶרֶת] (1): 42:19. Cf. φυλακή used for מִשְׁמֶרֶת (6).  
ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ + ὁ + δεσμωτήριον (1/1): [שֶׁר + בֵּית + הָ + סֶהֱר] (1): 39:23.  
ὁ (1/4,832): 41:51.  
ὀχύρωμα (1/4): 40:14. Cf. ὀχύρωμα used for בֹּרַר (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 46:31).
- 21 בְּכֶרֶה (6) πρωτοτόκια (5/5): 25:31, 32, 33, 34; 27:36.  
πρεσβεῖον (1/1): 43:33.

- 22 בן (383) υἱός (327/341): 4:17, 25, 26; 5:4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 28, 30, [32]; 6:2, 4, 10, 18+; 7:7+, 13+; 8:16+, 18+; 9:1, 8, 18, 19, 24; 10:1+, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7+, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 29, 31, 32; 11:5, 10, 11, [13]+, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 31++++; 12:5; 14:12; 15:2; 16:11, 15+; 17:12, 19, 23, 25, 26; 18:10, 14, 19; 19:12, 37, 38; 21:2, 3, 5, 7, [8], 9[+], 10++, 11, 13; 22:2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 20, [23]; 23:3, 5, 7, 10+, 16, 18, 20; 24:3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 36, 37, 38, 40, 47, 48, 51; 25:3, 4+, [5], 6+, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19; 27:1+, 5, 6, 8, 15+, 17, 20, 21, 24, 27, 29, [30], 31, 32, 42+, [46]; 28:5, 9; [29:1], 5, 12, 13, 32, 33, 34+, 35; 30:5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15+, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 35; 31:1, 43+; 32:1, 33; 34:2, [5]+, 7, 8, 13, [14], 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27; 35:5, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26+, 29; [36:2], 5, 6, 10++, 11, 12+, 13+, 14[+], 15+, 16, 17++, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39[+]; 37:2+, 3+, [4], 32, 33, 34, 35+; 38:3, 4, 5, 11, 26; 41:50; 42:1, 5, 11, 32, 37, 38; 45:9, 10++, 21, [26], 28; 46:5, 7++++, 8+, 9, 10+, 11, 12+, 13, 14, 15+, 16, 17+, 18, 19, [20][+], 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27; [47:6], 29; 48:1, 2, 5, 8, 9; 49:1, 2, 8, 9, 22+[+], 32, 33; 50:12, 13, 23+, 25. Cf. υἱός used for ילד (4); בן-עמי (1); ילד (1); בן-אונ' (1); בית (1); שבת (1); שבט (1).  
τέκνον (18/21): 3:16; 17:16; 22:7, 8; 27:13, 18, 20, 21, 25, 26, 37, 43; 30:1; 31:16, 43; 32:12; 43:29; 48:19. Cf. τέκνον used for ילד (2); און (1).  
εἰμί (7/505): 7:6; 12:4; 16:16; 17:24; 21:5; 25:26; 41:46. Cf. εἰμί used for היה (150); הוא (30); היא (23); יש (13); אין (13); הנה (11); הם (9); אתם (7); אנחנו (6); אתה (5); הנה (5); את (5); ינו (1); כבוד (1); נחנו (1); אפוא (1); אסר (1); נקה (2); זה (2); אנכי (2); עשה (2); עוד (3); עז (1); באש (1); מות (1); בוא (1); לזה (1); ישב (1); הן (1); רעע (1); כבד (1); לטש (1); ח (1); גדל (1).  
παιδίον (7/32): 17:12; 21:7; 25:22; 31:17, 28; 32:16; 50:23. Cf. παιδίον used for ילד (12); נער (11); ט (1).  
ὁ (4/4,832): 21:4; 23:8; 24:24; 25:9.  
ὁ + მოსχάριον (1/1): [בן + ה + בקר] (1): 18:8.  
οἰκογενής (1/7): [בית + בן] (1): 15:3. Cf. οἰκογενής used for ילד (2); בית (1).  
ἀλλογενής + ἔθνος (1/1): [בן + נכר] (1): 17:27.  
μωσχαρίον (1/2): [בן + בקר] (1): 18:7.  
Ἀμμανίτης (1/1): [בן + עמון] (1): 19:38.  
πᾶς (1/354): 23:11. Cf. πᾶς used for כל (349); כל (1); רבץ (1).  
ἐαυτοῦ + θεράπων + Ἰσαάκ (1/1): [בן + אדון + י] (1): 24:44.  
ὁμομήτριος (1/1): [בן + אם + י] (1): 43:29.  
πῶλος (1/3): 49:11. Cf. πῶλος used for עיר (1); עיר (1).  
“Omitted” (11): see §3.1.6 (8: 5:32; 17:1, 17, 25; 25:20; 26:34; 37:2; 50:26); §3.1.8 (3: 29:1; 33:19; 36:31).
- 23 בקר (18) βοῦς (12/25): 13:5; 18:7; 26:14; [30:43]; 32:8; 33:13; 34:28; 45:10; 46:32; 47:1, 17; 50:8. Cf. βοῦς used for פרה (12); שור (1).

- μόσχος (4/4): 12:16; 20:14; 21:27; 24:35.  
 μοσχάριον (1/2): [בֶּן + בָּקָר] (1): 18:7.  
 ὁ + μοσχάριον (1/1): [בֶּן + הַ + בָּקָר] (1): 18:8.
- 24 בָּקָר (19) πρωί (18/19): 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23,  
 31; 19:27; 20:8; 21:14; 22:3; 24:54; 26:31; 28:18; 29:25; 32:1; 40:6; 41:8; 44:3.  
 πρωινός (1/1): 49:27.
- 25 בְּרִית (27) διαθήκη (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.  
 συνωμότης (1/1): [בְּרִית + בָּעַל] (1): 14:13.
- 26 בְּרָכָה (16) εὐλογία (15/16): 27:12, 35, 36+, 38, 41; 28:4; 33:11; 39:5; 49:25++, 26+, 28. Cf. εὐλογία  
 used for תְּאֵנָה (1).  
 εὐλογητός (1/7): 12:2. Cf. εὐλογητός used for בָּרַךְ (6).
- 27 בֶּשֶׂר (35) σάρξ (32/32): 2:21, 23+, 24; 6:3, 12, 17, 19; 7:15, 16, 21; 8:17, [21]; 9:11, 15+, 16,  
 17; 17:11, 13, 14, 24, 25; 29:14; [34:24]; 37:27; 40:19; 41:2, 3, 4, 18, 19.  
 ἄνθρωπος (1/96): 6:13. Cf. ἄνθρωπος used for אִישׁ (69); אָדָם (25); אָדָם (1).  
 κρέας (1/1): 9:4.  
 ἀκροβυστία (1/7): [בֶּשֶׂר + עֲרֵלָה] (1): 17:23. Cf. ἀκροβυστία used for עֲרֵלָה (6).
- 28 בַּת (109) θυγάτηρ (102/102): 5:4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 30; 6:1, 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.  
 ἐκ (2/153): 20:12+.  
 γυνή (1/151): 30:13. Cf. γυνή used for אִשָּׁה (150).  
 υἱός (1/341): 36:39. Cf. υἱός used for בֶּן (327); יָלֵד (4); בְּנֵי־עַמִּי (1); יָלָד (1); בְּנֵי־אוֹנִי (1); בֵּית  
 (1); שִׁבְט (1).  
 “Omitted” (3): see §3.1.8 (2: 27:46; 38:12); §3.1.6 (1: 17:17).
- 29 דָּבָר (64) ῥῆμα (46/47): 15:1+; 18:14, 25; 19:21; 20:8; 21:11, [12]; 22:1, 16, 20; 24:9, 28, 30, 33,  
 52, 66; 27:34, 42; [29:12]; 30:31, 34; 31:1; 32:20; 34:14, 19; 37:8, 11; 39:7, 17,  
 19; 40:1; 41:28, 32, 37; 42:16, 20; 44:2, 6, 7+, [17], 18, 24; 47:30; 48:1. Cf. ῥῆμα used for  
 רָעָה (1).  
 φωνή (2/27): 11:1; 15:4. Cf. φωνή used for קוֹל (23); שָׁפָה (1); צִעֲקָה (1).  
 πράγμα (2/3): 19:22; 21:26. Cf. πράγμα used for מַעֲשֶׂה (1).  
 ἔνεκα (2/17): [דָּבָר + עַל] (2): 20:11, 18.  
 λόγος (2/3): 29:13; 34:18. Cf. λόγος used for אִמְרָה (1).  
 λέγω (2/622): 45:27.; [דָּבָר + כֹּחַ] (1): 44:10. Cf. λέγω used for אָמַר (604); דִּבֶּר (10); נָאָם  
 (1); קָרָא (1); פָּה (1).  
 περί (1/35): [דָּבָר + עַל] (1): 12:17.

μηδείς + ἄδικος (1/1): 19:8.

πρόσταγμα (1/3): 24:50. Cf. πρόσταγμα used for תַּשְׁמָרָה (1); חַק (1).

οὕτως (1/32): [לְהָ + הָ + דָּבָר + בָּ] (1): 39:19. Cf. οὕτως used for בֵּן (24); בָּה (6); זֶה (1).

ἐπερώτησις (1/1): 43:7.

διὰ (1/44): [רָבָר + לַע] (1): 43:18.

“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 20:10; 37:14).

- 30 דִּנְאִים (5) μανδραγόρας (4/5): 30:14, 15+, 16.  
μῆλον + μανδραγόρας (1/1): 30:14.
- 31 דַּעַת (2) γινώσκω (1/38): 2:17. Cf. γινώσκω used for יָדַע (36); רָאָה (1).  
οἶδα + γνωστός (1/1): 2:9.
- 32 דָּרָךְ (34) ὁδός (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.  
εὐοδός (1/9): [נַחָה + דָּרָךְ + בָּ] (1): 24:27. Cf. εὐοδός used for צֶלַח (6); קָרָה (1); נַחָה (1).  
πάροδος (1/1): 38:14.  
καθήκω (1/1): 19:31.  
κατά + ἐθισμός (1/1): 31:35.  
ἵππόδρομος (1/2): 48:7. Cf. ἵππόδρομος used for אֶפְרָח (1).
- 33 הַמֶּזֶן (2) πολὺς (1/19): 17:5. Cf. πολὺς used for רַב (9); גָּדוֹל (3); הַרְבֵּה (2); רַבב (1); עָצוּם (1); יוֹד  
(1); רַב (1).  
πλήθος (1/8): 17:4. Cf. πλήθος used for רַב (5); מְלֵא (1).
- 34 הָר (22) ὄρος (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].  
εἰς + ὄρος (3/3): 12:8; 19:17, 19.  
εἰς + ὀρεινός (1/1): 14:10.
- 35 זָהָב (9) χρυσίον (5/5): 2:11, 12; 13:2; 24:35; 44:8.  
χρυσοῦς (4/6): 24:22+, 53; 41:42. Cf. χρυσοῦς used for כֶּסֶף (2).
- 36 זָכָר (18) ἄρσην (13/13): 1:27; 5:2; 6:19, [20]; [7:2][+], 3[+], 9, 16; 17:14, 23; 34:24.  
ἀρσενικός (5/5): 17:10, 12; 34:15, 22, 25.
- 37 זָרַע (59) σπέρμα (58/60): 1:11+, 12+, 29; 3:15+; 4:25; 7:3; 8:22; 9:9; 12:7; 13:15, 16+; 15:3, 5, 13,  
18; 16:10; 17:7+, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19; 19:32, 34; 21:12, 13; 22:17+, 18; 24:7, 60; 26:3, 4++,  
24; 28:4, 13, 14+; 32:13; 35:12; 38:8, 9+; 46:6, 7; 47:19, 23, 24; 48:4, 11, 19. Cf. σπέρμα  
used for זָרַע (1); נֶזֶן (1).  
σπόριμος (1/2): 1:29.
- 38 חֶדֶשׁ (11) μήν (10/12): 7:11+; 8:4+, 5+, 13, 14+; 29:14.  
τρίμηνος (1/1): [שָׁלֹשׁ + חֶדֶשׁ] (1): 38:24.

- 39 חוץ (11) ἔξω (10/10): 15:5; 19:17; 24:29; 39:12, 13, 15, 18.; [חוץ + ב] (2): 9:22; 24:31.; [מן + חוץ] (1): 24:11.  
ἔξωθεν (1/3): [חוץ + מן] (1): 6:14. Cf. ἔξωθεν used for בעד (2).
- 40 תטא (4) ἁμαρτία (2/6): 18:20; 50:17. Cf. ἁμαρτία used for עון (1); הטא (1); טא (1); אשם (1).  
ἁμαρτάνω (1/7): 4:7. Cf. ἁμαρτάνω used for טח (6).  
ἁμάρτημα (1/1): 31:36.
- 41 חי (25) ζῶ (20/23): 2:7, 9; 3:14, 17, 22, 24; 6:17; 7:11, 15, 22; [8:13]; 23:1; 25:7, 17; 27:46; 47:8, [9]++, 28. Cf. ζῶ used for חי (1); חיה (1); מחיה (1).  
ζάω (2/74): 9:3; 27:46. Cf. ζάω used for חיה (52); חי (20).  
νή + ὁ + ὑγία (2/2): 42:15, 16.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 23:1).
- 42 חלום (34) ἐνύπνιον (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. ἐνύπνιον used for חלם (1).  
ὕπνος (8/10): 20:3, 6; 31:10, 11, 24; 40:9; 41:17, 22. Cf. ὕπνος used for חנה (2).  
ὁ + ἐνυπνιαστής (1/1): [חלום + ה + בעל] (1): 37:19.  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 41:12+).
- 43 חמוץ (17) ὄνος (15/17): 12:16; 22:3, 5; 24:35; 30:43; 32:6; 34:28; 42:26, 27; 43:18, 24; 44:3, 13; 45:23; 47:17. Cf. ὄνος used for חוץ (2).  
ὕποζύγιον (1/1): 36:24.  
καλός (1/41): 49:14. Cf. καλός used for טוב (32); יפה (6); חמדות (1); טובה (1).
- 44 חמס (4) ἀδικία (3/7): 6:11, 13; 49:5. Cf. ἀδικία used for עשק (2); עשק (1); עון (1).  
ἀδικέω (1/4): [י + חמס] (1): 16:5. Cf. ἀδικέω used for שקר (1); עשק (1); חטא (1).
- 45 חן (14) χάρις (13/14): 6:8; 18:3; 30:27; 32:6; 33:8, 10, 15; 34:11; 39:4, 21; 47:25, 29; 50:4. Cf. χάρις used for חמים (1).  
ἐλεος (1/7): 19:19. Cf. ἐλεος used for חסד (6).
- 46 חרב (6) μάχαιρα (5/7): 27:40; 31:26; 34:25, 26; 48:22. Cf. μάχαιρα used for מאכלת (2).  
ρόμφαία (1/1): 3:24.
- 47 חבט (6) ἀρχιμάγειρος (3/5): [חבט + ה + שר] (3): 37:36; 39:1; 41:12.  
ὁ + ἀρχιμάγειρος (2/2): [חבט + ה + שר] (2): 40:3; 41:10.  
ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμώτης (1/1): [חבט + ה + שר] (1): 40:4.
- 48 חד (96) χεῖρ (76/81): 3:22; 4:11; 5:29; 8:9; 9:2, 5+; 14:22; [16:6], 9, 12+; 19:10, 16++; 21:18; 22:6, 10, 12; 24:2, 9, 22, 30, 47; 25:26; 27:17, 22+, 23+; 30:35; 31:29; 32:12, 17; 33:10; 35:4; 37:21, 22+, 27; 38:18, 20, 28+, 29, 30; 39:1, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 22, 23[+]; 40:11, 13; 41:35, 42+, 44; 42:37; 43:9, 12, 15, 21, 26; 46:4; 47:29; [48:14]+, 17, 22; [49:8], 24. Cf. χεῖρ used for חר (4).  
ὕποχειριος (1/1): [חד + ב] (1): 14:20.  
βραχίων + χεῖρ (1/1): 49:24.

- παρά (6/52): [דַּ + מן] (4): 21:30; 31:39; 33:19; 38:20.; [דַּ + בָּ] (2): 44:16, 17.  
μετά (3/247): [דַּ + בָּ] (3): 24:10; 43:12, 22.  
βραχίων (2/3): 24:18; 27:16.  
πλατύς (2/3): [דַּ + רָחַב] (2): [34:10], 21. Cf. πλατύς used for רָחַב (1).  
φέρω (1/16): [וֹ + דַּ + בָּ + בוא + ה] (1): 32:14. Cf. φέρω used for בוא (8); לקח (1); נשא (1); ירד (1); נתן (1); יהב (1); תִּשָּׁב (1).  
πενταπλάσιος (1/1): [דַּ + שָׁמַח] (1): 43:34.  
μέρος (1/3): 47:24. Cf. μέρος used for חֶצֶק (1).  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 32:12; 48:17).
- 49 יוֹ (154) ἡμέρα (126/131): 1:5+, 8, 13, 14+, 16, 18, 19, 23, 31; 2:2+, 3, 4, 17; 3:5, 14, 17; 4:3; 5:1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 27, 31; 6:3, 4, 5; 7:4+, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 24; 8:3, 6, 10, 12, 22+; 9:29; 10:25; 11:32; 15:18; 17:12, [14], 23, 26; 18:11; 21:4, 8, 34; 22:4; 24:1, 55; 25:7, [8], 24; 26:32, 33; 27:2, 41, 44, 45; 29:7, 14, 20, 21; 30:14, 33, 35, 36; 31:22, 23, 39, 40; 32:33; 33:13, 16; 34:25; 35:3, [4], 28, 29; 37:34; 38:12; 39:10+, 11; 40:4, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20+; 41:1; 42:17, 18; 43:9; 44:32; 47:8, 9+++ , 26, 28, 29; 48:15, 20; 49:1; 50:3+, 4, 10. Cf. ἡμέρα used for יוֹשֶׁבֶת (2).  
σήμερον + ἡμέρα (3/3): 19:37, 38; 35:20.  
σήμερον (16/23): 4:14; 21:26; 22:14; 24:12, 42; 25:31, 33; 30:32; 31:43, 48; 40:7; 41:9; 42:13, 32; 47:23.; [הָ + ה + יוֹם] (1): 50:20. Cf. σήμερον used for הָ (2); שָׁכַר (1).  
χρόνος (2/2): 26:1, 15.  
πολυχρόνιος (1/1): [יוֹם + ה + דָּרַךְ] (1): 26:8.  
δειλινός (1/1): [יוֹם + ה + רוֹחַ] (1): 3:8.  
βασίλεια (1/3): 14:1. Cf. βασίλεια used for מַמְלָכָה (2).  
μεσημβρία (1/3): [יוֹם + ה + סָם + בָּ] (1): 18:1. Cf. μεσημβρία used for צָהָרִים (2).  
“Omitted” (3): see §3.1.6 (3: 7:11; 8:4, 14).
- 50 יֶלֶד (19) παιδίον (12/32): 21:8, 14, 15, 16; 30:26; 32:23; 33:1, 2, 5+, 13; 44:20. Cf. παιδίον used for נֶעַר (11); בֶּן (7); ט (1).  
παιδάριον (3/9): 33:14; 37:30; 42:22. Cf. παιδάριον used for נֶעַר (6).  
τέκνον (2/21): 33:6, 7. Cf. τέκνον used for בֶּן (18); אִין (1).  
νεανίσκος (1/6): 4:23. Cf. νεανίσκος used for נֶעַר (5).  
υἱός (1/341): 33:2. Cf. υἱός used for בֶּן (327); יֶלֶד (4); בֶּן-עַמִּי (1); בֶּן-אֹנִי (1); בֵּית (1); בֵּית (1); שֶׁבֶט (1).
- 51 יָם (13) θάλασσα (11/12): 1:10, 22, 26, 28; 9:2; 12:8; 13:14; 14:3; 22:17; 32:13; 41:49.  
ἐπί + θάλασσα (1/1): 28:14.  
παράλιος (1/1): [יָם + הָיָה + לָ] (1): 49:13.
- 52 יָקוּם (2) ἀνάστημα (1/1): 7:23.  
ἐξανάστασις (1/1): 7:4.

- 53 כְּבוֹד (4) δόξα (3/3): 31:1, [16]; 45:13.  
ἡπαρ (1/1): 49:6.
- 54 כֶּכָר (7) περίχωρος (5/5): 13:10, 11, 12; 19:17, 28.  
περίοικος (2/2): 19:25, 29.
- 55 בָּל (368) πᾶς (350/354): 1:21+, 25, 26+, 28[+][+], 29++, 30+++, 31; 2:1, 2, 3, 5+, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 19++, 20[+]+; 3:1+, 14++, 17, 20; 4:14, 15+; 5:5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 27, 31; 6:2, 5+, 12, 13, 17, [19][+]+, [20][+]+, 21, 22; 7:1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14+++, 15, 16, 19, [20], 21++, 22+, 23[+]; 8:1+[+][+], [9]+, 17++, 19+++, 20+, 21, 22; 9:2+++, 3+, 5, 10++, 11[+], 12, 15++, 16+, 17, 19, 29; 10:21, 29; 11:1[+], 4, 6+, 8, 9+; 12:3, 5[+], 20; 13:1, 9, 10+, 11, 15; 14:3, 7, 11+, 16, 20, 23; 15:10; 16:12++; 17:8, 10, 12+, 23++, 27; 18:18, [19], [24], 25, 26, 28; 19:17, 25[+], [29], 31; 20:7, 8[+], 13, 16+, 18; 21:12, 22; 22:18; 23:10, 17, 18; 24:1, 2, 10, 20, [22], 66; 25:4, 5, 18; 26:3, 4+, 11[+], 15; 27:33, 37; 28:14, 15[+], 22; 29:3, 8, 13, 22; 30:32[+], 33, 35++, 40; 31:1+, 6, 8+, [9], 16, 18[+], 21, [23], [31], 37+, 43; 32:11+, 20, [24]; 33:8, 11, 13; 34:15, 19, 22, 24+, 25, 29+, [30]; 35:2, 6; 36:6[+]+; 37:3, 4, 35; 39:4, 5+, 6, 8, 22+, 23; 40:17, 20; 41:8+, 29, 35, 37, [38], 39, 40, 41, 44, 46, 48, 51+, 54+, 55+, 56[+], 57+; 42:6, 11, 29, 36; 43:9, 34; 44:32; 45:1, [2], 8+, 9, 11, 13, 15, [18], 20, 22, [23], 26, 27; 46:1, [6]+, 7, 15, 22, 25, 26+, 27, 32, 34; 47:1, 12, 13, 14[+], 15, 17, 20, [23], [24]; 48:16; 49:28; 50:7+, 8[+], 15, [22].; [בָּל + אֵשׁ] (1): 45:1. Cf. πᾶς used for בָּן (1); כֹּלָה (1); רִבְעָ (1).  
ἅπας (1/1): 19:4.  
ὅσος (7/42): 6:17; 39:3.; [בָּל + אֵשׁ] (5): 31:12, 16; 34:29; 45:10, 13.  
ὅλος (5/5): 25:25; 31:34; 41:19, [30], 43.  
καταδείκνυμι (1/1): [בָּל + תַּפְשׁ] (1): 4:21.  
εἰ + τίς + σύ + ἄλλος + εἰμί (1/1): [בָּל + אֵשׁ + הָ + יָ] (1): 19:12.  
ὅς + ἄν (1/1): [בָּל + הָ] (1): 21:6.  
ὁ + καιρός + ὅς (1/1): 30:41.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 4:22).
- 56 כְּלִי (8) σκεῦος (5/5): 24:53; 27:3; 31:37+; 45:20.  
ἀγγεῖον (2/2): 42:25; 43:11.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 24:53).
- 57 כְּסָף (43) ἀργύριον (31/31): 13:2; 23:9, 13, 15, 16+; 24:35; 31:15; 42:25, 27, 28, 35+; 43:12+, 15, 18, 21+, 22+, 23; 44:1, 8+; 47:14+, 15+, 16, 18.  
ἀργυρώνητος (4/4): [כְּסָף + מְקַנָּה] (4): 17:12, 13, 23, 27.  
ἀργυροῦς (3/3): 24:53; 44:2, [4].  
δίδραχμον (2/4): [20:14], 16. Cf. δίδραχμον used for לְקַשֵּׁ (2).  
χρυσοῦς (2/6): 37:28; 45:22. Cf. χρυσοῦς used for הֶקֶץ (4).  
τιμή (1/2): 44:2. Cf. τιμή used for כְּסוּתָ (1).
- 58 כְּשָׁב (4) ἀρνός (3/3): 30:32, 33, 35.



- ἀμνός (1/4): 30:40. Cf. ἀμνός used for צאן (1); מִנְהָ (1); קְשִׁיטָה (1).
- 59 לָאֵם (4) *λαός* (3/23): 25:23++. Cf. *λαός* used for עַם (20).  
*ἄρχων* (1/11): 27:29. Cf. *ἄρχων* used for שָׂר (2); מִשְׁלָה (2); נְשִׂיאָה (2); שְׂדֵה (1); שְׂלִיטָה (1);  
שִׁבְטָה (1); מְלִיכָה (1).
- 60 לֵב (14) *διάνοια* (7/7): 8:21; 17:17; [24:15], 45; 27:41; 34:3; 45:26.  
*διανοέομαι* (2/3): [יָ + לֵב + אָל + עֶצֶב] (1): 6:6.; [יָ + לֵב + אָל] (1): 8:21. Cf. *διανοέομαι*  
used for מְחַשְּׁבָה (1).  
*καρδία* (3/5): 6:5; 42:28; 50:21. Cf. *καρδία* used for לִבָּב (2).  
*ἐσθίω* (1/52): [כֶּסֶם + לֵב + סַעַד] (1): 18:5. Cf. *ἐσθίω* used for אָכַל (49); אֶכְלָה (1); מֵאֲכָל (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 31:20).
- 61 לְחֵם (23) *ἄρτος* (20/22): 3:19; 14:18; 18:5; 21:14; 25:34; 27:17; 28:20; 37:25; 39:6; 41:54, 55; 43:31,  
32; 45:23; 47:15, [16], 17+, 19; 49:20.  
*σῆτος* (2/13): 47:12, 13. Cf. *σῆτος* used for שֶׁבֶר (5); בָּר (4); דִּגָּן (2).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 43:25).
- 62 מְאוֹמָה (7) *οὐδείς* (6/17): 30:31; [31:32]; 39:6, 9, 23; 40:15.  
*μηδείς* (1/2): 22:12.
- 63 מְאוֹרָה (5) *φωστήρ* (4/4): 1:14, 16++.  
*φαῦσις* (1/2): 1:15. Cf. *φαῦσις* used for אֹר (1).
- 64 מְאָכַל (4) *βρώσις* (2/8): 2:9; 3:6. Cf. *βρώσις* used for אֶכְלָה (3); אָכַל (1); אֶכְלָה (1).  
*βρώμα* (1/17): 6:21. Cf. *βρώμα* used for אֶכְלָה (16).  
*γένος* + *ὄς* + *ἐσθίω* (1/1): 40:17.
- 65 מְגוֹרָה (6) *παροίκησις* (2/2): 28:4; 36:7.  
*ὄς* + *παροικέω* (2/2): [יָ + מְגוֹרָה] (1): 17:8.; [יָ + מְגוֹרָה] (1): 47:9.  
*παροικέω* (2/13): 37:1.; [יָ + מְגוֹרָה] (1): 47:9. Cf. *παροικέω* used for גּוֹר (9).
- 66 מוֹלֶדֶת (9) *γένεσις* (2/15): 31:13; 32:10. Cf. *γένεσις* used for תּוֹלְדוֹת (12); יָלַד (1).  
*ὄς* + *γίνομαι* (2/2): [יָ + מוֹלֶדֶת] (1): 11:28.; [יָ + מוֹלֶדֶת] (1): 24:7.  
*γενεά* (2/12): 31:3; 43:7. Cf. *γενεά* used for דּוֹר (8); תּוֹלְדוֹת (1); שְׁלִישִׁים (1).  
*συγγένεια* (1/2): 12:1. Cf. *συγγένεια* used for שֵׁשׁ (1).  
*γίνομαι* (1/201): 24:4. Cf. *γίνομαι* used for הָיָה (155); יָלַד (18); גָּדַל (4); עָשָׂה (3); יָטַב (2);  
שָׁמַע (1); בָּחַן (1); יָדַע (1); הָיָא (1); הָוָה (1); עָצַם (1); לָא (1); עָלָה (1); רָבַב (1); בָּרָא (1); חָלִיל (2);  
(1).  
*ἔαγνος* (1/1): 48:6.
- 67 מוֹשֵׁב (3) *κατοίκησις* (2/2): 10:30; 27:39.  
*κατοικοδομέω* (1/1): 36:43.
- 68 מוֹתָה (7) *ἀποθνήσκω* (4/69): 25:11; 26:18; 27:7, 10. Cf. *ἀποθνήσκω* used for מוֹת (63); גּוֹעַ (1); כָּרַת (1).  
*θάνατος* (1/4): 21:16. Cf. *θάνατος* used for מוֹת (3).

- τελευτή (1/1): 27:2.  
 τελευτάω (1/6): 50:16. Cf. τελευτάω used for מות (4); גוע (1).
- 69 מֶלֶךְ (45) βασιλεύς (44/45): 14:1+++; 2++++; 5, 8++++; 9++++; 10[+]; 17++, 18, 21, 22; 17:6, 16; 20:2; 26:1, 8; 35:11; 36:31+; 39:20; 40:1+, 5, [17]; 41:46; [45:21]; [47:6]. Cf. βασιλεύς used for מֶלֶךְ (1).  
 ἄρχων (1/11): 49:20. Cf. ἄρχων used for שׂר (2); מֶשֶׁל (2); נָשִׂיא (2); שָׂדֶה (1); לֵאמֹר (1); שְׁלִיט (1); שֹׁבֵט (1).
- 70 מִנָּה (2) ἀμνός (1/4): 31:7. Cf. ἀμνός used for כֶּשֶׁב (1); צֹאן (1); קְשִׁיטָה (1).  
 ἀμνάς (1/4): 31:41. Cf. ἀμνάς used for כֶּבֶשׂה (3).
- 71 מִנְהָ (12) δῶρον (10/12): 4:4; 32:14, 19, 21, 22; 33:10; 43:11, 15, 25, 26. Cf. δῶρον used for מְנָדָה (1); זֶבֶד (1).  
 θυσία (2/4): 4:3, 5. Cf. θυσία used for זֶבֶח (2).
- 72 מִעָה (2) κοιλία (1/6): 25:23. Cf. κοιλία used for בֶּטֶן (2); קֶרֶב (2).  
 ἐκ (1/153): [מִן + מִעָה] (1): 15:4.
- 73 מִעֲשֶׂה (6) ἔργον (5/11): 5:29; 20:9; 40:17; 46:33; 47:3. Cf. ἔργον used for מְלָאכָה (4); עֲבוּד (2).  
 πράγμα (1/3): 44:15. Cf. πράγμα used for דְּבָר (2).
- 74 מְקוֹם (48) τόπος (47/51): 12:6; 13:3, 4, 14; 18:24, 26, 33; 19:12, 13, 14, 27; 20:11, 13; 21:31; 22:3, 4, 9, 14; 24:23, 25, 31; 26:7+; 28:11++, 16, 17, 19; 29:3, 22, 26; 30:25; 32:1, 3, 31; 33:17; [35:1], 7, 13, 14, 15; 36:40; [38:21], 22; 39:20; 40:3. Cf. τόπος used for שָׁם (2); בֵּית-אֵל (1); הָ (1).  
 συναγωγή (1/5): 1:9. Cf. συναγωγή used for קְהָל (3); מִקְוֶה (1).
- 75 מִקְנֶה (27) ατῆνος (16/45): 13:2, 7+; 26:14+; 29:7; 30:29; 31:9; 33:17; 34:5, 23; 47:6, 16+, 17+. Cf. ατῆνος used for בְּהֵמָה (21); צֹאן (7); רֶמֶשׂ (1).  
 ατῆσις (1/9): 49:32. Cf. ατῆσις used for אֶתְחָא (6); מִקְנֶה (1); רְכוּשׁ (1).  
 ὑπάρχω (5/17): 31:18; 36:6, 7; 46:6; 47:18. Cf. ὑπάρχω used for רְכוּשׁ (4); לֵ (2); מִינְקָה (1); קִנְיָן (1); יֵשׁ (1); בֵּית (1).  
 ατηνοστροφός (3/3): 4:20; 46:32, 34.  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 47:17+).
- 76 מִשְׁפָּחָה (13) φυλή (12/13): 10:5, 18, 20, 31, 32; 12:3; [24:4], 38, 40, 41; 28:14; 36:40. Cf. φυλή used for שִׁבְט (1).  
 γένος (1/27): 8:19. Cf. γένος used for מִין (18); עַם (6); בְּרִיעָמִי (1); מְאָכֶל (1).
- 77 מִשְׁקָה (11) οἰνοχοέω (1/1): 40:13.  
 ὁ + ἀρχαιοινοχόος (5/5): [שָׂר + הָ + מִשְׁקָה] (5): 40:2, 9, 20, 23; 41:9.  
 ἀρχαιοινοχόος (3/8): 40:1, 5.; [שָׂר + הָ + מִשְׁקָה] (1): 40:21.  
 ποτίζω (1/20): 13:10. Cf. ποτίζω used for שָׁקָה (18); גָּמָא (1).  
 ἀρχή (1/16): 40:21. Cf. ἀρχή used for רֹאשׁ (4); רִאשִׁית (3); תְּחִלָּה (3); מְמִשְׁלָה (2); רִאשׁוֹן (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); בֵּן (1).

- 78 נָגַד (2) κατά (1/94): [נָגַד + כָּ] (1): 2:18.  
θμοιος (1/1): [נָגַד + כָּ] (1): 2:20.
- 79 נִחֵלָה (2) κληρος (1/2): 48:6. Cf. κληρος used for מִשְׁפָּחָיִם (1).  
κληρονομία (1/1): 31:14.
- 80 נָכַר (4) ἀλλότριος (3/4): 17:12; 35:2, 4. Cf. ἀλλότριος used for נִכְרִי (1).  
ἀλλογενής + ἔθνος (1/1): [נָכַר + בֵּן] (1): 17:27.
- 81 נָעַר (27) παιδίον (11/32): 21:12, 17+, 18, 19, 20; 44:32, 33+, 34; 48:16. Cf. παιδίον used for יֶלֶד (12); בֶּן (7); הָיָה (1).  
παιδάριον (6/9): 22:5, 12; 43:8; 44:22, 30, 31. Cf. παιδάριον used for יֶלֶד (3).  
παῖς (4/95): 18:7; 22:3, 5, 19. Cf. παῖς used for עֶבֶד (85); נַעֲרָה (3); יֶלְדָּה (1); אִישׁ (1); נְעוּרִים (1).  
νεανίσκος (5/6): 14:24; 19:4; 25:27; 34:19; 41:12. Cf. νεανίσκος used for יֶלֶד (1).  
νέος (1/28): 37:2. Cf. νέος used for קָטָן (13); צָעִיר (8); קָטָן (6).
- 82 נַעֲרָה (9) παρθένος (5/7): 24:14, 16, 55; 34:3+. Cf. παρθένος used for בְּתוּלָה (1); עֲלֵמָה (1).  
παῖς (3/95): 24:28, 57; 34:12. Cf. παῖς used for עֶבֶד (85); נַעֲרָה (4); יֶלְדָּה (1); אִישׁ (1); נְעוּרִים (1).  
ἄβρα (1/1): 24:61.
- 83 נָפַח (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; 35:18; 37:21; 42:21; 44:30+; 46:15, 18, 22, 25, 26+, 27+; 49:6. Cf. ψυχή used for רוּחַ (1).  
ἀνὴρ (1/51): 14:21. Cf. ἀνὴρ used for אִישׁ (48); בַּעַל (1); מָס (1).  
σῶμα (1/5): 36:6. Cf. σῶμα used for פֶּגֶר (1); חֵלֶל (1); טָפ (1); גִּוְיָה (1).
- 84 סֶהַר (8) ὁ + ὀχύρωμα (2/2): [סֶהַר + הָ + בֵּית] (2): 39:20+.  
ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ (2/2): [סֶהַר + הָ + בֵּית + שָׂר] (2): 39:21, 22.  
ὁ + δεσμωτήριον (3/3): [סֶהַר + הָ + בֵּית] (3): 39:22; 40:3, 5.  
ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ + ὁ + δεσμωτήριον (1/1): [סֶהַר + הָ + בֵּית + שָׂר] (1): 39:23.
- 85 סָרִיס (4) εὐνοῦχος (3/3): 39:1; 40:2, 7.  
σπάδων (1/1): 37:36.
- 86 עֶבֶד (93) παῖς (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, 28; 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. παῖς used for נַעֲרָה (4); נַעֲרָה (3); יֶלְדָּה (1); אִישׁ (1); נְעוּרִים (1).  
οἰκέτης (5/5): 9:25; 27:37; 44:16, 33; 50:18.  
πατήρ (1/214): 26:24. Cf. πατήρ used for אָב (209); יָד (1); אָם (1).  
θεραπεία (1/1): 45:16.  
θεράπων (1/2): 50:17.

- 87      עד      (4) μάρτυς (1/2): 31:50. Cf. μάρτυς used for עדֿלָג (1).  
                                          μαρτυρέω (2/4): 31:48, 52. Cf. μαρτυρέω used for עדֿה (1); עדֿלָג (1).  
                                          μαρτύριον (1/2): 31:44. Cf. μαρτύριον used for עדֿה (1).
- 88      עדֿה      (2) μαρτύριον (1/2): 21:30. Cf. μαρτύριον used for עדֿה (1).  
                                          μαρτυρέω (1/4): 31:52. Cf. μαρτυρέω used for עדֿה (2); עדֿלָג (1).
- 89      עדֿר      (9) ποιμνιον (6/7): 29:2+, 3; 30:40; 32:17, 20. Cf. ποιμνιον used for נֶאֱמָר (1).  
                                          ποιμνη (2/2): 32:17+.  
                                          “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 32:17).
- 90      עֶזְרָה      (13) αἰώνιος (8/8): 9:12, 16; 17:7, 8, 13, 19; 21:33; 48:4.  
                                          αἰών (4/4): 3:22; 6:3, 4; 13:15.  
                                          ἀέναιος (1/1): 49:26.
- 91      עֶזְרָה      (24) πετεινός (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.  
                                          ὄρνειον (4/6): 6:20; 9:2, 10; 40:19. Cf. ὄρνειον used for עֶזְרָה (1); עֶזְרָה (1).
- 92      עֶזְרָה      (2) δέρμα (1/1): 27:16.  
                                          δερμάτινος (1/1): 3:21.
- 93      עֶזְרָה      (13) αἶψα (11/11): 15:9; 30:32, 33, 35; [31:10], [12], 38; 32:15; 37:31; 38:17, 20.  
                                          ἀπαλός (1/3): 27:9. Cf. ἀπαλός used for עֶזְרָה (2).  
                                          “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 27:16).
- 94      עֶזְרָה      (82) ὀφθαλμός (25/25): 3:5, 6, 7; 13:10, 14; 18:2; 21:19; 22:4, 13; 24:63,  
                                          64; 27:1; 29:17; 31:10, 12, 40; 37:25; 39:7; 43:29; 45:12+, [20]; 46:4; 48:10; 49:12.  
                                          ἐναντίον (34/76): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (29): 6:8; 16:4, 5; 18:3; 19:14, 19; 21:11,  
                                          12; 27:12; 28:8; 29:20; 30:27; 32:6; 33:8, 10, 15; 34:11, 18+; [35:22]; 38:7, 10; [39:4],  
                                          21; 41:37+; 47:25, 29; 50:4; [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (5): 23:11, 18; 30:41; 42:24; 47:19.  
                                          πηγή (7/13): 16:7+; 24:13, 29, 30, 42, 43. Cf. πηγή used for עֶזְרָה (2); עֶזְרָה (1); עֶזְרָה (1).  
                                          ἐπί + πηγή (2/2): 24:16, 45.  
                                          ὥς + ἄν + σύ + ἀρεστός + εἰμί (1/1): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (1): 16:6.  
                                          καθά + ἄν + ἀρέσκω + σύ (1/1): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (1): 19:8.  
                                          ὅς + ἔάν + σύ + ἀρέσκω (1/1): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (1): 20:15.  
                                          πρόσωπον (1/65): 20:16. Cf. πρόσωπον used for עֶזְרָה (58); עֶזְרָה (6).  
                                          βαρέως + φέρω (1/1): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (1): 31:35.  
                                          ἐπιμελέομαι (1/1): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (1): 44:21.  
                                          ζηλωτός (1/1): [עֶזְרָה + עֶזְרָה] (1): 49:22.  
                                          “Omitted” (7): see §3.1.1 (4: 45:5, 16+; 48:17); §3.1.8 (3: [32:2]; 33:1, 5).
- 95      עֶזְרָה      (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 עֶזְרָה (3); עֶזְרָה (2);

- (1) קְרִיתִים; (1) רַחֲבַת עִיר; (2) גֶּשֶׁן; (2) קְרִית אֲרָבָע.  
 εἰς + πόλις (1/1): 44:13.
- 96 ע (33) *λαός* (20/23): 14:16; 19:4; 23:7, 12, 13; 25:8; [26:11]; 32:8; 33:15; 34:22; 35:6; 41:40, 55; 42:6; 47:21; 48:19; 49:16, 29, 33; 50:20. Cf. *λαός* used for אָם (3).  
*γένος* (6/27): 11:6; 17:14; 25:17; 26:10; 34:16; 35:29. Cf. *γένος* used for מִין (18); מְשֻׁפָּחָה (1); בְּרִיעָמִי (1); מֶאֱכָל (1).  
*ἔθνος* (5/37): 17:16; 27:29; 28:3; 48:4; 49:10. Cf. *ἔθνος* used for גּוֹי (25); גּוֹיִם (2); זִזְוִים (1); נְשִׂיא (1); אֶמָּה (1); שֵׁם (1).  
 πολίτης (1/1): 23:11.  
*Αἰγύπτιος* (1/20): 47:23. Cf. *Αἰγύπτιος* used for מִצְרַיִם (10); מִצְרָיִם (9).
- 97 עמק (7) *κοιλίας* (4/4): 14:8, 10, 17; 37:14.  
*κοίλωμα* (1/1): [23:2].  
*φάραγξ* (1/3): 14:3. Cf. *φάραγξ* used for נַחֲל (2).  
*πεδῖον* (1/19): 14:17. Cf. *πεδῖον* used for שָׁדֶה (16); בְּקָעָה (1); אֲרָבָע (1); קְרִית אֲרָבָע (1).
- 98 עץ (28) *ξύλον* (25/25): 1:11, 12, 29; 2:9+, 16, 17; 3:1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 17, 22, 24; 6:14; 22:3, 6, 7, 9+; 40:19.  
*δένδρον* (3/3): 18:4, 8; 23:17.
- 99 עץ (7) *ὀστέον* (4/4): 2:23+; 29:14; 50:25.  
*καιρός* (2/13): 17:23, 26. Cf. *καιρός* used for מוֹעֵד (4); עַתָּה (3); פֶּעַם (2); קֵץ (1); כָּל (1).  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 7:13).
- 100 עקב (4) *πτέρνα* (3/3): 3:15; 25:26; 49:17.  
*πούς* (1/11): 49:19. Cf. *πούς* used for רַגְל (9).
- 101 ערב (13) *ἑσπέρα* (11/11): 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; 8:11; 19:1; 29:23; 30:16; 49:27.  
*ὀψέ* (1/1): 24:11.  
*δείλη* (1/1): 24:63.
- 102 ערוה (5) *γύμνωσις* (3/3): 9:22, 23+.  
*ἴχνος* (2/2): 42:9, 12.
- 103 פה (21) *στόμα* (13/13): 4:11; 8:11; 24:57; 29:2, 3+, 8, 10; 34:26; 41:40; 42:27; 44:1; 45:12.  
*ἐν* (3/488): [פה + ב] (3): 43:12, 21; 44:8.  
*κατά* (2/94): [פה + ל] (1): 43:7.; [פה + ל] (1): 47:12.  
*βρωσις* + *αὐτός* (1/1): [ו + פה + ב] (1): 25:28.  
*εἰς* (1/321): [פה + ב] (1): 44:2.  
*λέγω* (1/622): 45:21. Cf. *λέγω* used for אָמַר (604); דָּבַר (10); נָאָם (1); קָרָא (1); דָּבָר (1).
- 104 פנה (143) *πρόσωπον* (58/65): 2:6; 3:8; 4:5, 6, 14+, 16; 6:7; 7:4, 23; 8:8, 9, 13; 9:23; 11:4, 8, 9; 16:6, 8, 12; 17:3, 17; 18:16; 19:21, 28+; 23:8, 17; 25:18+; 27:30; 31:2, 5; 32:21+, 22, 31+; 33:10+, 18; 35:1, 7; 36:6; 38:15; 40:7; 41:46, 56; 43:3, 5, 31; 44:23, 26, 29; 46:30; 48:11; 50:1. Cf. *πρόσωπον* used for אָף (6); עֵין (1).

ἐναντίον (36/76): 30:40.; [פְּנֵה + לְ] (33): 6:11, 13; 7:1; 10:9+; [12:19]; 13:9; 17:1, 18; 18:22; 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.; [פְּנֵה + אֶת] (2): 19:13, 27.  
 ἔμπροσθεν (11/11): [פְּנֵה + לְ] (11): 24:7; 32:4, 17, 18; 33:3, 14; 41:43; 45:5, 7; 46:28; 48:20.  
 ἀπό (7/184): [פְּנֵה + מִן] (4): 6:13; 36:7; 41:31; 47:13.; [פְּנֵה + לְ + מִן] (2): 23:4; 47:10.; [ מִן פְּנֵה + עַל + ] (1): 23:3.  
 πρὸ (5/16): [פְּנֵה + לְ] (5): 13:10; 27:7, 10; 36:31; 50:16.  
 ἐπάνω (4/11): [פְּנֵה + עַל] (4): 1:2+, 29; 7:18. Cf. ἐπάνω used for עָלֶיךָ (1).  
 ἐπί (2/266): [פְּנֵה + עַל] (2): 6:1; 7:3.  
 ἐνώπιον (4/7): [פְּנֵה + לְ] (2): 24:51; 30:33.; [פְּנֵה + עַל] (1): 11:28.; [פְּנֵה + מִן] (1): 31:35.  
 Cf. ἐνώπιον used for בְּאֵר לְחַי רְאִי (1).  
 ἀπέναντι (3/6): [פְּנֵה + עַל] (3): 23:19; 25:9; 49:30.  
 διά (2/44): [פְּנֵה + מִן] (2): 7:7; 27:46.  
 κατὰ (1/94): [פְּנֵה + עַל] (1): 1:20.  
 κατέναντι (1/3): [פְּנֵה + עַל] (1): 50:13.  
 πρὶν + ἢ (1/1): [פְּנֵה + לְ] (1): 29:26.  
 ὁρμάω (1/1): [וְ + פְּנֵה + אֶת + שִׁים] (1): 31:21.  
 παρὰ (1/52): [פְּנֵה + אֶת + מִן] (1): 43:34.  
 πρὸς (1/253): [פְּנֵה + לְ] (1): 50:18.  
 “Omitted” (5): see §3.1.1 (4: 18:8; 24:33; 32:21; 46:28); §3.1.8 (1: 45:3).

- 105 פְּרִי (10) καρπός (8/9): 1:11, 12, 29; 3:2, 3, 6; 4:3; 30:2. Cf. καρπός used for זֶמְרָה (1).  
 κάρπιμος (2/2): 1:11, [12].
- 106 פֶּשַׁע (3) ἀδικία (2/7): 50:17+. Cf. ἀδικία used for חֲסָד (3); עֲשָׂה (1); עוֹן (1).  
 ἀδίκημα (1/1): 31:36.
- 107 פְּתָח (10) θύρα (3/9): 6:16; 18:2; 19:11. Cf. θύρα used for לְזָל (3).  
 ἐπί + θύρα (2/2): 18:1; 19:11.  
 πρὸς + θύρα (1/1): 18:10.  
 πρὸς + πρόθυρον (1/1): 19:6.  
 διαιρέω (1/4): [פְּתָח + לְ] (1): 4:7. Cf. διαιρέω used for בָּתַר (2); חֲצָה (1).  
 πύλη (1/5): 38:14. Cf. πύλη used for שַׁעַר (4).  
 ἐν + πυλών (1/1): 43:19.
- 108 צֹאן (65) πρόβατον (54/59): 4:2, 4; 12:16; 13:5; 20:14; 21:27, 28, [29]; 24:35; 26:14; 27:9; 29:2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9[+], 10+; 30:31, 32, 36, 38, 39+, 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. πρόβατον used for הֶשֶׁן (3); לְחֵל (2).  
 ατῆνος (7/45): 30:43; 31:43+; 33:13; 46:32; 47:1, 4. Cf. ατῆνος used for בְּהֵמָה (21); מִקְנֵה (16); שֶׂה (1).

- ῥάβδος (1/11): 30:38. Cf. ῥάβδος used for מִקְלָה (7); מִטָּה (2); מִטָּה (1).  
 ἄμνος (1/4): 30:40. Cf. ἄμνος used for בֶּשֶׂב (1); מִנָּה (1); קְשִׁיטָה (1).  
 ποίμνιον (1/7): 31:4. Cf. ποίμνιον used for עֶדְרָה (6).  
 ποιμήν (1/13): [יָצַח + רָעָה] (1): 46:32. Cf. ποιμήν used for רָעָה (10); יָצַח (2).
- 109 צָבֹא (4) δύναμις (3/3): 21:22, 32; 26:26.  
 κόσμος (1/1): 2:1.
- 110 צָוֹאֵר (8) τράχηλος (7/7): 27:16, 40; 33:4; 41:42; 45:14+; 46:29.  
 κλαυθμός (1/2): [יָצַח + צָוֹאֵר + לָעַל] (1): 46:29. Cf. κλαυθμός used for בְּכִי (1).
- 111 צִיד (11) θήρα (8/9): [25:28]; 27:5, 7, 19, 25, 30, 31, 33. Cf. θήρα used for צִידָה (1).  
 κυνηγός (2/2): 10:9+.  
 κυνηγέω (1/1): 25:27.
- 112 צִפּוֹן (2) πρὸς + βορέας (1/1): 13:14.  
 ἐπὶ + βορέας (1/1): 28:14.
- 113 קָבֵר (8) μνημεῖον (6/8): 23:6+, 9; 49:30; 50:5, 13. Cf. μνημεῖον used for קְבוּרָה (2).  
 τάφος (2/3): 23:4, 20. Cf. τάφος used for קְבוּרָה (1).
- 114 קָדָם (9) ἀνατολή (8/11): 2:8; 10:30; 11:2; 12:8+; 13:11; 25:6; 29:1. Cf. ἀνατολή used for קָדָם (2);  
 קֶדֶם (1).  
 ἀπέναντι (1/6): [קָדָם + מִן] (1): 3:24.
- 115 קָהָל (4) συναγωγή (3/5): 28:3; 35:11; 48:4. Cf. συναγωγή used for מִקְוֶה (1); מִקְוֶה (1).  
 σύστασις (1/1): 49:6.
- 116 קָיָה (5) μετά (4/247): [קָיָה + מִן] (4): 4:3; 8:6; 16:3; 41:1.  
 καιρός (1/13): 6:13. Cf. καιρός used for מוֹעֵד (4); עֵת (3); עֶצֶם (2); פֶּעַם (2); כָּל (1).
- 117 קָרַב (9) κοιλία (2/6): 41:21+. Cf. κοιλία used for בֶּטֶן (2); מִעָה (1).  
 ἐν (5/488): [קָרַב + בֶּ] (5): 18:12, [13], 24; 24:3; 25:22.  
 ἐπὶ (2/266): [קָרַב + בֶּ] (2): 45:6; 48:16.
- 118 ראש (20) κεφαλὴ (14/16): 3:15; 8:5; 11:4; 28:12; 40:16, 17, 19; 48:14+, 17++, 18; 49:26. Cf.  
 κεφαλὴ used for מִשְׁאֵת (2).  
 ἀρχή (4/16): 2:10; 40:13, 20+. Cf. ἀρχή used for תְּחִלָּה (3); רִאשִׁית (3); מִשְׁלָה (2); ראשון  
 (1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); מִשְׁקָה (1); כֶּן (1).  
 ἄκρος (2/4): 28:18; 47:31. Cf. ἄκρος used for קֶצֶף (2).
- 119 רֶב (5) πλῆθος (4/8): 16:10; 27:28; 30:30; 32:13. Cf. πλῆθος used for הַמִּוֶּן (1); מִלֵּא (1).  
 πλῆθος + πολὺς (1/1): 48:16.
- 120 רָגַל (13) πούς (10/11): 18:4; 19:2; 24:32+; 29:1; 30:30; 33:14; 43:24; 49:33.; [רָגַל + הָ] (1): 8:9. Cf.  
 πούς used for עֶקֶב (1).  
 μηρός (1/11): 49:10. Cf. μηρός used for יָרֵךְ (9); בֶּרֶךְ (1).  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:44); §3.1.1 (1: 33:14).

- 121 רוח (11) πνεῦμα (7/7): 1:2; 6:3, 17; 7:15; 8:1; 41:38; 45:27.  
 πνοή (1/2): [רוח + נְשָׁמָה] (1): 7:22. Cf. πνοή used for נְשָׁמָה (1).  
 δειλινός (1/1): [יֹם + רוּחַ + הַ] (1): 3:8.  
 ἐρίζω (1/1): [מָרָה + רוּחַ] (1): 26:35.  
 ψυχή (1/42): 41:8. Cf. ψυχή used for נְפֻשָׁה (41).
- 122 רָמַשׁ (15) ἐρπετόν (14/18): 1:24, 25, 26, [28], [30]; 6:7, [19], 20; 7:14, 23; [8:1], 17, [19]; 9:3. Cf.  
 ἐρπετόν used for רָמַשׁ (2); רָמַשׁ (2).  
 ατῆνος (1/45): 8:19. Cf. ατῆνος used for בְּהֵמָה (21); מִקְנֶה (16); צֶאֱן (7).
- 123 שָׁבַר (8) σῆτος (5/13): 42:2, 26; 43:2; 44:2; 47:14. Cf. σῆτος used for בָּר (4); דָּגָן (2); לֶחֶם (2).  
 ἀγορασμός (2/2): 42:19, [33].  
 πρᾶσις (1/1): 42:1.
- 124 שָׁכַם (6) ὤμος (4/4): 21:14; 24:15, 45; 49:15.  
 νῶτον (1/2): 9:23. Cf. νῶτον used for עָרָה (1).  
 Σίκιμα (1/4): 48:22. Cf. Σίκιμα used for שָׁכַם (2).
- 125 שָׁם (115) ὄνομα (110/112): 2:11, 13, 19, 20; 3:20; 4:17, 19+, 21, 25, 26+; 5:2, 3, 29; 10:25+; 11:4, 9, 29+; 12:2, 8; 13:4; 16:1, 11, 13, 15; 17:5+, 15+, 19; 19:22, 37, 38; 21:3, [31], 33; 22:14, 24; 24:29; 25:1, 13+, 16, 25, 26, 30; 26:18+, 20, 21, 22, 25, 33; 27:36; 28:19+; 29:16+, 32, 33, 34, 35; 30:6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 24; 31:48; 32:3, 28, 29[+], 30+, 31; 33:17; [35:7], 8, 10+, 15, 18; 36:10, 32, 35, 39+, 40; 38:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 29, 30; 41:45, 51, 52; 46:8; 48:6, 16+; 50:11. Cf. ὄνομα used for נֶכֶד (1); שְׁמֵעַ (1).  
 ἐπονομάζω (1/12): [שָׁם + קָרָא] (1): 4:17. Cf. ἐπονομάζω used for קָרָא (11).  
 ὀνομαστός (1/1): 6:4.  
 ἔθνος (1/37): 36:40. Cf. ἔθνος used for גֹּי (25); עַם (5); גִּוִּים (2); זִזְוִים (1); נְשִׂיאָה (1); אֶמְקָה (1).  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 35:10+).
- 126 שָׁמַיִם (44) οὐρανός (42/44): 1:1, 8, 9[+], 14, 15, 17, 20, 26, 28, 30; 2:1, 4+, 19, 20; 6:7, 17; 7:3, 11, 19, 23; 8:2+; 9:2; 11:4; 14:19, 22; 19:24; 21:17; 22:11, 15, 17; 24:3, 7; 26:4; 27:28, 39; 28:17; [40:17], [19]; 49:25.  
 εἰς + οὐρανός (2/2): 15:5; 28:12.
- 127 שָׁנָה (168) ἔτος (112/115): 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, 32; 6:3; 7:6, 11; 8:13; 9:28, 29; 11:10, 11, 12, [13][+], 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 32; 12:4; 14:4+, 5; 15:13; 16:3, 16; 17:1, 17, 24, 25; 21:5; 23:1; 25:7+, 17+, 20, 26; 26:34; 29:18, 20, 27, 30; 31:38, 41+; 35:28; 37:2; 41:26+, 27+, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54; 45:6, 11; 47:8, 9+; 18+, 28+; 50:22, 26.  
 δεύτερος + ἔτος (2/2): 11:10; 45:6.  
 δύο + ἔτος (1/1): 41:1.  
 ἐνιαυτός (5/5): 1:14; 17:21; 26:12; 47:17, 28.  
 ἑκατονταετής (1/1): [שָׁנָה + מֵאָה] (1): 17:17.



“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).

- 128 שַׁעַר (8) πύλη (4/5): 19:1; 28:17; 34:20, 24. Cf. πύλη used for פֶּתַח (1).  
πόλις (2/59): 22:17; 24:60. Cf. πόλις used for עִיר (48); אֵין (3); קְרִית אֲרָבָע (2); שָׁן (2);  
עִיר חֲבֻת עִיר (1); קְרִיתִים (1).  
εἰς (2/321): 23:10, 18.
- 129 שָׁבַע (7) εὐθηνία (6/6): 41:29, 31, 34, 47, [48], 53.  
πλησμονή (1/1): 41:30.
- 130 שָׁפָה (8) χεῖλος (6/6): 11:1, 6, 9; 22:17; 41:3, 17.  
γλῶσσα (1/4): 11:7. Cf. γλῶσσα used for שִׁנָּה (3).  
φωνή (1/27): 11:7. Cf. φωνή used for קוֹל (23); דְּבַר (2); צִעֲקָה (1).
- 131 שָׁק (5) σάκκος (4/4): 37:34; 42:25, 35+.  
μάρσιππος (1/17): 42:27. Cf. μάρσιππος used for אֲמַתְחַת (16).
- 132 תָּוֶךְ (17) μέσος (9/69): 1:6; 2:9; 3:3, 8; 15:10; 19:29; 23:10; 37:7; 40:20. Cf. μέσος used for בֵּין (59).  
ἐν (6/488): [תָּוֶךְ + בֵּין] (6): 9:21; 18:24, 26; 23:6, 9; 41:48.  
μετά (2/247): [תָּוֶךְ + בֵּין] (2): 35:2; 42:5.
- 133 תּוֹלְדוֹת (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 מוֹלְדוֹת (2); יֵלֶד (1).  
γενεά (1/12): 25:13. Cf. γενεά used for דּוֹר (8); מוֹלְדוֹת (2); שְׁלֵשִׁים (1).
- 134 תְּחִלָּה (4) ἀρχή (3/16): 41:21; 43:18, 20. Cf. ἀρχή used for רִאשׁוֹנָה (4); רִאשִׁית (3); מִתְּחִלָּה (2); רִאשׁוֹן  
(1); מִשְׁפָּט (1); מִשְׁקָה (1); בֵּין (1).  
πρῶτος (1/11): 13:3. Cf. πρῶτος used for רִאשׁוֹן (9); אֶחָד (1).

## No main

- 1 אָדָם (44) ἄνθρωπος (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+; 11:5; 16:12. Cf. ἄνθρωπος used for אִישׁ (69); אָדָם (1); בָּשָׂר (1).  
Ἀδὰμ (18/26): 2:16, 19+, 20, 21, 22+, 23, 25; 3:8, 9, 12, 20, 22, 24; 4:1; 5:1, 2. Cf. Ἀδὰμ  
used for אָדָם (8).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 9:6).
- 2 אֶהְיֶה (23) σκηνή (12/17): 4:20; 12:8; 13:3, 5; 18:1, 2, 9, 10; 26:25; 31:25; 33:19; 35:21. Cf. σκηνή used  
for סֹכֶת (2); תָּצַר (1); סֶכֶד (1).  
ἐπί + σκηνή (1/1): 18:6.  
οἶκος (8/70): 9:21, 27; 31:33++++, 34. Cf. οἶκος used for בַּיִת (60); בֵּית־אֵל (1).  
εἰς + οἶκος (1/6): 24:67.  
οἰκία (1/22): 25:27. Cf. οἰκία used for בַּיִת (20); טַב (1).

- 3 אִיב (2) ὑπεναντίος (1/2): 22:17. Cf. ὑπεναντίος used for אִשׁ (1).  
ἐχθρός (1/2): 49:8. Cf. ἐχθρός used for צַר (1).
- 4 אִישׁ (159) ἀνὴρ (48/51): [2:23]; 3:6, 16; 4:23; 12:20; 14:24; 16:3; 17:23, 27; 18:2, 16, 22; 19:4, 5, 8+, 9, 10, 11, 12; [20:2]; 24:16, 32, 54; 26:7+; 27:11+; 29:19, 22, 32, 34; 30:15, 18, 20; 32:7; 33:1; 34:7, 20; 38:21; 39:1, 2; 43:15; 46:32+, 34; 47:2, 6. Cf. ἀνὴρ used for נָפֶחַ (1); בַּעַל (1); מַס (1).  
ἄνθρωπος (67/96): 2:24; 4:1; 6:4, 9; 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. ἄνθρωπος used for אָדָם (25); אָדָם (1); בָּשָׂר (1).  
ἄνθρωπος + γεωργός (1/1): 9:20.  
ἄνθρωπος + τίς (1/1): 38:1.  
ἐκαστος (16/16): 10:5; 11:7; 13:11; 34:25; 37:19; 41:11; 42:21, 25, 35; 43:21, 33; 44:1, 11+, 13; 49:28.  
ἐκάτερος (1/1): 40:5.  
τίς (1/9): 13:16.  
αὐτός (1/1,600): [יִ + אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (1): 15:10.  
Σοδομίτης (1/1): [אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (1): 19:4.  
ἄγγελος (1/19): 19:16. Cf. ἄγγελος used for מַלְאָךְ (18).  
οὐδείς + εἰμί (2/2): [אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (1): 19:31.; [אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (1): 39:11.  
οὐδείς (5/17): 23:6; 41:44; 45:1.; [אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (2): [31:44], 50.  
οἰκέω (1/18): 24:13. Cf. οἰκέω used for יָשַׁב (17).  
μετά (1/247): 24:59.  
ἄγροικος (1/2): [אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (1): 25:27. Cf. ἄγροικος used for פָּרָא (1).  
ἕτερος (1/17): 31:49. Cf. ἕτερος used for אַחֵר (13); רֵעַ (1); עוֹד (1); אַחֵד (1).  
παῖς (1/95): 39:14. Cf. παῖς used for עֶבֶד (85); נָעַר (4); נַעֲרָה (3); יְלִידָה (1); נְעוּרִים (1).  
πρός + ἀλλήλων (1/1): [יִ + אִשָּׁה + אִישׁ] (1): 42:28.  
παῖς (1/354): [אִשָּׁה + בָּל] (1): 45:1. Cf. παῖς used for בָּל (349); בֶּן (1); כְּלָה (1); רֶבֶץ (1).  
“Omitted” (7): see §3.1.8 (7: 39:11, 14; 40:5; 41:12; 43:17; 45:22; 47:20).
- 5 אִשָּׁה (4) βρῶσις (3/8): 1:29, 30; 9:3. Cf. βρῶσις used for מֵאֲכָל (2); אָכַל (1); אָכַל (1).  
ἐσθίω (1/52): 6:21. Cf. ἐσθίω used for אָכַל (49); מֵאֲכָל (1).
- 6 אִלָּה (3) ἀρά (2/2): 24:41; 26:28.  
ὀρκισμός (1/3): 24:41. Cf. ὀρκισμός used for בָּאֵר שְׂבַע (2).
- 7 אִשָּׁה (14) πρόσωπον (6/65): 2:7; 3:19; 19:1; 42:6; [43:26]; 48:12. Cf. πρόσωπον used for פָּנָה (58); עֵין (1).  
ἔχω (1/24): [יִ + אִשָּׁה + בָּ] (1): 7:22. Cf. ἔχω used for הָרָה (3); הֵנָּה (2); הָרָה (2); יָ (2); יָאֵל (1); מֵצָא (1); יָשַׁב (1); לָ (1); לָקַח (1); אַחֵר (1); רֶבֶץ (1).  
αὐτός (1/1,600): [הֵ + אִשָּׁה + בָּ] (1): 24:47.

θυμός (3/3): 27:45; 49:6, 7.

θυμός (1/4): [אָ + חרה] (1): 30:2. Cf. θυμός used for חרה (2); נחם (1).

ὀργή (1/2): 39:19.

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 44:18).

- 8 אָתוֹן (4) ἡμίονος (2/2): 12:16; 45:23.  
ὄνος (2/17): 32:16; 49:11. Cf. ὄνος used for חֲמוֹר (15).
- 9 בָּטָן (4) γαστήρ (2/10): 25:23; 38:27. Cf. γαστήρ used for הרה (4); הָרָה (3); קשר (1).  
κοιλία (2/6): 25:24; 30:2. Cf. κοιλία used for קָרֵב (2); מַעָה (1).
- 10 בָּעַל (4) συνωμότης (1/1): [בָּרִית + בָּעַל] (1): 14:13.  
ἀνήρ (1/51): 20:3. Cf. ἀνήρ used for אִישׁ (48); נָפֶשׁ (1); מַס (1).  
ὁ + ἐνυπνιαστής (1/1): [בָּעַל + הָ + חֲלוֹם] (1): 37:19.  
κύριος (1/221): 49:23. Cf. κύριος used for יהוה (133); אֲדֹנָי (78); אֱלֹהִים (7); גִּבּוֹר (2).
- 11 בָּרָךְ (3) γόνυ (2/2): 30:3; 48:12.  
μηρός (1/11): 50:23. Cf. μηρός used for יָרֵךְ (9); רֶגֶל (1).
- 12 גָּלָל (3) ἔνεκα (1/17): [גָּלָל + בָּ] (1): 12:13.  
εἴσδος (1/1): 30:27.  
διὰ (1/44): [גָּלָל + בָּ] (1): 39:5.
- 13 דְּמוּת (3) ὁμοίωσις (1/1): 1:26.  
εἰκῶν (1/5): 5:1. Cf. εἰκῶν used for צֶלֶם (4).  
ιδέα (1/1): 5:3.
- 14 חוֹף (2) παράλιος (1/1): [חָף + חוֹף + לְ] (1): 49:13.  
ὄρμος (1/1): 49:13.
- 15 חֵיל (2) σῶμα (1/5): 34:29. Cf. σῶμα used for פָּגַר (1); נֶפֶשׁ (1); טַף (1); גִּוְיָה (1).  
δυνατός (1/3): 47:6. Cf. δυνατός used for עֶצֶם (1); יָכַל (1).
- 16 חֶלֶב (2) στέαρ (1/1): 4:4.  
μυελός (1/1): 45:18.
- 17 חֲלִיפָה (2) δισσός (1/2): 45:22. Cf. δισσός used for מְשָׁנָה (1).  
ἐξαλλάσσω (1/1): 45:22.
- 18 חֶם (2) καῦμα (1/2): 8:22. Cf. καῦμα used for חָרֵב (1).  
μεσημβρία (1/3): [חֶם + הָ + יוֹם] (1): 18:1. Cf. μεσημβρία used for צֶהְרִים (2).
- 19 חֶסֶד (12) δικαιοσύνη (5/10): 19:19; 20:13; 21:23; 24:27; 32:11. Cf. δικαιοσύνη used for צִדְקָה (3); נִקְיוֹן (1); אֲמָת (1).  
ἔλεος (6/7): 24:12, 14, [44], 49; 39:21; 40:14. Cf. ἔλεος used for חֵן (1).  
ἐλεημοσύνη (1/1): 47:29.
- 20 חֶק (3) δόμα (1/2): 47:22. Cf. δόμα used for מִתְּנָה (1).  
δόσις (1/2): 47:22.

- πρόσταγμα (1/3): 47:26. Cf. πρόσταγμα used for דָּבָר (1); מִשְׁמֶרֶת (1).
- 21 טוֹבָה (2) καλός (1/41): 44:4. Cf. καλός used for טוֹב (32); יָפֶה (6); תְּמִדוּת (1); תְּמִדָּה (1).  
ἀγαθός (1/8): 50:20. Cf. ἀγαθός used for טוֹב (4); מִיטֵב (2); טוֹב (1).
- 22 טָהוּ (7) ἀποσκευή (3/6): 34:29; 43:8; 46:5. Cf. ἀποσκευή used for רְכוּשׁ (3).  
παιδίον (1/32): 45:19. Cf. παιδίον used for יָלֵד (12); נָעַר (11); בֶּן (7).  
συγγένεια (1/2): 50:8. Cf. συγγένεια used for מוֹלָדֶת (1).  
οἰκία (1/22): 50:21. Cf. οἰκία used for בֵּית (20); אֶהָל (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 47:24).
- 23 יָגִין (2) λύπη (1/6): 42:38. Cf. λύπη used for עֲצָבוֹן (3); עָצָב (1); רָעָה (1).  
ὀδύνη (1/2): 44:31. Cf. ὀδύνη used for בְּיָאוֹנִי (1).
- 24 יָצָר (2) τίς (1/9): 6:5.  
ἐγκειμαι (1/2): 8:21. Cf. ἐγκειμαι used for חָפַץ (1).
- 25 יָרַק (2) χλωρός (1/4): 1:30. Cf. χλωρός used for חֵשֶׁן (1); חָלָה (1).  
λάχανον (1/1): 9:3.
- 26 בֶּן (2) ἀρχεινοχοῖα (1/1): 40:13.  
ἀρχή (1/16): 41:13. Cf. ἀρχή used for רֹאשׁ (4); רִאשִׁית (3); תְּחִלָּה (3); מְשָׁלָה (2); רִאשׁוֹן (1);  
מְשָׁפָה (1); מְשָׁקָה (1).
- 27 בְּנוֹר (2) ψαλτήριον (1/1): 4:21.  
κιθάρα (1/2): 31:27. Cf. κιθάρα used for עֲוִיבָה (1).
- 28 בָּה (9) πούς (1/11): [רָגַל + בָּה] (1): 8:9. Cf. πούς used for רָגַל (9); עֲקֵב (1).  
χείρ (4/81): 20:5; 31:42; 40:11, 21. Cf. χείρ used for יָד (77).  
πλάτος (4/6): 32:26+, 33+. Cf. πλάτος used for רֶחֶב (2).
- 29 מִטָּה (3) ῥάβδος (1/11): 47:31. Cf. ῥάβδος used for מִקְלָה (7); מִטָּה (2); צֶאֱנָה (1).  
κλίνη (2/2): 48:2; 49:33.
- 30 מִיִּנְקָה (2) ὑπάρχω (1/17): 24:59. Cf. ὑπάρχω used for מְקַנָּה (5); רְכוּשׁ (4); לָ (2); קִנְיָן (1); יֵשׁ (1); בֵּית (1).  
τροφός (1/1): 35:8.
- 31 מְקַנָּה (2) συναγωγή (1/5): [1:9]. Cf. συναγωγή used for קְהָל (3); מְקוֹם (1).  
σύστημα (1/1): 1:10.
- 32 מְקַנָּה (5) ἀργυρώνητος (4/4): [מְקַנָּה + בָּסָף] (4): 17:12, 13, 23, 27.  
κτῆσις (1/9): 23:18. Cf. κτῆσις used for אֲחֻזָּה (6); רְכוּשׁ (1); מְקַנָּה (1).
- 33 מְרֻאָה (11) ὄρασις (1/5): 2:9. Cf. ὄρασις used for בְּאֵר לְחַי רִאִי (2); מְצֻפָּה (1); פְּתִירוֹן (1).  
εὐπρόσωπος (1/1): [מְרֻאָה + יָפֶה] (1): 12:11.  
ὄψις (5/5): 24:16; 26:7; 29:17; 39:6; 41:21.  
εἶδος (3/9): 41:2, 3, 4. Cf. εἶδος used for תֹּאֵר (4); פְּנִיָּאֵל (1); פְּנוּאֵל (1).  
ὁ + αἰσχροός (1/1): [רָעָה + הָ + מְרֻאָה] (1): 41:4.

- 34 מְשֻׁנָּה (3) δεύτερος (1/18): 41:43. Cf. δεύτερος used for שְׁנִי (13); שְׁנָה (2); פָּעַם (1); שָׂאָר (1).  
 δισσός (1/2): 43:12. Cf. δισσός used for הַלִּיפָה (1).  
 διπλοῦς (1/7): 43:15. Cf. διπλοῦς used for מְכַפֵּלָה (6).
- 35 מְשֻׁפָּט (3) κρίσις (2/4): 18:19, 25. Cf. κρίσις used for עֵין מְשֻׁפָּט (1); שֹׁפֵט (1).  
 ἀρχή (1/16): 40:13. Cf. ἀρχή used for רֹאשׁ (4); רִאשִׁית (3); תְּחִלָּה (3); מְשָׁלָה (2); רִאשׁוֹן (1);  
 מְשָׁקָה (1); כֵּן (1).
- 36 מְשָׁקָל (3) ὀλκή (2/2): 24:22+.  
 σταθμός (1/1): 43:21.
- 37 מְשֻׁתָּה (5) πότος (2/2): 19:3; 40:20.  
 δοχή (2/2): 21:8; 26:30.  
 γάμος (1/1): 29:22.
- 38 נִגְב (4) ἐν + ἔρημος (1/1): 12:9.  
 εἰς + ἔρημος (1/1): 13:1.  
 λίψ (1/4): 13:14. Cf. λίψ used for קָדָם (1).  
 ἐπί + ἀνατολή (1/1): 28:14.
- 39 נֶחַל (3) φάραγξ (2/3): 26:17, 19. Cf. φάραγξ used for עֲמָק (1).  
 χεειμάρρους (1/1): 32:24.
- 40 נְעוּרִים (2) νεότης (1/3): 8:21. Cf. νεότης used for צְעִירָה (1); עוֹד (1).  
 παῖς (1/95): 46:34. Cf. παῖς used for עֶבֶד (85); נֶעַר (4); נַעֲרָה (3); יְלִידָה (1); אִישׁ (1).
- 41 נְשִׂיא (4) ἔθνος (1/37): 17:20. Cf. ἔθνος used for גּוֹי (25); עַם (5); גּוֹיִם (2); זִוּזִים (1); אֲמָה (1); שָׁם (1).  
 βασιλεύς (1/45): 23:6. Cf. βασιλεύς used for מֶלֶךְ (44).  
 ἄρχων (2/11): 25:16; 34:2. Cf. ἄρχων used for שָׂר (2); מַשָּׁל (2); שָׂדָה (1); לֵאָם (1); שְׁלִיט (1);  
 שִׁבְט (1); מְלִיךָ (1).
- 42 עֲבֹדָה (2) ἐργασία (1/1): 29:27.  
 δουλεία (1/1): 30:26.
- 43 עֲבוּר (15) ἔργον (2/11): 3:17; 8:21. Cf. ἔργον used for מַעֲשֶׂה (5); מְלָאכָה (4).  
 διά (4/44): [בָּ + עֲבוּר] (4): 12:13, 16; 18:26; 26:24.  
 ἔνεκα (3/17): [בָּ + עֲבוּר] (3): 18:29, 31, 32.  
 ἵνα (2/51): [בָּ + עֲבוּר] (2): 21:30; 46:34.  
 ὅπως (4/9): [בָּ + עֲבוּר] (3): 27:4, 19, 31.; [אֲשֶׁר + עֲבוּר + בָּ] (1): 27:10.
- 44 עוֹן (4) αἰτία (1/1): 4:13.  
 ἁμαρτία (1/6): 15:16. Cf. ἁμαρτία used for חַטָּאת (2); חַטָּאָה (1); חָטָא (1); אָשָׁם (1).  
 ἀνομία (1/1): 19:15.  
 ἀδικία (1/7): 44:16. Cf. ἀδικία used for חֲמָס (3); פֶּשַׁע (2); עֲשָׂק (1).
- 45 עֶפֶר (9) χοῦς (1/1): 2:7.

- γῆ (5/360): 3:14, 19+; 18:27; 26:15. Cf. γῆ used for אֶרֶץ (307); אֲדָמָה (43); שָׂדֶה (4); תְּהוֹם (1).  
 ἄμμος (3/6): 13:16+; 28:14. Cf. ἄμμος used for חוֹל (3).
- 46 עַת** (10) πρὸς (2/253): 8:11; 24:11.  
 καιρός (3/13): 18:10; 21:22; 38:1. Cf. καιρός used for מוֹעֵד (4); עֶצֶם (2); פֶּעַם (2); קֶץ (1); בָּל (1).  
 ὥρα (2/3): 29:7.; [עַת + וְ] (1): 18:14.  
 ἡνίκα (3/31): [עַת + בְּ] (2): 31:10; 38:27.; [עַת + לְ] (1): 24:11.
- 47 פְּלִיטָה** (2) σῶζω (1/8): 32:9. Cf. σῶζω used for מַלֵּט (4); נָצַל (1); חִיָּה (1).  
 κατάλειψις (1/1): 45:7.
- 48 פֶּעַם** (10) νῦν (3/48): 2:23; 29:35; 46:30. Cf. νῦν used for עַתָּה (37); הֵנָּה (1); עַדְנָה (1); וְ (1).  
 ἄπαξ (1/1): 18:32.  
 δεύτερος (1/18): 27:36. Cf. δεύτερος used for שְׁנִי (13); שְׁנָה (2); שָׁאֵר (1); מְשֻׁנָּה (1).  
 δῖς (2/2): 41:32; 43:10.  
 καιρός (2/13): 29:34; 30:20. Cf. καιρός used for מוֹעֵד (4); עַת (3); עֶצֶם (2); קֶץ (1); בָּל (1).  
 ἐπτάκις (1/2): [פֶּעַם + עַבְרַת] (1): 33:3. Cf. ἐπτάκις used for שְׁבַע (1).
- 49 פְּתוֹן** (5) ὄρασις (1/5): 40:5. Cf. ὄρασις used for רָאִי לְחֵי רֵאִי (2); מְרָאָה (1); מַצָּפָה (1).  
 διασάφησις + αὐτός (1/1): 40:8.  
 σύγκρισις (2/2): 40:12, 18.  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:11).
- 50 צִידָה** (3) θήρα (1/9): 27:3. Cf. θήρα used for צִיד (8).  
 ἐπισιτισμός (2/2): 42:25; 45:21.
- 51 צַעֲקָה** (3) κραυγή (2/3): 18:21; 19:13. Cf. κραυγή used for זַעֲקָה (1).  
 φωνή (1/27): 27:34. Cf. φωνή used for קוֹל (23); דְּבַר (2); שִׁפְפָה (1).
- 52 קְבוּרָה** (3) μνημεῖον (2/8): 35:20+. Cf. μνημεῖον used for קֶבֶר (6).  
 τάφος (1/3): 47:30. Cf. τάφος used for קֶבֶר (2).
- 53 קִיטוֹר** (2) φλόξ (1/2): 19:28. Cf. φλόξ used for עֲלֻטָּה (1).  
 ἀτμῖς (1/1): 19:28.
- 54 קִנְיָן** (2) ὑπάρχω (1/17): 34:23. Cf. ὑπάρχω used for מְקַנֵּה (5); רָכוּשׁ (4); לְ (2); מִינְקָה (1); יֵשׁ (1); בֵּית (1).  
 κτάομαι (1/14): 36:6. Cf. κτάομαι used for קָנָה (10); רָכַשׁ (2); עָשָׂה (1).
- 55 קָצָה** (6) μετά (1/247): [מִן + קָצָה] (1): 8:3.  
 ἄμα (1/8): [מִן + קָצָה] (1): 19:4. Cf. ἄμα used for יַחַד (6).  
 μέρος (1/3): 23:9. Cf. μέρος used for יָד (1).  
 ἀπό (1/184): [מִן + קָצָה] (1): 47:2.  
 ἄκρος (2/4): 47:21+. Cf. ἄκρος used for רֵאשׁ (2).

- 56 קציר (3) *θερισμός* (2/2): 8:22; 30:14.  
*ἀμητος* (1/1): 45:6.
- 57 רחמים (2) *χάρις* (1/14): 43:14. Cf. *χάρις* used for רח (13).  
*έντερον* (1/1): 43:30.
- 58 רכוש (11) *ύπάρχω* (4/17): 12:5; 13:6; 14:16; 36:7. Cf. *ύπάρχω* used for מקנה (5); ל (2); מינקת (1); קנן (1); ש (1); ב (1).  
*ίππος* (3/5): 14:11, 16, 21. Cf. *ίππος* used for סוס (2).  
*άποσκευή* (3/6): 14:12; 15:14; 31:18. Cf. *άποσκευή* used for רט (3).  
*κτῆσις* (1/9): 46:6. Cf. *κτῆσις* used for תח (6); מקנה (1); מקנה (1).
- 59 רע (7) *πλησίον* (2/3): 11:3, 7. Cf. *πλησίον* used for חס (1).  
*άλλήλων* (1/2): [ר + רע] (1): 15:10.  
*έτερος* (1/17): 31:49. Cf. *έτερος* used for אחר (13); איש (1); עד (1); אף (1).  
*ποιμήν* (2/13): 38:12, 20. Cf. *ποιμήν* used for רעה (10).  
*άδελφός* (1/179): 43:33. Cf. *άδελφός* used for חס (178).
- 60 רעה (10) *κακία* (2/2): 6:5; 31:52.  
*κακός* (3/6): 19:19; 26:29; 50:15. Cf. *κακός* used for רע (3).  
*ρήμα* (1/47): 39:9. Cf. *ρήμα* used for רב (46).  
*πονηρός* (3/25): 44:4; 50:17, 20. Cf. *πονηρός* used for רע (15); רעע (3); באש (1); לוד (1); ל (1).  
*λύπη* (1/6): 44:29. Cf. *λύπη* used for עצב (3); עצב (1); ג (1).
- 61 שבט (3) *άρχων* (1/11): 49:10. Cf. *άρχων* used for שר (2); משל (2); נשיא (2); שדה (1); אים (1); שליט (1); מלך (1).  
*φυλή* (1/13): 49:16. Cf. *φυλή* used for משפחה (12).  
*υίός* (1/341): 49:28. Cf. *υίός* used for בן (327); ילד (4); בן-עמי (1); ילד (1); בן-אוי (1); בת (1); ב (1).
- 62 שור (2) *βοϋς* (1/25): 32:6. Cf. *βοϋς* used for בקר (12); פרה (12).  
*ταϋρος* (1/2): 49:6. Cf. *ταϋρος* used for פר (1).
- 63 שחר (3) *δρθρος* (2/2): 19:15; 32:27.  
*πρωί* (1/19): [שחר + ה + עלה] (1): 32:25. Cf. *πρωί* used for בקר (18).
- 64 שלום (15) *είρηνη* (2/2): 15:15; 26:29.  
*είρηνικός* (1/7): 37:4. Cf. *είρηνικός* used for בן (5); שלם (1).  
*σωτηρία* (3/4): 26:31; 28:21; 44:17. Cf. *σωτηρία* used for ישועה (1).  
*σωτήριος* (1/1): 41:16.  
*ύγιαίνω* (5/5): 29:6+; 37:14; 43:27, 28.  
*ίλεως* (1/1): 43:23.  
*πῶς + έχω* (1/1): [שלום + ל] (1): 43:27.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 37:14).

- 65    שָׁדָה    (47) ἀγρός (22/22): 2:5+, 19, 20; 3:18; 23:9, 11, 13, 17++, 19, 20; 25:9, 10; 27:27; 30:14, 16; 33:19; 39:5; 49:29, 32.  
                   ἀγροικος (1/2): [שָׁדָה + אִשָּׁה] (1): 25:27. Cf. ἀγροικος used for אִשָּׁה (1).  
                   גֶּחַי (4/360): 3:1, 14; 47:20, 24. Cf. גֶּחַי used for אֶרֶץ (307); אֲדָמָה (43); עֵפֶר (5); תְּהוֹם (1).  
                   πεδίον (16/19): [4:8]+; 24:63, 65; 25:29; 27:3, 5; 29:2; 31:4; 34:5, 7, 28; 36:35; 37:7, 15; 41:48. Cf. πεδίον used for בְּקָעָה (1); עֵמֶק (1); קְרִית אֲרֵבֶעַ (1).  
                   ἀρχων (1/11): 14:7. Cf. ἀρχων used for שָׂר (2); מֶשֶׁל (2); נָשִׂיא (2); לָאָם (1); שְׁלִיט (1); שֶׁבֶט (1); מְלִיךָ (1).  
                   χώρα (1/9): 32:4. Cf. χώρα used for אֶרֶץ (5); אֹר (3).  
                   σπήλαιον (2/15): 49:30; 50:13. Cf. σπήλαιον used for מְעָרָה (12).
- 66    חֵי    (2) χλωρός (1/4): 2:5. Cf. χλωρός used for יָרֵק (1); לֵחַ (1).  
                   ἐλάτη (1/1): 21:15.
- 67    שְׂמָלָה    (7) ἱμάτιον (3/14): 9:23; 37:34; 44:13. Cf. ἱμάτιον used for בְּגָד (11).  
                   στολή (4/7): 35:2; 41:14; 45:22+. Cf. στολή used for בְּגָד (2); לְבוּשׁ (1).
- 68    שָׂר    (25) ἀρχων (2/11): 12:15; 47:6. Cf. ἀρχων used for מֶשֶׁל (2); נָשִׂיא (2); שָׂדָה (1); לָאָם (1); שְׁלִיט (1); שֶׁבֶט (1); מְלִיךָ (1).  
                   ἀρχιστράτηγος (3/3): 21:22, 32; 26:26.  
                   ἀρχιμάγειρος (3/5): [שָׂר + הָ + טָבַח] (3): 37:36; 39:1; 41:12.  
                   ὁ + ἀρχιμάγειρος (2/2): [שָׂר + הָ + טָבַח] (2): 40:3; 41:10.  
                   ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ (2/2): [שָׂר + בֵּית + הָ + סֹהַר] (2): 39:21, 22.  
                   ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ + ὁ + δεσμωτήριον (1/1): [שָׂר + בֵּית + הָ + סֹהַר] (1): 39:23.  
                   ὁ + ἀρχιοινοχόος (5/5): [שָׂר + הָ + מִשְׁקָה] (5): 40:2, 9, 20, 23; 41:9.  
                   ὁ + ἀρχισιτοποιός (3/3): [שָׂר + הָ + אָפָה] (3): 40:2, 16, 20.  
                   ὁ + ἀρχιδεσμώτης (1/1): [שָׂר + הָ + טָבַח] (1): 40:4.  
                   ἀρχιοινοχόος (1/8): [שָׂר + הָ + מִשְׁקָה] (1): 40:21. Cf. ἀρχιοινοχόος used for מִשְׁקָה (2).  
                   ἀρχισιτοποιός (2/7): [שָׂר + הָ + אָפָה] (2): 40:22; 41:10. Cf. ἀρχισιτοποιός used for אָפָה (2).
- 69    תְּאַנָּה    (2) ἀρεστός (1/2): 3:6.  
                   εὐλογία (1/16): 49:26. Cf. εὐλογία used for בְּרָכָה (15).
- 70    תְּהוֹם    (4) ἄβυσσος (3/3): 1:2; 7:11; 8:2.  
                   גֶּחַי (1/360): 49:25. Cf. גֶּחַי used for אֶרֶץ (307); אֲדָמָה (43); עֵפֶר (5); שָׂדָה (4).

## Adjectives

### Hapaxlegomena

- 1    אֲבָל    πενθέω (1/4): 37:35. Cf. πενθέω used for בָּכָה (2); אָבַל (1).  
 2    אֲדָמוֹנִי    πυρράκης (1/1): 25:25.



- 3 אִיֶּזֶן κράτος (1/1): 49:24.
- 4 אִשָּׁם ἐν + ἁμαρτία (1/1): 42:21.
- 5 דִּלּ פονηρός (1/25): 41:19. Cf. πονηρός used for רַע (15); רַעַע (3); רַעָה (3); בַּאֲשׁ (1); לִדּוֹל (1).
- 6 אִשָּׁם ἁμαρτωλός (1/1): 13:13.
- 7 חֲכִילִי χαρποισίος (1/1): 49:12.
- 8 חֲלִיִּי τραυματίας (1/1): 34:27.
- 9 חֲלִיִּי λείος (1/1): 27:11.
- 10 חֲרִיִּי κάρφος (1/1): 8:11.
- 11 חֲלִיִּי χλωρός (1/4): 30:37. Cf. χλωρός used for יֶרֶק (1); שִׁיחַ (1).
- 12 חֲרִיִּי πικρός (1/1): 27:34.
- 13 חֲרִיִּי ἀλλότριος (1/4): 31:15. Cf. ἀλλότριος used for נֶכֶד (3).
- 14 חֲרִיִּי αὐθάδης (1/2): 49:7.
- 15 חֲרִיִּי πολὺς (1/19): 18:18. Cf. πολὺς used for רַב (9); לִדּוֹל (3); הֲרִיבָה (2); רַבִּב (1); הֲמוֹן (1); עוֹד (1); רַב (1).
- 16 חֲרִיִּי γυμνός (1/5): 2:25. Cf. γυμνός used for עֵרֶם (3); חֲלִקָה (1).
- 17 חֲרִיִּי φρόνιμος (1/3): 3:1. Cf. φρόνιμος used for בֵּין (2).
- 18 חֲרִיִּי ἄτεκνος (1/1): 15:2.
- 19 חֲרִיִּי ἀπερίτμητος (1/1): 17:14.
- 20 חֲרִיִּי ἀρχων (1/11): 42:6. Cf. ἀρχων used for שָׂר (2); מַשָּׁל (2); נְשִׂיא (2); שָׂדֶה (1); לָאֵם (1); שִׁבְט (1); מֶלֶךְ (1).
- 21 חֲרִיִּי πίων (1/2): 49:20. Cf. πίων used for נַעַם (1).
- 22 חֲרִיִּי κατάγαιος (1/1): 6:16.
- 23 חֲרִיִּי ἄπλαστος (1/1): 25:27.

## Consistent

- 1 בְּכִיר (5) πρέσβυς (5/20): 19:31, 33, 34, 37; 29:26. Cf. πρέσβυς used for זָקֵן (8); לִדּוֹל (4); זָקֵן (3).
- 2 בְּרִד (2) σποδοειδής (2/3): 31:10, 12. Cf. σποδοειδής used for טֹלֵא (1).
- 3 בְּרִיא (6) ἐκλεκτός (6/7): 41:2, 4, 5, 7, 18, 20. Cf. ἐκλεκτός used for מְבַחֵר (1).
- 4 גְּבִיָּה (2) ὑψηλός (2/4): 7:19, [20]. Cf. ὑψηλός used for מוֹרָה (1); מְרִיָּה (1).
- 5 גְּבוֹר (4) γίγας (4/6): 6:4; 10:8, 9+. Cf. γίγας used for נְפִילִים (1); רַפָּאִים (1).
- 6 דֶּק (6) λεπτός (6/10): 41:3, 4, 6, 7, 23, 24. Cf. λεπτός used for רַק (3); רִיק (1).
- 7 הֲרָה (3) ἐν + γαστήρ + ἔχω (3/5): 16:11; 38:24, 25.

- 8 טְהוֹר (8) καθαρός (8/12): 7:2+, [3][+], 8+; 8:20+. Cf. καθαρός used for תָּם (2); נָקָה (1); נָקִי (1).
- 9 יָחִיד (3) ἀγαπητός (3/3): 22:2, 12, 16.
- 10 יָרָא (3) φοβέω (3/20): 22:12; 32:12; 42:18. Cf. φοβέω used for יָרָא (17).
- 11 כֵּן (5) εἰρηνικός (5/7): 42:11, 19, 31, 33, 34. Cf. εἰρηνικός used for שָׁלֵם (1); שְׁלֹום (1).
- 12 לְבָן (4) λευκός (4/6): 30:35, 37+; 49:12. Cf. λευκός used for עָדָן (2).
- 13 עֲיָר (2) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 25:29, 30. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גּוּעַ (4); חָרַב (2); תָּמַם (2); אָפַס (2); בָּצַר (1); חָדַל (1); כָּלָה (1); לָהָה (1); סוּר (1).
- 14 עִירָם (3) γυμνός (3/5): 3:7, 10, 11. Cf. γυμνός used for עָרִים (1); חֲלָקָה (1).
- 15 עָקָר (3) στειῖρα (3/3): 11:30; 25:21; 29:31.
- 16 צָדִיק (11) δίκαιος (11/11): 6:9; 7:1; 18:23[+], 24+, 25+, 26, 28; 20:4.
- 17 קָדָשׁ (3) πόρνη (3/5): 38:21+, 22. Cf. πόρνη used for זָנָה (2).
- 18 קָרוֹב (2) ἐγγύς (2/2): 19:20.; [קָרוֹב + אֶל] (1): 45:10.
- 19 קָשָׁה (2) σκληρός (2/7): 42:7, 30. Cf. σκληρός used for רָעָה (2); יָתָר (2); חָרָה (1).
- 20 רָחֵב (2) πλατύς (2/3): [דִּי + רָחֵב] (2): [34:10], 21. Cf. πλατύς used for רָחֵב (1).
- 21 רָחוֹק (2) μακρόθεν (2/3): [מִן + רָחוֹק] (2): 22:4; 37:18. Cf. μακρόθεν used for רָחוֹק (1).
- 22 רָק (3) λεπτός (3/10): 41:19, 20, 27. Cf. λεπτός used for דָּק (6); רֵיק (1).
- 23 רָשָׁע (4) ἀσεβής (4/4): 18:23[+], 25+.
- 24 שָׂבַע (2) πλήρης (2/6): 25:8; 35:29. Cf. πλήρης used for מָלֵא (4).
- 25 שָׁעִיר (2) δασύς (2/3): 27:11, 23. Cf. δασύς used for שָׁעִיר (1).

## Main

- 1 אֲחֵר (15) ἕτερος (13/17): 4:25; 8:10, 12; 17:21; 26:21, 22; 29:19, 27, 30; 30:24; 37:9; 41:19; 43:22. Cf. ἕτερος used for אֲחֵר (1); רָעָה (1); עֵד (1); אֲחֵד (1).  
ἄλλος (2/3): 41:3, [23].
- 2 אֶפְהָ (8) σιτοποιός (1/1): 40:17.  
ἀρχισιτοποιός (4/7): 40:1, 5.; [אֶפְהָ + הָ + שָׁר] (2): 40:22; 41:10.  
ὁ + ἀρχισιτοποιός (3/3): [אֶפְהָ + הָ + שָׁר] (3): 40:2, 16, 20.
- 3 גָּדֹל (34) μέγας (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 גָּדֹל (5); רַב (2); כָּבֵד (2); כָּבֵד (1).  
πρέσβυς (4/20): 27:1, 15, 42; 44:12. Cf. πρέσβυς used for זָקֵן (8); בָּכִיר (5); זָקֵן (3).  
πολύς (3/19): 15:14; 29:7; 41:29. Cf. πολύς used for רַב (9); הָרַבָּה (2); רַבִּב (1); הֶמּוֹן (1); עֲצוּם (1); עֵד (1); רַב (1).

- οὐ + ὑπερέχω (1/1): [לִּידָּ + וֹ + וֹאֵ] (1): 39:9.  
 πονηρός (1/25): 39:9. Cf. πονηρός used for רַע (15); רַעַע (3); רַעָה (3); בּאֵשׁ (1); לֵד (1).
- 4 יָקוֹן (9) πρέσβυς (8/20): 18:11; 19:4; 24:2; 35:29; 43:27; 44:20; 50:7+. Cf. πρέσβυς used for בְּכִיר (5); לִידָּ (4); יָקוֹן (3).  
 πρεσβύτης (1/1): 25:8.
- 5 חוֹם (4) φαιός (3/3): 30:32, 33, 35.  
 ποικίλος (1/10): 30:40. Cf. ποικίλος used for נָקָד (5); פֶּס (3).
- 6 יִי (25) ζάω (20/74): 1:20, 24; 2:7, 19; 3:20; 8:21; 9:10, 12, 15, 16; [21:19]; 25:6; 26:19; 43:7, 27, 28; 45:3, 26, 28; 46:30. Cf. ζάω used for חִיה (52); יִי (2).  
 ζῶον (1/1): 1:21.  
 ζωή (1/23): 1:30. Cf. ζωή used for יִי (20); חַיָּה (1); מְחַיֶּה (1).  
 θηρίον (1/19): 6:19. Cf. θηρίον used for חַיָּה (17); טָרֵף (1).  
 οὖτος (1/323): 18:10.  
 ὥρα (1/3): [יִי + עָה] (1): 18:14. Cf. ὥρα used for עָה (1).
- 7 טוֹב (41) καλός (32/41): 1:4, [8], 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31; 2:9+, 12, 17, 18; 3:5, 6, 22; 6:2; 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 יָפֵה (6); חֲמֻדָּה (1); טוֹבָה (1); חֲמֹר (1).  
 καλῶς (1/2): 26:29. Cf. καλῶς used for יָטֵב (1).  
 ὤς + ἄν + σύ + ἀρεστός + εἰμί (1/1): [יָ + עֵין + בָּ + טוֹב + הֵ] (1): 16:6.  
 καθαά + ἄν + ἀρέσκω + σύ (1/1): [כֹּס + עֵין + בָּ + טוֹב + בָּ] (1): 19:8.  
 ὄς + ἔάν + σύ + ἀρέσκω (1/1): [יָ + עֵין + בָּ + טוֹב + בָּ] (1): 20:15.  
 ὠραῖος (1/5): 26:7. Cf. ὠραῖος used for חֲמֹד (2); יָפֵה (2).  
 ἀγαθός (1/8): 29:19. Cf. ἀγαθός used for טוֹב (4); מְיָטֵב (2); טוֹבָה (1).  
 ὀρθῶς (1/3): 40:16. Cf. ὀρθῶς used for יָטֵב (2).  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 31:24, 29).
- 8 יָפֵה (9) καλός (6/41): 12:14; 29:17; 39:6; 41:2, 4, 18. Cf. καλός used for טוֹב (32); חֲמֻדָּה (1); טוֹבָה (1); חֲמֹר (1).  
 ὠραῖος (2/5): 29:17; 39:6. Cf. ὠραῖος used for חֲמֹד (2); טוֹב (1).  
 εὐπρόσωπος (1/1): [מְרָאָה + יָפֵה] (1): 12:11.
- 9 כָּבֵד (9) ἐνισχύω (4/7): 12:10; 43:1; 47:4, 13. Cf. ἐνισχύω used for שֹׁרָה (1); נָהַל (1); חֹזֶק (1).  
 ἰσχυρός (2/3): 41:31; 50:10. Cf. ἰσχυρός used for זִוְיִים (1).  
 μέγας (2/35): 50:9, 11. Cf. μέγας used for לִידָּ (25); גָּדֹל (5); רַב (2); כָּבֵד (1).  
 εἰμί + πλούσιος (1/1): 13:2.
- 10 מְלֵא (5) πλήρης (4/6): [27:27]; 41:7, 22, [24]. Cf. πλήρης used for מְבֹבֵב (2).  
 ἄξιος (1/1): 23:9.
- 11 מְעַט (11) μικρός (8/12): 24:17, 43; 26:10; 30:30; [42:2]; 43:2; 44:25; 47:9. Cf. μικρός used for קָטָן (2); מְצָרָה (2).

- ὁ (2/4,832): **43:11+**.  
 ἱκανός (1/2): **30:15**.
- 12** עֲלִיּוֹן (5) ὕψιστος (4/4): **14:18, 19, 20, 22**.  
 ἐπάνω (1/11): **40:17**.
- 13** דָּקָה (7) διάλευκος (4/8): **30:39, 40; 31:10, 12**. Cf. διάλευκος used for אֶלֶט (4).  
 λευκός (2/6): **31:8+**. Cf. λευκός used for לָבֵן (4).  
 ῥαντός (1/7): **30:35**. Cf. ῥαντός used for דָּקָה (3).
- 14** צָעִיר (9) νέος (8/28): **19:31, 34, 35, 38; 29:26; 43:33; 48:14; [49:22]**. Cf. νέος used for קֶטָן (13); קָטָן (6); נָעַר (1).  
 ἐλαχύς (1/3): **25:23**. Cf. ἐλαχύς used for קֶטָן (1); קָטָן (1).
- 15** קֶטָן (16) νέος (13/28): **42:13, 15, 20, 34; [43:3], [5], 29; 44:2, 12, 23, 26+; 48:19**. Cf. νέος used for צָעִיר (8); קָטָן (6); נָעַר (1).  
 μικρός (2/12): **19:11; 42:32**. Cf. μικρός used for מְעַר (8); מְצָר (2).  
 ἐλαχύς (1/3): **1:16**. Cf. ἐλαχύς used for צָעִיר (1); קָטָן (1).
- 16** קָטָן (7) νέος (6/28): **9:24; 27:15, 42; 29:16, 18; 44:20**. Cf. νέος used for קֶטָן (13); צָעִיר (8); נָעַר (1).  
 ἐλαχύς (1/3): **[27:6]**. Cf. ἐλαχύς used for קֶטָן (1); צָעִיר (1).
- 17** ראשון (11) πρῶτος (9/11): **8:13; 26:1; 28:19; 32:18, [20]; 33:2; 38:28; 40:13; 41:20**. Cf. πρῶτος used for תְּחִלָּה (1); תְּחִלָּה (1).  
 ἀρχή (1/16): **13:4**. Cf. ἀρχή used for רִאשִׁית (4); רִאשִׁית (3); תְּחִלָּה (3); מְשָׁפֶט (2); מְשָׁפֶט (1); מְשָׁפֶט (1); בֵּן (1).  
 πρωτότοκος (1/16): **25:25**. Cf. πρωτότοκος used for בְּכֹר (15).
- 18** רַב (12) πολὺς (9/19): **13:6; 21:34; 24:25; 26:14; 30:43; 33:9; 36:7; 37:34; 50:20**. Cf. πολὺς used for לִידָה (3); הִרְבָּה (2); רַבב (1); הִמּוֹן (1); עֲצוּם (1); עוֹד (1); רַב (1).  
 πληθύνω (1/28): **6:5**. Cf. πληθύνω used for רַבב (25); רַבב (1); דָּגָה (1).  
 μέγας (1/35): **25:23**. Cf. μέγας used for לִידָה (25); גָּדֹל (5); כְּבֹד (2); כְּבֹד (1).  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 7:11).
- 19** רָע (25) πονηρός (15/25): **2:9, 17; 3:5, 22; 6:5; 8:21; 13:13; 28:8; 31:24, 29; 37:2, 20, 33; 38:7; 47:9**.  
 Cf. πονηρός used for רָעָה (3); רָעָה (3); בָּאשׁ (1); לִידָה (1); לֵל (1).  
 αἰσχροός (4/6): **41:3, 19, 20, 21**.  
 ὁ + αἰσχροός (1/1): [מְרָאָה + הָ + רָע] (1): **41:4**.  
 κακός (3/6): **24:50; 44:34; 48:16**. Cf. κακός used for רָעָה (3).  
 κακοποιέω (1/3): [רָע + עָשָׂה] (1): **31:29**. Cf. κακοποιέω used for רָעָה (2).  
 σκυθρωπός (1/1): **40:7**.

No main

- 1** אֶדָּם (2) ἔψεμα (1/3): **25:30**. Cf. ἔψεμα used for נִדָּה (2).

πυρρός (1/1): 25:30.

- 2 אָהרֹן (2) ὀπίσω (1/17): 33:2. Cf. ὀπίσω used for אָהר (1); אָהר (1).  
ἔσχατος (1/2): 33:2. Cf. ἔσχατος used for אָהרִית (1).
- 3 חָכָם (3) σοφός (1/1): 41:8.  
συνετός (2/2): 41:33, 39.
- 4 נָקֵד (8) ῥαντός (3/7): 30:32, 33, 35. Cf. ῥαντός used for נָקֵד (1).  
ποικίλος (5/10): 30:39; 31:8+, 10, 12. Cf. ποικίλος used for פֶּס (3); חוּם (1).
- 5 נָקִי (2) ἀθῶος (1/2): 24:41. Cf. ἀθῶος used for נָקִי (1).  
καθαρός (1/12): 44:10. Cf. καθαρός used for נָקִי (8); תָּם (2); נָקִי (1).
- 6 רֵיק (2) κενός (1/2): 37:24. Cf. κενός used for רֵיק (1).  
λεπτός (1/10): 41:27. Cf. λεπτός used for רֵיק (6); רֵיק (3).
- 7 רָף (3) ἀπαλός (2/3): 18:7; 33:13. Cf. ἀπαλός used for רָף (1).  
ἀσθενής (1/1): 29:17.
- 8 שָׁלֵם (3) ἀναπληρόω (1/3): 15:16. Cf. ἀναπληρόω used for שָׁלֵם (1); מָלֵא (1).  
Σαλήμ (1/2): 33:18. Cf. Σαλήμ used for שָׁלֵם (1).  
εἰρηνικός (1/7): 34:21. Cf. εἰρηνικός used for שָׁלֵם (5); שָׁלֵם (1).
- 9 תָּמִים (2) τέλειος (1/1): 6:9.  
ἄμemptos (1/1): 17:1.

## Verbs

### Hapaxlegomena

- 1 אָבַד ἀπόλλυμι (1/10): [35:4]. Cf. ἀπόλλυμι used for אָבַד (7); סָפָה (1); הָרַג (1).
- 2 אָבַל πενθέω (1/4): 37:34. Cf. πενθέω used for אָבַל (2); אָבַל (1).
- 3 אָוִן ἐπισπουδάζω (1/1): 19:15.
- 4 אָזֵן ἐνωτίζομαι (1/1): 4:23.
- 5 אָלֵם δεσμεύω (1/2): 37:7. Cf. δεσμεύω used for אָסַר (1).
- 6 אָמַץ ὑπερέχω (1/3): 25:23. Cf. ὑπερέχω used for אָמַץ (1).
- 7 אָפָה πέσσω (1/1): 19:3.
- 8 אָצֵל ὑπολείπω (1/7): 27:36. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for אָצֵל (3); שָׁם (1); שָׁאָר (1); עָזַב (1).
- 9 אָרַךְ πολυχρόνιος (1/1): [יָם + הָ + אָרַךְ] (1): 26:8.
- 10 אָשַׁר μακαρίζω (1/1): 30:13.
- 11 אָשָׁה πονηρός + εἰμί (1/1): 34:30.

- 12 בהל *ταράσσω* (1/6): 45:3. Cf. *ταράσσω* used for מהה (1); זעף (1); פעם (1); חרד (1); מהר (1).
- 13 בוש *αἰσχύνω* (1/1): 2:25.
- 14 בזה *φασλίζω* (1/1): 25:34.
- 15 בלה *οὕπω + μέν* (1/1): [י + בלה + אַחר] (1): 18:12.
- 16 בעל *συνοικέω* (1/1): 20:3.
- 17 בצר *ἐκλείπω* (1/17): 11:6. Cf. *ἐκλείπω* used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עָץ (2); תמם (2); אפס (2); חדל (1); כלה (1); להה (1); סור (1).
- 18 ברך *κοιμίζω* (1/1): 24:11.
- 19 בשל *πέπειρος* (1/1): 40:10.
- 20 גאל *ῥύομαι* (1/1): 48:16.
- 21 גלח *ξυρέω* (1/1): 41:14.
- 22 גמא *ποτίζω* (1/20): 24:17. Cf. *ποτίζω* used for שקה (18); מִשְׁקָה (1).
- 23 גער *ἐπιτιμάω* (1/1): 37:10.
- 24 דגה *πληθύνω* (1/28): 48:16. Cf. *πληθύνω* used for רבה (25); רַב (1); רבב (1).
- 25 דון *καταμένω* (1/1): 6:3.
- 26 דלק *καταδιώκω* (1/5): 31:36. Cf. *καταδιώκω* used for רדף (3); דפק (1).
- 27 דפק *καταδιώκω* (1/5): 33:13. Cf. *καταδιώκω* used for רדף (3); דלק (1).
- 28 דשא *βλαστάνω* (1/1): 1:11.
- 29 הוה *γίνομαι* (1/201): 27:29. Cf. *γίνομαι* used for היה (155); ילד (18); גדל (4); עשה (3); יטב (2); הָלִיל (2); שמע (1); בחן (1); ידע (1); היא (1); עצם (1); מוֹלֶדֶת (1); לא (1); עלה (1); רבב (1); ברא (1).
- 30 הלל *ἐπαινέω* (1/1): 12:15.
- 31 זבד *δωρέω* (1/1): 30:20.
- 32 זבל *αἰρετίζω* (1/1): 30:20.
- 33 זיד *ἔψω* (1/1): 25:29.
- 34 זמם *ἐπιτίθῃμι* (1/11): 11:6. Cf. *ἐπιτίθῃμι* used for שים (6); ערך (1); נשא (1); נפל (1); עמס (1).
- 35 זנה *ἐκπορνεύω* (1/1): 38:24.
- 36 זעף *ταράσσω* (1/6): 40:6. Cf. *ταράσσω* used for מהה (1); פעם (1); חרד (1); מהר (1); בהל (1).
- 37 זרח *ἀνατέλλω* (1/4): 32:32. Cf. *ἀνατέλλω* used for צמח (2); צָמַח (1).
- 38 חבר *συμφωνέω* (1/1): 14:3.
- 39 חבש *ἐπισάττω* (1/1): 22:3.
- 40 חוס *φείδομαι* (1/5): 45:20. Cf. *φείδομαι* used for חשך (3); הִמְלָה (1).

- 41 חלה ἐνοχλέω (1/1): 48:1.
- 42 חמש ἀποπεμπτόω (1/2): 41:34. Cf. ἀποπεμπτόω used for חֲמִשָּׁה (1).
- 43 חפץ ἔγκειμαι (1/2): 34:19. Cf. ἔγκειμαι used for יָצַר (1).
- 44 חקק ἡγέομαι (1/2): 49:10. Cf. ἡγέομαι used for נָזַר (1).
- 45 חרש χαλκεύς (1/1): 4:22.
- 46 חשק προαιρέω (1/1): 34:8.
- 47 חתן ἐπιγαμβρεύω (1/1): 34:9.
- 48 טבח σφάζω (1/3): 43:16. Cf. σφάζω used for טַחַשׁ (2).
- 49 טבל μολύνω (1/1): 37:31.
- 50 טהר καθαρίζω (1/1): 35:2.
- 51 טחה βολή (1/1): 21:16.
- 52 טמן κατακρύπτω (1/1): 35:4.
- 53 טען γεμίζω (1/1): 45:17.
- 54 יבם γαμβρεύω (1/1): 38:8.
- 55 ימן ἐγώ + εἰς + δεξιός (1/1): 13:9.
- 56 יקע ναρκάω (1/3): 32:26. Cf. ναρκάω used for נָשָׂה (2).
- 57 ירה ἵστημι (1/36): 31:51. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); נצב (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); שים (2); תקע (1); רום (1).
- 58 ירה συναντάω (1/3): 46:28. Cf. συναντάω used for פָּגַע (1); פָּגַשׁ (1).
- 59 ישם παρατίθημι (1/5): 24:33. Cf. παρατίθημι used for שים (2); נתן (1); יצג (1).
- 60 כאב ἐν + πόνος (1/1): 34:25.
- 61 כבס πλύνω (1/1): 49:11.
- 62 כהה ἀμβλύνω (1/1): 27:1.
- 63 כחד ἐκτρίβω (1/7): 47:18. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for שחת (3); שָׁמַד (1); כרת (1); ירש (1).
- 64 כחש ἀρνέομαι (1/1): 18:15.
- 65 כמר συστρέφω (1/1): 43:30.
- 66 כרע ἀναπίπτω (1/1): 49:9.
- 67 לאה παραλύω (1/2): 19:11. Cf. παραλύω used for נָקַם (1).
- 68 לבן πλινθεύω (1/1): 11:3.
- 69 להה ἐκλείπω (1/17): 47:13. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עָנָף (2); תָּמַם (2); אָפַס (2); בָּצַר (1); חָדַל (1); כלה (1); סור (1).

- 70 לוח *εἰμί* (1/505): 29:34. Cf. *εἰμί* used for היה (150); הוא (23); אֵין (13); יֵשׁ (13); הִנֵּה (11); הֵם (9); אָתָם (7); בָּן (7); אֲנִי (6); אָתָּה (5); הִנֵּה (5); אָתָּה (5); עוֹד (3); עֲשֵׂה (2); יָהּ (2); נָקָה (2); אֲנִכִּי (2); רָעַע (1); אָסַר (1); יָנוּ (1); אֲפֹאֵל (1); נָחֵנוּ (1); דָּ (1); כָּבַד (1); בָּאֵשׁ (1); מוֹת (1); בּוֹא (1); יֵשֵׁב (1); לָטַשׁ (1); גָּדַל (1); הָן (1); קָבַד (1).

71 לוח *φυράω* (1/1): 18:6.

72 לִטַּשׁ *εἰμί + σφυροκόπος* (1/1): 4:22.

73 לִעֲטַט *γεύω* (1/1): 25:30.

74 מִגֵּן *παραδίδωμι* (1/2): 14:20. Cf. *παραδίδωμι* used for קָרָה (1).

75 מוֹשֶׁה *ψηλαφάω* (1/3): 27:21. Cf. *ψηλαφάω* used for מָשַׁח (2).

76 מִלֵּל *ἀναγγέλλω* (1/17): 21:7. Cf. *ἀναγγέλλω* used for נָגַד (14); שׁוּב (1); אָמַר (1).

77 מִנַּע *στερέω* (1/2): 30:2. Cf. *στερέω* used for פָּלַל (1).

78 מִרְדָּה *ἀφίστημι* (1/6): 14:4. Cf. *ἀφίστημι* used for עָתַק (1); נָגַשׁ (1); שָׁם (1); נָדַד (1); סָתַר (1).

79 מִרְרָה *διαβουλεύω* (1/1): 49:23.

80 מִשַּׁח *ἀλείφω* (1/1): 31:13.

81 מִשָּׁחַד *ἐξέλαω* (1/1): 37:28.

82 נָדַד *ἀφίστημι* (1/6): 31:40. Cf. *ἀφίστημι* used for עָתַק (1); מִרְדָּה (1); נָגַשׁ (1); שָׁם (1); סָתַר (1).

83 נִטַּשׁ *ἀξιώω* (1/1): 31:28.

84 נִכְלָה *πονηρεύομαι* (1/2): 37:18. Cf. *πονηρεύομαι* used for רָעַע (1).

85 נִסָּה *πειράζω* (1/1): 22:1.

86 נִסְךָ *σπένδω* (1/1): 35:14.

87 נִעַם *πίων* (1/2): 49:15. Cf. *πίων* used for שָׂמַח (1).

88 נִפַּח *ἐμφυσάω* (1/1): 2:7.

89 נִפֵּץ *διασπείρω* (1/7): 9:19. Cf. *διασπείρω* used for פָּוֶץ (5); פָּרַד (1).

90 נִקַּב *διαστέλλω* (1/4): 30:28. Cf. *διαστέλλω* used for פָּרַד (2); סוּר (1).

91 נִשָּׂא *ἀπατάω* (1/1): 3:13.

92 נִשַּׁב *συγκαθίζω* (1/1): 15:11.

93 נִשָּׂה *ἐπιλανθάνομαι + ποιέω* (1/1): 41:51.

94 נִשָּׂךְ *δάκνω* (1/1): 49:17.

95 נִסְבֵּל *πονέω* (1/1): 49:15.

96 נִסְכָּל *ἀφρόνως* (1/1): 31:28.

97 נִסְכָּר *ἐπικαλύπτω* (1/3): 8:2. Cf. *ἐπικαλύπτω* used for כִּסָּה (2).

98 נִסְמַךְ *στηρίζω* (1/2): 27:37. Cf. *στηρίζω* used for נִצָּב (1).



- 99 סעד ἐσθίω (1/52): [כס + לב + סעד] (1): 18:5. Cf. ἐσθίω used for אכל (49); אָכַלָה (1); מֵאָכֵל (1).
- 100 עול λοχεύω (1/1): 33:13.
- 101 עוף πέτομαι (1/1): 1:20.
- 102 עזר βοηθέω (1/1): 49:25.
- 103 קטף τίκτω (1/81): 30:42. Cf. τίκτω used for ילד (80).
- 104 עבר μισητός + ποιέω (1/1): 34:30.
- 105 קלף καλλωπίζω (1/1): 38:14.
- 106 עמם ἐπιτίθημι (1/11): [44:13]. Cf. ἐπιτίθημι used for שים (6); זמם (1); ערך (1); נשא (1); נפל (1).
- 107 ענן συννεφέω (1/1): 9:14.
- 108 עצם δυνατός + γίνομαι (1/1): 26:16.
- 109 עקב πτερνίζω (1/1): 27:36.
- 110 עקד συμποδίζω (1/1): 22:9.
- 111 עקר νευροκοπέω (1/1): 49:6.
- 112 ערה ἐκκενόω (1/1): 24:20.
- 113 עשר πλουτίζω (1/1): 14:23.
- 114 שקר ἀδικέω (1/4): 26:20. Cf. ἀδικέω used for שקר (1); חטא (1).
- 115 פוג ἐξίστημι (1/4): 45:26. Cf. ἐξίστημι used for חרד (1); יצא (1); תמה (1).
- 116 פוז ἐκλύω (1/2): 49:24. Cf. ἐκλύω used for פרק (1).
- 117 פחז ἐξυβρίζω (1/1): [49:4].
- 118 פלא ἀδυνατέω (1/1): 18:14.
- 119 פלג διαμερίζω (1/2): 10:25. Cf. διαμερίζω used for חלק (1).
- 120 פעם τάρασσω (1/6): 41:8. Cf. τάρασσω used for מהה (1); זעף (1); חרד (1); מהר (1); בהל (1).
- 121 פצה χαίνω (1/1): 4:11.
- 122 פרח θάλλω (1/1): 40:10.
- 123 פרק ἐκλύω (1/2): 27:40. Cf. ἐκλύω used for פוז (1).
- 124 פרר διασκεδάννυμι (1/1): 17:14.
- 125 פשט ἐκδύω (1/1): 37:23.
- 126 פתה πλατύνω (1/3): 9:27. Cf. πλατύνω used for רחב (1); פרץ (1).
- 127 פתל συναναστρέφω (1/1): 30:8.
- 128 צלע ἐπισκάζω (1/1): 32:32.
- 129 צפה ἐπιδίδωμι (1/2): 31:49. Cf. ἐπιδίδωμι used for נתן (1).

- 130 צרר ἀπορέω (1/1): [צַרְר + יָ + יֵ] (1): 32:8.
- 131 קדש ἀγιάζω (1/1): 2:3.
- 132 קוה περιμένω (1/1): 49:18.
- 133 קוץ προσοχθίζω (1/1): 27:46.
- 134 קטן ἱκανόω + ἐγώ (1/1): 32:11.
- 135 רבה τοξότης (1/1): [רְבָה + קֶשֶׁת] (1): 21:20.
- 136 רגז ὀργίζω (1/4): 45:24. Cf. ὀργίζω used for קָצַף (2); חָרָה (1).
- 137 רוד καθαιρέω (1/4): 27:40. Cf. καθαιρέω used for יָרַד (3).
- 138 רחב πλατύνω (1/3): 26:22. Cf. πλατύνω used for פָּתַח (1); פָּרַץ (1).
- 139 רחף ἐπιφέρω (1/3): 1:2. Cf. ἐπιφέρω used for הִלֵּךְ (1); שָׁלַח (1).
- 140 רמה παραλογίζομαι (1/2): 29:25. Cf. παραλογίζομαι used for חָלַף (1).
- 141 רעב πεινάω (1/1): 41:55.
- 142 רצה εὐδοκέω (1/3): 33:10. Cf. εὐδοκέω used for קָדַד (2).
- 143 רציץ σκιρτάω (1/1): 25:22.
- 144 שאה καταμανθάνω (1/2): 24:21. Cf. καταμανθάνω used for רָאָה (1).
- 145 שבר συντρίβω (1/2): 19:9. Cf. συντρίβω used for יָשַׁב (1).
- 146 שכך κοπάζω (1/4): 8:1. Cf. κοπάζω used for קָלַל (3).
- 147 שלם ἀνταποδίδωμι (1/2): 44:4. Cf. ἀνταποδίδωμι used for שׁוּב (1).
- 148 שמד ἐκτρίβω (1/7): 34:30. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for שָׁחַת (3); כָּרַת (1); יָרַשׁ (1); כָּחַד (1).
- 149 שנה δευτερόω (1/1): 41:32.
- 150 שען καταψύχω (1/1): 18:4.
- 151 שקל ἀποκαθίστημι (1/5): 23:16. Cf. ἀποκαθίστημι used for שׁוּב (4).
- 152 שקר ἀδικέω (1/4): 21:23. Cf. ἀδικέω used for עָשָׂה (1); חָטָא (1).
- 153 שוח ἀδολεσχέω (1/1): 24:63.
- 154 שחט ἐκθλίβω (1/1): 40:11.
- 155 שכל κατανοέω (1/2): 3:6. Cf. κατανοέω used for רָאָה (1).
- 156 שכל ἐναλλάξ (1/1): 48:14.
- 157 שמאל ἐγώ + εἰς + ἀριστερός (1/1): 13:9.
- 158 שרה ἐνισχύω (1/7): 32:29. Cf. ἐνισχύω used for כָּבֵד (4); נָהַל (1); חָזַק (1).
- 159 תלל παρακρούω (1/1): 31:7.
- 160 תמה ἐξίστημι (1/4): 43:33. Cf. ἐξίστημι used for חָרַד (1); יָצָא (1); פּוֹג (1).

161 תמך ἀντιλαμβάνω (1/1): 48:17.

162 טעק καταφρονέω (1/1): 27:12.

163 תפר ῥάπτω (1/1): 3:7.

## Consistent

1 אבק (2) παλαίω (2/2): 32:25, 26.

2 אות (3) ὁμοιόω (3/3): 34:15, 22, 23.

3 אמן (3) πιστεύω (3/3): 15:6; 42:20; 45:26.

4 אפס (2) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 47:15, 16. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עָיָה (2); תמס (2); בצר (1); חדל (1); בלה (1); לזה (1); סור (1).

5 בדל (5) διαχωρίζω (5/10): 1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for פרד (3); סור (1); שית (1).

6 בזז (2) διαρπάζω (2/2): 34:27, 29.

7 בחר (2) ἐκλέγω (2/2): 6:2; 13:11.

8 בין (2) φρόνιμος (2/3): 41:33, 39. Cf. φρόνιμος used for ערום (1).

9 בלל (2) συγχέω (2/2): 11:7, 9.

10 בלע (2) καταπίνω (2/2): 41:7, 24.

11 בקש (4) ζητέω (4/5): 37:15, 16; 43:9, 30. Cf. ζητέω used for מצא (1).

12 ברח (9) ἀποδιδράσκω (9/10): 16:6, 8; 27:43; 31:20, 21, 22, 27; 35:1, 7. Cf. ἀποδιδράσκω used for הלך (1).

13 בתר (2) διαιρέω (2/4): 15:10+. Cf. διαιρέω used for חצה (1).

14 גוד (2) πειρατεύω (2/2): 49:19+.

15 גור (9) παροικέω (9/13): 12:10; 19:9; 20:1; 21:23, 34; 26:3; 32:5; 35:27; 47:4. Cf. παροικέω used for קָגוּר (1).

16 גוז (3) κείρω (3/3): 31:19; 38:12, 13.

17 גזל (2) ἀφαιρέω (2/7): 21:25; 31:31. Cf. ἀφαιρέω used for נצל (2); אסף (1); נשא (1); סור (1).

18 גרש (3) ἐκβάλλω (3/3): 3:24; 4:14; 21:10.

19 דין (3) κρίνω (3/8): 15:14; 30:6; 49:16. Cf. κρίνω used for שפט (4); ריב (1).

20 זבח (2) θύω (2/2): 31:54; 46:1.

21 חבק (3) περιλαμβάνω (3/3): 29:13; 33:4; 48:10.

22 חוה (23) προσκυνέω (23/23): 18:2; 19:1; 22:5; 23:7, 12; 24:26, 48, 52; 27:29+; 33:3, 6, 7+; 37:7, 9, 10; 42:6; 43:26, 28; 47:31; 48:12; 49:8.

23 חמד (2) ὡραῖος (2/5): 2:9; 3:6. Cf. ὡραῖος used for יָפֶה (2); טוב (1).

- 24 חפר (8) ὀρύσσω (8/10): 21:30; 26:15, 18+, 19, 21, 22, 32. Cf. ὀρύσσω used for כרה (2).
- 25 חפש (3) ἐρευνάω (3/5): [31:33], 35; 44:12. Cf. ἐρευνάω used for משש (2).
- 26 חרב (2) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 8:13+. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); עִיף (2); תמם (2); אפס (2); בצר (1); חדל (1); בלה (1); לזה (1); סור (1).
- 27 חרש (2) παρασιωπάω (2/2): 24:21; 34:5.
- 28 טמא (3) μιάινω (3/4): 34:5, [13], 27. Cf. μιάινω used for חלל (1).
- 29 יבש (2) ξηραίνω (2/2): 8:7, 14.
- 30 יחל (2) ἐπέχω (2/2): 8:10, 12.
- 31 יחם (4) ἐγκισσάω (4/4): 30:39, 41+; 31:10.
- 32 ינק (2) θηλάζω (2/2): 21:7; 32:16.
- 33 יצק (2) ἐπιχέω (2/2): 28:18; 35:14.
- 34 יצר (4) πλάσσω (4/4): 2:7, 8, [15], 19.
- 35 כבש (2) κατακυριεύω (2/2): 1:28; [9:1].
- 36 כרה (2) ὀρύσσω (2/10): 26:25; 50:5. Cf. ὀρύσσω used for חפר (8).
- 37 מאן (3) οὐ + θέλω (3/3): 37:35; 39:8; 48:19.
- 38 מלך (12) βασιλεύω (12/12): 36:31+, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39; 37:8+.
- 39 מנה (2) ἐξαριθμέω (2/3): 13:16+. Cf. ἐξαριθμέω used for ספר (1).
- 40 נדר (2) εὐχόμεαι (2/2): 28:20; 31:13.
- 41 נהג (2) ἀπάγω (2/6): 31:18, 26. Cf. ἀπάγω used for אסר (2); אָסִיר (1); בוא (1).
- 42 נוד (2) τρέμω (2/2): 4:12, 14.
- 43 נוע (2) στένω (2/2): 4:12, 14.
- 44 נחה (2) εὐοδῶ (2/9): 24:48.; [נחה + נָחַר + נָחַר] (1): 24:27. Cf. εὐοδῶ used for צלח (6); קרה (1).
- 45 נטע (3) φυτεύω (3/3): 2:8; 9:20; 21:33.
- 46 ספד (2) κόπτω (2/2): 23:2; 50:10.
- 47 סתם (2) ἐμφράσσω (2/2): 26:15, 18.
- 48 עצר (3) συγκλείω (3/3): 16:2; 20:18+.
- 49 ערב (2) ἐκδέχομαι (2/2): 43:9; 44:32.
- 50 פוץ (5) διασπείρω (5/7): 10:18; 11:4, 8, 9; 49:7. Cf. διασπείρω used for נפץ (1); פרד (1).
- 51 פצל (2) λεπίζω (2/3): 30:37, 38.
- 52 צבר (2) συνάγω (2/15): 41:35, 49. Cf. συνάγω used for אסף (7); קוה (2); קבץ (2); קום (1); לקט (1).
- 53 צדק (2) δικάιόω (2/2): 38:26; 44:16.

- 54 צוד (3) *θηρεύω* (3/3): 27:3, 5, 33.
- 55 קוה (2) *συνάγω* (2/15): 1:9[+]. Cf. *συνάγω* used for אסף (7); קבץ (2); צבר (2); קום (1); לקט (1).
- 56 קנא (3) *ζηλόω* (3/3): 26:14; 30:1; 37:11.
- 57 קצה (2) *ὀργίζω* (2/4): 40:2; 41:10. Cf. *ὀργίζω* used for חרה (1); רגז (1).
- 58 קרע (3) *διαρρήγνυμι* (3/3): 37:29, 34; 44:13.
- 59 רדה (2) *ἄρχω* (2/13): 1:26, 28. Cf. *ἄρχω* used for חלל (6); משל (3); ברא (1); יאל (1).
- 60 רוח (2) *δσφραίνομαι* (2/2): 8:21; 27:27.
- 61 רחץ (5) *νίπτω* (4/4): 18:4; 19:2; 43:24, 31.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 24:32).
- 62 שבת (3) *καταπαύω* (3/4): 2:2, 3; 8:22. Cf. *καταπαύω* used for בלה (1).
- 63 שדף (5) *ἀνεμόφθορος* (5/5): [שדף + ה + קדים] (3): [41:7], [24], 27.; [שדף + קדים] (2): 41:6, 23.
- 64 שוף (2) *τηρέω* (2/2): 3:15+.
- 65 שחט (2) *σφάζω* (2/3): 22:10; 37:31. Cf. *σφάζω* used for טבח (1).
- 66 שכח (3) *ἐπιλανθάνομαι* (3/4): 27:45; 40:23; 41:30. Cf. *ἐπιλανθάνομαι* used for נשה (1).
- 67 שכל (5) *ἀτεκνόω* (5/5): 27:45; 31:38; 42:36; 43:14+.
- 68 שכר (2) *μεθύσκω* (2/2): 9:21; 43:34.
- 69 שלש (3) *τριετίζω* (3/3): 15:9++.
- 70 שמם (2) *ἐρημόω* (2/2): [47:19]+.
- 71 שפך (3) *ἐκχέω* (3/4): 9:6+; 37:22. Cf. *ἐκχέω* used for שחת (1).
- 72 שתה (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 שקה (1).
- 73 תלה (3) *κρεμάννυμι* (3/3): 40:19, 22; 41:13.

## Main

- 1 אהב (14) *ἀγαπάω* (10/11): 22:2; 24:67; 25:28+; 29:18, 30, 32; 34:3; 37:3; 44:20. Cf. *ἀγαπάω* used for אהב (1).  
*φιλέω* (4/11): 27:4, 9, 14; 37:4. Cf. *φιλέω* used for נשק (7).
- 2 אהל (2) *σκηνόω* (1/1): 13:12.  
*ἀποσκηνόω* (1/1): 13:18.
- 3 אחר (3) *χρονίζω* (2/2): 32:5; 34:19.  
*κατέχω* (1/4): 24:56. Cf. *κατέχω* used for אסר (2); אחז (1).

- 4 אכל (64) ἐσθίω (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. ἐσθίω used for הָכֵלָה (1); מְאָכֵל (1).  
κατεσθίω (8/8): **31**:15, 38; **37**:20, 33; **40**:17; **41**:4, 20; **43**:2.  
συνεσθίω (1/1): **43**:32.  
βρώσις (1/8): **2**:16. Cf. βρώσις used for הָכֵלָה (3); מְאָכֵל (2); אָכַל (1).  
κατάβρωσις (1/1): **31**:15.  
συγκαίω (1/1): **31**:40.  
μέλλω + ἀριστάω (1/1): **43**:25.  
συνδειπνέω (1/1): **43**:32.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **47**:24).
- 5 אמר (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**:1, 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, 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+, 28+, 29, 30+; **33**:5+, 8+, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15+; **34**:4+, 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, 14+, 18, 21, 22+, 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 דָּבַר (10); נָאָם (1); קָרָא (1); פָּה (1); דָּבָר (1).  
ἀντιλέγω (1/2): **44**:16. Cf. ἀντιλέγω used for דָּבַר (1).  
φημί (1/1): **24**:47.  
φάσκω (1/1): **26**:20.  
καλέω (1/85): **32**:29. Cf. καλέω used for קָרָא (84).

λαλέω (1/64): 42:22. Cf. λαλέω used for דבר (62); פגג (1).

ἀναγγέλλω (1/17): 48:1. Cf. ἀναγγέλλω used for נגד (14); מלל (1); שוב (1).

“Omitted” (7): see §3.1.7.5 (7: 3:17; 19:9; 23:13; 27:6; 30:28; 38:21; 42:2).

6 ארר (9) ἐπικατάρατος (6/6): 3:14, 17; 4:11; 9:25; 27:29; 49:7.

καταράομαι (3/5): 5:29; 12:3; 27:29. Cf. καταράομαι used for קלל (2).

7 בוא (220) ἔρχομαι (75/86): 11:31; 12:5; 13:18; 14:5, 7; 16:8; 18:21; 19:1, 9; [22:3], 9; 23:2; 24:30, 41, 42, 63; 25:29; 26:27; 27:30, 33, 35; 29:6, 9; 30:38+; 31:24; 32:7, 9, 12; 33:1, 14, 18+; 34:5, 7, 20; 35:6, 16, 27; 37:10+, 14, 19, 23, 25; 39:16; 41:14, 29, 35, 50, 54, 57; 42:5+, 6, 10, 12, 15, 29; 43:21, 25; 45:25; 46:1; 47:1+, [6], 15, 18; [48:1], 2, 5, 7+; 49:6, 10. Cf. ἔρχομαι used for הלך (3); בלה (1).

εἰσέρχομαι (56/57): 6:18, 20; 7:1, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16; 12:11, 14; 16:2, 4; 19:3, 5, 8, 22, 23, 31, 33, 34; 20:3, 13; 24:31, 32, 67; 29:21, 23, 30; 30:3, 4, [10], 16+; 31:33+; 34:25, 27; 38:2, 8, 9, 16+, 18; 39:11, 14, 17; 40:6; 41:21+; 43:26, 30; 44:14; 46:6, 8, 26, 27. Cf. εἰσέρχομαι used for קום (1).

ἕως + ἔρχομαι (5/5): [י + בוא] (5): 10:19+, 30; 13:10; 25:18.

ἀπέρχομαι (3/27): 15:15; 31:18; 45:17. Cf. ἀπέρχομαι used for הלך (21); שוב (2).

ἐπέρχομαι (1/1): 42:21.

εἰσάγω (11/13): 6:19; 8:9; 29:13, 23; 39:14, 17; 43:16, 17, 18+; 47:7. Cf. εἰσάγω used for לקח (2).

ἄγω (10/13): 2:19, 22; 42:20, 34, 37; 43:9; 44:32; 46:7, 32; 47:17. Cf. ἄγω used for יצא (1); ירד (1).

ἐπάγω (5/7): 6:17; 18:19; 20:9; 26:10; 27:12. Cf. ἐπάγω used for מטר (1); עבר (1).

ἀπάγω (1/6): 42:19. Cf. ἀπάγω used for נהג (2); אסר (2); אָסיר (1).

κατάγω (1/10): 37:28. Cf. κατάγω used for ירד (9).

φέρω (9/16): 4:3, 4; 27:4, 7, 14; 30:14; [33:11]; 43:2.; [י + יד + פ + בוא + ה] (1): 32:14. Cf. φέρω used for לקח (1); נשא (1); ירד (1); נתן (1); יהב (1); שָׁאַת (1).

εἰσφέρω (6/6): 27:10, 18, 25, 33; 37:32; 47:14.

προσφέρω (2/4): 27:31; 43:26. Cf. προσφέρω used for נשא (1); נגש (1).

καταφέρω (1/1): 37:2.

ἀναφέρω (1/5): 31:39. Cf. ἀναφέρω used for עלה (4).

ἦκω (8/10): 6:13; 42:7, 9; 45:16, 18; 46:31; 47:4, 5. Cf. ἦκω used for שוב (1); קום (1).

παραγίνομαι (6/7): 14:13; 26:32; [32:21]; 35:9; 45:19; 50:10. Cf. παραγίνομαι used for צוה (1).

εἰσπορεύομαι (5/5): 6:4; 7:16; 23:10, 18; 44:30.

πορεύομαι (2/65): 24:62; 37:30. Cf. πορεύομαι used for הלך (61); שוב (1); ירד (1).

δυσμῆ (2/2): 15:12, 17.

δύω (1/1): 28:11.

προβαίνω (2/3): 18:11; 24:1. Cf. προβαίνω used for הלך (1).

εὐδοκιμέω + ἀπέχω (1/1): [י + לָא + בוא] (1): 43:23.

- εἰσπαύμαι* (1/1): 19:10.
- εἰμί* (1/505): 30:33. Cf. *εἰμί* used for היה (150); הוא (30); היא (23); אֶנִּי (13); יֵשׁ (13); הִנֵּה (2); זֶה (2); נָקָה (2); עָשָׂה (3); עוֹד (5); אָתָּה (5); הִנֵּה (5); אָתָּה (6); אֲנִי (7); בֵּן (7); אָתָּם (7); הֵם (9); נָקָה (11); מוֹת (1); בָּאֵשׁ (1); כָּבֵד (1); יָד (1); נָחֲנוּ (1); אֶפֹּא (1); נִנוּ (1); אֶסֶר (1); רָעַע (1); אֲנִכִּי (2); לֹוֶה (1); לָטַשׁ (1); כָּבֵד (1); הָן (1); גָּדַל (1).
- ὁ + πατήρ + αὐτός* (1/1): [בוא + ל] (1): 27:5.
- κατά* (1/94): [מן + בוא] (1): 24:62.
- ἀναστρέφω* (1/9): 8:11. Cf. *ἀναστρέφω* used for שׁוּב (7); שׁוֹר (1).
- “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1): 46:28.
- 8 בחן (2) *φαίνω* (1/8): 42:15. Cf. *φαίνω* used for רָעַע (3); אֹר (2); חָרָה (1).  
*φανερὸς + γίνομαι* (1/1): 42:16.
- 9 בכה (16) *κλαίω* (14/14): 21:16; 27:38; 29:11; 33:4; 37:35; 42:24; 43:30+; 45:14+, 15; 46:29; 50:1, 17.  
*πενθέω* (2/4): 23:2; 50:3. Cf. *πενθέω* used for אָבֵל (1); אָבֵל (1).
- 10 בנה (16) *οἰκοδομέω* (13/13): 2:22; 4:17; 8:20; 10:11; 11:4, 5, 8; 12:7, 8; 13:18; 22:9; 26:25; 35:7.  
*τεκνοποιέω* (2/3): 16:2; 30:3.  
*ποιέω* (1/165): 33:17. Cf. *ποιέω* used for עָשָׂה (138); שִׁים (11); בָּרָא (9); נָתַן (2); יָטַב (2); עָכַר (1); נָשָׂה (1).
- 11 ברא (11) *ποιέω* (9/165): 1:1, 21, 27++; 5:1, 2+; 6:7. Cf. *ποιέω* used for עָשָׂה (138); שִׁים (11); נָתַן (2); יָטַב (2); בָּנָה (1); עָכַר (1); נָשָׂה (1).  
*ἄρχω* (1/13): 2:3. Cf. *ἄρχω* used for חָלַל (6); מָשַׁל (3); רָדָה (2); יָאֵל (1).  
*γίνομαι* (1/201): 2:4. Cf. *γίνομαι* used for היה (155); יָלַד (18); גָּדַל (4); עָשָׂה (3); יָטַב (2); קָלִיל (1); שָׁמַע (1); בָּחַן (1); יָדַע (1); הָיָא (1); הוּא (1); עָצַם (1); מוֹלְדֵת (1); לָא (1); עָלָה (1); רָבַב (2).
- 12 ברך (73) *εὐλογέω* (62/62): 1:22, 28; 2:3; 5:2; 9:1; 12:2, 3+; [14:19]+; 17:16+, 20; 22:17+; 24:1, 35, 48, 60; 25:11; 26:3, 12, 24; 27:4, 7, 10, 19, 23, 25, 27+, 29+, 30, 31, 33+, 34, 38, 41; 28:1, 3, 6+; 30:27, 30; 32:1, 27, 30; 35:9; 39:5; 47:7, 10; 48:3, 9, 15, 16, 20+; 49:25, 28+.  
*εὐλογητός* (6/7): 9:26; 14:20; 24:27, 31; 26:29; [43:28]. Cf. *εὐλογητός* used for בָּרַךְ (1).  
*ἐνευλογέω* (5/5): 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14.
- 13 גוע (6) *ἐκλείπω* (4/17): 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33. Cf. *ἐκλείπω* used for חָרַב (2); עָנָי (2); תָּמַם (2); אָפַס (2); סוֹר (1); לָהֶה (1); כָּלָה (1); חָדַל (1); בָּצַר (1).  
*τελευτάω* (1/6): 6:17. Cf. *τελευτάω* used for מוֹת (4); מָוֶת (1).  
*ἀποθνήσκω* (1/69): 7:21. Cf. *ἀποθνήσκω* used for מוֹת (63); מָוֶת (4); כָּרַת (1).
- 14 גלל (4) *ἀποκυλίω* (3/3): 29:3, 8, 10.  
*συκοφαντέω* (1/1): 43:18.
- 15 גנב (12) *κλέπτω* (7/7): 30:33; 31:19, 30, 32; 40:15; [44:4], 8.  
*κλέμμα* (2/2): 31:39+.  
*κλοποφορέω* (1/1): 31:27.  
*κλοπή* (1/1): 40:15.



- κρύπτω (1/6): 31:20. Cf. κρύπτω used for חבא (2); כסה (2); סתר (1).
- 16 דבר (73) λαλέω (62/64): 12:4; 16:13; 17:3, 22, 23; 18:19, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33; 19:14, 21; 20:8; 21:1, 2; 23:8, 16; 24:7, 15, 30, 33+, 45, 51; 27:5, 6, 19; 28:15; 29:9; 31:24, 29; 32:20; 34:3, 6, 8, 13, 20; 35:13, 14, 15; 37:4; 39:10, 17, 19; 41:9, 17; 42:7, 30; 43:19; 44:7, 16, 18; 45:12, 15, 27; 49:28; 50:4+, 17, 21. Cf. λαλέω used for פגע (1); אמר (1).  
λέγω (10/622): 8:15; 18:5; 23:3, 13; 41:28; 42:14, 24; 44:2, 6; 45:27. Cf. λέγω used for אמר (604); נאם (1); קרא (1); פה (1); דבר (1).  
ἀντιλέγω (1/2): 24:50. Cf. ἀντιλέγω used for אמר (1).
- 17 דבר (5) ἐκζητέω (4/4): 9:5++; 42:22.  
πυνθάνομαι (1/1): 25:22.
- 18 הלך (125) πορεύομαι (61/65): 2:14; 3:14; 8:3, 5; 9:23; 11:31; 12:4, 5, 9; 13:3; 16:8; 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. πορεύομαι used for בוא (2); שוב (1); ירד (1).  
συμπορεύομαι (3/3): 13:5; 14:24; 18:16.  
προπορεύομαι (2/4): 32:20, 21. Cf. προπορεύομαι used for עבר (1).  
πορεία (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 בוא (3); שוב (2).  
ἔρχομαι (3/86): 18:22; 32:7; 50:18. Cf. ἔρχομαι used for בוא (75); כלה (1).  
διέρχομαι (2/4): [4:8]; 22:5. Cf. διέρχομαι used for עבר (2).  
ἐξέρχομαι (1/54): 12:1. Cf. ἐξέρχομαι used for יצא (51); תמם (1).  
εὐαρεστέω (6/7): 5:22, 24; 6:9; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15. Cf. εὐαρεστέω used for שרת (1).  
οἶχομαι (3/3): 12:4; 25:34; 31:19.  
ἀποίχομαι (2/3): 14:12; 26:31. Cf. ἀποίχομαι used for שלח (1).  
δεῦρο (3/4): 19:32; 31:44; 37:13.  
δεῦτε (2/5): 37:20, 27. Cf. δεῦτε used for יהב (3).  
περιπατέω (2/2): 3:8, [10].  
ἀποτρέχω (2/3): 12:19; 24:51. Cf. ἀποτρέχω used for שוב (1).  
ἀπολύω (1/1): 15:2.  
διοδεύω (1/2): 13:17. Cf. διοδεύω used for עבר (1).  
προβαίνω (1/3): 26:13. Cf. προβαίνω used for בוא (2).  
ἀποδιδράσκω (1/10): 28:2. Cf. ἀποδιδράσκω used for ברח (9).  
ἐπιφέρω (1/3): 7:18. Cf. ἐπιφέρω used for רחף (1); שלח (1).  
βαδίζω (1/2): 42:19. Cf. βαδίζω used for שוב (1).  
“Omitted” (5): see §3.1.8 (4: 24:10; 26:13; 33:12; 45:17); §3.1.7.4 (1: 31:30).
- 19 הפך (4) καταστρέφω (3/4): 19:21, 25, 29. Cf. καταστρέφω used for שחת (1).  
στρέφω (1/1): 3:24.

- 20 הרג (17) ἀποκτείνω (16/20): 4:8, 14, 15, 23, 25; 12:12; [20:2], 11; 26:7; 27:41, 42; 34:25, 26; 37:20, 26; 49:6. Cf. ἀποκτείνω used for מוח (4).  
ἀπόλλυμι (1/10): 20:4. Cf. ἀπόλλυμι used for חת (7); ספה (1); אבד (1).
- 21 הרה (23) συλλαμβάνω (19/20): 4:1, 17, [25]; 16:4; 19:36; 21:2; 29:32, 33, 34, 35; 30:5, 7, [10], [12], 17, 19, 23; 38:3, 4. Cf. συλλαμβάνω used for נִפְתּוּלִים (1).  
λαμβάνω + ἐν + γαστήρ (1/1): 25:21.  
ἐν + γαστήρ + λαμβάνω (1/2): 38:18.  
ἐν + γαστήρ + ἔχω (2/5): 16:4, 5.
- 22 זכר (10) μιμνήσκομαι (9/11): 8:1; 9:15, 16; 19:29; 30:22; 40:14+, 23; 42:9. Cf. μιμνήσκομαι used for נִשָּׂא (2).  
ἀναμιμνήσκω (1/1): 41:9.
- 23 זרע (7) σπείρω (6/6): 1:11, 12, 29; 26:12; [47:19], 23.  
σπέρμα (1/60): 1:29. Cf. σπέρμα used for זֶרַע (58); נֶזֶן (1).
- 24 חבא (3) κρύπτω (2/6): 3:8, 10. Cf. κρύπτω used for כִּסָּה (2); סתר (1); גנב (1).  
κρυφῆ (1/1): 31:27.
- 25 חזק (6) κρατέω (2/2): 19:16; 21:18.  
ἐπικρατέω (2/4): 41:57; 47:20. Cf. ἐπικρατέω used for גבר (2).  
ἐνισχύω (1/7): 48:2. Cf. ἐνισχύω used for כָּבֵד (4); שרה (1); נהל (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:56).
- 26 חטא (8) ἁμαρτάνω (6/7): 20:6, 9; 39:9; 40:1; 43:9; 44:32. Cf. ἁμαρτάνω used for חָטָא (1).  
ἀποτίννυω (1/1): 31:39.  
ἀδικέω (1/4): 42:22. Cf. ἀδικέω used for שקר (1); עשק (1).
- 27 חיה (63) ζάω (52/74): 3:22; 5:3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26, [27], 28, 30; 9:28; 11:11, 12, 13[+][+], 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26; 12:13; 17:18; 19:19, 20; 20:7; 25:7; 27:40; 31:32; [35:28]; 42:2, 18; 43:8; 47:19; 50:22.  
Cf. ζάω used for חַי (20); חַי (2).  
ἐπιζάω (1/1): 47:28.  
τρέφω (2/3): 6:19, 20. Cf. τρέφω used for רעה (1).  
διατρέφω (2/3): 7:3; 50:20. Cf. διατρέφω used for בול (1).  
ἐκτρέφω (1/3): 45:7. Cf. ἐκτρέφω used for בול (1); נהל (1).  
ἐξανίστημι (2/5): 19:32, 34. Cf. ἐξανίστημι used for קום (2); שית (1).  
περιποιέω (1/3): 12:12. Cf. περιποιέω used for רכש (2).  
ἀναζωπυρέω (1/1): 45:27.  
σώζω (1/8): 47:25. Cf. σώζω used for מלט (4); פְּלִיטָה (1); נצל (1).
- 28 חלל (8) ἄρχω (6/13): 6:1; 9:20; 10:8; 11:6; 41:54; 44:12. Cf. ἄρχω used for משל (3); רדה (2); ברא (1); יאל (1).  
ἐλπίζω (1/1): 4:26.

- μιαίνω (1/4): **49:4**. Cf. *μιαίνω* used for טמא (3).
- 29 חלם (14) ἐνυπνιάζω (6/6): **28:12; 37:5, 6, 9, 10; 41:5**.  
 ὀράω + ἐνύπνιον (1/1): **41:1**.  
 ὀράω (7/144): **37:9; 40:5, 8; 41:11+, 15; 42:9**. Cf. ὀράω used for ראה (130); הִנֵּה (2); יָאִי בְּרָאִי לְחַיִּי (1); ירא (1).
- 30 חלם (4) ἀλλάσσω (3/3): **31:7; 35:2; 41:14**.  
 παραλογίζομαι (1/2): **31:41**. Cf. *παραλογίζομαι* used for רמה (1).
- 31 חלם (4) ἐλεέω (3/3): **33:5, 11; 43:29**.  
 καταδέω (1/1): **42:21**.
- 32 חסר (3) ἐλαττονέω (2/2): **8:3, 5**.  
 ἐλαττονόω (1/1): **18:28**.
- 33 חצה (2) διαιρέω (1/4): **32:8**. Cf. *διαιρέω* used for בתר (2).  
 ἐπιδιαιρέω (1/1): **33:1**.
- 34 חשך (4) φείδομαι (3/5): **20:6; 22:12, 16**. Cf. *φείδομαι* used for חֲלָקָה (1); חוס (1).  
 ὑπεξαιρέω (1/1): **39:9**.
- 35 חלם (5) διάλευκος (4/8): **30:32, 33, 35+**. Cf. *διάλευκος* used for חָרָב (4).  
 σποδοειδής (1/3): **30:39**. Cf. *σποδοειδής* used for בָּרָד (2).
- 36 חלם (2) ἄρχω (1/13): **18:27**. Cf. *ἄρχω* used for חָלַל (6); מָשַׁל (3); רדה (2); ברא (1).  
 ἔχω (1/24): **18:31**. Cf. *ἔχω* used for חָרָה (3); הִנֵּה (2); הרה (2); י (2); מִצָּא (1); יֵשׁ (1); לָ (1); בָּ (1); לקח (1); אָחַר (1); רָבַר (1).
- 37 ידע (58) γινώσκω (36/38): **3:5, 7, 22; 4:1, 9, 17, 25; 8:11; 9:24; 12:11; 15:8, 13+; 18:21; 19:8; 20:6, 7; 21:26; 22:12; 24:14, 16, 21, [44]; 27:2; 29:5+; 30:26, 29; 33:13; 38:9, 16, 26; 39:8; 42:33, 34; 44:27**. Cf. *γινώσκω* used for יָדַעַת (1); ראה (1).  
 ἐπιγινώσκω (1/12): **41:31**. Cf. *ἐπιγινώσκω* used for נכר (10).  
 ἀναγνωρίζω (1/1): **45:1**.  
 οἶδα (15/17): **3:5; [18:19]; 19:33, 35; 25:27; 28:16; 31:6, 32; 39:6; 42:23; 43:7, 22; 44:15; 48:19+**. Cf. *οἶδα* used for יָדַעַת (1); ראה (1).  
 συγγίγνομαι (1/2): **19:5**. Cf. *συγγίγνομαι* used for היה (1).  
 διάδηλος + γίνομαι (1/1): **41:21**.  
 δείκνυμι (1/5): **41:39**. Cf. *δείκνυμι* used for ראה (3); נגד (1).  
 ἐπίσταμαι (1/1): **47:6**.  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.7.4 (1: **43:7**).
- 38 יכל (22) δύναιμι (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. *δύναιμι* used for חָדַל (1).  
 δυνατός (1/3): **32:29**. Cf. *δυνατός* used for עצם (1); חֵיל (1).

- 39 יס' (15) προστίθῃμι (12/17): 4:2, 12; 8:12, 21+; 18:29; 25:1; 30:24; 37:8; 38:5, 26; 44:23. Cf. προστίθῃμι used for יס'א (5).  
 πάλιν (2/9): 8:10, [12]. Cf. πάλιν used for שוב (5); ע' (1).  
 "Omitted" (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 37:5).
- 40 יצ' (80) ἐξέρχομαι (51/54): 4:16; 8:7, 16, 18, 19; 9:10, 18; 10:11, 14; 12:4, 5; 14:8, 17; 15:4, 14; 17:6; 19:6, 14+, [15], 23; 24:5, [43], 50, 63; 25:25, 26; 27:3, 30; 28:10; 30:16; 31:13, 33; 34:1, 6, 26; 35:11; 38:28, 29, 30; 39:12, [13], 15, [18]; 41:46; 42:15; 43:31; 44:4, 28; 46:26; 47:10. Cf. ἐξέρχομαι used for הלך (1); תמם (1).  
 ἐξάγω (13/17): 1:24; 8:17; [11:31]; 15:5, 7; 19:5, 8, 12, 17; 38:24; 40:14; 43:23; 48:12. Cf. ἐξάγω used for ר'ש (2); תעה (1); ר' (1).  
 ἄγω (1/13): 38:25. Cf. ἄγω used for בוא (10); ירד (1).  
 ἐκπορεύομαι (6/6): 2:10; 24:11, 13, 15, 45; 34:24.  
 ἐκφέρω (3/3): 1:12; 14:18; 24:53.  
 οὐ + ὑποστρέφω (1/1): [שוב + י + יצ'א] (1): 8:7.  
 ἀφίημι (1/7): 35:18. Cf. ἀφίημι used for נשא (3); נתן (2); נוח (1).  
 ἐξίστημι (1/4): 42:28. Cf. ἐξίστημι used for חרד (1); תמה (1); פוג (1).  
 ἐξαποστέλλω (1/12): 45:1. Cf. ἐξαποστέλλω used for שלח (10).  
 "Omitted" (2): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:45); §3.1.7.4 (1: 27:30).
- 41 יק' (5) ἐγείρω (2/3): 41:4, 7. Cf. ἐγείρω used for קום (1).  
 ἐξεγείρω (2/2): 28:16; 41:21.  
 ἐκνήφω (1/1): 9:24.
- 42 יר' (20) φοβέω (17/20): 3:10; 15:1; 18:15; 19:30; [20:2], 8; 21:17; 26:7, 24; [28:13], 17; 32:8; 42:35; 43:23; 46:3; 50:19, 21. Cf. φοβέω used for יר'א (3).  
 φοβερός (1/1): 28:17.  
 θαρσέω (1/1): [יר'א + ל'א] (1): 35:17.  
 ὁράω (1/144): 43:18. Cf. ὁράω used for ראה (130); חלם (8); הנה (2); יראי (1).  
 בְּאֵר לְחַי רֵאִי (1).
- 43 ירד' (39) καταβαίνω (23/25): 11:5, 7; 12:10; 15:11; 18:21; 24:16, 45; 26:2; 28:12; 37:35; 38:1; 42:2, 3, 38; 43:4, 15, 20; 44:23, 26+; 45:9; 46:3, 4. Cf. καταβαίνω used for שוב (1); י'ש (1).  
 κατάγω (9/10): 37:25; 39:1+; 42:38; 43:11; 44:21, 29, 31; 45:13. Cf. κατάγω used for בוא (1).  
 ἄγω (1/13): 43:7. Cf. ἄγω used for בוא (10); יצ'א (1).  
 καθαιρέω (3/4): 24:18, 46; 44:11. Cf. καθαιρέω used for ירד (1).  
 πορεύομαι (1/65): 43:5. Cf. πορεύομαι used for הלך (61); בוא (2); שוב (1).  
 φέρω (1/16): 43:22. Cf. φέρω used for בוא (8); לקח (1); נשא (1); נתן (1); יהב (1); שָׁאַת (1).  
 "Omitted" (1): see §3.1.7.4 (1: 43:20).
- 44 ירש' (10) κληρονομέω (9/10): 15:3, 4+, 7, 8; 21:10; 22:17; 24:60; 28:4. Cf. κληρονομέω used for אחז (1).  
 ἐκτρίβω (1/7): 45:11. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for שחת (3); שמד (1); כרת (1); כחד (1).

- 45 ישב (72) κατοικέω (33/42): 11:2, 31; 13:6+, 7, 12+, 18; 14:7, 12; 19:25, 29, 30; 20:15; 21:20, 21; 22:19; 24:62; 25:11; 26:6, 17; 34:10+, [15], 30; 36:20; 37:1; 45:10; 46:34; 47:4, 6, 27; 50:22. Cf. κατοικέω used for שכן (7); בָּ (1); נִבְלָ (1).  
οικέω (17/18): 4:16, 20; 16:3; 19:30; 20:1; 24:3, 37; 25:27; 27:44; 29:19; 34:16, 21, 22, 23; 35:1; 36:7, 8. Cf. οικέω used for אִישׁ (1).  
κατοικίζω (2/3): 47:6, 11. Cf. κατοικίζω used for שכן (1).  
κάτοικος (1/1): 50:11.  
κάθημαι (7/7): 18:1; 19:1, 30; 21:16; 23:10; 38:11+.  
καθίζω (7/8): 21:16; 22:5; 27:19; 37:25; 38:14; 43:33; 48:2. Cf. καθίζω used for נוח (1).  
ἐπικαθίζω (1/1): 31:34.  
μένω (1/2): 24:55. Cf. μένω used for עמד (1).  
παραμένω (1/1): 44:33.  
εἰμί (1/505): 29:14. Cf. εἰμί used for היה (150); הוא (30); היא (23); אֲנִי (13); יֵשׁ (13); הָיָה (11); נָקָה (2); זָה (2); עָשָׂה (2); עוֹד (3); אָתָּה (5); הִנֵּה (5); אָתָּה (5); אֲנִי (6); אֲנִי (7); בָּן (7); אָתָּה (7); הֵם (9); הָם (11); מוֹת (1); בָּאשׁ (1); כְּבֹד (1); דָּ (1); נִחְנוּ (1); אָפֹא (1); יָנוּ (1); יָם (1); אֶסֶר (1); רָעַע (2); אֲנֹכִי (2); גָּדַל (1); הָן (1); כָּבֹד (1); לָטַשׁ (1); לֹוֹה (1); בּוֹא (1); שִׁנְטְרִיב (1/2): 49:24. Cf. συντρίβω used for שֶׁבֶר (1).
- 46 יתר (4) ὑπολείπω (3/7): 30:36; 32:25; 44:20. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for אֶצֶל (1); שִׁים (1); שָׂאָר (1); עֶזְב (1).  
ἐκζέω (1/1): 49:4.
- 47 כון (3) ἐτοιμάζω (2/5): 43:16, 25. Cf. ἐτοιμάζω used for יָכַח (2); פָּנָה (1).  
ἀληθής (1/1): 41:32.
- 48 כסף (2) ἐπιθυμέω (1/2): 31:30. Cf. ἐπιθυμέω used for נָגַרְם (1).  
ἐπιθυμία (1/2): 31:30. Cf. ἐπιθυμία used for רִצּוֹן (1).
- 49 כרת (8) διατίθημι (5/6): 15:18; 21:27, 32; 26:28; 31:44. Cf. διατίθημι used for קוּם (1).  
ἀποθνήσκω (1/69): 9:11. Cf. ἀποθνήσκω used for מוֹת (63); מָוֶת (4); גּוּעַ (1).  
ἐξολεθρεύω (1/1): 17:14.  
ἐκτρίβω (1/7): 41:36. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for שָׁחַח (3); שָׁמַד (1); יָרַשׁ (1); כָּחַד (1).
- 50 לבש (6) ἐνδύω (4/4): 3:21; 27:15; 38:19; 41:42.  
περιτίθημι (1/4): 27:16. Cf. περιτίθημι used for שִׁים (2); נָתַן (1).  
περιβάλλω (1/3): 28:20. Cf. περιβάλλω used for כָּסָה (2).
- 51 לקח (142) λαμβάνω (124/131): 2:15, 21, 22, 23; 3:6, 19, 22, 23; 4:19; 6:2, 21; 8:9, 20; 9:23; 11:29, 31; 12:5, 19+; 14:11, 12, 21, 23, 24; 15:9, 10; 16:3; 17:23; 18:4, 5, 7, 8; 19:14, 15; 20:2, 3, 14; 21:14, 21, 27, 30; 22:2, 6+, 10, 13; 23:13; 24:3, 4, 7+, 10, 22, 37, 38, 40, 48, 51, 65, 67; 25:1, 20; 26:34; 27:9, 14, 15, 35, 36+, 46; 28:1, 2, 6+, 9, 11, 18; 29:23; 30:9, 15+, 37; 31:1, 32, 34, 45, 50; 32:14, 23, 24; 33:11+; 34:2, 4, 9, 16, 17, 21, 25, 26, 28; 36:2, 6; 37:24, 31; 38:2, 6, 28; 39:20; 40:11; 42:16, 24, 33, 36; 43:11, 12, 13, 15+, 18; 44:29; 45:19; 48:13, 22. Cf. λαμβάνω used for נָשָׂא (3); הָרָה (2); קָשַׁר (1); הָאָ (1).

- παραλαμβάνω (4/4): **22:3; 31:23; 45:18; 47:2.**  
 ἀναλαμβάνω (3/7): **24:61; 46:6; 48:1.** Cf. ἀναλαμβάνω used for נשׂא (4).  
 δέχομαι (2/3): **4:11; 33:10.** Cf. δέχομαι used for נשׂא (1).  
 εἰσάγω (2/13): **7:2; 12:15.** Cf. εἰσάγω used for בוא (11).  
 προσάγω (1/2): **48:9.** Cf. προσάγω used for נגן (1).  
 μετατίθημι (1/1): **5:24.**  
 φέρω (1/16): **27:13.** Cf. φέρω used for בוא (8); נשׂא (1); ירד (1); נתן (1); יהב (1); שָׁאַת (1).  
 μεταπέμπω (1/1): **27:45.**  
 συλλέγω (1/2): **31:46.** Cf. συλλέγω used for לקט (1).  
 κομίζω (1/1): **38:20.**  
 ἔχω (1/24): **38:23.** Cf. ἔχω used for הָרָה (3); הָנָה (2); הררה (2); י (2); יאֵל (1); מצא (1); ישׁ (1); לֵ (1); רבִּי (1); אֶחָד (1); רבִּי (1).
- 52 מהר** (13) σπεύδω (8/8): **18:6+; 19:22; 24:18, 20, 46; 44:11; 45:9.**  
 ταχύνω (3/3): **18:7; 41:32; 45:13.**  
 ταχύς (1/1): **27:20.**  
 ταράσσω (1/6): **43:30.** Cf. ταράσσω used for מהה (1); זעף (1); פעם (1); חרד (1); בהל (1).
- 53 מול** (17) περιτέμνω (16/16): **17:10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27; 21:4; 34:15, 17, 22+, 24.**  
 περιτομή (1/1): **17:13.**
- 54 מות** (86) ἀποθνήσκω (63/69): **2:17; 3:3, 4; 5:5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31; 7:22; 9:29; [11:11], [13][+], [15], [17], [19], [21], [23], [25], 28, 32; 19:19; 20:3, 7; 23:2; 25:8, 17; 26:9; 27:4; 33:13; 35:8, 18, 19, 29; 36:33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39; 38:11, 12; 42:2, 20, 38; 43:8; [44:9], 20, 22; 45:28; 46:12, 30; 47:15, 19+, 29; 48:7, 21; 50:24.** Cf. ἀποθνήσκω used for מָוֶת (4); גוע (1); כרת (1).  
 θάνατος (3/4): **2:17; 3:4; 26:11.** Cf. θάνατος used for מָוֶת (1).  
 θανατόω (1/1): **38:10.**  
 θνήσκω (1/1): **50:15.**  
 νεκρός (8/8): **23:3, 4, 6+, 8, 11, 13, 15.**  
 ἀποκτείνω (4/20): **18:25; 37:18; 38:7; 42:37.** Cf. ἀποκτείνω used for הרג (16).  
 τελευτάω (4/6): **25:32; 30:1; 44:31; 50:26.** Cf. τελευτάω used for גוע (1); מָוֶת (1).  
 ἔνοχος + εἰμί (1/1): **26:11.**  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.7.4 (1: 20:7).
- 55 מחה** (4) ἐξάλειφω (3/4): **7:4, 23+.** Cf. ἐξάλειφω used for שׁחַת (1).  
 ἀπαλείφω (1/1): **6:7.**
- 56 מטר** (3) βρέχω (2/2): **2:5; 19:24.**  
 ἐπάγω + ὑετός (1/1): **7:4.**
- 57 מכר** (10) ἀποδίδωμι (9/18): **25:31, 33; 37:27, 28, 36; 45:4, 5; 47:20, 22.** Cf. ἀποδίδωμι used for שׁוּב (6); נתן (2); יהב (1).  
 πιπράσκω (1/1): **31:15.**

- 58 מל א (16) πίμπλημι (6/6): 6:11, 13; 21:19; 24:16; 26:15; 44:1.  
 πληρόω (6/7): 1:22, 28; 9:1; 25:24; 29:21; 50:3. Cf. πληρόω used for שרץ (1).  
 ἀναπληρόω (1/3): 29:28. Cf. ἀναπληρόω used for סג (1); שׁץ (1).  
 ἐμπίπλημι (1/1): 42:25.  
 συντελέω (1/11): 29:27. Cf. συντελέω used for כלה (8); רעע (1).  
 καταριθμέω (1/1): 50:3.
- 59 מל ט (5) σῶζω (4/8): 19:17+, 20, 22. Cf. σῶζω used for פְּלִיטָה (1); נצל (1); חיה (1).  
 διασῶζω (1/2): 19:19. Cf. διασῶζω used for שמר (1).
- 60 מצא א (56) εὕρισκω (54/56): 2:20; 4:14, 15; 6:8; 8:9; 11:2; 16:7; 18:3, 26, 28, 29, 30+, 31, 32; 19:19; 26:12, 19, 32; 27:20; 30:14, 27; 31:32, 33, 34, 35, 37; 32:6, 20; 33:8, 10, 15; 34:11; 36:24; 37:15, 17, 32; 38:20, 22, 23; 39:4; 41:38; 44:8, 9, 10, 12, 16+, 17, 34; 47:14, 25, 29; 50:4. Cf. εὕρισκω used for נשׁ (1).  
 ζητέω (1/5): 19:11. Cf. ζητέω used for בקשׁ (4).  
 ἔχω (1/24): 19:15. Cf. ἔχω used for הָרָה (3); הָנָה (2); הרר (2); י (2); יאל (1); ישׁ (1); ל (1); ק (1); לקח (1); אָחַר (1); רב (1).
- 61 מל ט (3) ἀναβλέπω (1/13): 15:5. Cf. ἀναβλέπω used for נשא (12).  
 περιβλέπω (1/1): 19:17.  
 ἐπιβλέπω (1/2): 19:26. Cf. ἐπιβλέπω used for רשׁ (1).
- 62 מל ט (36) ἀπαγγέλλω (21/22): 12:18; 14:13; 21:26; 24:28, 49+; 26:32; 27:42; 29:12, 15; 37:5; 38:13, 24; 41:24; 42:29; 43:7; 44:24; 45:13; 46:31; 47:1; 48:2. Cf. ἀπαγγέλλω used for פתח (1).  
 ἀναγγέλλω (14/17): 3:11; 9:22; 22:20; 24:23; 29:12; 31:20, 22, 27; 32:6, 30; 37:16; 43:6; 45:26; 49:1. Cf. ἀναγγέλλω used for מלל (1); שׁוב (1); אמר (1).  
 δείκνυμι (1/5): 41:25. Cf. δείκνυμι used for ראה (3); ידע (1).
- 63 מל ט (8) ἄπτω (5/6): 3:3; 20:6; 26:11; 32:26, 33. Cf. ἄπτω used for קרב (1).  
 ἐτάζω (1/1): 12:17.  
 βδελύσσομαι (1/1): 26:29.  
 ἀφικνέομαι (1/3): 28:12. Cf. ἀφικνέομαι used for נט (1); נשׁ (1).
- 64 מל ט (20) ἐγγίζω (12/18): 18:23; 19:9; 27:21, 22, 26, 27; 33:3; 44:18; 45:4+; 48:10, 13. Cf. ἐγγίζω used for קרב (4).  
 προσεγγίζω (3/3): 33:6, 7+.  
 προσέρχομαι (2/3): 29:10; 43:19. Cf. προσέρχομαι used for שׁוב (1).  
 ἀφίστημι (1/6): 19:9. Cf. ἀφίστημι used for עתק (1); מרד (1); שׁים (1); נדד (1); סתר (1).  
 προσάγω (1/2): 27:25. Cf. προσάγω used for לקח (1).  
 προσφέρω (1/4): 27:25. Cf. προσφέρω used for בוא (2); נשא (1).
- 65 מל ט (7) φεύγω (6/6): 14:10+; 39:12, 13, 15, 18.  
 καταφεύγω (1/1): 19:20.

- 66 נחש (5) οἰωνίζομαι (3/3): 30:27; 44:5, 15.  
οἰωνισμός (2/2): 44:5, 15.
- 67 נבר (11) ἐπιγιγνώσκω (10/12): 27:23; 31:32[+]; 37:32, 33; 38:25, 26; 42:7, 8+. Cf. ἐπιγιγνώσκω used for עד (1).  
ἀλλοτριόω (1/1): 42:7.
- 68 נסע (12) ἀπαίρω (7/9): 12:9; 13:11; 33:12, 17; 35:16; 37:17; 46:1. Cf. ἀπαίρω used for עתק (2).  
ἐξάιρω (1/4): 35:5. Cf. ἐξάιρω used for נשא (1); רום (1); אסף (1).  
κινέω (2/8): 11:2; 20:1. Cf. κινέω used for רמש (5); שרץ (1).  
στρατοπεδεύω (1/1): 12:9.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 35:21).
- 69 נפל (18) πίπτω (4/4): 17:3, 17; 44:14; 49:17.  
ἐπιπίπτω (5/6): 15:12+; 45:14; 46:29; 50:1. Cf. ἐπιπίπτω used for חלק (1).  
συμπίπτω (2/2): 4:5, 6.  
ἐμπίπτω (1/1): 14:10.  
προσπίπτω (1/1): 33:4.  
ἐπιβάλλω (1/6): 2:21. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for שית (3); שלח (1); נשא (1).  
καταπηδάω (1/1): 24:64.  
κατοικέω (1/42): 25:18. Cf. κατοικέω used for ישב (33); שכן (7); בָּ (1).  
ἐπιτίθῃμι (1/11): 43:18. Cf. ἐπιτίθῃμι used for שים (6); זמם (1); ערך (1); נשא (1); עמס (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 50:18).
- 70 נצב (12) ἵστημι (7/36): 18:2; 21:28, 29; 24:13; 33:20; 35:14, 20. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); שים (2); תקע (1); רום (1); ירה (1).  
ἐφίστημι (1/1): 24:43.  
παρίστημι (1/4): 45:1. Cf. παρίστημι used for עמד (2); שרת (1).  
στηρίζω (1/2): 28:12. Cf. στηρίζω used for סמך (1).  
ἐπιστηρίζω (1/1): 28:13.  
ὀρθόω (1/1): 37:7.
- 71 נצל (6) ἐξαιρέω (3/3): 32:12; 37:21, 22.  
ἀφαιρέω (2/7): 31:9, 16. Cf. ἀφαιρέω used for גזל (2); אסף (1); נשא (1); סור (1).  
σώζω (1/8): 32:31. Cf. σώζω used for מלט (4); פָּלִיטָה (1); חיה (1).
- 72 נקם (2) ἐκδικέω (1/2): 4:24.  
ἐκδικέω + παραλύω (1/1): 4:15.
- 73 נשק (11) φιλέω (7/11): 27:26, 27; 29:11, 13; 33:4; 48:10; 50:1. Cf. φιλέω used for אהב (4).  
καταφιλέω (3/3): 31:28; 32:1; 45:15.  
ὕπακούω (1/6): 41:40. Cf. ὕπακούω used for שמע (5).
- 74 נתן (150) δίδωμι (121/124): 1:29; 3:6, 12+; 4:12; 9:2, 3, 12; 12:7; 13:15, 17; 14:20, 21; 15:2, 3, 7, 18; 16:3, 5; 17:8, 16, 20; 18:7; 20:14, 16; 21:14, 27; 23:4, 9+, 11+; 24:7, 32, 35, 36, 41,



53+; **25:5**, 6, 34; **26:3**, 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 יהב (2).  
*ἀποδίδωμι* (2/18): **30:26**; **42:34**. Cf. *ἀποδίδωμι* used for מכר (9); שוב (6); יהב (1).  
*προσδίδωμι* (1/1): **29:33**.  
*ἐπιδίδωμι* (1/2): **49:21**. Cf. *ἐπιδίδωμι* used for צפה (1).  
*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 שים (12); נוח (1); שית (1); אסא (1).  
*παρατίθημι* (1/5): **18:8**. Cf. *παρατίθημι* used for שים (2); ישם (1); יצג (1).  
*περιτίθημι* (1/4): **41:42**. Cf. *περιτίθημι* used for שים (2); לבש (1).  
*ἀφίημι* (2/7): **20:6**; **45:2**. Cf. *ἀφίημι* used for נשא (3); יצא (1); נוח (1).  
*ποιέω* (2/165): **27:37**; **48:4**. Cf. *ποιέω* used for עשה (138); שים (11); ברא (9); יטב (2); בנה (1); עבר (1); נשה (1).  
*καθίστημι* (2/7): **41:41**, 43. Cf. *καθίστημι* used for פקד (3); שית (1); שים (1).  
*προεκφέρω* (1/1): **38:28**.  
*φέρω* (1/16): **43:24**. Cf. *φέρω* used for בוא (8); לקח (1); נשא (1); ירד (1); יהב (1); שאת (1).  
*ἐμβάλλω* (1/7): **39:20**. Cf. *ἐμβάλλω* used for שים (5); שלך (1).  
“Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: **23:11**, 13).

- 75 סחר (5) *ἐμπορεύομαι* (3/3): **34:10**, 21; **42:34**.  
*ἐμπορος* (2/2): **23:16**; **37:28**.
- 76 ספה (4) *ἀπόλλυμι* (1/10): **18:24**. Cf. *ἀπόλλυμι* used for שחת (7); הרג (1); אבד (1).  
*συναπόλλυμι* (2/2): **18:23**; **19:15**.  
*συμπαλαμβάνω* (1/1): **19:17**.
- 77 ספר (13) *διηγέομαι* (7/7): **24:66**; **29:13**; **37:9**; **40:8**, 9; **41:8**, 12.  
*ἀριθμέω* (4/5): **15:5**; **16:10**; **32:13**; **41:49**. Cf. *ἀριθμέω* used for ריק (1).  
*ἐξαριθμέω* (1/3): **15:5**. Cf. *ἐξαριθμέω* used for מנה (2).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **37:10**).
- 78 עבד (24) *δουλεύω* (15/15): **14:4**; **15:14**; **25:23**; **27:29**, 40; **29:15**, 18, 20, 25, 30; **30:26+**, 29; **31:6**, 41.  
*δουλός* (1/1): **15:13**.  
*καταδουλός* (1/1): [47:21].  
*ἐργάζομαι* (6/6): **2:5**, 15; **3:23**; **4:2**, 12; **29:27**.  
*γεωργός* (1/2): **49:15**. Cf. *γεωργός* used for אש (1).
- 79 עוד (2) *διαμαρτυρέω* (1/1): **43:3**.  
*διαμαρτυρία* (1/1): **43:3**.
- 80 עזב (11) *καταλείπω* (7/11): **2:24**; **39:12**, 13, 15, 18; **44:22+**. Cf. *καταλείπω* used for שאר (3); יצג (1).  
*ἐγκαταλείπω* (2/2): **24:27**; **28:15**.  
*ὕπολείπω* (1/7): **50:8**. Cf. *ὕπολείπω* used for יתר (3); אצל (1); שים (1); שאר (1).

ἐπιτρέπω (1/1): 39:6.

- 81 עלה (51) ἀναβαίνω (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.  
συναναβαίνω (3/3): 50:7, 9, 14.  
ἀναφέρω (4/5): 8:20; 22:2, 13; 40:10. Cf. ἀναφέρω used for בוא (1).  
συναναφέρω (1/1): 50:25.  
ἀναβιβάζω (2/3): 37:28; 46:4. Cf. ἀναβιβάζω used for רכב (1).  
γίνομαι (1/201): 19:15. Cf. γίνομαι used for היה (155); ילד (18); גדל (4); עשה (3); יטב (2); שמע (1); בחן (1); ידע (1); הִיא (1); הוּהוּ (1); עצם (1); מוֹלֶדֶת (1); לֹא (1); רַבב (1); ברא (1); חֲלִיל (2); (1).  
πρωί (1/19): [עלה + ה + שחר] (1): 32:25. Cf. πρωί used for בֶּקֶר (18).  
τέλος (1/1): 46:4.  
ἀνάγω (1/2): 50:24. Cf. ἀνάγω used for שוב (1).
- 82 עמד (16) ἵστημι (12/36): 18:22; 19:17, 27; 24:30, 31; 29:35; 30:9; 41:1, 17, 46; 43:15; 47:7. Cf. ἵστημι used for קום (7); נצב (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); שים (2); תקע (1); רום (1); ירה (1).  
παρίστημι (2/4): 18:8; 45:1. Cf. παρίστημι used for שרת (1); נצב (1).  
νέμω (1/3): 41:3. Cf. νέμω used for רעה (2).  
μένω (1/2): 45:9. Cf. μένω used for ישב (1).
- 83 ענה (20) ἀποκρίνομαι (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.  
ἐπακούω (2/9): 30:33; 35:3. Cf. ἐπακούω used for שמע (6); עתר (1).
- 84 ענה (5) ταπεινός (3/4): 16:9; 31:50; 34:2. Cf. ταπεινός used for רעע (1).  
κακός (2/3): 15:13; 16:6. Cf. κακός used for רעע (1).
- 85 עשה (153) ποιέω (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; 9:6, 24; 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. ποιέω used for שים (11); ברא (9); נתן (2); יטב (2); בנה (1); נשה (1); עבר (1).  
χράσμαι (4/5): 16:6; 19:8; 26:29; [34:31]. Cf. χράσμαι used for יטב (1).  
γίνομαι (3/201): 42:25; 44:2; 50:20. Cf. γίνομαι used for היה (155); ילד (18); גדל (4); יטב (2); בחן (1); ידע (1); הִיא (1); הוּהוּ (1); עצם (1); מוֹלֶדֶת (1); לֹא (1); עלה (1); רַבב (1); ברא (1); חֲלִיל (2); שמע (1).  
εἰμί (2/505): 29:26; 34:7. Cf. εἰμί used for היה (150); הוא (30); הִיא (23); אֵין (13); יֵשׁ (13); נקה (2); זָה (3); עוֹד (5); אֶתְּ (5); הִנֵּה (5); אֶתְּהוּ (6); אֶנְחֵנוּ (7); בֵּן (7); אֶתְּם (9); הֵם (11); הִנֵּה

אָנְכִי (1); כָּבֵד (1); אָסֵר (1); דָּ (1); נָחֲנוּ (1); אָפּוֹא (1); נוֹ (1); ם־ (1); בָּאֵשׁ (1); רָעַע (1); אָנְכִי (2); גָּדַל (1); מוֹת (1); הָן (1); לָטַשׁ (1); יֵשֵׁב (1); לוֹה (1); בּוֹא (1); קָנִין (1); רָכַשׁ (2); קָנָה (10); *κτάομαι* (1/14): 12:5. Cf. *κτάομαι* used for קָנָה (10); רָכַשׁ (2); קָנִין (1).  
 סֻנְטֵלֶעָ (1/11): [עָשָׂה + כָּלָה] (1): 18:21. Cf. *συντελέω* used for כָּלָה (8); מָלָא (1); רָעַע (1).  
*πράσσω* (1/1): 31:28.  
*κακοποιέω* (1/3): [עָשָׂה + רָעַע] (1): 31:29. Cf. *κακοποιέω* used for רָעַע (2).  
 “Omitted” (2): see §3.1.8 (2: 39:22; 45:19).

- 86 עָשָׂר (2) *ἀποδεκατόω* (1/1): 28:22.  
*δέκατος* (1/3): 28:22. Cf. *δέκατος* used for עָשָׂר (1); מֵעֶשֶׂר (1).
- 87 פָּגַע (3) *ἀπαντάω* (1/3): 28:11. Cf. *ἀπαντάω* used for פָּגַע (1); קָרָא (1).  
*συναντάω* (1/3): 32:2. Cf. *συναντάω* used for פָּגַע (1); יָרָה (1).  
*λαλέω* (1/64): 23:8. Cf. *λαλέω* used for דִּבֶּר (62); אָמַר (1).
- 88 פָּגַע (2) *ἀπαντάω* (1/3): 33:8. Cf. *ἀπαντάω* used for פָּגַע (1); קָרָא (1).  
*συναντάω* (1/3): 32:18. Cf. *συναντάω* used for פָּגַע (1); יָרָה (1).
- 89 פָּלַל (3) *προσεύχομαι* (2/2): 20:7, 17.  
*στερέω* (1/2): 48:11. Cf. *στερέω* used for מָנַע (1).
- 90 פָּצַר (3) *βιάζω* (1/1): 33:11.  
*καταβιάζομαι* (1/1): 19:3.  
*παραβιάζομαι* (1/1): 19:9.
- 91 פָּקַח (3) *διανοίγω* (2/2): 3:5, 7.  
*ἀνοίγω* (1/8): 21:19. Cf. *ἀνοίγω* used for פָּתַח (7).
- 92 פָּרָה (15) *αὐξάνω* (14/19): 1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; 17:6, 20; 28:3; 35:11; 41:52; 47:27; 48:4; 49:22+. Cf. *αὐξάνω* used for גָּדַל (3); פָּרַץ (1).  
*αὐξάνω* + *ἐγώ* (1/1): 26:22.
- 93 פָּתַח (9) *ἀνοίγω* (7/8): 7:11; 8:6; 29:31; 30:22; 41:56; 43:21; 44:11. Cf. *ἀνοίγω* used for פָּקַח (1).  
*ἀποσάττω* (1/1): 24:32.  
*λύω* (1/1): 42:27.
- 94 פָּתַר (9) *συγκρίνω* (7/7): 40:8, 16, 22; 41:12, 13, 15+.  
*ἀπαγγέλλω* (1/22): 41:8. Cf. *ἀπαγγέλλω* used for גָּדַל (21).  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 41:12).
- 95 צוּהַ (27) *ἐντέλλομαι* (19/19): 2:16; 3:11, 17; 6:22; 7:5, 9, 16; 12:20; 21:4; 27:8; 28:1, 6; 32:5, 18, 20; 42:25; 44:1; 45:19; 50:12.  
*συντάσσω* (2/2): 18:19; 26:11.  
*προστάσσω* (2/2): 47:11; 50:2.  
*ἐπιτάσσω* (1/1): 49:33.  
*παραγίνομαι* (1/7): 50:16. Cf. *παραγίνομαι* used for בּוֹא (6).  
*ὀρκίζω* (1/5): 50:16. Cf. *ὀρκίζω* used for שָׁבַע (4).

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 49:29).

- 96 צלח (7) εὐσδόω (6/9): 24:21, 40, 42, 56; 39:3, 23. Cf. εὐσδόω used for קרה (1); נחה (1).  
ἐπιτυγχάνω (1/1): 39:2.
- 97 קבר (28) θάπτω (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+, 6, 7, [12], 13, 14. Cf. θάπτω used for חנט (1).  
κατορύσσω (1/1): 48:7.  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 35:8).
- 98 קום (51) ἀνίστημι (35/40): 4:8; 9:9; 13:17; 19:14, 15, 33, 35; 21:18, 32; 22:3, 19; 23:3, 7; 24:10, 54, 61; 25:34; 27:19, 31, 43; 28:2; 31:13, 17, 35; 32:23; 35:1, 3; 37:7; 38:8, 19; 43:8, 13, 15; 44:4; 46:5. Cf. ἀνίστημι used for שכב (5).  
ἵστημι (7/36): 6:18; 9:11; 17:7, 19, 21; 23:17; 26:3. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); נצב (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); שים (2); תקע (1); רום (1); ירה (1).  
ἐξανίστημι (2/5): 18:16; 19:1. Cf. ἐξανίστημι used for חיה (2); שית (1).  
διατίθην (1/6): 9:17. Cf. διατίθην used for ברת (5).  
εἰσέρχομαι (1/57): 19:35. Cf. εἰσέρχομαι used for בוא (56).  
κυρόω (1/1): 23:20.  
συνάγω (1/15): 37:35. Cf. συνάγω used for אסף (7); קוה (2); קבץ (2); צבר (2); לקט (1).  
ἥκω (1/10): 41:30. Cf. ἥκω used for בוא (8); שוב (1).  
ἐγείρω (1/3): 49:9. Cf. ἐγείρω used for יקץ (2).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 31:21).
- 99 קנה (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 רכש (2); עשה (1); קָנָן (1).  
κτίζω (2/2): 14:19, 22.
- 100 קרא (112) καλέω (84/85): 1:5+, 8, 10+; 2:19+, 20, 23; 3:9, 20; 11:9; 12:18; 16:11, 13, 14, 15; 17:5, 15, 19; 19:22, 37, 38; 20:8, 9; 21:3, 12, 17; 22:11, 14, 15; 24:57, 58; 25:26, 30; 26:9, 20, 33[+]; 27:1, 36, 42; 28:19; 29:32, 33, 34, 35; 30:6, 8, 13, 18, 20, 21, 24; 31:4, 47+, 48, 54; 32:3, 31; 33:17; 35:7, 8, 10, 15, 18+; 38:3, 4, 5, 29, 30; 39:14; 41:8, 14, 45, 51, 52; 46:33; 47:29; 48:6; 49:1; 50:11. Cf. καλέω used for אמר (1).  
ἐπικαλέω (7/7): 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; 33:20; 48:16.  
ἐκκαλέω (1/1): 19:5.  
προσκαλέω (1/1): 28:1.  
ἐπονομάζω (12/12): 4:25, 26; 5:2, 3, 29; 21:31; 25:25; 26:18, 21, 22; 30:11.; [קרא + שם] (1): 4:17.  
ὀνομάζω (1/1): 26:18.  
βοάω (3/5): 39:14, 15, 18. Cf. βοάω used for צעק (1); נשא (1).  
κηρύσσω (1/1): [41:43].  
λέγω (1/622): 45:1. Cf. λέγω used for אמר (604); דבר (10); נִאֵם (1); פָּה (1); דִּבֶּר (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 35:10).

- 101 קרא (14) συνάντησις (10/10): 14:17; 18:2; 19:1; 24:17, 65; 29:13; 30:16; 32:7; 33:4; 46:29.  
 ἀπαντάω (1/3): 49:1. Cf. ἀπαντάω used for פגע (1); פגע (1).  
 συμβαίνω (2/5): 42:4, 38. Cf. συμβαίνω used for קרה (2); היה (1).  
 ἀντιπρόσωπος (1/1): 15:10.
- 102 קרב (5) ἐγγίζω (4/18): 12:11; 27:41; 37:18; 47:29. Cf. ἐγγίζω used for נש (12).  
 ἄπτω (1/6): 20:4. Cf. ἄπτω used for נגע (5).
- 103 ראה (149) ὁράω (130/144): 1:4, [8], 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, 23. Cf. ὁράω used for חלם (8); הנה (2); בָּאֵר לְחַי רִאִי (1); ירא (1).  
 καί + γάρ + ἐνώπιον + ὁράω (1/1): [הָ + גַּם + הֵלֶם + ראה + אַחֶר] (1): 16:13.  
 ἐνοράω (1/1): 20:10.  
 προοράω (1/1): 37:18.  
 ὑπεροράω (1/1): 42:21.  
 ἰδοῦ (4/86): 27:27; [31:44]; 41:41; 48:11.  
 δείκνυμι (3/5): 12:1; 41:28; 48:11. Cf. δείκνυμι used for נגד (1); ידע (1).  
 βλέπω (2/2): 45:12; 48:10.  
 καταμανθάνω (1/2): 34:1. Cf. καταμανθάνω used for שאה (1).  
 οἶδα (1/17): 39:3. Cf. οἶδα used for ידע (15); ידע (1).  
 γινώσκω (1/38): 39:23. Cf. γινώσκω used for ידע (36); ידע (1).  
 σκέπτομαι (1/1): 41:33.  
 ῥαθυμέω (1/1): 42:1.  
 κατανοέω (1/2): 42:9. Cf. κατανοέω used for שכל (1).
- 104 רבב (2) πληθύνω (1/28): 18:20. Cf. πληθύνω used for רבה (25); רב (1); דגה (1).  
 πολύς + γίνομαι (1/1): 6:1.
- 105 רבה (26) πληθύνω (25/28): 1:22+, 28; 3:16+; 7:17, 18; 8:17; 9:1, 7+; 16:10+; 17:2, 20; 22:17+; 26:4, 24; 28:3; 34:12; 35:11; 38:12; 47:27; 48:4. Cf. πληθύνω used for רב (1); רבב (1); דגה (1).  
 μεγαλύνω (1/3): 43:34. Cf. μεγαλύνω used for גדל (2).
- 106 רגל (7) κατασκοπεύω (1/1): 42:30.  
 κατάσκοπος (6/6): 42:9, 11, 14, 16, 31, 34.
- 107 רדף (5) καταδιώκω (3/5): 14:14; 31:23; 35:5. Cf. καταδιώκω used for דלק (1); דפק (1).  
 ἐκδιώκω (1/1): 14:15.  
 ἐπιδιώκω (1/1): 44:4.

- 108 רץ (10) τρέχω (6/6): 18:7; 24:20, 28, 29; 29:12, 13.  
 προστρέχω (2/2): 18:2; 33:4.  
 ἐπιτρέχω (1/1): 24:17.  
 ἐξάγω (1/17): 41:14. Cf. ἐξάγω used for יצא (13); שרץ (2); תעה (1).
- 109 רחק (2) μακρόθεν (1/3): 21:16.  
 ἀπέχω + μακράν (1/1): 44:4.
- 110 שאב (8) ὑδρεύω (6/6): 24:11, 19, 20, [43], 44, 45.  
 ἀντλέω (2/2): 24:13, 20.
- 111 שאל (14) ἐρωτάω (10/10): 24:47, 57; 32:18, 30+; 37:15; 40:7; 43:7, 27; 44:19.  
 ἐπερωτάω (4/4): [24:23]; 26:7; 38:21; 43:7.
- 112 שאר (5) καταλείπω (3/11): 7:23; 14:10; 42:38. Cf. καταλείπω used for עזב (7); יצג (1).  
 ὑπολείπω (1/7): 47:18. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for יתר (3); אצל (1); שים (1); עזב (1).  
 δεύτερος (1/18): 32:9. Cf. δεύτερος used for שני (13); שנה (2); פעם (1); משנה (1).
- 113 שבה (3) αἰχμαλωτεύω (2/2): 14:14; 34:29.  
 αἰχμαλωτὶς (1/1): 31:26.
- 114 שבע (19) ὄμνυμι (14/14): 21:23, 24, 31; 22:16; 24:7, 9; 25:33+; 26:3, 31; 31:53; 47:31+; 50:24.  
 ὀρκίζω (4/5): 24:37; 50:5, 6, 25. Cf. ὀρκίζω used for צוה (1).  
 ἐξορκίζω (1/1): 24:3.
- 115 שוב (67) ἀποστρέφω (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. ἀποστρέφω used for פנה (1); סבב (1).  
 ἀναστρέφω (7/9): 14:7, 17; 18:14; 22:5; 32:7; 37:29, 30. Cf. ἀναστρέφω used for בוא (1); שור (1).  
 ἐπιστρέφω (4/5): 8:12; 21:32; 44:13; 50:14. Cf. ἐπιστρέφω used for פנה (1).  
 ὑποστρέφω (2/3): 8:9; 43:10.  
 οὐ + ὑποστρέφω (1/1): [שוב + י + יצא] (1): 8:7.  
 ἐπαναστρέφω (1/1): 18:10.  
 ἀποδίδωμι (6/18): 20:7+, 14; 37:22; 42:25, 28. Cf. ἀποδίδωμι used for מכר (9); נתן (2); ירב (1).  
 ἐνδίδωμι (2/2): 8:3+.  
 ἀνταπόδομα (1/1): 50:15.  
 ἀνταποδίδωμι (1/2): 50:15. Cf. ἀνταποδίδωμι used for שלם (1).  
 ἀποκαθίστημι (4/5): 29:3; 40:13, 21; 41:13. Cf. ἀποκαθίστημι used for שקל (1).  
 πάλιν (2/9): 26:18; 30:31. Cf. πάλιν used for יסר (2); תן (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 הלך (21); בוא (3).

ἐπανέρχομαι (1/1): 50:5.

ἀνάγω (1/2): 42:37. Cf. ἀνάγω used for עלה (1).

ἐπισυνάγω (1/2): 38:29. Cf. ἐπισυνάγω used for צהר (1).

καταβαίνω (1/25): 43:13. Cf. καταβαίνω used for ירד (23); יר (1).

ἀναγγέλλω (1/17): 37:14. Cf. ἀναγγέλλω used for נגד (14); מלל (1); אמר (1).

ἀποτρέχω (1/3): 32:10. Cf. ἀποτρέχω used for הלך (2).

ἴκω (1/10): 18:10. Cf. ἴκω used for בוא (8); קום (1).

“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.7.4 (1: 24:5).

- 116 שכב (22) κοιμάω (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. κοιμάω used for ליך (5); ישן (1); רבץ (1).  
καθεύδω (2/2): 28:13; 39:10.
- 117 שכן (8) κατοικέω (7/42): 9:27; 14:13; 16:12; 25:18; 26:2; 35:22; 49:13. Cf. κατοικέω used for ישב (33); ב (1); נפל (1).  
κατοικίζω (1/3): 3:24. Cf. κατοικίζω used for ישב (2).
- 118 שלח (66) ἀποστέλλω (41/41): 8:7, 8; 19:13; 20:2; 21:14; 24:7, 40; 26:27; 27:45; 28:5; 30:25; 31:4; 32:4, 6, 19, 27+; 37:13, 14, 32; 38:17+, 20, 23, 25; 41:8, 14; 42:4, 16; 43:4, 5, 8, 14; 44:3; 45:5, 7, 8, 23, 27; 46:5, 28.  
ἐξαποστέλλω (10/12): 3:23; 8:10, [12]; 19:29; 25:6; 26:29, 31; 31:27, 42; 45:24. Cf. ἐξαποστέλλω used for יצא (1).  
ἐκτείνω (5/6): 3:22; 8:9; 19:10; 22:10; 48:14. Cf. ἐκτείνω used for רום (1).  
ἐκπέμπω (3/3): 24:54, 56, 59.  
συμπροπέμπω (2/2): 12:20; 18:16.  
πέμπω (1/1): 27:42.  
ἐπιβάλλω (1/6): 22:12. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for שית (3); נפל (1); נשן (1).  
ἀποίχομαι (1/3): 28:6. Cf. ἀποίχομαι used for הלך (2).  
ἐπιφέρω (1/3): 37:22. Cf. ἐπιφέρω used for רהר (1); הלך (1).  
ἀνίημι (1/2): 49:21. Cf. ἀνίημι used for נשן (1).
- 119 תלך (4) ῥίπτω (3/3): 21:15; 37:20, 24.  
ἐμβάλλω (1/7): 37:22. Cf. ἐμβάλλω used for שים (5); נתן (1).
- 120 שמע (64) ἀκούω (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; 42:2, 23; 43:25; 45:2; [47:6]; 49:2+.  
ἐπακούω (6/9): 16:11; 17:20; 21:17; 30:6, 17, 22. Cf. ἐπακούω used for ענה (2); עתר (1).  
ὕπακούω (5/6): 16:2; 22:18; 26:5; 27:13; 39:10. Cf. ὕπακούω used for נשך (1).  
εἰσακούω (5/5): 21:17; 34:17, 24; 42:21, 22.  
ἀκούω + σύ (1/1): 41:15.  
ἀκουστός + γίνομαι (1/1): 45:2.

διαβοάω (1/1): 45:16.

- 121 שמר (16) φυλάσσω (8/9): 2:15; 3:24; 18:19; 26:5; 30:31; 31:24, 29; 41:35. Cf. φυλάσσω used for פקדון (1).  
διαφυλάσσω (2/2): 28:15, 20.  
φύλαξ (1/1): 4:9.  
διατηρέω (3/3): 17:9, 10; 37:11.  
προσέχω (1/3): 24:6. Cf. προσέχω used for שעה (1); דבק (1).  
διασώζω (1/2): [35:3]. Cf. διασώζω used for מלט (1).
- 122 שפט (5) κρίνω (4/8): 16:5; 18:25; 19:9; 31:53. Cf. κρίνω used for דין (3); ריב (1).  
κρίσις (1/4): 19:9. Cf. κρίσις used for משפט (2); עין משפט (1).
- 123 שקה (19) ποτίζω (18/20): 2:6, 10; 19:32, 33, 34, 35; 21:19; 24:14, 18, 43, 45, 46+; 29:2, 3, 7, 8, 10. Cf. ποτίζω used for משקה (1); גמא (1).  
πίνω (1/21): 24:19. Cf. πίνω used for שתה (20).
- 124 שכר (2) μισθόω (1/1): 30:16.  
σήμερον (1/23): 30:16. Cf. σήμερον used for יום (18); יז (2).
- 125 שנא (7) μισέω (5/5): 26:27; 29:31, 33; 37:4, 8.  
ὕπεναντίος (1/2): 24:60. Cf. ὕπεναντίος used for איב (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: 37:5).
- 126 תמם (3) ἐκλείπω (2/17): 47:15, 18. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עיף (2); אפס (2); בצר (1); חדל (1); כלה (1); לזה (1); סור (1).  
ἐξέρχομαι (1/54): 47:18. Cf. ἐξέρχομαι used for יצא (51); הלך (1).
- 127 תעה (3) πλανάω (2/2): 21:14; 37:15.  
ἐξάγω (1/17): [20:13]. Cf. ἐξάγω used for יצא (13); שרץ (2); רוע (1).
- 128 תפש (2) ἐπισπάω (1/1): 39:12.  
καταδείκνυμι (1/1): [אב + כל + תפש] (1): 4:21.

## No main

- 1 אבה (2) βούλομαι (1/1): 24:5.  
θέλω (1/4): 24:8. Cf. θέλω used for מאן (3).
- 2 אור (4) φαῦσις (1/2): [1:14]. Cf. φαῦσις used for מור (1).  
διαφάυσκω (1/1): 44:3.  
φαίνω (2/8): 1:15, 17. Cf. φαίνω used for רעע (3); בחן (1); חרה (1).
- 3 אחז (4) κατέχω (1/4): 22:13. Cf. κατέχω used for אסר (2); אחר (1).  
ἐπιλαμβάνω (1/1): 25:26.  
ἐγκτάομαι (1/1): 34:10.  
κληρονομέω (1/10): 47:27. Cf. κληρονομέω used for ירש (9).





- 13 היה (322) εἰμί (150/505): 1:2, 6, 14, 15, 29; 2:18, 24, 25; 3:1, 5; 4:2, 8, 12, 14+, 17, 20, 21; 5:32; 6:3, 4, 9, 19, 21; 9:2, 3, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 26; 10:8, 9; 11:1, 3, 30; 12:2, 12; 13:3, 5, 6, 8; 15:5, 13; 16:12; 17:4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16+; 18:18, [23], 25; 21:20, 30; 24:14, 41, 43, 51; 25:20, 27; 26:3, 28, 34, 35; 27:12, 23, 33, 39, 40; 28:3, 14, 20, 21, 22; 29:20; 30:29, 30, 32, 34; 31:3, 5, 8+, [13], 42, 44; 32:9, [29]; 33:9; 34:5, 16, 22, 25; 35:3, 10, 11, 22; 36:7, 12, 13, 14; 37:2, 20, 27; 38:5, 9, 21, 22; 39:2+, 6, 21; 40:4, 13; 41:27, 36+, 40, [48], 54, 56; 42:5, 11, 31; 44:9, 10+, 17, 31; 45:10; 46:32, 34; 47:19, 24+, 25, 26; 48:5, 6, 19+, 21; 49:26. Cf. εἰμί used for הוא (30); היא (23); יש (13); אין (13); הנה (11); הם (9); בן (7); אתם (7); אנחנו (6); נחנו (1); אפוא (1); אסר (1); נקה (2); זה (2); עשה (2); אנכי (2); עוד (3); את (5); הנה (5); אתה (1); רעע (1); הן (1); ישב (1); לוח (1); בוא (1); מות (1); באש (1); ים (1); ינו (1); כבוד (1); לטש (1); גדל (1); יד (1).
- γίνομαι (155/201): 1:3+, 5+, 6[+], 8+, 9, 11, 13+, 14, 15, 19+, [20], 23+, 24, 30, 31+; 2:5, 7; 3:22; 4:2, 3, 8; 5:4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 27, 31; 6:1; 7:6, 10+, 12, 17; 8:6, 13; 9:27, 29; 10:10, 19, 30; 11:2, 3, 32; 12:10, 11, 14, 16; 13:7; 14:1; 15:1, 17+; 17:1+; 18:11, 12, 18; 19:17, 26, 29, 34; 20:12, 13; 21:20, 22; 22:1, 20; 23:1; 24:15, 22, 30, [45], 52, 60, 67; 25:3, 11; 26:1+, 8, 14, 28, 32; 27:1, 30+, [34]; 29:10, 13, 23, 25; 30:25, 41, 42, 43; 31:10, 40; 32:6, 11; 34:15, 25; 35:5, 16, 17, 18, 22, 28; 36:11, 22; 37:23; 38:1, 7, 9, 24, 27, 28; 39:2, 5+, 7, 11, 13, 19; 40:1, 20; 41:1, 8, 13, [53], 54; 42:35, 36; 43:2, 21; 44:24; 46:12; 47:9, 20, 28; 48:1; 49:15, 17; 50:9. Cf. γίνομαι used for ילד (18); גדל (4); עשה (3); יטב (2); חליל (2); שמע (1); בחן (1); ידע (1); היא (1); הוה (1); עצם (1); מולדת (1); לא (1); עלה (1); רבב (1); ברא (1).
- συγγίνομαι (1/2): 39:10. Cf. συγγίνομαι used for ידע (1).
- δοκέω (1/2): [היה + כ] (1): 19:14. Cf. δοκέω used for חשב (1).
- καταγελᾶω (1/1): [היה + ל + בוז] (1): 38:23.
- συμβαίνω (1/5): 41:13. Cf. συμβαίνω used for קרא (2); קרה (2).
- “Omitted” (13): see §3.1.8 (7: 2:10; 3:20; 8:5; 29:17; 34:10; 39:20, 22); §3.1.7.6 (6: 15:12; 38:29; 39:10, 15, 18; 46:33).
- 14 זקן (6) πρέσβυς (3/20): 18:12; 19:31; 24:1. Cf. πρέσβυς used for זקן (8); בכיר (5); גדול (4). γηράσκω (3/4): 18:13; 27:1, 2. Cf. γηράσκω used for זקנה (1).
- 15 חדל (3) παύω (1/6): 11:8. Cf. παύω used for בלה (5). ἐκλείπω (1/17): 18:11. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עיף (2); תמם (2); אפס (2); בצר (2); בלה (1); להה (1); סור (1). οὐ + δύνאμαι (1/1): 41:49.
- 16 חלק (3) ἐπιπίπτω (1/6): 14:15. Cf. ἐπιπίπτω used for נפל (5). διαμερίζω (1/2): 49:7. Cf. διαμερίζω used for פלג (1). διαδίδωμι (1/1): 49:27.
- 17 חנה (3) καταλύω (1/7): 26:17. Cf. καταλύω used for לין (4); קלון (2). παρεμβάλλω (2/2): [32:2]; 33:18.

- 18 חנט (3) ἐνταφιάζω (2/2): 50:2+.  
θάπτω (1/27): 50:26. Cf. θάπτω used for קבר (26).
- 19 חרד (2) ἐξίστημι (1/4): 27:33. Cf. ἐξίστημι used for יצא (1); תמה (1); פוג (1).  
ταράσσω (1/6): 42:28. Cf. ταράσσω used for מהה (1); זעף (1); פעם (1); מהר (1); בהל (1).
- 20 חרה (12) λυπέω (1/2): 4:5. Cf. λυπέω used for עצב (1).  
περίλυπος + γίνομαι (1/1): [יָ + לָ + חרה] (1): 4:6.  
λυπηρός (1/1): 34:7.  
τὶς (2/9): 18:30, 32.  
θυμός (3/4): 39:19; 44:18.; [יָא + חרה] (1): 30:2. Cf. θυμός used for נחם (1).  
βαρέω + φέρω (1/1): [יָא + פָּ + חרה] (1): 31:35.  
ὀργίζω (1/4): 31:36. Cf. ὀργίζω used for קצף (2); רגז (1).  
σκληρός + φαίνω (1/2): 45:5. Cf. σκληρός + φαίνω used for רעע (1).  
ἐρείδω (1/1): [49:6].
- 21 חשב (5) λογίζομαι (2/2): 15:6; 31:15.  
δοκέω (1/2): 38:15.  
βουλεύω (2/2): 50:20+.
- 22 טרף (5) θηρίον (1/19): 37:33. Cf. θηρίον used for תִּי (17); תִּי (1).  
θηριόβρωτος + γίνομαι (2/1): [טרף + טרף] (2): 44:28+.  
ἀρπάζω (1/1): 37:33.  
ἄρπαξ (1/1): 49:27.
- 23 ידה (2) ἐξομολογέομαι (1/1): 29:35.  
αἰνέω (1/1): 49:8.
- 24 יהב (8) δεῦτε (3/5): 11:3, 4, 7. Cf. δεῦτε used for הלך (2).  
ἀποδίδωμι (1/18): 29:21. Cf. ἀποδίδωμι used for מכר (9); שוב (6); נתן (2).  
δίδωμι (2/124): 30:1; 47:15. Cf. δίδωμι used for נתן (121).  
ἔάω (1/1): 38:16.  
φέρω (1/16): 47:16. Cf. φέρω used for בוא (8); לקח (1); נשא (1); ירד (1); נתן (1); שָׂא (1).
- 25 יטב (11) ὀρθῶς (2/3): 4:7+. Cf. ὀρθῶς used for טוב (1).  
εὖ + γίνομαι (2/2): 12:13; 40:14.  
εὖ + χράομαι (1/1): 12:16.  
εὖ + ποιέω (2/2): 32:10, 13.  
καλῶς (1/2): 32:13. Cf. καλῶς used for טוב (1).  
ἀρέσκω (2/4): 34:18; 41:37.  
χαίρω (1/1): 45:16.
- 26 יכח (6) ἀλγθεύω (1/2): 20:16.  
ἐλέγχω (3/3): 21:25; 31:37, 42.  
ἐτοιμάζω (2/5): 24:14, 44. Cf. ἐτοιμάζω used for כון (2); פנה (1).

- 27 ילד (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 יטע (1).  
τοκετός (1/1): **35:16.**  
γίνομαι (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. γίνομαι used for היה (155); גדל (4); עשה (3); יטב (2); חָלִיל (2); ברא (1); רבב (1); עלה (1); לָא (1); מוֹלֶדֶת (1); עצם (1); הוה (1); הִיא (1); ידע (1); בחן (1); שמע (1).  
γεννάω (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.** γίνομαι + υἱός (4/4): **17:17; 46:20[+], [21].**  
γένεσις (1/15): **40:20.** Cf. γένεσις used for תולדות (12); מוֹלֶדֶת (2).  
μαῖα (2/2): **35:17; 38:28.**

28 יצג (5) παρατίθηναι (1/5): **30:38.** Cf. παρατίθηναι used for שים (2); נתן (1); ישם (1).  
καταλείπω (1/11): **33:15.** Cf. καταλείπω used for עזב (7); שאר (3).  
ἵστημι (3/36): **43:9; [44:32]; 47:2.** Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); נצב (7); נסה (2); שים (2); תקע (1); רום (1); ירה (1).

29 ישן (3) ὑπνός (1/1): **2:21.**  
κοιμάω (1/27): **[41:21].** Cf. κοιμάω used for שכב (20); לִין (5); רבץ (1).  
“Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **41:5**).

30 כבד (3) μέγας (1/35): **18:20.** Cf. μέγας used for גדול (25); גדל (5); רב (2); כָּבֵד (2).  
εἰμί + ἔνδοξος (1/1): **34:19.**  
βαρυνπέω (1/1): **48:10.**

31 כול (4) ἐκτρέφω (1/3): **45:11.** Cf. ἐκτρέφω used for חיה (1); נהל (1).  
διατρέφω (1/3): **50:21.** Cf. διατρέφω used for חיה (2).  
σιτομετρέω (2/2): **47:12, [14].**

32 כלא (2) συνέχω (1/1): **8:2.**  
κωλύω (1/1): **23:6.**

33 כלה (19) συντελέω (8/11): **2:1, 2; 6:16; 17:22; 24:15, 45; 43:2; [49:5].** Cf. συντελέω used for מלא (1); רעע (1).  
παύω (5/6): **18:33; [24:14], 19, 22; 27:30.** Cf. παύω used for חדל (1).  
καταπαύω (1/4): **49:33.** Cf. καταπαύω used for שבת (3).  
ἐκλείπω (1/17): **21:15.** Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עָץ (2); תמם (2); אפס (2); בצר (1); חדל (1); לזה (1); סור (1).  
πᾶς (1/354): **24:19.** Cf. πᾶς used for כָּל (349); בָּן (1); רבץ (1).  
ἀναλίσκω (1/1): **41:30.**

- παρέρχομαι (1/6): 41:53. Cf. παρέρχομαι used for עבר (5).  
 ἔρχομαι (1/86): 44:12. Cf. ἔρχομαι used for בוא (75); הלך (3).
- 34 כסה (8) ἐπικαλύπτω (2/3): 7:19, 20. Cf. ἐπικαλύπτω used for סכר (1).  
 συγκαλύπτω (1/1): 9:23.  
 κατακαλύπτω (1/1): 38:15.  
 κρύπτω (2/6): 18:17; 37:26. Cf. κρύπτω used for חבא (2); סתר (1); גנב (1).  
 περιβάλλω (2/3): 24:65; 38:14. Cf. περιβάλλω used for לבש (1).
- 35 כפר (2) ἀσφαλτόω (1/1): 6:14.  
 ἐξιλάσχομαι (1/1): 32:21.
- 36 לין (9) καταλύω (4/7): 19:2+; 24:23, 25. Cf. καταλύω used for מלון (2); חנה (1).  
 κοιμάω (5/27): 24:54; 28:11; 31:54; 32:14, 22. Cf. κοιμάω used for שכב (20); ישן (1); רבץ (1).
- 37 לקט (2) συλλέγω (1/2): 31:46. Cf. συλλέγω used for לקט (1).  
 συνάγω (1/15): 47:14. Cf. συνάγω used for אסף (7); קוה (2); קבץ (2); צבר (2); קום (1).
- 38 מהה (2) τάρασσω (1/6): 19:16. Cf. τάρασσω used for זעף (1); פעם (1); חרד (1); מהר (1); בהל (1).  
 βραδύνω (1/1): 43:10.
- 39 משל (8) ἄρχω (3/13): 1:18; 4:7; 45:26. Cf. ἄρχω used for חלל (6); רדה (2); ברא (1); יאל (1).  
 ἄρχων (2/11): 24:2; 45:8. Cf. ἄρχων used for שר (2); נשיא (2); שדה (1); לאם (1); שליט (1); שפ (1); מלך (1).  
 κυριεύω (3/3): 3:16; 37:8+.
- 40 משש (4) ψηλαφάω (2/3): 27:12, 22. Cf. ψηλαφάω used for מוש (1).  
 ἐρευνάω (2/5): 31:34, 37. Cf. ἐρευνάω used for חפש (3).
- 41 נהל (2) ἐνισχύω (1/7): 33:14. Cf. ἐνισχύω used for כבד (4); שרה (1); חזק (1).  
 ἐκτρέφω (1/3): 47:17. Cf. ἐκτρέφω used for חיה (1); בול (1).
- 42 נוח (4) τίθημι (1/27): 2:15. Cf. τίθημι used for נתן (12); שים (12); שית (1); אסף (1).  
 καθίζω (1/8): 8:4. Cf. καθίζω used for ישב (7).  
 καταλιμπάνω (1/1): 39:16.  
 ἀφίημι (1/7): 42:33. Cf. ἀφίημι used for נשא (3); נתן (2); יצא (1).
- 43 נחם (9) διαναπαύομαι (1/1): 5:29.  
 ἐνθυμέομαι (1/1): 6:6.  
 θυμώω (1/4): 6:7. Cf. θυμώω used for חרה (2).  
 παρακαλέω (5/5): 24:67; 37:35+; 38:12; 50:21.  
 ἀπειλέω (1/1): 27:42.
- 44 נטה (9) ἵστημι (2/36): 12:8; 33:19. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); נצב (7); יצג (3); שים (2); תקע (1); רום (1); ירה (1).  
 ἐπικλίνω (1/1): 24:14.  
 ἐκκλίνω (1/4): 38:16. Cf. ἐκκλίνω used for סור (2); עבר (1).

- πήγνυμι (2/3): **26:25; 35:21**. Cf. πήγνυμι used for קקט (1).  
 ἀφικνέομαι (1/3): **38:1**. Cf. ἀφικνέομαι used for נגנ (1); נשׁ (1).  
 καταχέω (1/1): **39:21**.  
 ὑποτίθημι (1/3): **49:15**. Cf. ὑποτίθημι used for יפ (2).
- 45 נכה** (12) ἀναιρέω (1/1): **4:15**.  
 πατάσσω (5/5): **8:21; 14:15; 19:11; 32:12; 37:21**.  
 κατακόπτω (2/2): **14:5, 7**.  
 κοπή (1/1): **14:17**.  
 ἐκκόπτω (2/2): **32:9; 36:35**.  
 συγκόπτω (1/1): **34:30**.
- 46 נקה** (2) καθαρός + εἰμί (1/1): **24:8**.  
 ἁθῶς + εἰμί (1/1): **24:41**.
- 47 נשא** (48) προσφέρω (1/4): **4:7**. Cf. προσφέρω used for בוא (2); נשׁ (1).  
 φέρω (1/16): **36:7**. Cf. φέρω used for בוא (8); לק (1); ירד (1); נתן (1); יהב (1); תאץ (1).  
 ἀφίημι (3/7): **4:13; 18:26; 50:17**. Cf. ἀφίημι used for נתן (2); יצא (1); נוח (1).  
 ἀνίημι (1/2): **18:24**. Cf. ἀνίημι used for חלשׁ (1).  
 ἐπαίρω (2/2): **7:17; 13:10**.  
 ἐξαίρω (1/4): **29:1**. Cf. ἐξαίρω used for נסע (1); רום (1); אסא (1).  
 αἶρω (6/8): **43:34; 44:1; 45:23+; 46:5; 47:30**. Cf. αἶρω used for סור (1).  
 χωρέω (1/1): **13:6**.  
 ἀναβλέπω (12/13): **13:14; 18:2; 22:4, 13; 24:63, 64; 31:12; [32:2]; 33:1, 5; 37:25; 43:29**. Cf. ἀναβλέπω used for נבט (1).  
 θαυμάζω (1/1): **19:21**.  
 ἀναβοάω (2/3): **21:16; 27:38**. Cf. ἀναβοάω used for צעק (1).  
 βοάω (1/5): **29:11**. Cf. βοάω used for קרא (3); צעק (1).  
 λαμβάνω (3/131): **21:18; 27:3; 31:17**. Cf. λαμβάνω used for לקח (124); הרה (2); קשר (1); הא (1).  
 ἀναλαμβάνω (4/7): **45:19, 27; 46:5; 50:13**. Cf. ἀναλαμβάνω used for לקח (3).  
 προσδέχομαι (1/1): **32:21**.  
 δέχομαι (1/3): **50:17**. Cf. δέχομαι used for לקח (2).  
 γέμω (1/1): **37:25**.  
 ἐπιβάλλω (1/6): **39:7**. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for שית (3); נפל (1); שלח (1).  
 μιμνήσκω (2/11): **40:13, 20**. Cf. μιμνήσκω used for זכר (9).  
 ἀφαιρέω (1/7): **40:19**. Cf. ἀφαιρέω used for גזל (2); נצל (2); אסף (1); סור (1).  
 ἐπιτίθημι (1/11): **42:26**. Cf. ἐπιτίθημι used for שים (6); זמם (1); ערך (1); נפל (1); עמס (1).  
 “Omitted” (1): see §3.1.8 (1: **31:10**).
- 48 נשא** (4) καταλαμβάνω (2/4): **31:25; 44:4**. Cf. καταλαμβάνω used for דבק (2).  
 εὕρισκω (1/56): **44:6**. Cf. εὕρισκω used for מצא (54).

- ἀφικνέομαι (1/3): 47:9. Cf. ἀφικνέομαι used for נגג (1); נטה (1).
- 49 סבב (5) κυκλόω (2/2): 2:11, 13.  
 περικυκλόω (1/1): 19:4.  
 περιστρέφω (1/1): 37:7.  
 ἀποστρέφω (1/25): 42:24. Cf. ἀποστρέφω used for שוב (23); פנה (1).
- 50 סגר (4) ἀναπληρόω (1/3): 2:21. Cf. ἀναπληρόω used for שָׁלַם (1); מלא (1).  
 κλείω (1/1): 7:16.  
 ἀποκλείω (1/1): 19:10.  
 προσοίγω (1/1): 19:6.
- 51 סור (11) ἀποκαλύπτω (1/1): 8:13.  
 ἐκκλίνω (2/4): 19:2, 3. Cf. ἐκκλίνω used for עבר (1); נטה (1).  
 διαχωρίζω (1/10): 30:32. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for בדל (5); פרד (3); שית (1).  
 διαστέλλω (1/4): 30:35. Cf. διαστέλλω used for פרד (2); נקב (1).  
 αἶρω (1/8): 35:2. Cf. αἶρω used for נשא (6).  
 περιαιρέω (3/3): 38:14, 19; 41:42.  
 ἀφαιρέω (1/7): 48:17. Cf. ἀφαιρέω used for גזל (2); נצל (2); אסף (1); נשא (1).  
 ἐκλείπω (1/17): 49:10. Cf. ἐκλείπω used for גוע (4); חרב (2); עָיַף (2); תמס (2); אפס (2); בצר (2); להה (1); כלה (1); חדל (1).
- 52 סתר (2) κρύπτω (1/6): 4:14. Cf. κρύπτω used for חבא (2); כסה (2); גנב (1).  
 ἀφίστημι (1/6): 31:49. Cf. ἀφίστημι used for עתק (1); מרד (1); נגש (1); שים (1); נדד (1).
- 53 עבר (23) ἐπάγω (1/7): 8:1. Cf. ἐπάγω used for בוא (5); מטר (1).  
 διοδεύω (1/2): 12:6. Cf. διοδεύω used for הלך (1).  
 διέρχομαι (2/4): 15:17; 41:46. Cf. διέρχομαι used for הלך (2).  
 παρέρχομαι (5/6): 18:3, 5; 30:32; 32:32; 50:4. Cf. παρέρχομαι used for כלה (1).  
 προέρχομαι (2/2): 33:3, 14.  
 ἐκκλίνω (1/4): 18:5. Cf. ἐκκλίνω used for סור (2); נטה (1).  
 δόκιμος (1/1): 23:16.  
 διαβαίνω (6/6): 31:21, 52+; 32:11, 23, 24.  
 προπορεύομαι (1/4): 32:17. Cf. προπορεύομαι used for הלך (2).  
 παραπορεύομαι (2/2): 32:22; 37:28.  
 διαβιβάζω (1/1): 32:24.
- 54 עצב (3) διανοέομαι (1/3): [יָ + לָב + לָא + עצב] (1): 6:6. Cf. διανοέομαι used for מְחַשְּׁבָה (1).  
 κατανύσσομαι (1/2): 34:7.  
 λυπέω (1/2): 45:5. Cf. λυπέω used for חרה (1).
- 55 ערך (2) παρατάσσω (1/1): 14:8.  
 ἐπιτίθημι (1/11): 22:9. Cf. ἐπιτίθημι used for שים (6); זמם (1); נשא (1); נפל (1); עמס (1).
- 56 עתק (3) ἀφίστημι (1/6): 12:8. Cf. ἀφίστημι used for מרד (1); נגש (1); שים (1); נדד (1); סתר (1).

- ἀπαίρω (2/9): [26:21], 22. Cf. ἀπαίρω used for נסע (7).
- 57 עתר (2) δέομαι (1/4): 25:21.  
ἐπακούω (1/9): 25:21. Cf. ἐπακούω used for שמע (6); ענה (2).
- 58 פנה (4) ἀποστρέφω (1/25): 18:22. Cf. ἀποστρέφω used for שוב (23); סבב (1).  
ἐπιστρέφω (1/5): 24:49. Cf. ἐπιστρέφω used for שוב (4).  
ἐτοιμάζω (1/5): 24:31. Cf. ἐτοιμάζω used for יכח (2); כון (2).  
πρός (1/253): 24:63.
- 59 פקד (9) ἐπισκέπτομαι (3/3): 21:1; 50:24, 25.  
ἐπισκοπή (2/2): 50:24, 25.  
καθίστημι (3/7): 39:4, 5; 41:34. Cf. καθίστημι used for נתן (2); שית (1); שים (1).  
συνίστημι (1/1): 40:4.
- 60 פרד (8) ἀφορίζω (2/2): 2:10; 10:5.  
διασπείρω (1/7): 10:32. Cf. διασπείρω used for פוץ (5); נפץ (1).  
διαχωρίζω (3/10): 13:9, 11, 14. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for בדל (5); סור (1); שית (1).  
διαστέλλω (2/4): 25:23; 30:40. Cf. διαστέλλω used for נקב (1); סור (1).
- 61 פרץ (4) πλατύνω (1/3): 28:14. Cf. πλατύνω used for פתח (1); רחב (1).  
αὐξάνω (1/19): 30:30. Cf. αὐξάνω used for פרה (15); גדל (3).  
πλουτέω (1/1): 30:43.  
διακόπτω (1/1): 38:29.
- 62 צחק (11) γελάω (5/5): 17:17; 18:12, 13, 15+.  
γελοιάζω (1/1): 19:14.  
συγχαίρω (1/1): 21:6.  
παίζω (2/2): 21:9; 26:8.  
ἐμπαίζω (2/2): 39:14, 17.
- 63 צמח (5) ἀνατέλλω (2/4): 2:5; 3:18. Cf. ἀνατέλλω used for צמח (1); זרח (1).  
ἐξανατέλλω (1/1): 2:9.  
ἀναφύω (2/2): 41:6, 23.
- 64 צעק (3) βοάω (1/5): 4:10. Cf. βοάω used for קרא (3); נשא (1).  
ἀναβοάω (1/3): 27:34. Cf. ἀναβοάω used for נשא (2).  
κράζω (1/1): 41:55.
- 65 קבץ (3) συνάγω (2/15): 41:35, 48. Cf. συνάγω used for אסף (7); קוה (2); צבר (2); קום (1); לקט (1).  
ἀθροίζω (1/1): 49:2.
- 66 קדד (3) εὐδοκέω (2/3): 24:26, 48. Cf. εὐδοκέω used for רצה (1).  
κύπτω (1/1): 43:28.
- 67 קלל (7) κοπάζω (3/4): [8:7], 8, 11. Cf. κοπάζω used for שכך (1).  
καταράομαι (2/5): 8:21; [12:3]. Cf. καταράομαι used for ארר (3).



- ἀτιμάζω (2/2): 16:4, 5.
- 68 קרה (4) εὐοδῶ (1/9): 24:12. Cf. εὐοδῶ used for צלח (6); נחה (1).  
 παραδίδωμι (1/2): 27:20. Cf. παραδίδωμι used for מגן (1).  
 συμβαίνω (2/5): 42:29; 44:29. Cf. συμβαίνω used for קרא (2); היה (1).
- 69 קשה (3) δυστοκέω (1/1): 35:16.  
 σκληρῶς (1/1): 35:17.  
 σκληρύνω (1/1): 49:7.
- 70 קשר (4) ἐν + γαστήρ + λαμβάνω (1/2): 30:41.  
 ἐπίσημος (1/1): 30:42.  
 δέω (1/2): 38:28. Cf. δέω used for אסר (1).  
 ἐκκρεμάννυμι (1/1): 44:30.
- 71 רבץ (5) ἡσυχάζω (1/1): 4:7.  
 ἀναπαύω (2/2): 29:2; 49:14.  
 κοιμάω (1/27): 49:9. Cf. κοιμάω used for שכב (20); לין (5); ישן (1).  
 ἔχω + πᾶς (1/1): 49:25.
- 72 רום (6) ὑψόω (3/9): 7:17; 39:15, 18. Cf. ὑψόω used for גדל (4); גבר (2).  
 ἐκτείνω (1/6): 14:22. Cf. ἐκτείνω used for שלח (5).  
 ἵστημι (1/36): 31:45. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); נצב (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); שים (2);  
 תקע (1); ירה (1).  
 ἐξαίρω (1/4): 41:44. Cf. ἐξαίρω used for נשא (1); נסע (1); אסף (1).
- 73 ריב (5) μάχομαι (3/3): 26:20, 22; 31:36.  
 κρίνω (1/8): 26:21. Cf. κρίνω used for שפט (4); דין (3).  
 λοιδορέω (1/1): [49:23].
- 74 ריק (2) ἀριθμέω (1/5): 14:14. Cf. ἀριθμέω used for ספר (4).  
 κατακενόω (1/1): 42:35.
- 75 רכב (3) ἐπιβαίνω (1/1): 24:61.  
 ἀναβιβάζω (1/3): 41:43. Cf. ἀναβιβάζω used for עלה (2).  
 ἵππεύς (1/2): 49:17. Cf. ἵππεύς used for פָּרָשׁ (1).
- 76 רכש (4) κτάομαι (2/14): 12:5; 46:6. Cf. κτάομαι used for קנה (10); עשה (1); קָנָן (1).  
 περιποιέω (2/3): 31:18; 36:6. Cf. περιποιέω used for חיה (1).
- 77 רמש (11) ἐρπετόν (2/18): 1:21; 7:8. Cf. ἐρπετόν used for רָמַשׁ (14); שָׂרָץ (2).  
 ἔρπω (4/4): 1:26, 28, 30; [6:20].  
 κινέω (5/8): 7:14, 21; 8:17, 19; 9:2. Cf. κινέω used for נסע (2); שרץ (1).
- 78 רעה (24) ποιμήν (11/13): 4:2; 13:7+, 8+; 26:20+; [29:8]; 46:34; 47:3.; [רעה + צאן] (1): 46:32. Cf.  
 ποιμήν used for רָעַ (2).  
 ποιμαίνω (4/4): 30:31, 36; 37:2, 13.

- βόσκω (5/5): 29:7, 9; 37:12, 16; 41:2.  
 νέμω (2/3): 36:24; 41:18. Cf. νέμω used for עמד (1).  
 τρέφω (1/3): 48:15. Cf. τρέφω used for חיה (2).  
 κατισχύω (1/1): [רעה + יָבֵן] (1): 49:24.
- 79 רעע (11) ταπεινός (1/4): [15:13]. Cf. ταπεινός used for ענה (3).  
 πονηρέυομαι (1/2): 19:7. Cf. πονηρέυομαι used for נכל (1).  
 πονηρός + φαίνω (2/2): [35:22]; 38:10.  
 πονηρός + συντελέω (1/1): 44:5.  
 κακός (1/3): 19:9. Cf. κακός used for ענה (2).  
 κακοποιέω (2/3): 31:7; 43:6.  
 σκληρός + φαίνω (1/2): 21:11. Cf. σκληρός + φαίνω used for חרה (1).  
 σκληρός + εἰμί (1/1): 21:12.  
 βαρύς + καταφαίνω (1/1): 48:17.
- 80 רפא (3) ἰάομαι (1/1): 20:17.  
 ἐνταφιαστής (2/2): 50:2+.
- 81 שבר (14) πωλέω (2/2): 41:56; 42:6.  
 ἀγοράζω (7/7): 41:57; 42:5, 7; 43:4, 22; 44:25; 47:14.  
 πρίαμαι (5/5): 42:2, 3, 10; 43:2, 20.
- 82 שחח (19) φθείρω (1/1): 6:11.  
 καταφθείρω (5/5): 6:12+, 13, 17; 9:11.  
 ἐξαλείφω (1/4): 9:15. Cf. ἐξαλείφω used for מחה (3).  
 καταστρέφω (1/4): 13:10. Cf. καταστρέφω used for הפך (3).  
 ἀπόλλυμι (7/10): 18:28+, [29], [30], 31, 32; 19:13. Cf. ἀπόλλυμι used for ספה (1); הרג (1);  
 אבד (1).  
 ἐκτρίβω (3/7): 19:13, 14, 29. Cf. ἐκτρίβω used for שמד (1); כרת (1); ירש (1); כחד (1).  
 ἐκχέω (1/4): 38:9. Cf. ἐκχέω used for שפך (3).
- 83 שית (8) τίθημι (1/27): 3:15. Cf. τίθημι used for נתן (12); שים (12); נוח (1); אסף (1).  
 ἐξάνιστημι (1/5): 4:25. Cf. ἐξάνιστημι used for קום (2); חיה (2).  
 καθίστημι (1/7): 41:33. Cf. καθίστημι used for פקד (3); נתן (2); שים (1).  
 διαχωρίζω (1/10): 30:40. Cf. διαχωρίζω used for בדל (5); פרד (3); סור (1).  
 μίγνυμι (1/1): 30:40.  
 ἐπιβάλλω (3/6): 46:4; 48:14, 17. Cf. ἐπιβάλλω used for נפל (1); שלח (1); נשא (1).
- 84 שכח (8) ὀρθρίζω (3/3): 19:2, 27; 20:8.  
 ἀνίστημι (5/40): 21:14; 22:3; 26:31; 28:18; 32:1. Cf. ἀνίστημι used for קום (35).
- 85 שעה (2) ἐφοράω (1/2): 4:4. Cf. ἐφοράω used for רָאָה (1).  
 προσέχω (1/3): 4:5. Cf. προσέχω used for שמר (1); דבק (1).

- 86 שָׁקַף (3) καταβλέπω (1/1): 18:16.  
ἐπιβλέπω (1/2): 19:28. Cf. ἐπιβλέπω used for נבט (1).  
παρακύπτω (1/1): 26:8.
- 87 שָׁרַף (4) ἐξάγω (2/17): 1:20, 21. Cf. ἐξάγω used for יצא (13); תעה (1); ריץ (1).  
κινέω (1/8): 7:21. Cf. κινέω used for רמש (5); נסע (2).  
πληρόω (1/7): 9:7. Cf. πληρόω used for מלא (6).
- 88 שָׁרַח (2) εὐαρεστέω (1/7): 39:4. Cf. εὐαρεστέω used for הלך (6).  
παρίστημι (1/4): 40:4. Cf. παρίστημι used for עמד (2); נצב (1).
- 89 שָׁטַח (3) ἐγκατέω (1/1): 27:41.  
ἐνέχω (1/1): 49:23.  
μνησικακέω (1/1): 50:15.
- 90 שָׁם (48) τίθημι (12/27): 2:8; 4:15; 24:2, 9; 28:11; 30:41, 42; 31:37; 32:13; 47:26; 48:20; 50:26. Cf. τίθημι used for נתן (12); נוח (1); שית (1); אספ (1).  
ἐπιτίθημι (6/11): 9:23; 21:14; 22:6, 9; 37:34; 48:18. Cf. ἐπιτίθημι used for זמם (1); ערך (1); נשא (1); נפל (1); עמס (1).  
περιτίθημι (2/4): 24:47; 41:42. Cf. περιτίθημι used for לבש (1); נתן (1).  
ὑποτίθημι (2/3): 28:18; 47:29. Cf. ὑποτίθημι used for נטה (1).  
παρατίθημι (2/5): 43:31, 32. Cf. παρατίθημι used for נתן (1); ישם (1); יצג (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 עשה (138); ברא (9); נתן (2); יטב (2); בנה (1); עכר (1); נשה (1).  
ἵστημι (2/36): 28:18, 22. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); נצב (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); תקע (1); רום (1); ירה (1).  
ἀφίστημι (1/6): 30:36. Cf. ἀφίστημι used for עתק (1); מרד (1); נגש (1); נדד (1); סתר (1).  
καθίστημι (1/7): 47:6. Cf. καθίστημι used for פקד (3); נתן (2); שית (1).  
ὀρμάω (1/1): [ו' + פָּנָה + אַת + שִׁים] (1): 31:21.  
ἐμβάλλω (5/7): 31:34; 40:15; 43:22; 44:1, 2. Cf. ἐμβάλλω used for שלך (1); נתן (1).  
ἐπιμελέομαι (1/1): [ל' + ע' + י' + ע' + שִׁים] (1): 44:21.  
ὑπολείπω (1/7): 45:7. Cf. ὑπολείπω used for יתר (3); אצל (1); שאר (1); עזב (1).
- 91 שָׁרַף (2) ὀπτάω (1/1): 11:3.  
κατακαίω (1/1): 38:24.
- 92 תקע (2) πῆγγυμι (1/3): 31:25. Cf. πῆγγυμι used for נטה (2).  
ἵστημι (1/36): 31:25. Cf. ἵστημι used for עמד (12); קום (7); נצב (7); יצג (3); נטה (2); שים (2); רום (1); ירה (1).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaesus, Anneli. *Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*. AASF Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1982.
- Aejmelaesus, Anneli. "OTI *causale* in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 11–30 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Aejmelaesus, Anneli. "OTI *recitativum* in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 31–42 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Aejmelaesus, Anneli. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." Pages 56–69 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Aejmelaesus, Anneli. "Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the Kaige Revisers." Pages 41–53 in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after "Les Devanciers d'Aquila"*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaesus and Tuukka Kauhanen. De Septuaginta Investigationes 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
- Aitken, James. "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 507–512 in *On Stone and Scroll*. Edited by James Aitken, K. J. Dell, and B. A. Mastin. BZAW 420. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Aitken, James. "The Characterization of Speech in the Septuagint Pentateuch." Pages 9–31 in *The Reception of the Hebrew Bible in the Septuagint and the New Testament*. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Cheryl Exum. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.

Aitken, James. "The Language of the Septuagint and Jewish Greek Identity." Pages 120–134 in *The Jewish-Greek Tradition in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire*. Edited by James Aitken and James Carleton Paget. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn. "'Your Only Son, Your Beloved One' (Genesis 22): When Septuagint and Messianism Meet." Pages 19–31 in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Edited by Marc Vervenne and F. García Martínez. Lueven: Lueven University Press, 2005.

Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn. "Content-Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique." Pages 357–376 in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn. “Etymological Translations in the Septuagint.”

Pages 193–201 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*.

Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.

Ausloos, Hans, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Valérie Kabergs. “The Study of Aetiological

Wordplay as a Content-Related Criterion in the Characterization of LXX Translation

Technique.” Pages 273–294 in *Die Septuaginta — Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte:*

*3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D),*

*Wuppertal 22.-25. Juli 2010*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT

286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Baab, Otto. “A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis.” *JBL* 52 (1933): 239–243.

Baden, Joel. *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. FAT 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,

2009.

Baden, Joel. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*.

ABRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Baden, Joel. *The Promise to the Patriarchs*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Bakker, Egbert. “Boundaries, Topics, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of

the Ancient Greek Particle  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ .” *Studies in Language* 17 (1993): 276–277.

- Bakker, Stéphanie J. *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 15. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. MSU 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barr, James. "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts." Pages 381–403 in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Claude Cox. SCS 23. Jerusalem: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Beck, John Alan. *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique*. StBibLit 25. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Benner, Drayton. "A Tool for a High-Carat Gold-Standard Word Alignment." Pages 80–85 in *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, and Humanities (LaTeCH)*. Gothenburg, Sweden: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2014.
- Bernstein, Moshe. "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon." *DSD* 3 (1996): 37–57.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia 62. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bons, Eberhard. “Ακακία and ἄκακος. Considerations on a Septuagint Term for ‘Innocence.’”

Pages 491–501 in *Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*. BTS 8. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. “The Classification of Literalism in Ancient Hebrew-Greek Translation.” Pages 139–160 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.

Brayford, Susan. “The Taming and Shaming of Sarah in the Septuagint of Genesis. PhD diss., The University of Denver, 1998.

Brayford, Susan. *Genesis*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Brock, Sebastian. “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity.” *GRBS* (1979): 69–87.

Brooke, George. “4Q254 Fragments 1 and 4, and 4Q254a: Some Preliminary Comments.” Pages 185–192 in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and Its World*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994.



- Brown, William. *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3*. SBLDS 132. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Brown, William. "Reassessing the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis 1: A Response to Martin Rösel." *BIOSCS* 32 (1999): 35–39.
- Brunette-Bletsch, Rhonda. "The Reception of Genesis in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." Pages 447–468 in *The Book of Genesis*, VTSup 152. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Caird, G. B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II." *JTS* 20 (1969): 21–40.
- Cook, Johann. "'Ancient' Readings in the Translations of the Old Testament." *JNSL* 12. (1984): 41–52.
- Cook, Johann. "The Translator of the Greek Genesis." Pages 169–182 in *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea: V Congreso de la IOSCS*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C, 1985.
- Cook, Johann. "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis." Pages 91–125 in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Claude Cox. SCS 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Daube, David. *The Exodus Pattern in the Bible*. All Souls Studies 2. London: Faber and Faber, 1963.
- Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996.

DiBittonto, Anna. "Frammenti di petizioni del periodo tolemaico: studio sul formulario."

*Aegyptus* 67 (1976): 109–137.

Dik, Helma. *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 5. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1995.

Dik, Helma. "Interpreting Adjective Position in Herodotus." Pages 33–92 in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*. Edited by Egbert Bakker. Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava Supplementum 171. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Dik, Helma. *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Dover, Kenneth. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974.

Dozeman, Thomas. "The Wilderness and Salvation History in the Hagar Story." *JBL* 117 (1998): 23–43.

Evans, T. V. "A Hebraism of Mixed Motivation." Pages 211–228 in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

Evans, T. V. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. “Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta.”

*Sef* 37 (1977): 239–259.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. “The Interpretation of Genesis 15:6: Abraham’s Faith and Righteousness in a Qumran Text.” Pages 257–268 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Paul Shalom et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Fritsch, Charles. *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch*. Princeton Oriental Texts 10. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943.

Gentry, Peter. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. SCS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Grossman, Jonathan. *Abram to Abraham: A Literary Analysis of the Abraham Narrative*. Alte Testament im Dialog 11. Bern: Peter Lang AG, 2016.

Guillou, Liane. “Analysing Lexical Consistency in Translation.” Pages 10–18 in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation*. Sofia, Bulgaria: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2013.

Gunkel, Hermann. *The Stories of Genesis*. Edited by John Scullion and William Scott. Vallejo: BIBAL Press, 1994.

Harl, Marguerite. *La Genèse*. La Bible d’Alexandrie 1. Paris: CERF, 1986.

- Harl, Marguerite. "La 'ligature' d'Isaac (Gen. 22,9) dans la Septante et chez les Pères grecs." Pages 457–472 in *Hellenica et Judaica hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by André Caquot, et al. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- Harl, Marguerite. "La Bible d'Alexandrie. I. The Translation Principles." Pages 181–197 in *X Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Bernard Taylor. Atlanta, SBL Press: 2001.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892–1906.
- Hauspie, Katrin. "Transcriptions of Hebrew Words." Pages 172–181 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Hendel, Ronald. *The Text of Genesis I-II: Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Hendel, Ronald. "On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis: A Reply to Rösel." *BIOSCS* 32 (1999): 31–34.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and its Implications for the NETS Version." *BIOSCS* 33 (2000): 76–93.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "Lexicography and the Translation of a Translation: The NETS Version and the Septuagint of Genesis." *BIOSCS* 37 (2004): 73–86.

- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis." Pages 85–103 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "Genesis: To the Reader." Pages 1–6 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V., ed. *"Translation is Required:" The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. SCS 56. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Genesis." Pages 405–426 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Craig Evans et al. VTSup 152. Brill: Leiden, 2012.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "Innovative Elements in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint Pentateuch." Pages 306–315 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. "In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1–2.3." Pages 17–67 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. SCS 67. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Honigman, Sylvie. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. London: Routledge, 2003.

- Itagaki, Masaki et al. "Automatic Validation of Terminology Translation Consistency with Statistical Method." Pages 269–274 in *European Association for Machine Translation Summit XI*. Copenhagen: European Association for Machine Translation, 2007.
- Jay, Jeff. *The Tragic in Mark: A Literary-Historical Interpretation*. HUT 66. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Johannessohn, Martin. *Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*. Kirchhain N.-L.: Max Schmiersow, 1910.
- Johnson, Scott Fitzgerald. *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism*. Aldershot: Routledge, 2006.
- Joosten, Jan. "Elaborate Similes — Hebrew and Greek: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique." *Biblica* 77 (1996): 227–236.
- Joosten, Jan. "Do the Finite Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Express Aspect?" *JANES* 29 (2002): 49–70.
- Joosten, Jan. "On Aramaising Renderings in the Septuagint." Pages 587–600 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Martinus Baasten and Willem van Persen. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Joosten, Jan. "Language as Symptom: Linguistic Clues to the Social Background of the Seventy." *Text* 23 (2007): 69–80.

Joosten, Jan. "Reflections on the 'Interlinear Paradigm' in Septuagintal Studies." Pages 163–178 in *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and J. Jokiranta. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Joosten, Jan. "The Septuagint as a Source of Information on Egyptian Aramaic in the Hellenistic Period." Pages 93–105 in *Aramaic in Its Historical and Linguistic Setting*. Edited by Holger Gzella and Margaretha Folmer. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 50. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.

Joosten, Jan. *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*. FAT 83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Kepper, Martina. "Genesis / Das erste Buch Mose." Pages 107–119 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H = Handbook of the Septuagint*. Edited by Martin Karrer, et al. Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlaghaus, 2016.

Kepper, Martina. "Kontextualisierende Übersetzungspraxis in der Genesis-Septuaginta?" Pages 523–536 in *Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Kierkegaard, Søren. "Fear and Trembling." Pages 18–69 in *Existentialism: Basic Writings*. Edited by Charles Guignon and Derk Pereboom. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1995.

- Kim, Hayeon. "Multiple Authorship of the Pentateuch." PhD diss., Hebrew University, 2006.
- Kim, Kyung-Rae. "Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint." PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1994.
- Klinken, Willem van. "From Literal to Free? A Study of Development in the Genesis Translation of the Septuagint." ThM thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2006.
- Knobloch, Frederick. "Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995.
- Knobloch, Frederick. "'Transcription Technique' and the Text of the Greek Genesis." *BIOSCS* 35 (2002): 97–109.
- Konstan, David. "Shame." Pages 91–110 in *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Kugel, James. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Lambdin, Thomas. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1971.
- Lee, John. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SCS 14. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.



Lee, John. "Accuracy and Idiom: the Renderings of *Mittahat* in the Septuagint Pentateuch."

Pages 79–99 in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Kristin de Troyer, et al. CBET 72. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

Lee, John. "The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Documentary Evidence." Pages 98–108 in

*Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.

Leiter, Nechama. "The Translator's Hand in Transpositions? Notes on the LXX of Genesis 31." *Text* 14 (1988): 105–130.

Lewis, Jack. *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Longacre, Robert. *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48*. 2nd ed. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Louw, Theo van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peters, 2007.

Louw, Theo van der. "Did the Septuagint Translators Really Intend the Greek Text as it Is?"

Pages 449–466 in *Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli*

2014. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Louw, Theo van der. “The Evolution of the LXX-Genesis Translator.” Pages 146–157 in *Die Septuaginta: Geschichte – Wirkung – Relevanz, 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal, 21-24. Juli 2016*. Edited by Martin Meiser et al. WUNT 20. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Louw, Theo van der. “The Unity of LXX Genesis and Exodus.” Forthcoming article in VT.
- Marquis, Galen. “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.” *Text* 13 (1986): 59–84.
- McKay, K. L. “Aspect in Imperative Constructions in New Testament Greek.” *NT* 27 (1985): 201–226.
- Meer, Michaël van der. “Syria in the Septuagint: Studies in the Natural and Geographical Context of the Septuagint.” Pages 171–211 in *Die Septuaginta — Text, Wirkung, Rezeption: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2012*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Siegfried Kreuzer. WUNT 325. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Meiser, Martin. “Die Bedeutung der Rezeptionsgeschichte für die Septuagintaforschung.” Pages 425–443 in *Die Septuaginta — Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D),*

*Wuppertal 22.-25. Juli 2010*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Meiser, Martin. “Der Traum in der griechisch-römischen Antike, im antiken Judentum und im antiken Christentum.” Pages 258–274 in *Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Mleynek, Sherryll. “Aristotle and God: The Poetics of Sacrifice.” *JAAR* 62 (1994): 107–121.

Moberly, R. W. L. “Abraham's Righteousness (Genesis xv 6).” Pages 103–130 in *Studies in the Pentateuch*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 41. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Mulroney, James. “The Standardization of Translation Choice for למה within the LXX-Pentateuch: ἵνα τι as a Neolinguistic Phrase.” Pages 425–435 in *XV Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël van der Meer, and Martin Meiser. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. “The Infinitive in the Septuagint.” Pages 259–271 in *VIII Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. SCS 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Translation Techniques and Beyond." Pages 13–22 in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model." Pages 221–235 in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "The Logico-Semantic Analysis of the Genitive Relationship in the LXX Greek (Gen 1–25)." Pages 313–321 in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Syntax of the Participle in the Septuagint Books of Genesis and Isaiah." Pages 185–202 in *Die Septuaginta — Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.-25. Juli 2010*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Aspects of the (Morpho)syntax of the Infinitive in Qumran Hebrew."

Pages 80–87 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*.

Edited by Eibert Tigchelaar et al. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Muraoka, Takamitsu *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Septuagint Greek: A Syntactical Perspective." Pages 467–474 in *Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Mussies, Gerard. "Phonology and Morphology of Septuagint Greek." Pages 89–97 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.

Nicholson, Ernest W. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Niehoff, Maren. *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Olofsson, Staffan. "Consistency as a Translation Technique." *SJOT* 6 (1992): 14–30.

- Olofsson, Staffan. "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint." Pages 217–237 in *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*. ConBOT 57. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Pardee, Dennis. "The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in a Nutshell." Pages 285–316 in *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach and Pat-el Na'ama. SAOC 67. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Perkins, Larry. "The Order of Pronominal Clitics and other Pronouns in Greek Exodus — An Indicator of the Translator's Intentionality." *JSCS* 45 (2012): 46–76.
- Péter-Contesse, René. "Was Potiphar a Eunuch?: (Genesis 37.36; 39.1)." *BT* 47 (1996): 142–146.
- Peters, Melvin K. H. "Translating a Translation: Some Final Reflections on the Production of the New English Translation of Greek Deuteronomy." Pages 119–134 in *"Translation is Required:" the Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert. SCS 56. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010.
- Pfeiffer, Stefan. "Joseph in Ägypten: Althistorische Beobachtungen zur griechischen Übersetzung und Rezeption von Gen 39–50." Pages 313–322 in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- Pfeiffer, Stefan. "Ägyptische Elemente im Griechischen der LXX." Pages 231–245 in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Philo. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Translated by C. D. Yonge. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Pietersma, Albert. "Articulation of the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV." Pages 184–202 in *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*. Edited by Gerard Norton and Stephen Pisano. OBO 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Pietersma, Albert. *Translation Manual: For a New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)*. Ada: Uncial Books, 1996.
- Pietersma, Albert. "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." Pages 337–364 in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference*. Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Pietersma, Albert. "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited." Pages 3–21 in *"Translation is Required:" the Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert. SCS 56. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010.
- Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright. "To the Reader of NETS." Pages xiii–xx in *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Pomeroy, Sarah. "Some Married Women in the Papyri." Pages 83–124 in *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*. New York: Schocken, 1984.
- Prestel, Peter and Stefan Schorch. "Genesis: Das erste Buch Moses." Pages 1.145–257 in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch." Pages 1–78 in *The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Rajak, Tessa. "Translating the Septuagint for Ptolemy's Library: Myth and History." Pages 176–193 in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*. JSOTSup 89. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
- Renehan, Robert. "More on Compound and Simplex Verbs." Pages 11–27 in *Studies in Greek Texts: Critical Observations to Homer, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes and other Authors*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.



Rife, John Merle. "The Mechanics of Translation Greek." *JBL* 52 (1933): 244–252.

Rijksbaron, Albert. "The Discourse Function of the Imperfect." Pages 237–254 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*. Edited by Albert Rijksbaron, et al. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1988.

Rijksbaron, Albert. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 2002.

Römer, Thomas. "The Exodus in the Book of Genesis." Pages 1–20 in *The Pentateuch in Recent Research*. Edited by Stig Norin. SEÅ 75. Uppsala: Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet, 2010.

Rösel, Martin. "Die Übersetzung der Gottesbezeichnungen in der Genesis-Septuaginta." Pages 357–378 in *Ernten, was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by D. R. Daniels, et al. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991.

Rösel, Martin. *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*. BZAW 223. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

Rösel, Martin. "The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis." *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 62–70.

Rösel, Martin. "2.4.1.1 Genesis." *Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Armin Lange, et al. Leiden: Brill, 2016. doi:10.1163/2452-4107\_thb\_COM\_0002040101.

- Sailhamer, John. *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.
- Scarlata, Mark. *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4:1-16*. LHBOTS 573. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Scarlata, Mark. "Genesis." Pages 13–28. in *T&T Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by James Aitken. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- Schehr, Timothy. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb in Septuagint Genesis 1-15*. PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1990.
- Schironi, Francesca. "Theory into Practice: Aristotelian Principles in Aristarchean Philology." *CP* 104.3 (2009): 279–316.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia B.132.1. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Tiedeakademia, 1965.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Der Gebrauch des *genetivus absolutus* in der Septuaginta." Pages 131–136 in *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Edited by Avigdor Shinan. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 401–406 in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1973.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Die Wiedergabe einiger hebräischen Zeitangaben mit der Präposition ׀ in der Septuaginta." ASTI (1978): 138–146.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Renderings of Hebrew Comparative Expressions with ׀ in the Greek Pentateuch." BIOSCS 12 (1979): 27–42.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Die Wiedergaben des ׀ instrumenti im griechischen Pentateuch." Pages 31–46 in *Glaube und Gerechtigkeit: in memoriam Rafael Gyllenberg*. Edited by Jarmo Kiilunen, et al. Helsinki: Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft, 1983.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im griechischen Pentateuch." StOr 55 (1984): 279–294.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Personalpronomens als Subjekt im griechischen Pentateuch." Pages 115–128 in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox. Mississauga: Benben, 1984.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer." Pages 28–39 in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaesus and Raija Sollamo. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian toimituksia Sarja B 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax." Pages 40–52 in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*

*am 4. Juni 1987*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaesus and Raija Sollamo. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian toimituksia Sarja B 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. AASF Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

Sollamo, Raija. "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch." Pages 101–113 in *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea: V Congress de la IOSCS*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1985.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Koinē Background for the Repetition and Non-Repetition of the Possessive Pronoun in Co-Ordinate Items." Pages 52–63 in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlaf Fraenkel et al. MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 75–85 in *VII Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Claude Cox. SCS 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy." Pages 43–62 in *VIII*

- Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. SCS 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Sollamo, Raija. *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint*. SCS 40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Sollamo, Raija. "The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland." *SJOT* 10 (1996): 159–168.
- Sollamo, Raija. "Repetitions of Prepositions in the Septuagint of Genesis." Pages 371–384 in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Edited by F. García Martínez and Marc Vervenne. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Sollamo, Raija. "The Place of the Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter." Pages 153–160 in *XII Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Melvin Peters. SCS 54. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006.
- Sollamo, Raija. "Reflexive Pronouns in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 309–326 in *XV Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël van der Meer, and Martin Meiser. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*. FAT 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. "Pentateuchal Coherence and the Science of Reading." Pages 253–68 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel,*

- and North America*. Edited by Jan Gertz et al. FAT 111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. ISBL 453. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Steyn, Gert Jacobus. “Heliopolis and On in the Septuagint.” Pages 155–168 in *Die Septuaginta — Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Tal, Abraham, ed. *Genesis (Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato)*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
- Talshir, Zipora. “Double Translations in the Septuagint.” Pages 21–63 in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Claude Cox. SCS 31. Jerusalem: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX.” *JTS* 9 (1908): 597–601.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*. New York: Georg Olms, 1987.
- Tjen, Anwar. *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*. LHBOTS 515. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

- Tov, Emanuel. "The Representation of the Causative Aspects of the Hiph'il in the LXX: A Study in Translation Technique." *Bib* 63 (1982): 417–424.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX." *JSJ* 15 (1984): 65–89.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX." *Text* 12 (1985): 149–187.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX — Their Nature and Distribution." Pages 64–73 in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlaf Fraenkel et al. MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Loan-words, Homophony, and Transliterations in the Septuagint." Pages 165–181 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions: A Further Characteristic of the Kaige-Th Revision?" Pages 501–512 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs." Pages 19–50 in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of*

- the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Reinhard Kratz. BZAW 439. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1-11." Pages 470–489 in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*. VTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Trible, Phyllis. "Hagar: The Desolation of Rejection." Pages 9–36 in *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. OBT 13. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Tsevat, Matitiah. "Hagar and the Birth of Ishmael." Pages 53–76 in *The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies*. New York: Ktav, 1980.
- Voitila, Anssi. "La Technique de traduction du Yiqtol (l'imparfait hébreu) dans l'Histoire du Joseph grecque (Gen 39,39-50)." Pages 223–237 in *VII Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Claude Cox. SCS 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Voitila, Anssi. *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le pentateuque grec: une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction*. Publications de la Société d'Exégèse de Finlande 79. Helsinki: Société d'Exégèse de Finlande, 2001.



Voitila, Anssi. "The Use of Tenses in the L- and B-texts in the Kaige-section of 2 Reigns."

Pages 213–237 in *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3.*

*Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D),*

*Wuppertal 22.-25. Juli 2010.* Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer et al. WUNT 286.

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Voitila, Anssi. "Septuagint Syntax and Hellenistic Greek." Pages 109–118 in *Handbuch zur*

*Septuaginta: LXX.H: Die Sprache der Septuaginta.* Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan

Joosten. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.

Wade, Martha Lynn. "Evaluating Lexical Consistency in the Old Greek Bible." *BIOSCS* 33

(2000): 53–75.

Wade, Martha Lynn. *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of*

*Exodus in the Old Greek.* SCS 49. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Wagner, J. Ross. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint*

*Hermeneutics.* FAT 88. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013.

Walser, Georg. *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the*

*Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament.* Studia Graeca et Latina

Lundensia 8. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001.

Walser, Georg. "A Peculiar Word Order Rule for the Septuagint and for Cognate Texts."

Pages 499–511 in *X Congress of the IOSCS.* Edited by Bernard Taylor. SCS 51.

Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.

- Walser, Georg. "Die Wortfolge der Septuaginta." Pages 258–266 in *Die Septuaginta — Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Weissert, David. "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques." *Text* 8 (1973): 31–44.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Meridian Library 6. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Wevers, John William, ed. *Genesis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Wevers, John William. *Text History of the Greek Genesis*. MSU 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Wevers, John William. "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies." *BIOSCS* 18 (1985): 16–38.
- Wevers, John William. "The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-partem Reflections." Pages 51–60 in *VII Congress of the IOSCS*. Edited by Claude Cox. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. SCS 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Wifstrand, Albert. "Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta."

K: Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1949-1950, II (1950):  
44-70.

Wright, Benjamin. *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text*.

SCS 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Wright, Benjamin. "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in

the LXX." Pages 311-335 in *VI Congress of the IOSCS*. SCS 23. Atlanta: Scholars  
Press, 1986.

Wright, Benjamin. "Noah and the Flood in the Septuagint." Pages 137-142 in *Noah and His*

*Book(s)*. Edited by Michael Stone, et al. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010.

Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Peabody:

Hendrickson, 2002.

Youngblood, Kevin. "Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations." PhD diss., The

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004.

Zerwick, Max. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples*. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 114.

Rome: Iura Editionis et Versionis Reservantur, 1963.