

TRIALS OF THE FOREIGN: AN INVESTIGATION OF OLD GREEK GENESIS 49.1-15

by

KARLENA MAE CAGNOLI

Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural Ministry, ACTS/TWU, 2011

Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

in the

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

March 20, 2025

© Karlana Mae Cagnoli, 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At ACTS Seminaries of Trinity Western University, which is the home of the John William Wevers Institute for Septuagint Studies, not only have I had the fortuitous surprise of being introduced to Septuagint Studies, I have also been granted the opportunity to learn from some of the foremost specialists in this flourishing, multidisciplinary field.

Professor Robert J.V. Hiebert, my thesis supervisor, has been my instructor in Septuagint Studies, Old Testament, and biblical languages. I am profoundly grateful for his wise counsel, mentorship, advocacy, valuable suggestions and corrections, patience, kindness, and for the inspiration he has been to me as a scholar, teacher, and Christian. תודה רבה רבה. The encouragement and prayers of Rob and his wife Karen Hiebert have lifted my spirit and spurred me on time and time again. Professor Larry J. Perkins, who has instructed me in biblical Greek, New Testament, and Septuagint Studies, has been another source of encouragement. A gracious host of the online biweekly Greek Readings series historically known as “Greek for Breakfast,” Dr. Perkins continues to challenge and inspire me. I owe a very deep debt of gratitude to the MTS/MTH Committee of ACTS Seminaries. My striving to finish the MTS program was hindered first by illness and then by a devastating personal trial. The fact that the Committee safeguarded my prospects to finish the MTS provided me with a beacon of light at the end of a long dark tunnel. To every other professor, staff member (especially Admissions Director Liisa Polkki and ACTS Librarian William Badke), and student at ACTS Seminaries, I want to thank you all. You have given me some of my happiest and most fruitful years of spiritual-intellectual growth and community, a legacy that I will always cherish.

Words fail me to express my appreciation for my beloved husband and love of my life, Dr. Bruno Cagnoli. I thank Bruno for his love, companionship, encouragement, patience, and support. His dedication to science (as a geophysicist) and scholarship provides me with a standard of excellence that I can only aspire to. I also thank my parents, Melford (Bud) and Lorraine Nygaard, for sowing good and godly seeds in my life when I was a very young child, for their love, and their ongoing interest in my progress. In this regard, I pay special tribute to my grandfather, H. Garfield Fagan. “Grumps” was my first teacher, mentor, confidant, supporter, and probably the most important godly influence in my life. I very much appreciate Charlene Rast, Frances Weller and Marie-José Fortin for their prayers, spiritual encouragement, and friendship. Finally, yet above all, I praise and thank “the LORD, the LORD himself, [who] is my strength and my defense,” with exceedingly great joy, praise, and thanksgiving, I ever “draw water from the wells of salvation” (cf. Isaiah 12.3).

ABSTRACT

The Septuagint was a landmark literary achievement that was pivotal for the development of Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity, yet this Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures often exhibits a peculiarly literalistic translation approach that replicates the syntax of its Semitic source texts. To gain fresh perspectives on the strategies employed during the Septuagint's production, researchers have turned to the discipline of Translation Studies. Among influential translation theorists is Antoine Berman, whose seminal essay entitled "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign" outlines twelve deforming tendencies that a text may undergo during its translation. The present thesis undertakes to test the efficacy of Berman's negative analytic for use in Septuagint research, in conjunction with a detailed philological commentary on Old Greek Genesis 49.1-15. This study demonstrates that, besides elucidating the features and nature of this translated text, Berman's categories constructively facilitate the description of the translator's proclivity for foreignization/domestication and translation/commentary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Sigla and Abbreviations.....	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Constitutive Character of Septuagint Genesis.....	1
1.2 Interaction between Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies.....	5
1.3 “Trials of the Foreign:” Antoine Berman’s Negative Analytic of Translation.....	10
1.4 Research Question.....	14
CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY AND “TRIALS OF THE FOREIGN”.....	17
2.1 Further Definition of Berman’s “Trials”.....	17
2.2 Additional Methodological Principles for Commentary Preparation.....	20
CHAPTER 3. GENESIS 49.1-4: PREAMBLE AND ADDRESS TO ROUBEN.....	27
3.1 Contextual Outline of Genesis 49.1-33.....	27
3.2 Preamble (v. 1).....	27
3.3 Preamble (v. 2).....	36
3.4 Summary: Preamble (vv. 1-2).....	38
3.5 Rouben (v. 3).....	39
3.6 Rouben (v. 4).....	45
3.7 Summary: Rouben Pericope (vv. 3-4).....	49
CHAPTER 4. GENESIS 49.5-7: SYMEON AND LEUI.....	53
4.1 Symeon and Leui (v. 5).....	53
4.2 Symeon and Leui (v. 6).....	57
4.3 Symeon and Leui (v. 7).....	62
4.4 Summary: Symeon and Leui Pericope (vv. 5-7).....	65
CHAPTER 5. GENESIS 49.8-12: IOUDAS.....	68
5.1 Ioudas (v. 8).....	68

5.2 Ioudas (v. 9).....	71
5.3 Ioudas (v. 10).....	76
5.4 Ioudas (v. 11).....	81
5.5 Ioudas (v. 12).....	84
5.6 Summary: Ioudas Pericope (vv. 8-12).....	86
CHAPTER 6. GENESIS 49.13-15: ZABOULON AND ISSACHAR.....	92
6.1 Zaboulon (v. 13).....	92
6.2 Issachar (v. 14).....	94
6.3 Issachar (v. 15).....	97
6.4 Summary: Zaboulon and Issachar Pericopes (vv. 13-15).....	100
6.5 Synopsis: Berman's "Trials" in Gen 49.1-15.....	102
CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION.....	108
Bibliography.....	111
Appendix 1.....	121
Appendix 2.....	127

SIGLA AND ABBREVIATIONS**Sigla**

1^o, 2^o, etc. the first appearance, second appearance, etc.

Abbreviations

DO	Direct Object
DTS	Descriptive Translation Studies
fn.	footnote
fr.	fragment
G	translator(s) of Greek Genesis (OG-Gen)
HB	Hebrew Bible
KJV	King James Version
LXX	Septuagint
ms.	manuscript
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NIV	New International Version
OG-Gen	Greek Genesis (Wevers)
RSV	Revised Standard Version
“trial(s)”	“trial(s) of the Foreign”
v./vv.	verse/verses

The following abbreviations are used for major contributing sources:

<i>BDB</i>	Brown, Francis. <i>et al. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</i> . Peabody: Hendrickson, 1907.
<i>BHS</i>	Elliger, Karl. <i>et al.</i> , eds. <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
<i>DCH</i>	Clines, David J.A. <i>et al.</i> , eds. <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Vols. 1-5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-.
<i>GKC</i>	Kautzsch, Emil, ed. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Translated by Arther E. Cowley. 2 nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
<i>HALOT</i>	Holladay, William L. <i>A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> .

Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.

LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie, <i>The Online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon</i> (Irvine: University of California, 2011), online at http://www.tlg.uci.edu/lcj
MT	Masoretic Text, as found in <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>NETS</i>	<i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i>
NRSV	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i>
TLG	Pantelia, Maria C., ed. Thesaurus Linguae Graecae® Digital Library. University of California. http://www.tlg.uci.edu

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Constitutive Character of Septuagint Genesis

“The Septuagint,” a heterogeneous collection of mainly translated texts as well as original Greek compositions dating from roughly the third to the first century BCE, has been the focus of a wealth of scholarly research in recent decades. Very little is known about the actual *Sitze im Leben* or historical circumstances which set the translation initiative(s) in motion, yet the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into Greek was one of the most ambitious translation projects that we are aware of in the ancient world. According to one of the few surviving ancient sources, the so-called *Letter of Aristeas* (ca. second century BCE), the High Priest Eleazer sent 72 Jewish elders (six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel)¹ from Jerusalem to Alexandria in response to an invitation from the Egyptian king Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-247 BCE), who had commissioned the translation of the Hebrew Law into Greek for deposit in the royal library. After being isolated on the small island of Pharos, just opposite Alexandria, for a mere 72 days, the sages emerged triumphantly with their completed translation of the entire Pentateuch. The king gave his royal seal of approval on their work, treating the translators to congratulatory festivities, honours, and gifts. Such a scenario seems quite implausible to most modern scholars.² They dismiss the *Letter of Aristeas* as a work of fiction, an *apologia* for the authority of the Greek translations. However, scholars generally do accept the Alexandrian provenance and temporal precedence of the Septuagint Pentateuch.³ It is thus the translation texts themselves that are the primary source of data with which one may, as one Septuagint specialist puts it, trace the trail of the Septuagint translators.⁴ By carefully analyzing each translation segment, one uncovers clues that offer a glimpse of the cultural *milieu* as well as the linguistic and literary concerns (and even, perhaps, philosophical, theological, or political ideals) that shaped the ultimate translation product.

A textual-linguistic feature that the Septuagint (hereafter often abbreviated as LXX) translations have in common is the distinctive syntax and word order of LXX Greek, a Greek that has been variously described as “translationese,” as having “a strong Semitic influence,”⁵ and as being “hardly

¹ Hence the term “Septuagint” from the Latin term *septuaginta* which means “seventy.”

² For a stimulating and sophisticated reappraisal of Septuagint origins that interprets the *Letter of Aristeas* as “historical myth” which possibly preserves collected memories from the early Ptolemies, cf. Tessa Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 1-68.

³ Jannes Smith, *Translated Hallelujahs: A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on Select Septuagint Psalms* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 1, fn. 2.

⁴ Anneli Aejmelaesus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

⁵ Henry St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 29.

Greek at all, but rather Hebrew in disguise.”⁶ This linguistic characteristic can be explained, in part, by what Gideon Toury describes as “the law of interference,” namely, the fact that in virtually all translations, ancient or modern, “phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text.”⁷ Nonetheless, the degree of Semitic influence in the LXX (ranging from a slight Semitic overtone to the extreme of “unintelligibility”) suggests that further explanation beyond “the law of interference” may be necessary. The problem of fully accounting for the nature of LXX Greek is compounded by the fact that the translation methods employed, ranging from free to isomorphic renditions of the source text, vary from translator to translator and even within the same biblical book.

The LXX of Genesis (hereafter, OG-Gen⁸) is among the oldest translations in the LXX and has been dated to approximately the third century BCE.⁹ Its vocabulary and overall morpho-grammatical system are consistent with the popular Greek found in extra-biblical texts, such as papyri and inscriptions, from the first half of the third century BCE in Alexandria.¹⁰ OG-Gen, like the rest of the Greek Pentateuch, was produced during the very period when Classical Greek was phasing out and Koine (Hellenistic) Greek was emerging as the *lingua franca* of the ancient world. After comparing the language of the LXX with the Greek found in papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions of the Hellenistic period, Gustav Adolf Deissmann concluded that the Greek of the LXX is that of the “Egypto-Alexandrian dialect” dating back to the Ptolemaic period.¹¹

The exact source text(s) or *Vorlage(n)* for LXX translation texts cannot always be reconstructed, yet a comparison of OG-Gen with the Masoretic Text (MT) reveals that in most cases,

⁶ Frederick C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1905, repr. 1995), 21.

⁷ Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995), 275.

⁸ OG-Gen is the abbreviated form of Old Greek Genesis.

⁹ Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 17-18. The third century BCE dating of the Greek Pentateuch is supported by evidence that Demetrius, a Jewish-Hellenistic historian from the latter part of the third century BCE, was already familiar with Greek Genesis. Henry Swete’s comparative analysis of extracts from Demetrius with OG-Gen provides compelling evidence that Demetrius drew his quotations from the Septuagint. Fragments of Deuteronomy 23-28 (Pap Rylands 458) and Deuteronomy 31:36-32:7 (Pap Fouad 266) have been dated to the second century BCE and the first century BCE, respectively. Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 40. By 132 BCE, the prologue of the book of Sirach makes references to an Alexandrian Bible composed of the Torah, the Prophecies, and the Writings.

¹⁰ Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 40; John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, SCS 14 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 148. General statements regarding the peculiar Greek syntax and vocabulary found in OG-Gen can also be applied to the Greek Pentateuch and other translation texts of the LXX.

¹¹ Gustav Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies: Contributions chiefly from papyri and inscriptions, to the history of language, the literature and the religion of Hellenistic Judaism and primitive Christianity*, trans. Alexander Grieve (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901), 66-71.

the content, word order, and syntactical structure of the Greek are quite often similar if not identical to that of the MT. The MT thus serves as a provisional (albeit hypothetical) *Vorlage* for the purposes of analysis of translation technique for the majority of LXX scholars studying OG-Gen.¹² OG-Gen has been stylistically characterized as “good κοινή Greek,”¹³ yet certain syntactical features from its Hebrew *Vorlage(n)* have been transferred during the process of translation. For example, Hebrew prepositions are often isomorphically represented with a Greek preposition, which sometimes results in some awkwardness in the Greek syntax. Thus, the reason for the proportionately “large number of prepositional phrases in place of an accusative after a transitive verb”¹⁴ is sometimes attributable to the influence of the underlying Hebrew language system rather than that of the Greek.¹⁵ Another noteworthy example of linguistic interference from the Semitic source text is the frequent rendering of the Hebrew syntactical structure consisting of an infinitive absolute (free infinitive) plus a cognate finite verb¹⁶ with a Greek dative noun plus a cognate finite verb combination.¹⁷

Gen 3.4

לא מות תמתון	You will not die ¹⁸
οὐ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε	You will not die by death ¹⁹

Gen 17.13

המול ימול	[the one bought with money] must be circumcised
περιτομῇ περιτμηθήσεται	[the one bought with money] shall be circumcised with circumcision

¹² This is not to say, of course, that the translator(s) of OG-Gen had an exact copy of what we know as the MT as his/their *Vorlage* but rather that there are enough similarities between the MT and OG-Gen to warrant using the MT as a starting point for comparative analysis, bearing in mind that the choice of MT as a provisional *Vorlage* certainly does not preclude the possibility that more than one *Vorlage* may have been consulted by the translator(s) of OG-Gen.

¹³ Thackeray, *A Grammar*, 13.

¹⁴ Thackeray, *A Grammar*, 46.

¹⁵ This observation must be balanced with Takamitsu Muraoka's assertion that “the most important point about the syntax of prepositions is that in the Hellenistic period, in comparison with earlier periods, they assumed greater significance in fulfilling diverse function which used to be performed by the oblique cases.” Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (Leuven: Peeters, 2016), 215, §26.

¹⁶ The Hebrew infinitive absolute plus cognate finite verb emphasizes the verbal idea. Bruce K. Waltke and Michael P. O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, ID: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 584.

¹⁷ This structure is attested only in isolated instances of Classical Greek literature.

¹⁸ English translation of MT throughout this thesis is according to the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) unless otherwise specified.

¹⁹ English translation of OG-Gen throughout this thesis, unless otherwise specified, is the translation in NETS: Robert J.V. Hiebert, “Genesis,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, eds. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Besides the Semitic syntax, there are examples, at a semantic level, of the translator's employment of phenomena such as isolates and transcriptions.²⁰

Given these linguistic features, questions arise in relation to what extent the language in OG-Gen parallels conventional Greek style, syntax, and vocabulary found in non-translation sources and documents of the Hellenistic period. Scholars such as Henry Gehman,²¹ Nigel Turner,²² and Matthew Black²³ believed that the language of the Septuagint was a peculiar Jewish-Greek dialect, a dialect that was in use by the large community of Alexandrian Jews and that made sense to them. However, Deissmann insisted that "a more exact investigation of Alexandrian Greek will...yield the result that far more of the alleged Hebraisms of the LXX than one usually supposes are really phenomena of Egyptian, or of popular, Greek,"²⁴ that is, popular *koine* as opposed to literary *koine*.²⁵ Similarly, John A. L. Lee's important study of the vocabulary of the Greek Pentateuch in comparison with use of the lexis attested in documents dated to about the time of the translation of the Pentateuch convincingly demonstrates that "the case for regarding the Greek of the LXX as a 'Jewish-Greek' dialect is a weak one....The Greek of the LXX is to be regarded as essentially the Greek of the time and its peculiarities are to be explained chiefly as a result of the translation process."²⁶ This translation process was shaped by the translators' awareness that they were working on a canonical text. John William Wevers describes the approach of both the translators of OG-Gen and OG-Exodus to their work in this way:

Theirs was a holy task, which they did not take lightly. They were, after all, interpreting God's word, written in a language imperfectly understood by many Jews of the Alexandrian community,

²⁰ Isolates are Greek words which the translator has chosen based on his conception that the Greek word has some similarity to a Hebrew morpheme. Examples of isolates in OG-Gen are Gen 7.4 and 7.23 where the translator associates the word ζῶον ("living thing") with the root קום ("rise/stand up"), thus rendering the Hebrew with ἐξανέστασις ("a rising up") and ἀνάσταναι ("something that rises"). Transcriptions are typically used to render proper nouns or names but they also occur in instances in which the translator may not have known the meaning of a Hebrew word. Loan words that have a Semitic etymology such as ἄρκαβόν (= עֲרֵבֹן) in Gen 38.17, 18, and 20 are actually attested in pre-LXX Greek and cannot be considered mere transcriptions. These phenomena as well as other examples illustrating the distinctive lexical and morpho-grammatical character of OG-Gen are described in more detail by Robert J.V. Hiebert in "To the Reader of Genesis," NETS, 1-5. See also Robert J.V. Hiebert, "Ruminations on Translating the Septuagint of Genesis in the Light of the NETS Project," in *"Translation is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Robert J.V. Hiebert (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 76-84.

²¹ "If the LXX made sense to Hellenistic Jews, we may infer that there was a Jewish Greek which was understood apart from the Hebrew language." Henry S. Gehman, "The Hebraic Character of the Septuagint," *Vetus Testamentum*, no. 2 (April 1951): 81-90. For a similar analysis, see also Henry S. Gehman, "Hebraisms of the Old Greek Version of Genesis," *Vetus Testamentum* (April 1953): 141-148.

²² Nigel Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek," *Vetus Testamentum* 5, no. 2 (April 1955): 208-213.

²³ "And this language, like the Hebrew of the Old Testament which moulded it, was a language apart from the beginning; Biblical Greek is a peculiar language, the language of a peculiar people." Matthew Black, "The Semitic Element in the New Testament," *The Expository Times* (1965-1966): 23.

²⁴ Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 70.

²⁵ Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 8.

²⁶ Lee, *A Lexical Study*, 145-146.

and they rendered it into their vernacular, the Hellenistic Greek spoken and understood in Alexandria. This implied that their translation was not just a casual bit of work, something tossed off in passing, but was a studied procedure. It meant that the translators considered their task thoughtfully, did not simply put Hebrew words into equivalent Greek lexemes, but tried to put into Greek dress what they believed God intended to say to his people.²⁷

On the one hand, one could argue that Wevers is overstating his case, given the presence of isolates and some transcriptions and stereotypes. On the other hand, numerous other examples of rather sensitively contextualized renderings of Hebrew lexemes into Greek support Wevers's conclusion that the translators were concerned to render their source texts faithfully.

A comparative analysis of the text of OG-Gen with the MT demonstrates that, quite often, not only the content but also the word order and even the morphological units of the MT are mirrored in OG-Gen. Cameron Boyd-Taylor thus describes the general constitutive norms of OG-Gen as atomism, isomorphism, and minimalism.²⁸ However, Robert J.V. Hiebert qualifies the observation regarding the “translator's proclivity to reproduce his *Vorlage* quantitatively”²⁹ by acknowledging the fact that “the fairly frequent presence of what Lee and others call natural Greek in LXX-Gen and elsewhere has resulted in renderings that are not always isomorphic.”³⁰ Hiebert further observes that OG-Gen “exhibits within each translation unit and throughout the corpus varying degrees of dependence”³¹ on its *Vorlage* as well as instances of both intelligibility and “unintelligibility” in OG-Gen. Scholars have long sought an explanation for these perplexing anomalies.

1.2 Interaction between Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies

In the past few decades, LXX researchers have explored the field of Translation Studies to gain fresh insight regarding how to analyze these ancient translation texts. One fairly recent attempt to account for instances of unintelligibility in LXX texts is the so-called “interlinear” paradigm. Albert Pietersma, Benjamin Wright, and Cameron Boyd-Taylor believe that the norms of translation evinced by the textual-linguistic make-up of LXX texts, such as “a relatively high degree of isomorphic and

²⁷ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), xii.

²⁸ Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 308.

²⁹ 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 R. Glenn Wooden (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 91. The term “serial fidelity” rather than isomorphism is perhaps preferable to describe the quantitative representation of the *Vorlage* which is not always isomorphic, but nonetheless reflects the Hebrew syntax, the Hebrew lexemes, or the Hebrew word order. Cf. Larry Perkins, “The Greek Exodus Translator's [or Translators'] Rendering of אֱלֹהִים,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 82 (2020), 18.

³⁰ Robert J.V. Hiebert, in comments to the present author, November 21, 2020.

³¹ Hiebert, “The Hermeneutics of Translation,” 102.

lexical consistency between the target text and the source text...formal correspondence in word order”³² and instances of unintelligibility warrant a working hypothesis that goes beyond the concept of literality. The term “interlinear” has been chosen “to signal a relationship of linguistic subservience and dependence of the Greek translation vis-à-vis the Hebrew parent text.”³³ The concept of interlinearity does not signify that Hebrew semantics overrides Greek meaning, neither does one have the license to resort to Hebrew meanings in order to resolve textual or exegetical difficulties in the Greek text.³⁴ Instead, in places where the meaning of the Greek text is unclear, the Hebrew source text can be consulted for linguistic information that might disambiguate the Greek translation.³⁵

Any theory of translation for “the LXX as produced,” Pietersma insists, “can only be derived from its textual-linguistic make-up.”³⁶ The phrase “the LXX as produced” underscores the critical distinction between the production history of the LXX and its subsequent reception history. James Barr describes the mental processes associated with the Septuagint’s production history as “those of the translators themselves, whose decisions about meaning were reached from the Hebrew text” whereas the mental processes associated with its reception history are “those of later readers, most of whom did not know the original [Hebrew text].”³⁷ Failure to clearly separate the Septuagint’s production from its reception can result in a researcher imposing interpretations or ideas on the translation product that the original translators never had.³⁸

Many of the foundational assumptions that shaped the development of the interlinear paradigm were drawn from Gideon Toury’s work in the field of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS).³⁹ Adopting the favoured sociological/empiricist approach, Toury undertook to situate DTS within a

³² Albert Pietersma, “Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited,” in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. Cameron Boyd-Taylor (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 375.

³³ Albert Pietersma, “A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint,” in *A Question of Methodology*, 157. Subservience and dependence do not mean that “every linguistic item in the Greek can only be understood by reference to the parent text, nor that the translation *always* has an isomorphic relationship to its source, but that the Greek text *qua* text has a dimension of unintelligibility.” Pietersma, 157.

³⁴ Pietersma, “A New Paradigm,” 159.

³⁵ Pietersma, “A New Paradigm,” 162.

³⁶ Albert Pietersma, “Messianism and the Greek Psalter: In Search of the Messiah” in *A Question of Methodology*, 246.

³⁷ James Barr, “Common Sense and Biblical Language,” *Biblica* 49 (1968): 379.

³⁸ Making a distinction between the production history and the reception history of a translation, says Pietersma, is “axiomatic for the discipline of Septuagint Studies.” Pietersma, “Messianism and the Greek Psalter,” 244.

³⁹ Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, Benjamins Translation Library 4 (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995), 12-14.

research framework that is descriptive and based on socio-semiotics⁴⁰ and Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory.⁴¹ DTS assumes that translation is the process of negotiating between the linguistic, literary, cultural, and social conventions (i.e. "norms") associated with the language of the source text and those associated with the target language. The textual-linguistic make-up of the translation "governs the strategies whereby a target text (or parts thereof) is derived from its original, and hence the relationships which hold them together."⁴² The translation is judged to be "adequate" when it reflects the form of the source text. It is considered to be "acceptable" when it aligns with the norms of the target language. In actuality, the translation will represent a continuum between the two poles of adequacy and acceptability.⁴³ The task of the DTS researcher is to approach the translated document scientifically as raw data. The overall textual-linguistic character of the translation is assessed, and then, generalizations (i.e. "norms" or "laws") are formulated to facilitate the description and explanation of the various translational phenomena.

Boyd-Taylor demonstrates in detail how Toury's DTS methodology can be employed in LXX research in his volume entitled *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*.⁴⁴ Although the interlinear paradigm has received mixed reviews from some LXX scholars,⁴⁵ the development of the paradigm has achieved two critical objectives. Firstly, it has offered a

⁴⁰ The field of semiotics, as defined by its founder Ferdinand de Saussure, is "the science that studies the life of signs within society....Semiology would show what constitutes signs, what laws govern them." Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, eds. Perry Meisel and Haun Saussy, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 16. See also Michael Halliday, *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning* (London: Edward Arnold, 1978). It was Michael Halliday who introduced the term "social semiotics" and defined meaning-making as a social practice.

⁴¹ According to Even-Zohar, "the term 'polysystem' is more than just a terminological convention. Its purpose is to make explicit the conception of a system as dynamic and heterogeneous in opposition to the synchronistic approach. It thus emphasizes the multiplicity of intersections and hence the greater complexity of structuredness involved." Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory," *Poetics Today* 11, no. 1 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990), 9 and 12.

⁴² Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 12 - 14.

⁴³ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 49.

⁴⁴ Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, 38-366.

⁴⁵ For a summary of various perspectives voiced during a Panel on Modern Translations of the Septuagint at the Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Oslo, 1998), see Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, 12-15. For a collection of articles that were generated in connection with this Panel, see Bernard A. Taylor, ed., *Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*, Society for Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001). Articles in this volume by scholars expressing reservations about the paradigm include: Marguerite Harl, "La Bible D'Alexandrie 1. The Translation Principles," 1981-1997; Natalio Fernández Marcos, "Reactions to the Panel on Modern Translations," 233-240; and Arie von der Kooij, "Comments on NETS and La Bible D'Alexandrie," 229-231. Perhaps the strongest opposition to the interlinear paradigm is articulated by Takamitsu Muraoka in "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model," in *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2008), 221-235. For a detailed rebuttal to Muraoka's article, see Pietersma, "A Response to Muraoka's Critique of Interlinearity," in *A Question of Methodology*, 315-337.

reasonably well-developed methodology that can be employed as a point of departure for LXX research. Secondly, the paradigm has encouraged LXX scholars to engage in discussion about theories of translation (or the lack thereof) and how presuppositions impact their methodology and research outcomes.

With regard to OG-Gen, Hiebert's assessment of the interlinear paradigm is that it generally describes the dependent relationship of OG-Gen *vis-à-vis* its Hebrew source. For example, various kinds of literalistic renderings in OG-Gen, such as isolates, are readily accounted for by the interlinear model.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, culturally-conditioned phenomena such as contextualization, harmonization, and expansion that are present in OG-Gen are examples of cases in which the Hebrew cannot be the arbiter of meaning. According to Boyd-Taylor, Hiebert "clearly has some reservations [about the interlinear paradigm]. [Hiebert] observes that the sort of 'deliberate, culturally conditioned changes' he cites exhibit an 'independence from the Hebrew' that might undermine the assumption" of interlinearity.⁴⁷ Boyd-Taylor believes "what is at issue is whether or not the relative independence of Greek Genesis from its Hebrew parent should be understood against the background of a more fundamental dependence and subservience."⁴⁸ Hiebert's conclusion is that the interlinear model can serve as a useful heuristic tool for the study of OG-Gen, yet "the term interlinear must be nuanced to account for the fact that the LXX translator did, at times, interrupt his literalistic rendering of the Hebrew *Unterlage* to clarify or contextualize something for his intended readership. Why that would happen in certain situations but not others is not always clear."⁴⁹ Evidently, more research is necessary in order to refine a translation theory, if one can be articulated, that can be applied to Septuagint Studies, qualifying and explaining further the nature of the relationship between a text like OG-Gen and its source and also the implications of such a relationship for exegesis and hermeneutics.

Theo A. W. van der Louw is another scholar who sees promise in Toury's DTS, yet has reservations about its efficacy for analyzing ancient translation texts such as the LXX. His main reservation is that Toury's model "presupposes an intricate knowledge of both source and target culture"⁵⁰ in regard to assessment of a text's "acceptability" versus its "adequacy." For van der Louw,

⁴⁶ Robert J.V. Hiebert, "Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33 (2000): 84.

⁴⁷ Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, 270. Here, Boyd-Taylor is interacting with Hiebert's article "Translation Technique" (p. 88).

⁴⁸ Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, 270-271.

⁴⁹ Hiebert, "Translation Technique," 93.

⁵⁰ Theo A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 21.

“acceptability” refers to what is acceptable “in the light of the target culture, i.e. Greek-speaking Jewry in the Hellenistic period.”⁵¹ It is true that limited knowledge of the cultural milieu of Second Temple Judaism presents challenges for LXX researchers. However, “acceptability” refers not to target *culture*, but rather to the text’s alignment with the norms of the target *language*; “adequacy” refers to its reflection of the form of the source *text* (emphases mine). Therefore, the systematic bottom-up textual analysis that Toury advocates is feasible, given the fact that a great deal is already known about the languages of ancient Greek and Hebrew. Scholars also have access to a reasonably good-sized collection of textual sources with which to compare data.

Notwithstanding, van der Louw has made an important contribution to Septuagint Studies which indeed “offers elements which can improve methodological accuracy for both the text-critical and ideological study of the Septuagint,”⁵² employing methodology derived from “early [or linguistic] Translation Studies.”⁵³ He engages in an essentially bottom-up approach to analyzing a translation text at a micro level, identifying and describing ‘shifts’ (or transformations) that occur during the process of translating. Transformations are categorized according to labels that describe the procedure employed by a translator for any given micro-unit of text, whether describing changes at a lexical level (e.g. cultural counterpart) or a grammatical/syntactical level (e.g. change of word class). Alternatively, transformations also describe processes such as the idiomatic translation of an idiom, the redistribution of semantic features, additions, and omissions, etc.⁵⁴ Essentially, van der Louw underscores the usefulness of categorizing transformations for analyzing the problems that a translator encounters while translating,⁵⁵ along with the solution(s) adopted.⁵⁶ His analytical approach is a valuable tool for granting researchers a window on the process of translation itself, given that the LXX is an ancient collection whose translators can no longer be interviewed nor did they leave behind any notes or commentary on their translation process.

As we have seen, cutting-edge scholars have turned to the field of Translation Studies for insight regarding translation theory, methodology, and their application to Septuagint Studies. With its many subfields and diverse perspectives, Translation Studies has the potential to furnish additional tools to employ in the study of the production history of the LXX. One such tool that could be used in assessing

⁵¹ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 20.

⁵² Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 367.

⁵³ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 16.

⁵⁴ For a complete inventory of van der Louw’s transformations, see van der Louw, *Transformations*, 61-90.

⁵⁵ The word “problem” itself has many layers of meaning in terms of translation studies. The approach of van der Louw is essentially a “problem-oriented study of transformations.” Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 373.

⁵⁶ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 17.

variations between a source text and its translation is Antoine Berman's⁵⁷ so-called "negative analytic of translation." Berman provides a list of criteria on the basis of which one might undertake to explore OG-Gen's linguistic system(s), networks of signification, literary character and, above all, its relationship to its *Vorlage*. The procedures adopted by the translator can thereby be analyzed in order to evaluate how faithfully the source text has been rendered.

1.3 "Trials of the Foreign": Antoine Berman's Negative Analytic of Translation

In his seminal essay, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign,"⁵⁸ Antoine Berman defines translation as the "trial of the Foreign."⁵⁹ For Berman, this is a trial in a double sense. On the one hand, translation "establishes a relationship between the Self-Same (*Propre*) and the Foreign by aiming to open up the foreign work to us in its utter foreignness."⁶⁰ On the other hand, "translation is a trial *for the Foreign as well*, since the foreign work is uprooted from its own *language-ground* (*sol-de-langue*). And this trial, often an exile,⁶¹ can also exhibit the most singular power of the translating act: to reveal the foreign work's most original kernel, its most deeply buried, most Self-Same, but equally the most 'distant' from itself."⁶² Translating technical or scientific texts only involves performing a semantic transfer that is a means to the end of transmitting technical-scientific knowledge. In contrast, translating literature is "work on the letter" (*lettre*), a process of translation that is unequivocally not a method⁶³ since the word "work" embodies the endless and skillfully discerning task of *labouring* to discover and recover the *lettre* of the original literary work (of art), giving this *lettre* fresh expression in its subsequent translation(s). The *lettre* of the original literary work is its being-in-language and comprises

⁵⁷ Antoine Berman (1942-1991) was a French philosopher, historian, translator, and translation theorist.

⁵⁸ Antoine Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. and trans. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 284-297. This is a publication of a work that was originally published in French as Antoine Berman, "La traduction comme épreuve de l'étranger," *Texte 4* (1985): 67– 81. *L'Épreuve de l'étranger* is Berman's translation of the phrase *die Erfahrung des Fremden* used by Martin Heidegger in his discussion of a poem by Friedrich Hölderlin. While *Erfahrung* is sometimes translated in English as "experience," the word "trial" or "ordeal" captures the connotation of a struggle signified by Berman's perfect choice of the French term *épreuve* to render this German word.

⁵⁹ In Berman's writings and also in this thesis, "Foreign" with a capital "F" refers to the distinctive Self-Same of a source text's *lettre* whereas "foreign" with a lowercase "f" is more generically used in contexts that refer to a foreign language or culture.

⁶⁰ Berman, "Translation and the Trials," 284.

⁶¹ Here, Berman is not suggesting that every act of translating a work is an act of sending the work into exile (note the word "often"). Instead, the metaphor of an exile seems to portray the powerful image, which may be true especially when the target language is significantly different from the source language, of forceful removal from its own language-ground and its residency as a foreigner, an exile, in a distant language-ground.

⁶² Berman, "Translation and the Trials," 284.

⁶³ According to Berman, "each text poses specific 'problems' of translatability – which is why there can be no method in this field." Antoine Berman, Isabelle Berman, and Valentina Sommella, *The Age of Translation: A Commentary on Walter Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator,"* trans. Chantal Wright (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), 68 and 42, respectively.

more than its syntax and semantic content. This being-in-language is the essence of the work as a totality and includes elements such as its linguistic patternings, use of language, form, discursive order, rhythms, the quality and quantity of its signifiers, and its networks of signification.⁶⁴ “In a text composed in its mother tongue,” says Berman, “the relationship of form and content, of the signifier to the signified is one of absolute unity”⁶⁵ in which “each signifier in the text is both indissolubly tied to all other signifiers and to its own diachronic historical aspect.”⁶⁶ The act of translating (i.e. trial of the Foreign) will ineluctably alter these signifiers and their networks. Hence, “the relationship between form and content is looser (because the same thing can be translated in several different ways); the relationship of the signifier to other signifiers has also become random...and the signifier’s link to its own diachrony is undone.”⁶⁷ In the trials of the Foreign, translating “inevitably becomes a manipulation of signifiers, where two languages enter into various forms of collision and somehow *couple*.”⁶⁸ The antithesis of the trials of the Foreign is the acclimation or “naturalization” of translation. For Berman, “the properly *ethical* aim of the translating act [is] receiving the Foreign as the Foreign.”⁶⁹

A key influence in the formation of Berman’s philosophical ideas was Friedrich Schleiermacher, who argued that there are only two methods of translation: “Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him,”⁷⁰ or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him.”⁷¹ Developing the ideas of Schleiermacher and Berman further, American translation historian and theorist Lawrence Venuti coined the terms “domestication” (“an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values”)⁷² and “foreignization” (“an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text”).⁷³ It is worth quoting in full Venuti’s description of the dynamics between the source and target cultures if foreignization is adopted in translation:

The “foreign” in foreignizing translation is not a transparent representation of an essence that resides in the foreign text and is valuable in itself, ***but a strategic construction whose value is***

⁶⁴ Concerning these networks of signification, Berman writes that every literary work “contains a hidden dimension, an ‘underlying’ text, where certain signifiers correspond and link up, forming all sorts of networks beneath the ‘surface’ of the text itself.” Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 292.

⁶⁵ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 70.

⁶⁶ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 125.

⁶⁷ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 70.

⁶⁸ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 285.

⁶⁹ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 286.

⁷⁰ This translation would be oriented to the literary, linguistic, and cultural context of the source text.

⁷¹ André Lefevere, *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977),

74. This translation would be oriented to the literary, linguistic, and cultural context of the target language.

⁷² Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 20.

⁷³ Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility*, 20.

contingent on the current target-language situation. Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. In its effort to do right abroad [in this sense, Venuti is referring to Schleiermacher's metaphor], this translation method must do wrong at home, *deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience*—choosing to translate a foreign text excluded by domestic literary canons, for instance, or *using a marginal discourse to translate it* [bold emphasis mine].⁷⁴

On the other hand, in the process of domestication (Venuti) or acclimation/naturalization (Berman), Berman detects an underlying “system of textual deformation,” that frustrates and disallows translation (i.e. “trial of the Foreign”). These forces or tendencies, which give rise to the deviation of “the trial of the Foreign” from its essential aim, are outlined in Berman's negative analytic of translation. This is described in terms of twelve deforming tendencies:⁷⁵

1. **Rationalization:** rearrangement of the discursive order of sentences; rationalizing contraction; annihilation of concreteness in favour of abstraction.
2. **Clarification:** displacement of the indefinite and ambiguous with the definite, clear and explicit.
3. **Expansion:** addition of elements that add nothing; unnecessarily augmenting, stretching, flattening, and/or slackening a work, thus impairing its rhythmic flow.
4. **Ennoblement and popularization:** treatment of the source text as raw material and rewriting the text in order to produce elegantly beautiful prose or poetry; “rhetorization” or “poetization” to enhance meaning and/or the esthetic value (e.g. its sound; its orality) in the target language.
5. **Qualitative impoverishment:** replacement of source text expressions, terms or figures (e.g. something that evokes an image and is thus iconic) with that which lacks the original signifying, iconic, or sonorous richness.
6. **Quantitative impoverishment:** a lexical loss; reducing the number of signifiers or chain of signifiers with the result of obscuring the original's portrayal of reality.
7. **Destruction of rhythms:** a strategy that might, for example, involve alteration of punctuation in written work; more difficult to do in prose, but a tendency in poetry or theatre.
8. **Destruction of underlying networks of signification:** disruption or elimination of signifiers that link up with each other and define a literary work's signifying process, a process that creates an important hidden dimension in the original which, unfortunately, is not transmitted to the translation.
9. **Destruction of linguistic patternings** (also known as “style”): similar to rationalization, clarification, and expansion, but refers to the translator's choice of sentence constructions (e.g. the translator's frequent recourse to a particular type of subordination introduced by words such as “because;” the translator's treatment of time, etc.) that are not in the essential system of the source text.
10. **Destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization:** replacement of verbs with nominal constructions or nominalization, thus destroying the physicality and concreteness of the vernacular language; compromising the orality of the vernacular; exoticizing the

⁷⁴ Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 20.

⁷⁵ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 288-296.

vernacular by replacing a foreign vernacular with a local vernacular (e.g. “using Parisian slang to translate the *lunfardo* [dialect] of Buenos Aires”⁷⁶).

11. **Destruction of expressions and idioms:** large scale replacement of idioms, images, figures, proverbs, or expressions in the original text with target language equivalents, thereby attacking the discourse of the source text and rendering an ethnocentric translation.
12. **Effacement of the superimposition of languages:** failure to capture the relationship between dialects and the vernacular; destroying the diversity of languages, discursive types or voices that are present in the source text.

According to Berman, “norms” (e.g. cultural, social, literary) partly impact the act of translating but actually apply to all types of writing practices. In contrast, his analytic approach concentrates on “the universals of deformation inherent in translating as such.”⁷⁷ The root cause of these tendencies, according to Berman, is the determination to achieve “an embellishing restitution of meaning, based on the typically Platonic separation between spirit and letter, sense and word, content and form, the sensible and the non-sensible....[The] Platonic figure of translation...sets up as an absolute only one essential possibility of translating, which is precisely the restitution of meaning.”⁷⁸ The alternative to the Platonic figure of translation, Berman says, is literal translation:

“[L]iteral” means: attached to the letter (of works). Labor on the letter [*lettre*] in translation is more originary than restitution of meaning. It is through this labor that translation, on the one hand, restores the particular signifying process of works (which is more than their meaning) and, on the other hand, transforms the translating language.⁷⁹

Berman’s negative analytic with respect to the translation process thus exposes what he sees as the Platonic figure of a translation’s preoccupation with elegance, explication, and clarification. The words “destruction” and “effacement” that he uses to describe these tendencies and his term “negative analytic” clearly portray his philosophical and ethical commitment to foreignization as opposed to domestication as a valid translation methodology. Nevertheless, one need not adopt Berman’s ethical and prescriptive stance as a prerequisite for employing his analytic as an investigative tool. The tension between foreignization (i.e. bringing the reader to the source) and domestication (i.e. bring the source to the reader) exists in every translation.

⁷⁶ Berman gives this particular example in Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 294.

⁷⁷ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 296.

⁷⁸ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 296.

⁷⁹ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 297. Berman’s description of this “labour on the *lettre*” is a notable contrast to van der Louw’s assertion that “literal translation is always the fastest and easiest method.” Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 57. For van der Louw, transformations are necessary because “literal translation does not work,” although “literal translation” is listed as one of van der Louw’s transformations. Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 57 and 64.

1.4 Research Question

Berman's idea of twelve deforming tendencies was developed as part of a strategy for uncovering and evaluating the variations between virtually any source text and its translation. His analytic has been constructively employed in several different research contexts. For example, Christy Maya Uktolseya used Berman's analytic to present a detailed analysis of the deforming tendencies evident in the English translation of the Indonesian novel *Bekisar Merah*.⁸⁰ Elif Tasdan successfully applied Berman's analytic to the Turkish translation of a philosophical work, Albert Camus's *L'Étranger*.⁸¹ She investigated potential deviation from the source text's ideological or literary inferences that may have resulted from factors such as the translator's individual preferences, cultural/social environments, or political/ideological backgrounds. The results of her study led her to conclude that "even the smallest interventions of translators may cause a great loss both in the content and the intent of philosophical novels. The deformations created by translators may also alter the perception of the philosophy intended to be conveyed to the target society."⁸² Peter Hodges found Berman's analytic to be an effective frame of reference from which to evaluate his English translation of French author Boris Vian's short stories.⁸³ Hodges concluded that, compared to several other theoreticians who have attempted to expand the spectrum of comparative descriptive studies, Berman has formulated criteria that provide "the most relevant linguistic overview to see where there is divergence between the source and target texts."⁸⁴

Although Berman's categories have been successfully employed for research on the translation of literary works,⁸⁵ Berman's negative analytic has never been applied to investigate a LXX translation. It is noteworthy that Berman's and Venuti's analogy of bringing the reader to the source text or, in other

⁸⁰ Christy Maya Uktolseya, "Destruction of *Bekisar Merah*: Antoine Berman's Deforming Tendencies in *The Red Bekisar*," *K@ta: A Biannual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature* 19, no. 2 (December 2017): 41-47.

⁸¹ Elif Tasdan, "L'Étranger Strange to its Translation: Critical Analysis of the Turkish Translation of *L'Étranger* from Berman's Perspective," *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching* 5, no. 2 (June 2017): 314-323. 322.

⁸² Tasdan, "L'Étranger Strange to its Translation:" 322.

⁸³ Peter Hodges, "The Application of Berman's Theory as a Basis for Target Text Evaluation," *The AALITRA Review: A Journal of Literary Translation* 11 (May 2016): 48-59.

⁸⁴ Hodges, "The Application of Berman's Theory," 49.

⁸⁵ The following are a few additional examples of investigations that apply Berman's analytic to literary works and also political headlines: Afsheen Kashifa, "Deforming Tendencies in the Urdu Translation of *The Old Man and the Sea*" (Master's thesis, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, 2018); Zahra Jafari and Amin Karimnia, "A Survey of Poetry Translation According to Antoine Berman's (1985) Text Deformation System: A Case Study of English Translation of Book II of *Mathnavi Manavi*," *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* 2, no. 2 (2015): 54-65; Fahimeh Vamenani and Moslem Sadeghi, "An Examination of Berman's Negative Deformation Tendencies on [the] Persian Translation of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* Novel," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 7, no. 5 (September 2018): 135-143; Shaghayagh Sadeghi and Bahram Mowlaie, "Contrastive Analysis of Political News Headlines Translation According to Berman's Deformative Forces," *Journal of Language and Translation* 8, no. 3 (September 2018): 31-43.

words, bringing the reader to the foreign, seems to resonate with similar language used by Pietersma⁸⁶ to describe the translation process of bringing the reader to the source rather than bringing the source to the reader.⁸⁷ Given Venuti's assertion that foreignization is "a strategic construction,"⁸⁸ the possibility that there could be much more behind what has been characterized as "translationese" and exhibiting a "strong Semitic influence" and "hardly Greek at all, but rather Hebrew in disguise" in LXX Greek is intriguing. Could the translator of OG-Gen have employed a foreignizing method (consciously or unconsciously), a method that involved "stag[ing] an alien reading experience"⁸⁹ in which, to some degree at least, a tolerant reader would be necessary? On the other hand, does the textual-linguistic make-up of OG-Gen suggest an overarching methodology of domestication? In an investigation of these and other critical issues pertaining to translation theory and exegesis, Berman's negative analytic can constructively be employed to study afresh the OG-Gen translator's strategies in dealing with matters of syntax, semantics, and other facets of literary discourse pertaining to both the source text and the target language.

The primary focus of the present study, therefore, is to test the efficacy of Berman's negative analytic as an investigative tool for Septuagint Studies. To do so, a single passage of OG-Gen has been selected for investigation: Gen 49.1-15. This chapter is an extract from a larger segment of discourse in which Jacob/Iakob summons his sons just prior to his death and issues his parting words to them. Genesis 49 contains a particularly high concentration of enigmatic Hebrew words, a fact that makes translation of this section a difficult task.⁹⁰ A well-known example occurs in Genesis 49.10:

שִׁלֹּה	Tribute [comes] to him (NRSV)
	Shiloh (KJV, NASB)
	To whom it belongs (RSV, NIV)

Besides the challenges Genesis 49 presents for translators, this chapter is rich in metaphorical and poetic imagery as well as in intertextual allusions. Exploring the ancient translator's approach to this

⁸⁶ Albert Pietersma, "A New English Translation of the Septuagint," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*, Septuagint Commentary Series 51, ed. Bernard A. Taylor (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 219.

⁸⁷ Pietersma borrows this language from Sebastian Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," *Old Testament Studies* 17 (1972): 11-30; idem, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1978): 69-87.

⁸⁸ Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 20.

⁸⁹ Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 20.

⁹⁰ Raymond de Hoop cites no fewer than 22 Hebrew words or phrases that are enigmatic and difficult for translators. Raymond de Hoop, *Genesis 49 in Its Literary and Historical Context* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999; repr. 2007), 7-8.

chapter, his treatment of the literary imagery, and his handling of the difficulties in the text is a fascinating prospect.

The principal research question is: What is the efficacy of Berman's negative analytic for assessing the nature of the translation strategies in OG-Gen 49.1-15? Careful analysis of the textual-linguistic make-up, style, and literary character of OG-Gen as well as of the interplay between foreignization and domestication is required in order for that question to be answered. In other words, at every turn the Greek counterparts of the source text need to be studied with a view to identifying the translation strategies that they exhibit, classifying them according to Berman's categories of deforming tendencies, and assessing the impact of these tendencies on the translation product. In particular, Berman's analytic shows promise with regard to elucidating the underlying processes of signification in a source text and providing a synopsis as to what degree these were transferred to its target text. Moreover, the analytic may show to what extent the translator of Gen 49:1-15 made a conscious decision to preserve specific elements of the Foreign while, at the same time, exhibiting an effort to adapt his Semitic source text to the norms of the target language (i.e. domestication). In addition to shedding light on the translator's interpretative approach and methodology, this investigation may possibly contribute to the refinement of a translation theory for Septuagint Studies, with OG-Gen as a point of focus.

Following a discussion in chapter 2 of methodological principles employed in the present study, this thesis involves a two-part investigation. First, it is necessary to gather data in conjunction with textual-linguistic analysis of OG-Gen 49.1-15. This entails writing a detailed philological commentary on the passage, with a focus on word, phrase, and sentence units of discourse in relation both to the underlying source text and to the natural, compositional Greek of the period of the translation. Once the translation choices in OG-Gen 49.1-15 have been analyzed, any of Berman's deforming tendencies that are apparent in OG-Gen 49.1-15 are identified and their impact on the textual-linguistic make-up and literary character of OG-Gen is discussed, especially as they relate to the dynamics of foreignization and domestication. Finally, conclusions are drawn regarding Berman's analytic and its efficacy for assessing the translation strategies employed in OG-Gen 49.1-15.

CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY AND “TRIALS OF THE FOREIGN”

2.1 Further definition of Berman’s “Trials”

Before proceeding with a commentary on OG-Gen 49.1-15, a few words must be said regarding the application of Berman’s negative analytic to an ancient text as well as several presuppositions that undergird his “trials” as a whole. From the outset, Berman seeks to analyze a “*system* of textual deformation”⁹¹ which refers not to an organized method but rather to an interconnecting network that constitutes a complex whole.⁹² He also considers the possibility that there may be still additional types of deforming tendencies. Moreover, the various deformations may derive from or combine with others.⁹³ In his volume entitled *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne*,⁹⁴ Berman provides the most systematic explanation of how he critically analyzes translated texts. He describes three successive stages. In the first stage, the reader suspends any hasty judgment and embarks on “the long, patient activity of reading and rereading the translation(s), *while completely setting aside the original text.*”⁹⁵ For Berman, this gesture averts an unprincipled comparison of the translation with its *Vorlage* that involves an almost febrile search for defectivity in the translation—the “tendency to want to judge a translation, and *to want to do only this.*”⁹⁶ The main point in this and subsequent stages of Berman’s negative analytic (and thus a goal of analysis in this thesis) is emphatically not to “nitpick” the translator’s work nor to generally view his/her work as a destruction of the original. It is instead to ‘dignify’ a translator and his/her work, since analyzing and assessing the translation is placing value on it, just as one might engage in critique of authors and their respective original literary works.⁹⁷

In the second stage, the reader should endeavour to establish “whether the translated text ‘stands’ ...as a real text,” and to ascertain its “degree of *immanent consistency* outside of any relation to the original.”⁹⁸ In so discovering whether or not the translation is well-written in a broad sense, the sensitive reader should be attentive to textual zones in which the translation exhibits some weakness or defectiveness (places where the text seems to lose its rhythm, flows too easily or fluently or becomes

⁹¹ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 286. Emphasis mine.

⁹² One of the definitions of “system” in the *Oxford English Dictionary* is “a collection of natural objects, features, or phenomena considered as or forming a connected or complex whole” (accessed July 11, 2023 at 14:44, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/system_n, item 3d).

⁹³ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 288.

⁹⁴ Antoine Berman, *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne*, trans. and ed. Françoise Massardier-Kenney (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2009). This work was based on his lecture notes and was published posthumously, as indeed were many of his works.

⁹⁵ Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 29. Emphasis in italics is Berman’s.

⁹⁶ Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 29. Emphasis is Berman’s.

⁹⁷ Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 30.

⁹⁸ Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 50. Emphasis his.

permeated by fashionable words, etc.). Conversely, the rereading also may reveal textual zones that are, in Berman's words, "miraculous," "writing that is *writing of translation*, writing that no French writer⁹⁹ could have written, a foreigner's writing harmoniously moved into French without any friction (or if there is friction, a beneficial one)."¹⁰⁰ Diverging from the norms of the target language, "the translator has *foreign-written* in French and thus has produced a new French."¹⁰¹ After this preliminary reading of the target text, a similar reading and rereading of the original text ensues to uncover its internal logic, stylistic traits, "signifying zones," and other aspects that distinguish the work in question.¹⁰²

Peter Connor rightly discerns that Berman's preliminary reading requires "readers of considerable literary sensitivity, capable of discerning linguistic deviance in a translated text without consultation of the original."¹⁰³ Exhibiting such sensitivity towards an ancient Greek translation poses a significant challenge which is complicated by the fact that a twenty-first century researcher can never experience immersion in the linguistic and cultural milieu of the Second Temple period to the degree that nuances and subtleties might be intuitively apprehended as would be the case for a speaker of Hellenistic/Koine Greek.¹⁰⁴ This thesis thus focuses on the final stage of Berman's analytic of translation. In this stage, there is a 'confrontation' between the translated text and the corresponding passages in its *Vorlage*. Berman specifies that his negative analytic should be applied with deductive analysis of the translation text in the Cartesian sense. The present deductive study can therefore be conceived of as a work of textual archaeology that is an exclusively *translator-oriented investigation*¹⁰⁵ since it explores the production history of the translated text. It seeks to discern the strategies and techniques employed by the translator(s) during the process of translation that eventually gave shape to the end product, which in this case is the translation of OG-Gen. Through a process of systematic textual analysis, the researcher seeks to gain insight into the various "weaknesses" and/or "miracles" that may be present in this ancient Greek translation.

⁹⁹ Or in the case of this thesis, no Greek writer.

¹⁰⁰ Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 50. Emphasis in italics is Berman's.

¹⁰¹ Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 50-51.

¹⁰² Berman, *Toward a Translation*, 54-55.

¹⁰³ Peter Connor, "Reading Literature in Translation," in *A Companion to Translation Studies*, eds. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2014), 430.

¹⁰⁴ For that matter, this also applies to an ancient Hebrew speaker, with respect to consideration of the source text.

¹⁰⁵ "The principle of original meaning," which is the second principle in the preamble to "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint," is further qualified as follows: "[Although] commentators may make use of reception history in an effort to ascertain what the Greek text meant at its point of inception and may from time to time digress to comment on secondary interpretations, the focus shall be on what is perceived to be the original meaning of the text." "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint," Preamble §2: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/prospectus.html>.

The text of OG-Gen that is the focus of the present study is the eclectic critical edition of John William Wevers in the Göttingen Septuaginta series.¹⁰⁶ This investigation is predicated on the assumption that, as is the case with any literary translated text, OG-Gen was *derived* from the *lettre* (i.e. being-in-language) of its (Semitic) source text. As stated above, the *lettre* consists of more than its meaning (if meaning is narrowly defined as its lexical meaning or, in instances where a phrase or sentence is taken as a meaningful unit, the transmission of a coherent message or statement)¹⁰⁷ but also encompasses other elements and dimensions such as its form and discursive order. It therefore does not necessarily follow that G's primary goal was to transmit a coherent message from the source to target text. At any given point, a translator's concern during his work on the *lettre* may focus on other objectives such as, for instance, retaining the syntax of the source text or simply representing a Hebrew word by means of Greek characters (i.e. transliteration). Nonetheless, literal translation ("work on the *lettre*") in OG-Gen often does involve the task of decoding and recoding meaning of the source text, especially if one takes into account the many different facets of meaning (e.g. linguistic or grammatical meaning).¹⁰⁸ Whenever G has attempted to encode meaning, he has done so in the target language (Greek).¹⁰⁹

In order to determine *how* meaning (or other elements of the *lettre*) was discerned and then translated at any given point, OG-Gen is mapped onto a plausible, yet hypothetical, *Vorlage* for which the Hebrew MT is the point of departure for research, as exemplified in the following mapping of Gen 1.1:

¹⁰⁶ John William Wevers, *Genesis. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974). The choice of the Göttingen critical edition is in line with "the principle of original text," which is outlined in the preamble to "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint." Cf. "A Prospectus," Preamble §1.

¹⁰⁷ Eugene Nida's writings, for example, deal extensively with the complex and multi-faceted concept of meaning. He discerns types of meaning that include linguistic/grammatical meaning (that is, "meaningful relationships which exist within language"), referential/lexical meaning (that is, how a verb is denoted, described, or defined and how it relates to a referent in a given context), and emotive/conative/rhetorical meaning (this type of meaning relates "to the responses of the participants in the communicative act"). Eugene Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 57 and 70.

¹⁰⁸ See fn. 105 and fn. 107.

¹⁰⁹ In this sense, the Greek text is "perceived to be *compositionally* dependent on its source, though not *semantically* dependent." "Guidelines for Contributors to the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint," Preamble §1.1.1: <https://www.twu.ca/sites/default/files/sblcseriesguidelinesrev2.pdf>.

Gen 1.1

MT	ב ראשית	ברא	אלהים	את	ה שמים		ו את	ה ארץ
	prep + noun	verb (perf. 3rd sg active)	noun	DO marker ¹¹⁰	def. art. + noun		conj +DO marker	def. art. + noun
	<i>in the beginning</i>	<i>created</i>	<i>God</i>		<i>the heavens</i>		<i>and</i>	<i>the earth</i>
NRSV		In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.						
OG-Gen	ἐν ἀρχῇ	ἐποίησεν	ὁ θεὸς	τὸν οὐρανὸν			καὶ	τὴν γῆν
	prep + noun	verb (aorist 3rd sg act)	def. art. + noun	def. art. + noun			conj.	def. art. + noun
	<i>in the beginning</i>	<i>made</i>	<i>the God</i>	<i>the sky</i>			<i>and</i>	<i>the earth</i>
NETS		In the beginning God made the sky and the earth						

By comparing the morpho-grammatical make-up of the Hebrew parent text to its Greek offspring, one can see that the syntax of the MT is virtually mirrored in OG-Gen, apart from the Hebrew DO marker and the absence of a definite article in אלהים. With this dimension in view, it is now possible to note the various adjustments the translator made in his efforts to duplicate the syntax of his Semitic *Vorlage*.

One must also consider the relationship of the translation to the target language with respect to the target linguistic and literary system. Analysis of this dimension involves comparing the Greek of OG-Gen with *non-translation* Classical and Koine Greek to determine the degree to which the translator accommodated his translation to the grammatical, syntactical, semantic, and stylistic conventions of the target language. It is critical to analyze as much relevant data as possible from non-translation Greek documents (including papyri and inscriptions) which are preferably textual witnesses contemporaneous with OG-Gen.

2.2 Additional Methodological Principles for Commentary Preparation

The commentary on OG-Gen 49.1-15 is prepared in conformity with the “Guidelines for Contributors to the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint,” a set of protocols

¹¹⁰ The Hebrew language system often attests the use of the particle את to mark the following direct object (DO).

that was shaped on the basis of several foundational principles inspired, in part, by Toury's work in the area of DTS. In the Preamble to these Guidelines, it is stated that the verbal make-up of the Septuagint is "understood in terms of *conventional* linguistic usage (i.e., the grammar and lexicon of the target language) rather than in terms of what may be encountered in translation Greek."¹¹¹ Accordingly, one of the foundational principles of this undertaking is that of "linguistic parsimony, which is understood to mean that, as a general rule, no words or constructions of translation-Greek shall be considered normal Greek, unless attested in in non-translation writings."¹¹² Berman speaks of the kinship of languages and the fact that languages couple and collide during the process of translation. Hence, translators may creatively use and transform the target language. Even so, a researcher should be aware (as presumably the translator was also aware) of the respective conventional linguistic usages of both the source and target languages to properly access the relationship between a *Vorlage* and its translation. Moreover, ancient Greek translations subsequent to OG-Gen, such as "the Three,"¹¹³ are consulted where they exist, as Berman insists on the usefulness of such comparative analysis.¹¹⁴

Another principle is that of the source text as "arbiter of meaning, which is understood to mean that, although as much as possible the translated text is read like an original composition in Greek, the commentator will need to have recourse to the parent text for linguistic information essential to the proper understanding of the Greek."¹¹⁵ It must be kept in mind, however, that "all that the source text can legitimately be made to do is to *arbitrate* between *established meanings* in the target language....It can therefore *not* be used to create new senses and, in point of fact, it *precludes* that the source text override the target text."¹¹⁶ According to Berman, reading and doing a commentary on a translated text (without recourse to its source) can only be a movement through meaning¹¹⁷ since such a commentary does not take into account the true nature of the translation—its derivation from the *lettre* of its *Vorlage*. In other words, commentary on a translated text (apart from its source) permits interpretation, but not exegesis, if one understands exegesis as the critical explanation for the constitutive character of the translation text. Therefore, to analyze a translated text such as OG-Gen and discern how meaning

¹¹¹ "Guidelines," Preamble §1.2. See also Dirk Büchner, ed., *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 67 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 257.

¹¹² "A Prospectus," Preamble §5.

¹¹³ "The Three" are Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, respectively.

¹¹⁴ Connor, "Reading Literature," 431.

¹¹⁵ "A Prospectus," Preamble §3.

¹¹⁶ Albert Pietersma, "A Response to Muraoka's Critique," 321. The use of the word "meaning" in this quotation specifically pertains to lexical/semantic meaning. Pietersma, "A Response to Muraoka's Critique," 321.

¹¹⁷ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 28. Meaning here seems to refer to interpretation of a meaningful transmission or message.

may have been derived from its source, recourse to its *Vorlage* is part of the analytical process. Moreover, “[t]he meaning of the text is best understood as encompassing both *what* the translator did and *why*.”¹¹⁸ As for the matter of searching out the translator’s intentions, these can only “be inferred from the transformation of the source text and the verbal make-up of the target text itself.”¹¹⁹

Interestingly, the “Guidelines” encourage commentators “to distinguish between strategies [i.e. a translator’s *modi operandi*] and norms [i.e. Toury’s definition of norms], where this is appropriate.”¹²⁰ It bears mentioning that Toury’s key concept of norms and Berman’s notion of *horizon* are similar.¹²¹ Berman’s *horizon* is “a social constraint acting on translators, and so are Toury’s translational norms.”¹²² Toury’s norms tend to refer to those that were current at the time when a work was translated whereas Berman’s *horizon* includes the consideration of tradition, a lineage of past translations and literary works, and a historical dimension. However, Toury and Berman concur that a translator can opt not to employ the norms that may be favoured at a particular time.¹²³ Berman’s *horizon*, in fact, is quite relevant in the context of investigating a biblical translation such as OG-Gen. The *horizon* of the translator of OG-Gen undoubtedly included his consideration of other portions of the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g. intertextuality within the Pentateuch) as well as traditions—religious, cultural, and also scribal—which may have influenced his translation choices.¹²⁴ It is these facets of a translator’s *horizon* that make study of a LXX text such as OG-Gen so intriguing.

Another distinction between the approaches of Toury and Berman is that Toury is focused on the task of simply describing translations (hence, the designation Descriptive Translation Studies) without making any evaluative judgments as to whether one translation is better than another. Berman’s writings, as we have seen, concentrate more on the ethics of translation and explore the question of what constitutes an ideal translation. Toury emphasizes the social dimension of translation whereas Berman is more inclined than Toury to discuss the individual’s role in translation. Despite the contrast between Toury’s relativism and descriptiveness, on the one hand, and Berman’s idealism and

¹¹⁸ “Guidelines,” Preamble §1.4.1. On the other hand, “[i]t should not be presupposed in any given instance that translator’s primary intention was to produce an intelligible text.” “Guidelines,” Preamble §1.4.3.

¹¹⁹ “Guidelines,” Preamble §1.4.2.

¹²⁰ Toury’s concept of norms is described in “Guidelines” as “general principles underlying a translator’s handling of the source text.” “Guidelines,” Volume Introduction §3.2.2 (i); §3.2.2.2.1(i); §3.2.2.2.1(ii).

¹²¹ Siobhan Brownlie, “Berman and Toury: The Translating and Translatability of Research Frameworks,” *Traduction, Terminologie et Rédaction* 16, no. 1 (2003): 116.

¹²² Brownlie, “Berman and Toury,” 104.

¹²³ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 64. Antoine Berman, *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995), 59.

¹²⁴ Berman’s concept of *horizon* and its application to Septuagint Studies is another interesting line of inquiry that could be followed in future research projects.

prescriptiveness, on the other, there have been, nonetheless, perspectival changes over time, a development that “brings the discourses closer together, Toury granting individuals a greater role, and Berman proposing a relativistic notion of ethics.”¹²⁵ It seems clear, then, that the two research frameworks are sufficiently compatible for the type of analysis conducted in the present investigation. When one undertakes to test the efficacy of Berman’s negative analytic of translation as an investigative tool in Septuagint Studies, it is critical to highlight the fact that at the heart of Berman’s analytic is a list of translation phenomena (i.e. twelve deforming tendencies) and not a theory of translation as such. Therefore, in conducting such an assessment, one is not required to commit to the philosophical elements (e.g. Berman’s prescriptive and ethical stance) embedded in his theoretical writings, aspects of which might be at variance with Toury’s research framework that informs the conceptual basis and thus the methodology of the present thesis.

At the end of each section of commentary, the textual data gathered are assessed in the light of Berman’s negative analytic of translation. The task at this point is to examine each translation choice in that section of OG-Gen 49 and then assess its impact on the target text with reference to Berman’s deforming tendencies. This is not to suggest that any given translation strategy is inevitably in accord with one of Berman’s categories nor that a given translation strategy is consistently assigned to the same category. For instance, linguistic compression—a type of translation technique that involves synthesizing linguistic elements in the target text—does not always produce rationalizing contraction since, as Berman acknowledges, rationalization could result from rationalizing contraction, rearrangement of the discursive order of sentences, or the annihilation of concreteness in favour of abstraction.¹²⁶ Each instance of linguistic compression must be evaluated as to whether it impacts the text in a “rationalizing” manner or whether, for example, it results in destruction of rhythms, quantitative impoverishment, and/or destruction of linguistic patternings. Thus, one cannot preclude the possibility that a single translation choice may be associated with more than one of Berman’s categories since they characterize the *impact* of various types of strategies employed throughout a translation.

One misses the point, distorting analysis and its conclusions, if every “deformation” is assigned the same level of significance. Instead, it is those deformations that create tension with some integral aspect of the original and/or interfere with the very warp and weft of the original textual tapestry that should be assigned importance. Besides the intensity of the impact of a deforming tendency, the

¹²⁵ Brownlie, “Berman and Toury,” 116.

¹²⁶ Berman, “Translation and then Trials,” 288-289.

frequency of a deformation must also be taken into consideration. It must be acknowledged that the process of classifying “deformations” seems somewhat subjective (or hermeneutical). Nevertheless, the present study endeavours to duly explain the significance of each deformation and, as stated above, to balance the more hermeneutical aspects of Berman’s approach by applying other more empirical principles of analysis such those prescribed in Toury’s DTS.

Regarding the twelve deformations that Berman has outlined, *quantitative impoverishment* can result from various types of linguistic phenomena that, according to Peter Hodges, may sometimes include semantic levelling. An example of semantic levelling occurs in Gen 3.19 where the NRSV retains the semantic specificity of the two Hebrew terms אדמה and עפר (“By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground [אדמה], for out of it you were taken; you are dust [עפר], and to dust [עפר] you shall return”). Despite the semantic overlap between אדמה and עפר with the meaning of “ground,” only עפר conveys the notion of “dust.” NETS appropriately reflects the lexical loss that results from G’s decision to render אדמה and עפר with the single Greek term γῆ (“By the sweat of your face you will eat your bread until you return to the earth [γῆ] from which you were taken, for you are earth [γῆ] and to earth [γῆ] you will depart”). Instead of analyzing such lexical loss as *quantitative impoverishment* (as does Hodges), this thesis will employ the category *destruction of networks of signification* for instances when a single Greek term (e.g. γῆ) has at least two Hebrew signifiers (e.g. עפר, ארץ, and אדמה) and at least one of these presumably has a distinctive connotation (e.g. עפר). The category *destruction of networks of signification* sufficiently conveys the notion that the *Vorlage* has more signifiers or signifying chains than does the translated text. Assessing *destruction of networks of signification* frequently involves taking into account the translation of a word or phrase at a macro level (i.e. its various rendering[s] as they occur throughout the entire translated text) as opposed to at a micro level (i.e. an immediate context). There is no lexical loss, however, if semantic levelling occurs because a single target text item renders two source text items that share its same meaning (e.g. “coat” as a translation of both “manteau” and “poil”).¹²⁷ As for the deformation of *ennoblement*, one must be attentive as to whether G aims to improve the style by failing to be faithful to the stylistic features of the *Vorlage* or by failing to replicate the occurrence of any errors. For example, Hodges cites an example of semantic differentiation in which English verbs such as “agree,” “insist,” “concede,” “answer,” or “acknowledge” are the counterparts to the French verb *dire*. Since the repeated use of the verb *dire* may be considered a stylistic feature of the French *Vorlage*, any “rewording or

¹²⁷ This example was drawn from Hodges, “The Application of Berman’s Theory,” 56.

improvement of the text,”¹²⁸ says Hodges, is *ennoblement*. When considering the LXX translators’ often commendable attempt to render their respective *Vorlagen* with astute sensitivity to context, classifications such as *ennoblement* are by no means pejorative affronts to their “work on the *lettre*.” Instead, Berman’s analytic is rather an invitation—an investigative tool—for translators/researchers to engage in thoughtful reflection regarding the degree of a translation’s faithfulness to its source text. His categories are thus designed not to decry or scorn deformations, but rather to heighten awareness of possible deforming tendencies with respect to a translation’s *Vorlage*.

In Septuagint Studies, it would be a formidable challenge to attempt to discern the categories of *destruction of vernacular networks* and *effacement of the superimposition of languages* within a context of ancient languages since doing so requires considerable sensitivity to connotative register and subtle linguistic and cultural nuances. Analysis of such categories of “deformation” evidently need to be quite restricted to avoid the pitfall of venturing into speculative conjecture.

Finally, in OG-Gen, there are several instances in which a Greek lexical item in Gen 49.1-15 has a completely different meaning than its Hebrew counterpart. Such discrepancies between the target and source texts may be categorized as both *qualitative impoverishment* and *quantitative impoverishment* (i.e. the original meaning is lost) and even *expansion*, since the apparent lexical loss is replaced with new meaning that is not present in the *Vorlage*. None of these terms seems adequate to describe the replacement (in a given context) of a single Hebrew item with one in Greek that means something completely different. Given that the deformation of *destruction of underlying networks of signification* should be reserved for analysis of relationships between various signifiers in the *Vorlage*, it seems reasonable to add a new category to Berman’s twelve deforming tendencies, namely that of *rescripting*. The “trial” of *rescripting* describes the total lexical loss of a signifier that is coincident with its semantic replacement with the result that the original text’s portrayal of reality is rescripted.

An essential aspect of analyzing OG-Gen’s *lettre* is surveying and citing vast numbers of passages where various phenomena occur. References to a *single* chapter and verse tend to be cited in-text while more extensive lists of biblical references appear in footnotes. In so doing, it is not my intention to assign more prominence to single citations nor to relegate longer citations and their respective phenomena to a peripheral status. Footnoted biblical citations are purely a practical way of keeping the main text clear and as readable as possible. In a similar vein, English glosses are most often

¹²⁸ Hodges, “The Application of Berman’s Theory,” 57.

employed in-text, while occasionally English glosses may appear in footnotes as an accommodation to readers who may not be familiar with Greek and/or Hebrew.

CHAPTER 3. GENESIS 49.1-4: PREAMBLE AND ADDRESS TO ROUBEN

3.1 Contextual Outline of Genesis 49.1-33

As in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, the Septuagint of Genesis 49 follows a segment of narrative in which Iakob blesses Ioseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasse (chapter 48), and then promises to give Ioseph one portion more than his brothers (48.22). In the Preamble of the following chapter (49.1-2), the dying patriarch calls his sons with a view to proclaiming what they can expect ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ("at the last of the days"). Iakob's poetic oracles begin in v. 2 and end in v. 27, organized according to the following broad outline: Sons of Leia (vv. 3-15), Sons of Balla and Zelpha (vv. 16-21), and Sons of Rachel (vv. 22-27). Iakob first reproaches his three eldest sons Rouben, Symeon, and Leui (vv. 3-7) and then effectively endows Ioudas with a privileged status in a proportionately longer utterance (vv. 8-12). This is followed by brief words for Zaboulon, Issachar, Dan, Gad, Aser, and Nephthali in turn (vv. 13-21). Ioseph is given prominence in another comparatively longer pronouncement in which Iakob bestows several distinctive blessings upon Rachel's firstborn (vv. 22-26). After briefly addressing his youngest son, Benjamin (v. 27), Iakob concludes his final words to his children with instructions concerning his burial (vv. 28-32). He then breathes his last and is added to his people (v. 33).

3.2 Preamble (v. 1)

וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֶל בָּנָיו וַיֹּאמֶר הֲאִסְפוּ וְאֵגִידָה לָכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא אֲתֶכֶם בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים
Then Jacob called his sons, and said: "Gather around, that I may tell you what will happen to you in days to come."
Ἐκάλεσεν δὲ Ἰακώβ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν Συνάχθητε, ἵνα ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν, τί ἀπαντήσῃ ὑμῖν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν.
Then Iakob summoned his sons and said: "Gather together in order that I may tell you what will happen to you at the last of the days."

G usually replicates the predominantly Hebrew paratactic clause constructions that would have appeared in his *Vorlage* by adopting the default rendering of καὶ for the Hebrew conjunction ו (vav). The function and status of Hebrew vav is notoriously difficult to classify since the implied relationship between Hebrew clauses is not readily discerned from the meaning of the conjunction itself.¹²⁹ Richard Steiner's linguistic research suggests that vav is sometimes lexically empty, simply serving to join two

¹²⁹ Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka assign vav the function of every possible type of subordinate clause. Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, rev. ed. (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006), 584-604.

clauses syntactically.¹³⁰ In other instances, *vav* may be glossed as “and,” “or,” or “then.”¹³¹ When καί appears extensively as a clausal connector, the relationships between the clauses are made as ambiguous as they are in the Hebrew. G’s choice of postpositive conjunction δέ for the Hebrew *vav* in v. 1 indicates that, instead of the more covert clausal cohesion of Hebrew parataxis, G opts for the logically systemizing properties of hypotaxis¹³² which are prevalent in Greek clause constructions. G explicitly marks the transition which is inferred by the events of the narrative. This is in line with Herbert Smyth’s category of the copulative δέ as “the ordinary particle used in connecting successive clauses or sentences which add something new or different, but not opposed, to what precedes.”¹³³ Since G disambiguates the function of *vav* by marking this transition, the “trial of the Foreign” (hereafter, “trial[s]”) with respect to its negative analytic is *clarification* of the *Vorlage*. Accordingly, the “trial” of *destruction of linguistic patternings* ensues since the prevalent parataxis in the *Vorlage* now appears as hypotaxis in OG-Gen. The LXX translators never transgress the rule that the postpositive δε cannot take the first position of the clause,¹³⁴ and so G has adjusted the word order of his *Vorlage* with the verb καλέω appearing first in the clause. Evidently, G’s concern here is to produce a translation in natural Greek and this is a strong indication that OG-Gen is not conceived as a “translation-as-calque (or translation-as-copy).”¹³⁵ Such translations (which would presumably resemble an interlinear) Berman has described as “the naïve production of (or attempt at reproducing) a *tangible* resemblance.”¹³⁶ The aorist of καλέω is a fitting equivalent for the *vav*-consecutive preterite of אָקַר root 1.¹³⁷ The accusative without a preposition frequently follows καλέω in classical Greek as it

¹³⁰ Richard C. Steiner, “Does the Biblical Hebrew Conjunction -ו Have Many Meanings, One Meaning, or No Meaning at All?,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119, no. 2 (2000): 266-267.

¹³¹ Steiner, “Biblical Hebrew Conjunction,” 266.

¹³² Hypotaxis (when a syntactic-semantic relationship is indicated by an overt function word that joins two clauses or phrases) is the counterpart of parataxis (the absence of lexical or morphological markers that indicate the relationship between two juxtaposed grammatical elements). Robert Holmstedt, “Hypotaxis,” in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, ed. Geoffrey Khan (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 2:220.

¹³³ Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), §2836; Steven Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), §2.3.

¹³⁴ John A. Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch: Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2011-2012* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 33.

¹³⁵ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 117.

¹³⁶ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 117.

¹³⁷ Of the 85 times that καλέω appears in OG-Gen, it renders אָקַר root 1 in all but two instances (Gen 26.33 - no counterpart in the MT; Gen 32.29 - the counterpart is אָמַר). A number of other Greek equivalents for אָקַר root 1 indicate a good measure of semantic differentiation on the part of G for this particular Hebrew verb. These Greek counterparts include: ἐπονομάζω (Gen 4.17, 25, 26; 5.2, 3, 29; 21.31; 25.25; 26.18, 21, 22; 30.11), ἐπικαλέω (Gen 4.26; 12.8; 13.4; 21.33; 26.25; 33.20; 48.16), ἐκκαλέω (Gen 19.5), ὀνομάζω (Gen 26.18), προσκαλέω (Gen 28.1), εἰμί (Gen 35.10, ἀλλ’ Ἰσραὴλ ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου), βοάω (Gen 39.14, 15, 18), κηρύσσω (Gen 41.43), and λέγω (Gen 45.1).

does here. Τοὺς υἱοὺς constitutes the direct object in Greek while the phrase אל בניי functions as the indirect object in Hebrew. Given the fact that G's omission of the preposition אל is a concession to the grammatical-syntactical requirements of Greek, the slight *quantitative impoverishment* can be discounted.

A word must be said about G's treatment of proper nouns. Indeed, the importance of naming and the meaning of names is an intrinsically distinctive feature in the Hebrew *lettre*—an integral, Foreign element—of Genesis. Networks of signification may, for example, distinguish a particular event or idea¹³⁸ associated with the namesake's birth and/or underline further aspects of the namesake's character. Such signifying networks are often exploited in Hebrew narrative and poetry to evoke an image, idea, or create wordplay¹³⁹ and/or irony.¹⁴⁰ Berman perceives that certain words in literature contain a “signifying or ‘iconic’ richness [which]... ‘creates an image,’ enabling a perception of resemblance.”¹⁴¹ At least some of the Hebrew names in Genesis fit that description. The first name that appears in Gen 49 is a case in point. יעקב was derived from wordplay on the root עקב (cf. Gen 25.26 [עקב] “Afterward his brother came out, with his hand gripping Esau's heel; so he was named Jacob.”); 27.36 [“Esau said, ‘Is he not rightly named Jacob? For he has supplanted me these two times. He took away my birthright; and look, now he has taken away my blessing.’”]). On account of this play on words,¹⁴² the essence of the Hebrew name יעקב itself contains signifying/iconic richness.¹⁴³ Whenever G translates the meaning of names (e.g. rendering Adam's wife חוה as Ζωή [= Life], Gen 3.20),¹⁴⁴ this element of richness is evinced in OG-Gen. However, G most often transcribes proper nouns (in Gen 4.1, חוה is transcribed as Εὐαν [accusative]). Transcription of proper nouns generally represents the phonetic value of the Hebrew characters in

¹³⁸ E.g. Adam's naming of Eve (Gen 3.20); Eve's naming of Cain (4.1); the LORD's naming of Ishamel (16.11) and Israel (32.28; 35.10); Abraham's naming of Isaac (21.3-7); the naming of Jacob's sons (29.31-22; 35.17-18).

¹³⁹ As it will be seen, there are various instances of Hebrew wordplay in the Gen 49 poem (e.g. 49.8 regarding Judah's name).

¹⁴⁰ One example of irony is associated with Isaac's name (יצחק, which means “he will laugh” [Gen 21.3]). Sarah had laughed in disbelief when she overheard the prophecy of Isaac's birth (18.12) and then she denied that she had laughed (18.13-15). When Isaac, the son of promise, is born Sarah says, “God has brought laughter for me (עשה לי אלהים); everyone who hears will laugh with me” (21.6-7).

¹⁴¹ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 291.

¹⁴² The play on words regarding עקב exhibits a (hidden) network of signification regarding the root עקב, which also applies to other instances where this root occurs in Gen (e.g. Gen 3.15). The appearance of יעקב in Jer 9.3b with עקב יעקב כי כל אח (‘for all your kin are supplanters’ [9.4b, NRSV]) suggests that יעקב does contain a signifying/iconic richness.

¹⁴³ NRSV includes the footnoted gloss “*He takes by the heel* or *He supplants*” to ensure that its readership is aware of the meaning of יעקב (Jacob).

¹⁴⁴ Other examples include Gen 16.13-14; 28.10.

Greek ones as G understood them,¹⁴⁵ although the transcription of יַעֲקֹב as Ἰακώβ may not have originated with G.¹⁴⁶ The foreignness of the sound of a Semitic name is somewhat retained when it is transcribed into Greek, yet the dimension of the name's signifying richness is not replicated. While acknowledging that OG-Gen evinces some measure of *qualitative impoverishment* regarding its transcription of the Hebrew names in Gen 49.1-15, it is hard to determine its degree. Questions such as how transparent the meanings of names were to ancient Hebrew-speaking audiences¹⁴⁷ make accessing *qualitative impoverishment* difficult, despite its probable occurrence in some cases such as in the transcription of יַעֲקֹב. The possibility of *qualitative impoverishment* is duly noted with respect to the various Hebrew names that occur in Gen 49.1-15, but not affirmed in the final analysis of this thesis.

G replicates וַיֹּאמֶר, another *vav*-consecutive preterite, with the conjunction καί followed by the aorist third singular form of λέγω, the most frequent counterpart to אָמַר in the 607 instances in which it occurs in the MT of Genesis.¹⁴⁸ On occasion, G employs other Greek equivalents for אָמַר, demonstrating G's desire to differentiate semantically between the various senses of the Hebrew verb אָמַר during the course of his translation.¹⁴⁹ On the other hand, συνάγω is the counterpart to a range of Hebrew lexemes.¹⁵⁰ Gen 49.1 contains one of seven occurrences of συνάγω where אָסַף appears in the MT of Genesis.¹⁵¹ To be sure, G's choice of συνάγω for אָסַף in Gen 49.1 is suitable. Yet given the fact that the equivalents of אָסַף in its eight other appearances in OG-Gen are, respectively, προστίθημι,¹⁵² ἀφαιρέω,¹⁵³ τίθημι,¹⁵⁴ and ἐξαίρω,¹⁵⁵ it is evident that a slight degree of clarifying *expansion* occurs when all of these occurrences of אָסַף are taken into account. One can see that, by its very nature, the

¹⁴⁵ Emanuel Tov, "Loan-words, Homophony, and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Biblica* 60 (1979): 230. When a name, such as Ἰακώβ, ends in a consonant, it is not hellenized nor is it declinable. Thackeray, *A Grammar*, 160 (§11.1).

¹⁴⁶ Hebrew ב (/v/) is transcribed as Greek β (/b/) since there is no counterpart to /v/ in Greek.

¹⁴⁷ For an introduction to the many issues pertaining to the interpretation of Hebrew names (onomastic hermeneutics), see Jeffrey L. Cooley, "Judean Onomastic Hermeneutics in Context," *Harvard Theological Review* 112, no. 2 (2019): 184–208, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816019000051>; and Kathleen Abraham, "Hebrew Names," in *Personal Names in Cuneiform Texts from Babylonia (c. 750–100 BCE): An Introduction*, Caroline Waerzeggers and Melanie M. Groß, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024), 139–165.

¹⁴⁸ Six times in OG-Gen, אָמַר has no counterpart in the MT (Gen 3.17; 19.9b; 23.13; 27.6b; 38.21a; 42.2).

¹⁴⁹ These Greek verbs include φημί (Gen 24.47), φάσκω (Gen 26.20), καλέω (Gen 32.29b), λαλέω (Gen 42.22b), ἀντιλέγω (Gen 44.16b), and ἀπαγγέλλω (Gen 48.1). As discussed in chapter 2 (page 29), some of these examples would be considered a clarifying *expansion* of the source text.

¹⁵⁰ These include: the *niphal* stem of קוּר root 2 (Gen 1.9), the *qal* stems of קוּם (Gen 37.35), קָבַץ (Gen 41.35, 48), and צָבַר (Gen 41.35, 49), and the *piel* stem of לָקַט (Gen 47.14). Thus, the Greek text manifests some degree of semantic levelling. There is no Hebrew counterpart for the second instance of συνάγω in Gen 1.9.

¹⁵¹ Gen 6.21; 29.3, 7, 8, 22; 34.30; 49.1.

¹⁵² Gen 25.8; 25.17; 35.29; 49.29, 33b.

¹⁵³ Gen 30.23.

¹⁵⁴ Gen 42.17.

¹⁵⁵ Gen 49.33a.

phenomenon of semantic differentiation can illuminate the approach of the translator and his work on the *lettre*.

G appropriately selects the aorist imperative passive form συνάχθητε, which has a reflexive force with the meaning “bring yourselves together,”¹⁵⁶ for the *niphal* stem הִסְפִּי וְאִגִּידָהּ. Συνάχθητε is followed by the co-ordinating conjunction ἵνα plus the subjunctive of ἀναγγέλλω. Their Hebrew counterparts הִסְפִּי וְאִגִּידָהּ consist of a volitional form (i.e. imperative) + simple *vav* + cohortative (1st person) verb form.¹⁵⁷ This is a syntactical sequence that expresses a result or purpose.¹⁵⁸ A dative object typically follows the verb ἀναγγέλλω, which is the equivalent of נָגַד *hiphil*,¹⁵⁹ in direct speech. Thus, G’s employment of the dative pronoun ὑμῖν is an acceptable rendering of לָכֶם since the semantic content of the preposition ל is aptly conveyed without any awkwardness that might have resulted from translating the Hebrew preposition with a Greek preposition. *Destruction of linguistic patternings* is therefore negligible. Through his use of a ἵνα clause for וְאִגִּידָהּ, G makes it explicit that Iakob’s purpose for summoning his sons is to tell them something that he wants them to know before his imminent death. The “trials” resulting from G’s translation choice can therefore be categorized as the *destruction of linguistic patternings* (i.e. Hebrew parataxis) brought about by rationalizing *clarification*.

A Greek relative pronoun is the default equivalent for אֲשֶׁר in most of its occurrences in OG-Gen. However, in OG-Gen 49.1, the neuter interrogative pronoun τί renders the independent relative particle אֲשֶׁר which is preceded by the particle אֵל that marks the relative clause as a direct object. There is no Greek counterpart to the Hebrew direct object marker אֵל nor is one syntactically necessary in the highly inflected language of Greek. Typically after verbs of saying, knowing, making known and so forth, one would expect a simple relative pronoun.¹⁶⁰ Even so, τίς / τί is sometimes used for ὅστις / ὅ τι in indirect questions.¹⁶¹ The employment of an interrogative pronoun instead of a relative clause in Gen 49.1 is consistent with natural Greek usage and it thus performs the same semantic function as its Hebrew counterpart. As such, any “trial” of *destruction of linguistic patternings* is insignificant.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1733.

¹⁵⁷ Wevers’ description of the structure as “a long form of the imperfect וְאִגִּידָהּ” is somewhat misleading. Cf. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 822.

¹⁵⁸ Waltke and O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew*, §39.2.2.

¹⁵⁹ Gen 3.11; 9.22; 22.20; 24.23; 29.12; 31.20, 22, 27; 32.6(5), 30(29); 37.16; 43.6; 45.26. In Gen 37.14, ἀναγγέλλω renders הִשְׁבֵּד. G sometimes employs the cognate ἀπαγγέλλω for נָגַד (Gen 12.18; 14.13; 21.26; 24.28, 49; 26.32; 27.42; 29.12, 15; 37.5; 38.13; 38.24; 41.24; 42.29; 43.7; 44.24; 45.13; 46.31; 47.1; 48.2). In Gen 41.25, ἔδειξεν is the rendering for הִגִּיד, while in Gen 21.7 ἀναγγέλλω is the counterpart to מָלַל, root 1.

¹⁶⁰ “After verbs of saying...the simple relatives are found where the indefinite relatives (or the interrogatives) might stand in an indirect question.” Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2668.

¹⁶¹ Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 91. LSJ, s.v. “τίς, τι,” B.II.

The phrase $\text{ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν}$ renders באחרית הימים, a fixed, idiomatic expression in Hebrew. The phrase may be presumed (often mistakenly) to have eschatological associations or connotations if one fails to consider the basic meaning of באחרית הימים as well as its use in context.¹⁶⁷ אחר, from which אחרית and its cognates¹⁶⁸ derive, has the basic meaning of “coming after” or “behind.”¹⁶⁹ George Buchanan has surveyed the use of the expression באחרית הימים in the Hebrew/Aramaic Bible, demonstrating that it can be employed in various contexts.¹⁷⁰ In general, it refers to a *period* of time that comes after a point of reference inferred from each context. This reference point might be “now” from the point of view of the speaker (thus, “in the coming days” [after now] = in a future period after now),¹⁷¹ but not necessarily so. Alternatively, the Hebrew expression may describe a period that comes *after* a point of reference that is in the future.¹⁷² Moreover, any theological associations that this temporal idiom may suggest are contingent upon the context in which

¹⁷² Deut 4.30; 31.29; Ezek 38.16; Hos 3.5.

it appears.¹⁷³ Thus, אשר יקרא אתכם באחרית הימים in Gen 49.1 can simply be glossed as “what will happen to you in the future.”¹⁷⁴

In the present passage, instead of rendering the meaning of the Hebrew phrase with an equivalent Greek expression, G translates each separate component with a corresponding formal equivalent (i.e. serial fidelity). The preposition ἐπί renders the preposition ב. Ἐσχατος, when referring to time, means “last, end.”¹⁷⁵ The choice of Ἐσχατος for אחרית is thus a case of semantic modification since both terms share the general meaning of “later time.” אחרית denotes “coming after, later, following” whereas Ἐσχατος expresses a temporal extremity. This begs the question as to whether or not G intended ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν to refer to a particular temporal extremity, that of an eschatological “end time.” The translators of the Targum texts, for example, render the phrase באחרית הימים as בסוף יומיא¹⁷⁶ (“at the end of the days”) or בסוף עקיב יומיא¹⁷⁷ “at the end of the heel of the days” or, in other words “at the ultimate end of the days.” In contrast to the temporal modifier אחרית (“coming after,” “afterwards”), the word סוף (synonymous with קץ) is punctiliar in connotation, thus denoting a specific end point.¹⁷⁸ The origins of the Targum texts are virtually impossible to date, and so it is uncertain whether the ideas expressed in the Targum played any role in the formation of the LXX texts.

Annette Steudel, in her comprehensive synopsis of the use of אחרית הימים in Qumran texts, concludes that באחרית הימים

does not mean the time of salvation, it also does not mean ‘a punctual end,’ of history, nor does it mean ‘future.’ Rather, what is meant by the term אחרית הימים is a limited period of time, that is the last of series of divinely pre-planned periods into which history is divided. This last period of time directly before the time of salvation covers aspects of the past, as well as aspects of the present time, and of the future. The best translation for אחרית הימים in the Qumran texts is therefore ‘the end of the days,’ or even better but more freely ‘the final period of history.’¹⁷⁹

Steudel’s findings indicate that, as early as the Qumran texts, the basic understanding of באחרית הימים as referring to a period of time is retained. Evidently, the Qumran community’s focus on eschatological themes shaped their expression and use of the Hebrew phrase. Whether the specific hermeneutical traditions of the Qumran community were also part of G’s *horizon* cannot, at this point, be ascertained.

¹⁷³ Buchanan, “Eschatology,” 190.

¹⁷⁴ Both the Ugaritic *uḥryt* (“future”) and Akkadian *ana aḥrat umi* (“in the future”) are comparable to this sense of אחרית in the Hebrew. Buchanan, “Eschatology,” 188; de Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 87.

¹⁷⁵ LSJ, s.v. “Ἐσχατος.”

¹⁷⁶ Cf. *Targum Onkelos* on Gen 49.1 and Num 24.14.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. *Targum Neophyti* on Deut 4.30.

¹⁷⁸ BDB, s.v. “סוף.”

¹⁷⁹ Annette Steudel, “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* 16. 2 (62) (1993): 231.

Hence, insight into any possible eschatological connotations of the phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν can best be gained by examining the syntax, semantics, and narrative framework of OG-Gen itself.

Gen 49.1 is the only instance in the Pentateuch where ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν renders the phrase באחרית הימים, although the similar phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν σου is the counterpart to באחריתך in Deut 8.16.¹⁸⁰ In the LXX, there are two main ways of translating the thirteen occurrences of באחרית הימים: ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν¹⁸¹ and ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν.¹⁸² G's choice of the plural ἐσχάτων is noteworthy, although the singular form ἐσχάτου is another popular option for rendering the singular term אחרית in the phrase באחרית הימים.¹⁸³ Buchanan considers the possibility that G has confused the *yod* in באחרית with *vav*, translating the phrase literally.¹⁸⁴ While it is true that *yodh* and *waw* are sometimes confused in ancient Semitic texts, no textual witnesses attest that this is the case in OG-Gen 49.1.

Other explanations have been offered to account for the syntax of ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. For instance, G's change of 'accidence' regarding the difference in number between אחרית and ἐσχάτων (given the strong likelihood that this phrase in the MT was identical to G's *Vorlage*) seems to highlight a syntactical relationship between the plural genitives ἐσχάτων and τῶν ἡμερῶν. If ἐσχάτων is construed as a feminine attributive adjective, despite the fact that it is anarthrous,¹⁸⁵ the phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν could be rendered as "at [the time of]¹⁸⁶ the last days." Alternatively, in view of the choice of the presumed neuter dative singular form of ἔσχατον in ἐπ' ἐσχάτω τῶν ἡμερῶν (Deut 4.30) and of the neuter genitive singular form in ἐπ' ἐσχάτου ἡμερῶν (Num 24.14), and on the basis of a comparison with the phrase τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς θαλάσσης ('the far ends of the ocean') (Ps 138.9), Takamitsu Muraoka postulates "the neuter gender for the standing expression ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν" in Gen 49.1.¹⁸⁷ His rendering "at the end time"¹⁸⁸ seems to favour an eschatological interpretation of the phrase. Muraoka's reckoning of the syntax of this passage is possible, yet in that

¹⁸⁰ In one instance each, באחרית הימים is rendered as ἐπ' ἐσχάτω τῶν ἡμερῶν (Deut 4.30), ἔσχατος τῶν ἡμερῶν (Deut 31.29) and ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (Isa 2.2).

¹⁸¹ Gen 49.1; Jer 37(30).24; Ezek 38.16; Dan 2.28; Hos 3.5, and Mic 4.1.

¹⁸² Num 24.14; Jer.23.20; 49.39(25.19); and Dan 10.14.

¹⁸³ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 820.

¹⁸⁴ "Inasmuch as אחרות occurs in the Talmud and Mishnah and since *yodh* and *waw* are often indistinguishable in such documents as the Dead Sea Scrolls, we must suspect that the same was the case for the documents used by the LXX translators." Buchanan, "Eschatology," 190.

¹⁸⁵ To clearly function as an attributive adjective, an article should be present before ἐσχάτων. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1154. However, "the article is very often omitted in phrases containing a preposition." Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1128, cf. ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου, Demosthenes, *In Midiam* 23.2; *In Timocratem* 108.1.

¹⁸⁶ A temporal understanding of ἐπί + genitive. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1689b.

¹⁸⁷ Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, 103.

¹⁸⁸ Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, 103.

case the neuter genitive singular form ἐσχάτου rather than the plural ἐσχάτων would seem to be the most obvious choice for rendering אחרית here. The fact that G opts for the plural form ἐσχάτων, which produces agreement with the feminine plural ἡμερῶν,¹⁸⁹ makes its analysis as an adjectival modifier (and not a substantive) so compelling, with the phrase being understood to mean “the last [i.e. inferring a temporal extremity] of the days.” It is conceivable that the choice of the plural form ἐσχάτων was motivated by the desire to avoid substantivizing אחרית, perhaps as an attempt to minimize the notion that the phrase should be interpreted with eschatological nuances. If that were the case, however, one might well ask why the translator did not choose another type of terminology (e.g. ὕστερος; ὀπίσω; λοιπός). Any of these Greek terms could have unambiguously expressed the notion of the future in a general sense, yet there is no occurrence of ὀπίσω in the Pentateuch,¹⁹⁰ ὕστερος does not appear in the LXX,¹⁹¹ and λοιπός occurs only once in Gen 45.6 (καὶ ἔτι λοιπὰ πέντε ἔτη = וְעוֹד חֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים) to make reference to a well-defined temporal period. Unsurprisingly, ἔσχατος is the term frequently chosen by LXX translators to render various derivatives of the root אחר.¹⁹² Hence, the most plausible explanation for G’s choice of the plural of ἔσχατος as a counterpart of אחרית seems to be, again, his concern that his Greek translation replicate both the overall semantic and syntactic form of his *Vorlage* as far as possible.

All things considered, the general meaning of “at the last days” does not seem any different than “at the last of the days” (NETS),¹⁹³ regardless of whether one analyzes the syntax of ἐσχάτων in the phrase ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν as a substantivized adjective or an attributive adjective. On the surface, the Greek phrase need not refer to an eschatological “end time.” For Wevers, “it is unlikely that the term [ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν] means anything more than ‘in the future,’”¹⁹⁴ perhaps the immediate future (e.g. the days immediately after Iakob’s death or the period of mourning following his death) or a more distant future period. This seems reasonable at first blush, but Wevers does not include any discussion regarding how v. 1 might correlate with the content of Gen 49, particularly with

¹⁸⁹ Buchanan, “Eschatology,” 190.

¹⁹⁰ However, ὀπίσω is employed fairly frequently in the books of Judges, Tobit, and Daniel. Even so, this Greek term never collocates with “days” in extant Greek literature.

¹⁹¹ In Dan 5.27, the translator has chosen the verb ὑστερέω as a counterpart of חסיר.

¹⁹² The following is a list of such occurrences in the Greek Pentateuch: Exod. 4.8; Lev 27.18; Num 2.31; 24.14: 31.2; Deut 4.30; 8.16; 13.10; 17.7, 24.3 (2x); 31.27, 29 (2x); 32.20; 34.2.

¹⁹³ Steudel considers ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν and ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν to be equivalent in meaning and adds, “Put another way, for the [LXX] translators ‘in the last days’ meant the same as ‘at the end of the days.’” The two different expressions rather seem “to reflect the particular stylistic preferences of the various translations concerned.” Steudel, “אחרית הימים,” 232.

¹⁹⁴ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 820.

reference to Ioudas (vv. 8-12). As such, the issue of possible eschatological nuances of ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν will be more thoroughly assessed in chapter 5 of this thesis, where the question as to whether G has shaped his rendering of Gen 49.8-12 to portray Ioudas as a messianic and, therefore, eschatological figure will be considered.

At this juncture, it is clear enough that G's translation replicates the basic form of באחרית הימים, apart from the change of accident. Since there is no identical expression in Greek, the result is a collision of languages and a loss of the original meaning of the Hebrew idiomatic expression. The latter is a consequence of deforming the meaning of אחרית by means of a Greek counterpart that connotes a temporal extremity (ἐσχάτος). Factoring in the consideration of Berman's "trials," ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν for באחרית הימים would constitute *destruction of expressions and idioms*.

3.3 Preamble (v. 2)

הקבצו ושמעו בני יעקב ושמעו אל ישראל אביכם
Assemble and hear, O sons of Jacob; listen to Israel your father.
Assemble and listen, sons of Jacob, and listen to Israel your father. ¹⁹⁵
ἄθροίσθητε καὶ ἀκούσατε, υἱοὶ Ἰακώβ, ἀκούσατε Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν.
Assemble, and hear, O sons of Iakob; hear Israel your father.

Iakob's sons (υἱοί) are addressed in the vocative case and the poetic material begins,¹⁹⁶ as in the Hebrew, with two imperatives. In the passive voice, ἄθροίζω means "be gathered together" and it is the counterpart to the *niphal* stem of קָבַץ, which has the same meaning.¹⁹⁷ This is the only occurrence of the verb ἄθροίζω in OG-Gen. The choice of the aorist imperative ἀκούσατε for the Hebrew imperative שמעו is also an acceptable rendering. Ἀκούω translates שמע in the majority of cases that the Hebrew verb appears in Genesis with only a few instances in which it is translated by the Greek cognates

¹⁹⁵ De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 86. De Hoop's translation reads "Assemble and listen, sons of Jacob, and listen to Israel your father." De Hoop repeats the word "listen" to produce an identical translation for the repeated verb שמע. On the other hand, NRSV semantically differentiates its rendering of שמע with two different English verbs: "Assemble and hear (שמע), O sons of Jacob; listen (שמע) to Israel your father."

¹⁹⁶ Warrants for including v. 2 in the poetic material Gen 49 are the parallelism between the two stichs in this verse (sons of Iakob // Israel your father) as well as the sonorous repetition of the imperative "hear." Whether or not OG-Gen 49.1-15 evinces other poetic traits and/or could be considered a Greek poem will be dealt with in more detail throughout this thesis.

¹⁹⁷ The verb συναγώ is used in the other two instances in OG-Gen of the *qal* form of קָבַץ, Gen 41.35, 48.

ὑπακούω,¹⁹⁸ ἐπακούω,¹⁹⁹ or εἰσακούω.²⁰⁰ Noteworthy is the assonance of the initial *alpha* in the verbal pair ἀθροίσθητε καὶ ἀκούσατε as well as their rhythmic similarity, a poetic feature in the Greek text that is likely coincidental. It is one of those “miracles” that Berman speaks about which emerge from a translator’s work on the *lettre*.

The second stich, which parallels ἀκούσατε, υἱοὶ Ἰακώβ, is asyndetic, whereas a *vav* introduces it in the MT. There are no alternate readings in *BHS*, whereas in the Göttingen apparatus this stich is preceded by καὶ only in ms. 125. It is therefore likely that the absence of a *vav* has originated with the translator of OG-Gen, who may have been prompted by stylistic concerns such as a desire to accentuate the rhythm and flow of the poetic parallelism. Moreover, the asyndetic ἀκούσατε highlights the poetic assonance of this second instance of ἀκούσατε with ἀθροίσθητε καὶ ἀκούσατε. Not replicating the Hebrew conjunction in OG-Gen results in *quantitative impoverishment* as well as *destruction of linguistic patternings* (i.e. Semitic parataxis) which, in this instance, has the added impact of *destruction of rhythms* since the asyndetic clause necessitates a pause (or cadence point)²⁰¹ at the end of the preceding clause. There is no counterpart to the preposition לָא nor is one necessary since “the person or thing, whose words, sound, etc., are perceived by the senses, stands in the genitive.”²⁰² Any *quantitative impoverishment* resulting from the absence of an equivalent for לָא in OG-Gen is therefore negligible as the omitted preposition is an accommodation to the Greek language system.

Finally, while υἱοὶ Ἰακώβ (which follows the first instance of ἀκούσατε in v. 2) is contextually to be construed as in the vocative case, it is less likely that the uninflected Ἰσραήλ is a vocative since its appositive τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν is in the genitive case.²⁰³ The patriarch refers to himself as Israel, the name given to him by God²⁰⁴ after a night of wrestling with a mysterious divine representative (Gen 32.28[29]). Ἰσραήλ, a transcription of יִשְׂרָאֵל, occurs 42 times in OG-Gen. It does not appear in early papyri, inscriptions, nor extant Greek literature (apart from its occurrence in a third century fragment of

¹⁹⁸ Gen 16.2; 22.18; 26.5; 27.13; 39.10.

¹⁹⁹ Gen 16.11; 17.20; 21.17; 30.6, 17, 22.

²⁰⁰ Gen 21.17; 34.17; 34.24; 42.21; 22.

²⁰¹ This cadence point could be indicated by a punctuation mark (a period, for example, in an English rendering), although the ancient Greek manuscripts do not specify any punctuation mark.

²⁰² Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1361 and §1365.

²⁰³ If Ἰσραήλ could be inflected, it would be in the genitive case as well since it is the object of the imperative ἀκούσατε and the genitival modifier of υἱοί.

²⁰⁴ Cf. Gen 32. 28 (29): Οὐ κληθήσεται ἔτι τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἰακώβ, ἀλλὰ Ἰσραήλ ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου, ὅτι ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ, καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός (Your name shall no longer be called Iakob, but Israel shall be your name, because you have prevailed with a god, and with humans you are powerful). Gen 35.10: לֹא יִעֲקֹב יֹאמַר עוֹד שְׁמִי כִּי אִם יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי שָׂרִית עִם אֱלֹהִים (You shall no longer be called Jacob, but Israel, for you have striven with God and with humans, and have prevailed). Cf. Hos 12.4: בִּבְטֵן עֲקַב אֶת אֲחִיו וּבְאוֹנוֹ שָׂרָה אֶת אֱלֹהִים (“In the womb he tried to supplant his brother, and in his manhood he strove with God” [12.3, NRSV]).

Manetho)²⁰⁵ before its attestation in the LXX. Nonetheless, it seems unlikely that this transliteration originated with G. A Greek-speaking Jewish audience would have been familiar with the name Israel, but not necessarily a Gentile audience. Whether יִשְׂרָאֵל might mean “God strives”²⁰⁶ or “God perseveres,”²⁰⁷ God’s assigning to Jacob this new name signifies divine favour and blessing.²⁰⁸ In any case, OG-Gen’s paronomastic rationale (32.29[30]) for the meaning of the name is obscured in OG-Gen (i.e. prevailing with “a god,” as in NETS, rather than with God).²⁰⁹

3.4 Summary: Preamble (vv. 1-2)

Overall, the “trials” that can be discerned in vv. 1-2 are:²¹⁰

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
1	וּיקְרָא (ו)	δὲ	Clarification ²¹¹ Destruction of linguistic patternings
*	יַעֲקֹב	Ἰακώβ	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	אֵל בְּנוֹ	τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ (i.e. no preposition)	Quantitative impoverishment (negligible)
	וַאֲגִידָה לָכֶם	ἵνα ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν	Clarification (ἵνα purpose clause) Destruction of linguistic patternings
	לָכֶם	ὑμῖν	Destruction of linguistic patternings (negligible)
	אֲשֶׁר	τί	Destruction of linguistic patternings (negligible)
	בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים	ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν	Destruction of expressions and idioms
2	וַשְׁמַעוּ	ἀκούσατε	Quantitative impoverishment (no counterpart to <i>vav</i>) Destruction of linguistic patternings (no counterpart to <i>vav</i> ; no parataxis)

²⁰⁵ Fragmenta 1477.003. Karl Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum (FHG)* 2 (Paris: Didot, 1841-1870).

²⁰⁶ John Skinner, *Genesis*, International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910), 409.

²⁰⁷ Samuel Driver, *The Book of Genesis* (London: Methuen, 1907), 295. Cf. Hos 12.3-4.

²⁰⁸ In Gen 32.28(29), G’s explanation of the significance of the name is ὅτι ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ, καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός (“because you have prevailed with a god, and with humans you are powerful”).

²⁰⁹ Cf. Gen 32.29(30).

²¹⁰ The * symbol in this and following summative charts indicates that the possibility of *qualitative impoverishment* should be noted, yet these instances are not included in the final analysis at the end of the present study.

²¹¹ The parallel to Berman’s *clarification* is van der Louw’s use of the term *explicitation*. Van der Louw does not cite the example of δὲ as a counterpart to *vav* in Gen 2.6 as explicitation; the transformation goes unmentioned. Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 108-109 and 149. In fact, it might be considered a matter of debate whether this translation move should be categorized as explicitation because for most Hebrew grammarians “but, then, etc.” is included with “and” within the range of meaning of ו. Even so, *clarification* (or explicitation) is a reasonable designation since G has made explicit the covert cohesion in the Hebrew text in his translation.

			Destruction of rhythms
	אל	-	Quantitative impoverishment (negligible)
*	ישראל	Ἰσραήλ	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)

Apart from the obscuring of the sense of באחרית הימים with ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, the general meaning of vv. 1-2 in OG-Gen and MT is basically the same. One could compare G's work on the *lettre* (being-in-language) of his source text in v. 1 to that of an artist who has outlined with greater definition the somewhat indistinct images of an impressionist painting. G has transformed the fluid, spontaneous orality of his *Vorlage* into a coherently logical presentation of its content. In two of the instances of *destruction of linguistic patternings*, G exhibits a concern to clarify the logical inferences of his translation, in one instance marking a transition (δέ) and in another a purpose clause (ἵνα). G is expressing in Greek what is inherently implicit in his Hebrew *Vorlage* besides the fact that, as Berman notes, the act of translation generally tends to move towards the more explicit.²¹² Due to the modification of the Hebrew parataxis in v. 2, the parallelism between the two stichs as well as the poetic assonance of ἀθροίσθητε and the two instances of ἀκούσατε involve modifications that are slightly more pronounced, which may have enhanced the aesthetic value of OG-Gen for a Greek-speaking audience. In this regard, G's work on the *lettre* could arguably be leaning towards the deforming tendency of *ennoblement* (an attempt to improve on the style of the source text) given that Hebrew parataxis is an integral aspect of what is "Foreign" in the *Vorlage*. Up to this point, there is no apparent staging of an alien reading experience nor is there any use of a marginal discourse (other than, perhaps, the curious phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν) which would constitute a foreignizing translation. Moreover, G's omission of a semantic counterpart to prepositions on two occasions is an indication that G did not have an underlying goal of producing a merely isomorphic end product.

3.5 Rouben (v. 3)

ראובן בכרי אתה כחי וראשית אוני יתר שאת ויתר עז
Reuben, you are my firstborn, my might and the first fruits of my vigor; excelling in rank and excelling in power.
Ῥουβὴν, πρωτότοκός μου σύ, ἰσχύς μου καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου,

²¹² Berman, "Translation and the Trials," 289.

σκληρὸς φέρεσθαι καὶ σκληρὸς αὐθάδης
Rouben, you are my firstborn, my might and beginning of my children, hard to bear and hard, self-centered.

‘Πουβήν, the name of Iakob’s firstborn son by Leia, is a transcription of רְאוּבֵן (Gen 29.32),²¹³ preserving the foreign sound of the Semitic name, and is undeclined. The Hebrew *lettre* in Gen 29.32 clarifies the significance of Reuben’s name and this explanation is suitably rendered in Greek. The function of ‘Πουβήν as a vocative is discernible given Iakob’s second person references to Rouben in vv. 3 and 4. The punctuation of the Göttingen edition signifies the construal of πρωτότοκός μου σύ as a syntactical unit with σύ functioning as the subject.²¹⁴ This nominal clause construction reflects the syntax suggested by the accentuation of the MT רְאוּבֵן בְּכֹרִי אֶחָד. Πρωτότοκος renders the Hebrew noun בכר (firstborn) in all of its appearances in the MT²¹⁵ except for one instance (Gen 48.14) where OG has no counterpart to בכר. Given that when an adjective functions as a substantive, it more frequently appears with the article,²¹⁶ one observes that there is no definite article before πρωτότοκός μου in Gen 49.3. Once again, the Greek mirrors the Hebrew. In other instances in OG-Gen where the construction πρωτότοκος plus possessive genitive appears, G typically has employed the article.²¹⁷ With regard to how one might render these constructions in English, Smyth distinguishes “ὁ ἐμὸς φίλος, ὁ φίλος ὁ

²¹³ John Skinner disputes the commonly cited etymology of the name רְאוּבֵן as [ר] [ע] [נ] [י] claiming, “That is too extravagant for even a Heb[rew] etymologist.” Skinner, *Genesis*, 386. Skinner’s suggested derivation of רְאוּבֵן (= רְאוּבֵן בעל) seems no less “extravagant.” The name “Reubel” does, however, appear in some manuscripts of LXX, the Syriac, and Josephus. Herbert Ryle, *The Book of Genesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 302. What seems more plausible is that it is based on the phrase רְאוּבֵן בְּכֹרִי (“See, a son!”). Ryle, *The Book of Genesis*, 301. cf. Ephraim A. Speiser, *Genesis*, Anchor Yale Bible (Yale: Yale University Press, 1974), <https://www.theologyandreligiononline.com.twu.idm.oclc.org/encyclopedia-chapter?docid=b-9780300261851&tocid=b-9780300261851-PT2.B&pdfid=9780300261851.0008.CH002.pdf#b-9780300261851-N29.32> (accessed September 9, 2023 at 15:30), see commentary notes on Gen 29.32.

²¹⁴ Henry Swete’s edition interprets ‘Πουβήν, πρωτότοκός μου (ראובן בכרי) as a title in itself, perhaps as an appositive. He places σύ in the following stich (Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, vol. 1 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901], 98) despite Smyth’s assertion that “an appositive to a proper name has the article when it designates a characteristic or something well known.” Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1160. Likewise, Frank Moore Cross, Jr. and David Noel Freedman believe the Hebrew pronoun אתה (σύ in the Greek) “is to be connected with the following phrase, in agreement with the LXX and Vulgate.” Frank Moore Cross, Jr. and David Noel Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975), 77, n.2.

²¹⁵ Gen 4.4; 10.15; 22.21; 5.13; 27.19, 32; 35.23; 36.15; 38.6, 7; 41.51; 43.33; 46.8; 48.14, 18; 49.3.

²¹⁶ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §908.

²¹⁷ For example, in Gen 27.19: Ἐγὼ Ἦσαὺ ὁ πρωτότοκος σου εἰς בכרך. The article likewise is present in Gen 27.32: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ υἱός σου ὁ πρωτότοκος Ἦσαὺ / אני בְּכֹרְךָ עִשׂוֹ. In Gen 38.6, G has again included a definite article in καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰούδας γυναῖκα Ἦρ τῇ πρωτοτόκῳ αὐτοῦ as a rendering of וַיִּקַּח יְהוּדָה אִשָּׁה לְעַר בְּכוֹרוֹ. It should be noted that these preceding examples are all syntactically different from the one in Gen 49.3, although Gen 27.19 and 38.6 provide relevant points of contrast because the structure in which a definite article appears is in apposition to the main clause. In Gen 38.7, no definite article appears in the Greek: Ἦρ πρωτότοκος Ἰούδα / עַר בְּכוֹר יְהוּדָה.

ἐμός, ὁ φίλος μου *my friend* from φίλος ἐμός, φίλος μου *a friend of mine*.”²¹⁸ Construing the first stich as “Rouben, you are *a* firstborn of mine” might have certain implications with respect to the scenario depicted in Gen 49. Iakob appears to bypass Rouben in order to bestow birthright privileges upon Ioudas and Ioseph, leading perhaps to the idea that Rouben is not the *only* firstborn. In other words, Rouben is the firstborn of Leia, whom Iakob was deceived into marrying (Gen 29.15-30) and whose womb the Lord opened when he saw “that Leia was hated” by her husband (Gen 29.31-32). However, the firstborn of Rachel, Iakob’s desired and beloved wife, was Ioseph (Gen 30.22-25). There are indications in the Genesis narrative that Jacob/Iakob loved Rachel’s firstborn more than his other sons and assigned Joseph/Ioseph blessings that a firstborn should inherit (e.g. Gen 37.3-4; 48; 49.22-26). Moreover, it was Joseph’s/Ioseph’s birth that prompted Jacob’s/Iakob’s decision to return to his own region and country (Gen 30.25), suggesting that this son’s birth had special significance for him. However, the absence of the article is far more likely due to G’s frequent concern for serial fidelity to his *Vorlage*. Just as probable is John Lee’s assertion that such omissions of the article, “a feature of older poetry, notably Homer and Attic Tragedy,” in poetic passages of the Greek Pentateuch²¹⁹ were undoubtedly “deliberate and intended as a poetic characteristic.”²²⁰

Ἰσχύς appears three times in OG-Gen²²¹ and its consistent equivalent in Hebrew, כֹּחַ, expresses the same range of meanings.²²² Iakob regards his firstborn to be his might. In the Greek Pentateuch, the definite article before the construction ἰσχύς plus genitive personal pronoun appears in fifteen out of sixteen cases, with Gen 49.3 being the only exception, a phenomenon which is, again, attributable to G’s concern for serial fidelity and/or a poetic style. The fact that Rouben was Iakob’s firstborn child continues to be emphasized in v. 3. G’s καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου, which is parallel to πρωτότοκός μου σὺ (see above), is an interpretative rendering of וראשית אוני. It is improbable that the *Vorlage* would have read בני instead of אוני. No witnesses in OG-Gen’s textual history attest to variant readings.

Furthermore, for כ to be mistaken for א would be unusual. If the final *yod* in אוני is parsed as a first person pronominal suffix, one is left with the consonants און. MT’s pointing of אֹנִי may signify

²¹⁸ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1196.

²¹⁹ e.g. Gen 49.1-27; Exod 15.1-18; Deut. 32.1-43; 33.2-29.

²²⁰ Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch*, 88. With regard to the LXX translators’ decision to omit rather than include a definite article in their Greek translations, more research must be carried out (by surveying a large sample of Classical Greek poetry and prose) in order to discern whether the lack of definite articles in places where one might normally find them in Greek would impact a Greek audience’s perception of the Greek syntax and style.

²²¹ Gen 4.12; 31.6; 49.3.

²²² Elsewhere in the Pentateuch, ἰσχύς is the default rendering of כֹּחַ (Exod 9.16; 15.6; 32.11; Lev 26.20; Num 14.13, 17; Deut 4.37; 8.17, 18; 9.29). Other Hebrew equivalents for ἰσχύς are עֹז (Exod 15.13), גְּבוּרָה (Exod 32.18, Deut 3.24 [2°]), חֵיל (Num 24.18), and גִּדּוּל (Deut 3.24; 9.26).

“beginning of my trouble/sorrow” if the word is taken to mean אָנן.²²³ The meaning of אָנן is reflected in G’s choice of υἱὸς ὀδύνης μου “son-of-my-pain” to translate בן אוני in Gen 35.18, a passage associated with the birth of Benjamin (ותקרא שמו בן אוני). Alternatively, MT’s pointing of אוני suggests that this word may be read as און root 1²²⁴ with the first person pronominal suffix, meaning “my vigor.”²²⁵ The firstborn Reuben is thus portrayed as the product of his father’s strength and energy, a positive description which is parallel to the final stich of verse 3 (יתר שאת ויתר עז).

The only other time in the Pentateuch that און occurs is in a context that features the same Hebrew expression (ראשית און) that appears in Gen 49.3. The translator of Deut 21.17 has similarly rendered און as οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀρχὴ τῆς ἀνάστασίν μου.²²⁶ The term ἀρχή appears sixteen times in OG-Gen to render ראשית און,²²⁷ ראש,²²⁸ ראשון,²²⁹ ממשלה,²³⁰ משקה,²³¹ כן root 4,²³² and תחלה.²³³ As for τέκνον, elsewhere in OG-Gen, it occurs 20 times. Its default equivalent is בן²³⁴ and it renders ילד twice.²³⁵ There is no evidence that any of the translators of the Pentateuch²³⁶ were familiar with the meaning of “vigor” as און root 1 has been glossed by BDB, although one cannot discount the possibility that they knew the meaning but rather chose to translate און interpretively. In fact, the rendering of ἀρχὴ τῆς ἀνάστασίν μου for ראשית און was likely induced by the presence of the word ראשית along with its proximity to the word בכר. This perhaps led G to infer correctly that ראשית און was associated in some way with Reuben/Rouben’s firstborn status. Since both ἀρχὴ τῆς ἀνάστασίν μου and ראשית און refer to the idea that Iakob’s first offspring was Rouben, G has employed a translation strategy known as situational translation in which “the same situation is described from a different angle.”²³⁷ With ἀρχή

²²³ “Trouble/sorrow.” BDB, s.v. “אָנן;” cf. Symmachus, ἀρχὴ ὀδύνης; Vulgate, *principium doloris mei*; cf. LXX Num 23.21 where אָנן is rendered as μόθος = “trouble,” NETS.

²²⁴ “Vigour, wealth.” BDB s.v. “און.”

²²⁵ NRSV.

²²⁶ One should note the difference in spelling of און plus pronominal suffix that appears in the MT. In Gen 49.3, the *plene* orthography appears (וראשית אוני) whereas in Deut 21.17, the orthography is defective (ראשית אנו). Deut 21.15-17 prohibits a father from favouring the child of a loved wife over his firstborn of an unloved wife. Assuming that OG-Gen was the first book of the Pentateuch to be translated into Greek, one may surmise that G’s rendering in Gen 49.3 may well have influenced the translator of Deut 21.17.

²²⁷ Gen 1.1; 10.10; 49.3.

²²⁸ Gen 1.10; 40.13 [1°]; 40.20 [2x].

²²⁹ Gen 13.4, 40.13[2°].

²³⁰ Gen 1.16 [2x].

²³¹ Gen 40.21.

²³² Gen 41.13.

²³³ Gen 41.21; 43.18; 43.20.

²³⁴ Gen 3.16; 17.16; 22.7, 8; 27.13, 18, 20, 21, 25, 26, 37, 43; 30.1; 31.16, 43; 32.11 [12]; 43.29; 48.19.

²³⁵ Gen 33.6, 7.

²³⁶ Elsewhere in the HB, the translator of Job 40.16 rendered און as δύναμις, which denotes “strength” and, as such, suggests the notion of “vigor.”

²³⁷ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 79.

τέκνων μου, G circumvents any potential difficulties arising from discerning the meaning of און, creating poetic parallelism with πρωτότοκός μου σύ. Nonetheless, the meaning of “beginning of my vigor” is quite different than “beginning of my children.” The “trial” of *rescripting* results from the fact that τέκνον and און are not semantic equivalents. Moreover, since the quality of root און is quite rich with its various denotations and connotations, OG-Gen also manifests *destruction of underlying networks of signification*. These particular “trials” are evinced for yet another reason. When Leah names her son Reuben (Gen 29.32), she uses the word עֲנִי (“my affliction”)²³⁸ to describe her plight of being unloved by her husband. עֲנִי (עָנִי, noun derived from עָנָה root 3) is a homophone of אוֹנִי (און root 1, Gen 49.3) along with אוֹנִי (אָנָן, Gen 35.18). The Hebrew poet may have exploited these various homophones, which appear in their various contexts of the *lettre* of Genesis, to create a play on words. In doing so, Jacob could be ironically intimating in Gen 49.3 to indicate that what was Leah’s affliction has become his. Such subtleties of meaning that are intrinsic to the tapestry of the Hebrew *lettre* (e.g. the network of signification of these Hebrew roots) are virtually impossible to reproduce in a Greek translation.

In the last stich of v. 3, the coordinating conjunction καί replicates Hebrew *vav*, connecting two parallel phrases which both begin with σκληρός, which is G’s choice for יָתֵר. Σκληρός conveys the basic notion of something that is “hard,” having a range of connotations meaning “difficult,” “harsh,” “cruel,” or “stubborn.”²³⁹ Besides its use in Gen 49.3, the counterpart of σκληρός in vv. 7 and 30 of Gen 42 is קשה.²⁴⁰ In Gen 49.3, it seems that G interprets the significance of “excess” associated with the word יָתֵר (“remainder, excellence, excess”)²⁴¹ as an excess of unseemly behaviour. In contrast, the Hebrew author likely intended the meaning of “excellence.” As the Greek meaning is completely different than its Hebrew counterpart, the result, again, is the “trial” of *rescripting*. In fact, the Hebrew poet skillfully crafts a witty play on words with יָתֵר in v. 3 and תוֹתֵר in v. 4, an aspect of the Hebrew *lettre* which is lost in translation. As such, OG-Gen again exhibits the “trial” of *destruction of underlying networks of signification*.

The repetition of σκληρός intensifies the emphasis on Reuben’s negative character. By employing the present middle-passive infinitive φέρεσθαι (“to bear,” “carry” [fig.] “endure, suffer”),²⁴²

²³⁸ As stated in fn. 213, this word is commonly employed as an etymology for Reuben’s name.

²³⁹ LSJ, s.v. “σκληρός.”

²⁴⁰ Σκληρός also occurs in Gen 21.11-12 (σκληρόν δὲ ἐφάνη τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα / וירע הדבר מאד / Μὴ σκληρόν ἔστω τὸ ῥῆμα ἐναντίον σου περὶ τῆς παιδίου / אל ירע בעיניך על הנער) and in Gen 45.5 (μηδὲ σκληρόν ὑμῖν φανήτω / ואל יחר בעיניכם).

²⁴¹ BDB, s.v. “יָתֵר” and “יָתֵר.”

²⁴² LSJ, s.v. “φέρω.”

G has evidently interpreted the consonants שאת as שָׂאָת, the infinitive construct of נָשָׂא (“lift, carry, take”).²⁴³ The Greek text thus portrays Rouben unfavorably as a difficult burden for his father to carry.²⁴⁴ Conversely, the meaning of the MT is somewhat obscure. שאת, in the phrase יתֵר שאת, can be read as a bound structure of which the head noun is יתֵר. The pointing שָׂאָת, which appears in the MT, may also be interpreted as the singular feminine noun²⁴⁵ שָׂאָת, which means “exaltation, dignity” (BDB) or “rank” (NSRV). In any case, the disparaging connotation of “hard to bear” (σκληρὸς φέρεσθαι) is quite different from the Hebrew poem’s more positive depiction of Reuben as “excelling in rank” (NRSV). G likely had to grapple with the meaning of שאת and in so doing he chose an interpretation that coincided with the general shape and direction that his translation was taking, that of portraying Rouben in a negative light. OG-Gen thus manifests *destruction of linguistic patternings* due to G’s translating the Hebrew noun שאת as an infinitive and since this infinitive has a completely different meaning than the noun, the result is the “trial” of *rescripting*.

G’s choice of αὐθάδης²⁴⁶ in the next phrase (as well as in Gen 49.7) expresses the notion of self-willed arrogance. Apart from these two instances of αὐθάδης in OG-Gen, it appears only one other time in the LXX in Prov 21.24 where it renders יהיר (“proud”).²⁴⁷ As for עֹז (derived from the root עָזָה), DCH identifies it as the noun עֹז (“strength, power”), which MT points as עֹז because of the *sillûq* accent in the phrase יתֵר עֹז.²⁴⁸ According to Wevers, G “seems to understand the notion of strength in the sense of strong of will.”²⁴⁹ Even so, the meaning of עֹז and αὐθάδης is quite different, which again results in the “trial” of *rescripting*. Striking is Iakob’s damning characterization of Rouben in OG-Gen. Rouben is hard, stubborn, and difficult to bear whereas the Hebrew narrative in v. 3 describes the firstborn positively as a manifestation of his paternal virility. There is no trace of the wit and irony apparent in the source text—i.e. initially describing Reuben in quite positive terms in v. 3 only to disdainfully reject him v. 4. In considering the horizon of the translator, one wonders if G’s unflattering portrayal of the forsaken firstborn (Rouben) could have been motivated, in part, as a justification for the dying

²⁴³ BDB, s.v. “שָׂאָת;” also Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, φέρεσθαι = שָׂאָת.

²⁴⁴ In a certain way, this would almost be like a restitution of the notion that Rouben has become an affliction for Iakob (see discussion of the wordplay of the various meanings of אָוֶן with עָנִי, which appears in the first stich of Gen 49.3).

²⁴⁵ HALOT parses it as a substantivized infinitive. Skinner argues that שָׂאָת is best interpreted as having the connotation of arrogance based on the sense of the word in Hab 1.7 and translates שאת יתֵר as “exceeding in pride.” Skinner, *Genesis*, 514, fn. 3a.

²⁴⁶ “Self-willed, stubborn.” LSJ, s.v. “αὐθάδης.”

²⁴⁷ BDB, s.v. “יהיר.”

²⁴⁸ DCH, s.v. “עֹז.” BDB and HALOT identify it as the noun עֹז. BDB, s.v. “עֹז.” Cf. HALOT, “עֹז” and “עֹז” where עֹז is regarded to be a by-form of the noun עֹז.

²⁴⁹ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 821.

patriarch's decision to reject his firstborn (which would have been a transgression of the law in Deut 21.15-17, see above) and effectively to grant the birthright and blessings to Ioudas and Ioseph, respectively (cf. Gen 49.8; 22-26).

3.6 Rouben (v. 4)

<p>פחז כמים אל תותר כי עלית משכבי אביך אז חללת יצועי עליה</p>
<p>Unstable as water, you shall no longer excel because you went up onto your father's bed; then you defiled it—you²⁵⁰ went up onto my couch!</p> <p>Deceptive²⁵¹ like water—you shall have no superiority, For you went up to your father's bed, Then you defiled the concubine's couch.</p>
<p>ἐξυβρίσας ὡς ὕδωρ, μὴ ἐκζέσης· ἀνέβης γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην τοῦ πατρὸς σου· τότε ἐμίανας τὴν στρωμνὴν οὗ ἀνέβης.</p>
<p>You became wanton like water; do not boil over. For you went up upon your father's bed; then you defiled the couch where you went up!</p>

Part of the translator's *horizon* would presumably include mention of Iakob's firstborn, Rouben, in an intertextual reference to Gen 49.3-4 in 1 Suppl/Chr 5.1-2:

And Rouben's sons, Israel's firstborn (υἱοὶ Ρουβὴν πρωτοτόκου Ἰσραήλ / בכור ישראל) — because he was the firstborn (ὁ πρωτότοκος / הבכור), but he gave his blessing to his son Ioseph son of Israel, when he climbed into his father's bed (ἐν τῷ ἀναβῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ), and he was not reckoned in the genealogy as firstborn (εἰς πρωτοτόκια), because Ioudas was powerful in strength (δυνατὸς ἰσχύι) also among his brothers and one from him became a leader (εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐξ αὐτοῦ), and the blessing was Ioseph's... (NETS)

This passage alludes to Rouben's incestuous relations with his father's concubine Balla (Gen 35.21[22]) and Iakob's decision to take away Rouben's birthright and give these privileges to his two younger brothers Ioudas and Ioseph (Gen 49.8-12, 22-26). In Gen 49.4, the verb ἐξυβρίζω means "break out into insolence," "wax wanton" or commit acts of extravagance or violence.²⁵² Tov's citation of the word is accented as ἐξυβρίσας (an aorist participle) while Wevers's pointing is ἐξυβρίσας (the second person aorist indicative form of ἐξυβρίζω), a pointing that takes into account the second person

²⁵⁰ LXX, Syriac, Targums; Hebrew *he*.

²⁵¹ Verse translation by de Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 86, 91.

²⁵² LSJ, s.v. "ἐξυβρίζω."

aorist verbs in the rest of v. 4 and also the renderings in the Samaritan Pentateuch, Peshitta, and Targum as indicated in *BHS*.²⁵³ As such, Tov reasonably concludes that, rather than the *hapax legomenon* פָּהוּ (a noun) which appears in the MT, G's "rendering probably reflects the same reading as the S[amaritan] P[entateuch] (פָּהוּת), also presupposed by Aquila (ἐθαμβευσας) and Symmachus (ὑπερξέσας)."²⁵⁴ De Hoop argues that, instead of glossing the verb פָּהוּ as "be wanton, reckless" (BDB) or "be insolent, undisciplined" (*HALOT*),²⁵⁵ the verb likely means something approximating "to deceive, act unfaithfully,"²⁵⁶ basing his conclusions on a systematic study of the Hebrew root פָּהוּ in biblical and post-biblical contexts. Whatever the basic definition of פָּהוּ actually is, Aaron Rubin suggests that the root *phz* in Arabic and Modern South Arabian (with its use in sexual idioms)²⁵⁷ implies that the Hebrew poet intended a *double entendre* with his choice of פָּהוּ(ת) in the phrase כָּמִים פָּהוּ(ת),²⁵⁸ since it is Reuben's sexual misconduct (cf. Gen 35.22) that Jacob rebukes. Indeed, William Loader's research suggests that G seemed to be aware of the sexual connotations implicit in the Hebrew root פָּהוּ.²⁵⁹ The translator thus arguably expresses Iakob's moral disapproval by characterizing his son's behaviour as *sexually* unrestrained ("wanton"). In the case of a *double entendre* for פָּהוּ(ת), OG-Gen manifests *qualitative impoverishment* since the play on words in the Hebrew *lettre* (that is, two underlying meanings for פָּהוּ) is not evinced in the translation, despite G's apt conveyance of the sexual connotations of the root פָּהוּ.

Rouben became wanton like water (ὕδωρ), evidently because of his action of defiling his father's bed (see below). Ὡς ὕδωρ mirrors כָּמִים and this simile evokes the image of an unchecked passion that overflows. G's choice of the verb ἐκξέω represents a creative development of this water metaphor in which Iakob enjoins Rouben to not repeat his past behaviour: "do not boil over."²⁶⁰ This rather compelling imagery seems to be a fitting description of the unbridled passion associated with Rouben's

²⁵³ This is the second person perfect form פָּהוּתָּ, cf. *BHS*, Gen 49.4.

²⁵⁴ Emanuel Tov, "Gen 49 in the Septuagint – Trial and Error," in *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide. Text-critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 269, ed. Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 256-257. He translates the Greek as "you became wanton," as in NETS.

²⁵⁵ BDB, s.v. "פָּהוּ," cf. Judg 9.4; Zeph 3.4.

²⁵⁶ Raymond de Hoop, "The Meaning of *phz* in Classical Hebrew," *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 10 (1997): 20.

²⁵⁷ These idioms relate to sexual intercourse and are based on the root *phz* (Arabic and Modern South Arabian), which has a basic meaning of "thigh." Aaron Rubin, "Genesis 49:4 in Light of Arabic and Modern South Arabian," *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 500-501.

²⁵⁸ Rubin, "Genesis 49:4," 502.

²⁵⁹ William R.G. Loader, *Sexuality and Gender* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 63. Loader also cites the Aramaic Levi Document 6.3/16 and 1 Enoch 8.2 as further evidence that פָּהוּ should be interpreted as having sexual connotations.

²⁶⁰ Μη + subjunctive form, here the aorist ἐκξέω expresses prohibition. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1800.

incestuous relations with Balla. Ἐκζέσης renders תוֹתֵר (*hiphil* stem²⁶¹ of יָתַר, which means “excel, shew pre-eminence”)²⁶² and so in the MT Jacob chastises his eldest with his assertion, “You shall no longer excel.” The Hebrew verb has the same root as יָתַר (σκληρός) in v. 3 and is evidence of wordplay in the Hebrew that is not reproduced in OG-Gen which, as indicated earlier, is the “trial” of *rescripting*. The transformation of תוֹתֵר to ἐκζέσης is one of semantic modification since “boiling over” is related to the general notion of excess. Nevertheless, the Greek text loses the implicit reference of the loss of Reuben’s birthright as Jacob’s firstborn (“do not boil over” as opposed to “you shall not excel” in the MT).²⁶³ Thus, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *qualitative impoverishment*.

The γάρ clause,²⁶⁴ which alludes to events recounted in Gen 35.21(22), is logically linked to ἐξυβρίσας because it explains why Rouben could be wanton. In contrast, כִּי in the Hebrew text provides an explanation as to why Jacob has determined that his son would no longer excel—namely, lay claim to the rights and status of a firstborn son. Ἀνέβης is a suitable rendering of the second person singular perfect form עלית. Evidence of considerable semantic differentiation by G when translating עלה is indicated by the number of the counterparts that have been chosen throughout Genesis: ἀναβαίνω,²⁶⁵ ἀναβιβάζω,²⁶⁶ συναναβαίνω,²⁶⁷ ἀναφέρω,²⁶⁸ ἀνάγω,²⁶⁹ ἀνοίγω,²⁷⁰ and συναναφέρω.²⁷¹ This is due to the fact that the ancient Greek language is a lexically richer language than what is attested in biblical Hebrew.²⁷² Greek words for “bed” such as κοίτη can be a euphemism for sexual intercourse,²⁷³ just like מִשְׁכָּב, which is its Hebrew equivalent in the majority of its 26 occurrences in the Pentateuch. The terms κοίτη and מִשְׁכָּב only occur here in Genesis. However, the singular form κοίτη represents a change of accident from the plural form of מִשְׁכָּב that appears in the MT, resulting in the “trial” of *quantitative*

²⁶¹ Second person singular masculine jussive form תוֹתֵר.

²⁶² BDB, s.v. “יָתַר.”

²⁶³ Loader, *Sexuality and Gender*, 63.

²⁶⁴ The Hebrew word order is adjusted to typical Greek order with γάρ appearing after the verb.

²⁶⁵ Gen 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; 46.4, 29, 31; 49.4 [2x]; 50.5, 6, 7.

²⁶⁶ “To bring up” (Gen 37.28; 46.4).

²⁶⁷ Gen 50.7, 9, 14.

²⁶⁸ “To bring up, offer up” (Gen 8.20; 22.2).

²⁶⁹ Gen 50.24.

²⁷⁰ “To open, unlock” (Gen 40.10). Cf. Gen 7.11; 8.6; 29.31; 30.22; 41.56; 43.21, 44.11(פתח).

²⁷¹ “To carry up,” (Gen 50.25).

²⁷² There are some 8198 biblical Hebrew words (of which 2000 are *hapax legomena*) and 7879 Rabbinic Hebrew words. Ghil’ad Zuckermann, *Language Contact and Lexical Enrichment in Israeli Hebrew* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 64–65. This is in comparison more than 60,000 classical Greek words attested until the 4th century BCE. Nick Nicolas, <https://hellenisteukontos.opoudjis.net/2017-01-05-how-many-words-does-the-greek-language-have/>. The *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* contains entries of over 140,000 head words.

²⁷³ Ed Sanders, “Sexual Jealousy and *Erôs* in Euripides’ *Medea*,” in *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, ed. Ed Sanders, Chiara Thumiger, Christopher Carey, and Nick J. Lowe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 45.

impoverishment in OG-Gen. The reference to a single bed in OG-Gen likely is an allusion to Rouben's violation of Balla. Ἐπί used with the accusative often refers to movement onto or upon a height,²⁷⁴ but here in Gen 49.4 it has no explicit counterpart in the Hebrew. This addition in OG-Gen, though virtually negligible, might be considered the "trial" of *expansion*.

Τότε is the counterpart to זא in four out of six instances that it occurs in OG-Gen.²⁷⁵ The τότε clause and the preceding γάρ clause could be understood to express the idea of a sequence.²⁷⁶ First, Rouben went up upon his father's bed, and then he went a step further by defiling the bed.

Alternatively, one may interpret Rouben's audacious action of going up as the very moment when defilement took place. The latter option suits the context; it indicates what actually happened (illicit sexual relations with Balla)²⁷⁷ when Rouben brazenly violated his father's bed. The growing wantonness of Rouben's actions seems to qualify G's use of disparaging adjectives in v. 3. A difference between στρωμνή ("bed spread or prepared: generally, bed, couch"),²⁷⁸ which is the counterpart to יצוע, and κοίτη is that κοίτη especially can refer to the marriage-bed.²⁷⁹ יצוע also means "couch, bed," like its synonym מִשְׁכָּב, but connotes the action of spreading out (e.g. one's bed).²⁸⁰ OG-Gen exhibits *quantitative impoverishment* as τὴν στρωμνήν does not have any possessive pronoun, which would be a counterpart to the pronominal suffix in יצועי.

G's choice of μιαινω seems to be a fitting match for its Hebrew counterpart חלל, a word that is often used in cultic or legal contexts meaning "pollute, defile, profane."²⁸¹ In the MT, the accents indicate that the words חללת and יצועי belong to different clauses, that חללת has no explicit object, and that יצועי could be construed as the object of the following verb עלה. Against the MT's accentuation, the *piel* of חלל should be transitive either with יצועי as the object or with an implied object (it). Another problem with translating the last two stiches of MT v. 4 is that the last word (עלה) is a third person

²⁷⁴ LSJ, s.v. "ἐπί."

²⁷⁵ Gen 12.6; 13.7; 24.4; 49.4.

²⁷⁶ LSJ, s.v. "τότε."

²⁷⁷ cf. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 821.

²⁷⁸ LSJ, s.v. "στρωμνή." Its earliest attestation in TLG is Aeschylus, *Choephoroe* 671 and Euripides, *Phoenissae* 421 and it subsequently appears in the works of historians (e.g. Thucydides, *Historiae* 8.81; Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.1) and Plato (*Protagoras* 321.7). It is thus not especially marked as a poetic word. The *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms* documents a Greek inscription (CGRN 96) which describes a private familial cult of the early Hellenistic period (3rd century BCE). The inscription specifies that bed cushions were prepared for Heracles (lines 19-20) for a wedding celebration and "the prepared couch and the statues for Heracles should remain [in place] until the marriage is celebrated" (ἡ δὲ στρωμνὴ καὶ τὰ [ἄ]γάλματα τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ἔστω [κατὰ χώραν] ὑπάρχοντα). (<http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be/file/96/?lemma1=%CF%83%CF%84%CF%81%CF%89%CE%BC%CE%BD%CE%AE&condition1=none>).

²⁷⁹ LSJ, s.v. "κοίτη." E.g. Aeschylus, *Supplices* 804; Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 17; fragment 546.

²⁸⁰ BDB, s.v. "יצוע" and "יצועי."

²⁸¹ BDB, s.v. "חלל," root 3. Elsewhere in the Pentateuch, חלל appears in Exod (3x), Lev (19x), Num (2x) and Deut (3x).

singular verb,²⁸² which seems at odds with the presence of second person singular verbs (עלית; חללת). To solve these difficulties, G structures his text so that τὴν στρωμνὴν is unequivocally the object of the verb ἐμίανας (= חללת). Then, he creates an adverbial phrase with the addition of the adverb οὗ which specifies where the “going up” took place. In doing so, G has made the difficult Hebrew syntax smoother and has generated rationalizing *expansion* in his translation. Moreover, by reading עלה as a free infinitive and rendering it with a second singular aorist verb, G could maintain grammatical consistency in vv. 3-4.²⁸³ The result of these translation strategies described above is that OG-Gen manifests the “trials” of *destruction of linguistic patternings* and *rationalization*, since the syntax has been virtually recomposed. Moreover, there is an ensuing *destruction of rhythm* because the *Vorlage* contains a poem and replicating its rhythm in a foreign language is a formidable, if not an impossible, task.

3.7 Summary: Rouben Pericope (vv. 3-4)

The “trials” in vv. 3-4 appear as follows:

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
3*	ראובן	Ρουβήν	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	וראשית אוני	καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου,	Rescripting Destruction of underlying networks of signification (און)
	יתר שאת	σκληρὸς φέρεισθαι	Rescripting (יתר) Destruction of underlying networks of signification (יתר-תותר [vv. 3-4]) Rescripting (שאת) Destruction of linguistic patternings (substantive to infinitive)
	ויתר עז	καὶ σκληρὸς αὐθάδης	Rescripting (יתר) Destruction of underlying networks of signification (יתר-תותר [vv. 3-4]) Rescripting (עז)

²⁸² These consonants could be construed as an infinitive absolute (עֲלֶה, e.g. Gen 46.4), a participle (עֹלֶה, e.g. Gen 38.13), or the perfect *qal* masculine singular עָלָה in Gen 49.4 (MT pointing).

²⁸³ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 822.

4	פחז(ת)	ἐξύβρισας	Qualitative impoverishment (wordplay, <i>double entendre</i>)
	תותר	ἐκζέσης	Qualitative impoverishment Destruction of underlying networks of signification (תותר-יתר [vv. 3-4])
	-	ἐπὶ	Expansion (negligible)
	משכבי	τὴν κοίτην	Quantitative impoverishment (change of accident [plural MT and singular OG-Gen])
	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνήν οὗ ἀνέβης	Quantitative impoverishment (missing first person possessive suffix in יצועי) Destruction of linguistic patternings (addition of adverb οὗ, so change of syntactic function [subordinate clause]); change of accident (3 rd person to 2 nd person verb) Rationalization Expansion (addition of οὗ) Destruction of rhythms

In testing the efficacy of the negative analytic for use in Septuagint Studies up to this point, one may conclude that Berman's categories have offered a fruitful point of departure for analyzing to what extent the crucible of translation has modified the Hebrew *lettre*. It appears as though G's prevalent translation method involves the employment of some kind of Greek counterpart for each Hebrew word that appears in his *Vorlage*. Thus, the word order of the Hebrew text tends to be replicated in OG-Gen. Even so, John Lee astutely observes that for the Pentateuch translators "Greek syntax, not Hebrew, is the translators' starting point. It is the instrument they use to deal with a text in another language with its own, often alien syntax."²⁸⁴ This is clearly evident, for example, in the list of "trials" manifested in G's translation of יצועי עלה. These various deformations can be attributed to G's efforts to produce a coherent and acceptable Greek text. Moreover, the fact that Greek is a language characterized by "flexible word order"²⁸⁵ facilitates the production either of natural Greek or a rendering in which, as Lee puts it, "the Greek matches the Hebrew, but Greek and Hebrew syntax coincide, so the result may

²⁸⁴ Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch*, 262, §7.2.2.

²⁸⁵ "In all periods of Greek, all permutations of S[ubject], V[erb] and O[bject] are attested, within the domain of main, declarative clauses. We can therefore call them 'flexible word order' languages." Allison Kirk, "Word Order and Information Structure in New Testament Greek" (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2012), 12, <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157>.

or may not be due to interference.”²⁸⁶ It does not appear, therefore, as though an alien reading experience is being staged in the translation (*foreignization*). There are additional reasons for this assessment.

“The Self-Same (*Propre*) and the Foreign”²⁸⁷ of the Hebrew poem has not come through unscathed in the translation process. The most pervasive “trials” in v. 3 are *rescripting* and the *destruction of underlying networks of signification*. The Hebrew signifying network includes words that express the notions of strength, primacy, and excellence (כֹּחַ, רֵאשִׁית, אֹן, יֵתֵר, שֹׂאֵת, עֹז) with reference to Jacob’s firstborn son, Reuben. The dying patriarch begins his address to Reuben by describing him in positive terms, exalting his firstborn as the one who constituted the proof of his father’s strength and virility. In OG-Gen, however, Iakob demeans Rouben and sternly criticizes him as being hard to bear and self-centered. OG-Gen thus mischaracterizes Iakob as being much harsher towards his eldest son than is the case in the source text. Noteworthy also is the distinction between the MT and OG-Gen readings of Gen 35.22(21). In the MT, וַיֵּלֶךְ רְאוּבֵן וַיִּשְׁכַּב אֶת בִּלְהָה פִּלְגֶשׁ אָבִיו וַיִּשְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל (“Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father’s concubine; and Israel heard of it”). In OG-Gen, the additional phrase καὶ πονηρὸν ἐφάνη ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ²⁸⁸ (“and it seemed evil in his sight”) appears. Whether or not this interesting addition originated with G or reflects a different *Vorlage* with respect to the MT is an open question. 4QGen-Exod^a, a Qumran fragment that might have shed light on this issue, is damaged at the very point where the phrase could have appeared.²⁸⁹ Whatever the case, the combination of Iakob’s more severe criticism of Rouben in the Greek text of Gen 49.3-4 and the additional phrase in Gen 35.21(22) has the overall effect of enhancing the moral judgement of OG-Gen²⁹⁰ with regard to Rouben’s sexual misconduct with his father’s concubine. In other words, G may have wanted to ensure that Rouben’s actions are unequivocally condemned. As a consequence, OG-Gen lacks the irony and surprise of the jarring reversal that takes place in the MT in the movement from v. 3 to v. 4.

²⁸⁶ A third category that Lee identifies is a Greek rendering that “matches the Hebrew but is *not* [emphasis his] natural Greek, and interference from Hebrew is certain.” Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch*, 262, §7.2.2.

²⁸⁷ Berman, “Translation and the Trials,” 284.

²⁸⁸ Presumably, the Hebrew retroversion of the Greek phrase would be וִירַע בְּעֵינָיו.

²⁸⁹ “The last 12-15 letter-spaces [of 4QGen-Exod^a] may be reconstructed as blank, or could contain the [LXX] addition.” James R. Davila, “4QGen-Exod^a,” in *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XII*, Qumran Cave 4/VII, Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, eds. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 10. Gary A. Rendsburg makes the compelling argument that the missing part of the Qumran fragment would be white space. Generally, says Rendsburg, the fragment seems to more frequently align with the MT and, moreover, in the event that the missing part *did* contain the phrase that appears in OG-Gen, that line would be shorter compared to the other lines of the fragment. This would make it less likely that the missing line in the fragment could have contained the addition that appears in OG-Gen. Gary A. Rendsburg, *How the Bible is Written* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2019), 561.

²⁹⁰ Loader, *Sexuality and Gender*, 63.

G has had to wrestle with the untranslatability of the Hebrew *lettre*. That is, vv. 3-4 exhibit text-critical difficulties which have created a perplexing Hebrew syntax that translators have long had to grapple with. G's compulsion to translate has allowed him to overcome the untranslatability (defined in the Bermanian sense as "the text's drive to particularity (uniqueness) and an assertion of its fullness [or self-sufficiency]")²⁹¹ of the interpretatively challenging phrases וְרֵאשִׁית אוֹנִי and יִתֵּר שְׂאֵת. Berman defines this compulsion as any translator's "drive for his [or her] translation."²⁹² Assuming that G's *Vorlage* read the same as the MT, one concludes that G must have known, for example, that καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου was not a literal rendering of וְרֵאשִׁית אוֹנִי. Yet G's aim in Gen 49.3-4 would have been to identify parallels and patterns that would afford him the means of formulating a sensible and coherent translation. The instances of *rescripting* suggest that G creatively sought to circumvent any impasse (e.g. doubt about a Hebrew meaning) so that he could complete his translation mandate. Moreover, instead of the terse, poetic style of the *Vorlage*, OG-Gen in v. 4 reads more like narrative prose and this effect is achieved, in part, by the addition of the adverb οὕ. Furthermore, cohesion is created by means of the second person pronoun in v. 3 and the second person verbs in v. 4.

An important point to consider is whether the fact that the *lettre* is a Hebrew poem is adequately conveyed in OG-Gen 49.1-15. Many of the Hebrew poetic devices have been lost in translation, resulting in *qualitative impoverishment*. Would a Greek audience perceive Iakob's words as merely an extended verbal address to each of his sons instead of a poem? One must keep in mind that Greek poetic aesthetics have distinctive elements that may not be characteristic of Hebrew poetry and vice versa. Meter is one such element that is arguably more prominent in Greek poetry than Hebrew poetry.²⁹³ OG-Gen 49.1-15 is not marked by any consistent Greek meter. Nevertheless, OG-Gen actually does contain poetic features (highlighted throughout this thesis) such as metaphors, imagery, repetitions, and parallelism which have transferred from the Hebrew *lettre*. There are also a few instances of Greek alliteration.

²⁹¹ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 79-80.

²⁹² Antoine Berman, *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*, trans. Stefan Heyvaert (New York: State University of New York Press, 1992), 178.

²⁹³ Whether or not Hebrew poetry has meter continues to be debated by scholars. Scholarly perspectives include a) the notion that Hebrew poetry is based on syllabic weight (long and short syllables, as in classical Greek poetry), b) the idea that syllable stress is the basis of Hebrew meter, c) various syllable-count theories, and d) the concept that Hebrew rhythmic qualities are derived from parallelism. For a helpful overview and bibliography of these and other viewpoints, see Michael Wade Martin, "Does Ancient Hebrew Poetry Have Meter?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 140, no. 3 (2021): 503-529, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jbl.2021.0024>.

CHAPTER 4. GENESIS 49.5-7: SYMEON AND LEUI

4.1 Symeon and Leui (v. 5)

שמעון ולוי אחים כלי חמס מכרתיהם
Simeon and Levi are brothers; weapons of violence are their swords. ²⁹⁴
Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι ἀδελφοί· συνετέλεσαν ἀδικίαν ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν
Symeon and Leui are brothers; they perpetrated injustice by their choice ²⁹⁵

Συμεὼν and Λεὺι, the names of Iakob's second and third eldest sons, are both undeclined. These transcriptions are quite successful in preserving the foreign sound of the names שמעון and לוי respectively.²⁹⁶ שמעון is based on the verb שמע (Gen 29.33b)²⁹⁷ while לוי was derived from the *niphal* form of ליה meaning “join oneself, be joined to” (Gen 29.34).²⁹⁸ G also suitably translates the explanations for these names as they appear in the Hebrew *lettre* of Gen 29.33-34.²⁹⁹ As with the name ראוּבֵן, any signifying richness inherent in these names' sonorities cannot be determined. Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι ἀδελφοί may be read as a nominal clause in which ἀδελφοί is the predicate nominative of what precedes. Wevers has judiciously chosen this reading (as did also the Masoretes) for his critical edition, explaining that it “fits the poetic character of the passage.”³⁰⁰ In G's version of Gen 34.14, Symeon and Leui are identified as the brothers of Dina who speak deceitfully to Sychem and his father Hemmor (Gen 34.13).³⁰¹ While ἀδελφοί is anarthrous in Gen 49.5 and there is no mention of Dina, the phrase

²⁹⁴ According to de Hoop, the phrase מכרתיהם should be rendered as “knives.” De Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 97.

²⁹⁵ Or *course of action*.

²⁹⁶ Although no surviving written documents or inscriptions attest to the usage of these Greek transcriptions prior to the third century BCE, it is quite likely that these Greek transcriptions of Hebrew names pre-date the production of OG-Gen. For example, for such purposes as commercial activities or other engagement with non-Jews, Hebrew names would inevitably have to be rendered in Greek.

²⁹⁷ Skinner, *Genesis*, 386; Wevers, *Greek Text*, 472.

²⁹⁸ BDB, s.v. “לָוִי.”

²⁹⁹ “Ὅτι ἤκουσεν κύριος ὅτι μισοῦμαι, καὶ προσέδωκέν μοι καὶ τοῦτον· ἐκάλεσεν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν (“Because the Lord has heard that I am hated, he has also in addition given me this one too;” and she called his name Symeon”) renders כִּי שמעון ויהוה כי שמוא אנכי ויתן לי גם את זה ותקרא שמו שמעון (“Because the LORD has heard that I am hated, he has given me this also;” and she named him Simeon”). Ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ πρὸς ἐμοῦ ἔσται ὁ ἀνὴρ μου, τέτοκα γὰρ αὐτῷ τρεῖς υἱούς· διὰ τοῦτο ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Λεὺι (“At the present time my husband will be on my side, for I have borne him three sons;” therefore she called his name Leui”) renders לוי כי ילדתי לו שלשה בנים על כן קרא שמו לוי (“Now this time my husband will be joined to me, because I have born him three sons;” therefore he was named Levi”).

³⁰⁰ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 822. Alternatively, the phrase Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι ἀδελφοί could be construed as the subject of the verb συνετέλεσαν. In this case, ἀδελφοί would be in apposition to Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι.

³⁰¹ This detail does not appear in the MT nor in OG-Gen of Gen 34.13. However, the phrase Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι οἱ ἀδελφοί Δίνας occurs again in Gen 34.25 with corresponding equivalents in the MT.

Συμεὼν καὶ Λεὺι ἀδελφοί (as is the case with the corresponding section of the Hebrew *Vorlage*) constitutes an allusion to the events recounted in Gen 34 concerning the vengeful wrath of Symeon and Leui against the Chorrites for the rape of their sister Dina. Besides the reference to the blood ties of familial relationships, the word “brothers” here connotes the notion of a common interest, an idea that is developed further in v. 6 in the sense of their common council and the alliance that was established to perform their dastardly deed.

Symeon and Leui “perpetrated (συνετέλεσαν) injustice by their choice” (v. 5). Choosing the aorist indicative of συντελέω, G has produced a reading that reflects the third person plural form כלו derived from the root כלה (“accomplish”)³⁰² rather than a counterpart to כלי (“weapons”)³⁰³ in the MT. Although συντελέω is the most frequently employed equivalent for כלה,³⁰⁴ G differentiates semantically in his rendering of כלה by employing various other suitable Greek verbs, including παύω,³⁰⁵ ἐκλείπω (Gen 21.15), ἀναλίσκω (Gen 41.30), παρέρχομαι (Gen 41.53), and καταπαύω (Gen 49.33). As for the reading of כלו rather than כלי, the final consonants *vav* and *yod*, respectively, may sometimes be confused during scribal transmission.³⁰⁶ Nonetheless, in light of Aquila’s choice of σκεύη (which indicates that his *Vorlage* here read כלי), it is possible that G’s *Vorlage* had the same reading.³⁰⁷ If so, G may thus have opted for the reading כלו as part of his effort to deal with the difficulty of making contextual sense of the puzzling term מכרתיהם, which appears later in this verse. G’s decision to read כלו instead of כלי generates the “trials” of *rescripting* (since συνετέλεσαν has a different meaning than כלי) as well as *destruction of linguistic patternings* because כלי is a plural noun and συνετέλεσαν is third person plural verb. The consequence of this alteration to the syntax of the Hebrew poem is *destruction of rhythm*. Moreover, the pronoun “they” implicit in the plural verb is a rationalizing *expansion* that anaphorically refers to Symeon and Leui.

Αδικία occurs seven times in OG-Gen as the counterpart to חַמַּס (3x),³⁰⁸ עָוֹן (Gen 44.16), and פֶּשַׁע (Gen 50.17[2x]). Such Hebrew terms that denote violence, sin, or wrongdoing (along with antithetical terms such as those having to do with righteousness, peace, and justice) form an integral aspect of the Hebrew *lettre* and the thematic framework of the book of Genesis. Therefore, at a

³⁰² BDB, s.v. “כָּלָה.”

³⁰³ BDB, s.v. “כֵּל.” Cf. Gen 27.3; 49.5.

³⁰⁴ Gen 2.1, 2; 6.16; 17.22; 18.21; 24.15, 45; 43.2.

³⁰⁵ Gen 18.33; 24.22; 27.30.

³⁰⁶ Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 10.

³⁰⁷ In fact, כלי occurs nine times in Genesis where it is usually rendered by σκεῦος (Gen 24.53[1^o]; 27.3; 31.37[2x]; 45.20; Gen 49.5; cf. ἀγγεῖον = כלי, Gen 42.25; 43.11).

³⁰⁸ Gen 6.11, 13; 49.5.

macro level OG-Gen exhibits *destruction of networks of signification* due to semantic leveling since some of these Hebrew terms are not exact equivalents of ἀδικία. In Gen 49.5, ἀδικία and חמס have the notion of “wrongdoing” in common. However, ἀδικία does not explicitly denote “violence” as does the word חמס. Consequently, the impact of G’s selection of ἀδικία for חמס in this context is the “trial” of *qualitative impoverishment*. The “injustice” in this verse alludes to the vengeful slaughter of the Chorrites by Symeon and Leui as recounted in Gen 34.25-31.

The term αἵρεσις denotes “taking” (a village or town),³⁰⁹ taking a course of action, or making a choice.³¹⁰ The meaning of the term מכרתיהם that appears in MT Gen 49.5 is uncertain since מכרה, the root noun, is a *hapax legomenon* whose meaning is unknown.³¹¹ According to Wevers’ sensible reckoning of the Greek text, G interprets the first letter of מכרתיהם as the preposition מן when rendering it as ἐξ.³¹² The remaining letters of מכרתיהם may be based on the root כרת (“cut off, cut down”), which could possibly give rise to a substantive meaning a “cutting off” or a “cutting down” or, perhaps, destruction. Alternatively, מכרתיהם could be explained as derived from the root כרה, from which might be engendered a substantive denoting a “digging” (e.g. the digging of a pit expressed figuratively as the notion of “plotting against others”³¹³) or perhaps the pit itself,³¹⁴ an interpretation that seems to lie behind Aquila’s rendering ἀνασκαφαί (spelled -φε).³¹⁵ Another potential explanation for מכרתיהם could be that it is a noun going back to the root כרר³¹⁶ and signifies an “attack” or “surrounding.”³¹⁷ Similarly, the reading מקמרתיהם, posited by *BHS*, would denote the notion of laying a net for enemies so as to overthrow them.³¹⁸ All of these explanations for the enigmatic מכרתיהם are possible. In any case, G might have chosen αἵρεσις because he considered it to be a fitting description of the choice made or the course of action taken by Symeon and Leui when they plundered the Chorrites’ village.

³⁰⁹ Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Βαβυλῶνος αἵρεσιν ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Σκύθας αὐτοῦ Δαρείου ἔλασις (“After the taking of Babylon, Darius himself marched against the Scythians”). Herodotus, *The Persian Wars, Volume II: Books 3-4*, LCL 118, trans. A.D. Godley (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921), 198-199, §4.1.1.

³¹⁰ LSJ, s.v. “αἵρεσις.” Αἵρεσις only appears in the Septuagint three other times, rendering נדבה in Lev 22.18 and 21. It means “choice” in these contexts as well as in 1 Macc 8.30.

³¹¹ As Samuel Driver has noted, the rendering of ‘sword’ in English translations of the MT “rests ultimately upon the resemblance to μαχαίρα.” Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, 83.

³¹² Wevers also considers the possibility that G read מכרתיהם as מבחרתיהם. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 822. In this scenario, G would have had to “misread” several letters (e.g. *kaph* as *bet*; a missing *khet* between an alleged *bet* and *resh*) and so this possibility does not seem as likely, though it is not impossible.

³¹³ BDB, s.v. “כרה.”

³¹⁴ BDB, s.v. “מכרה.”

³¹⁵ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 822, fn. 7.

³¹⁶ Cognate languages suggest the meanings of “attack anew, advance and retreat” or “surround, enclose.” BDB, s.v. “כרר.”

³¹⁷ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 822.

³¹⁸ מקמרתיהם, cf. Isa 19.8; perhaps Hab 1.15. This reading is based on כמר, root 3. BDB, s.v. “כמר,” root 3, (“overthrow, lay prostrate”), מקמרת (“net”).

Instead of ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (as in Wevers' edition), de Hoop postulates a Greek text of ἐξαίρεσεως αὐτῶν in his re-examination of a noteworthy variant reading in codices Alexandrinus [A] and Vaticanus [B]: "To be exact, both [manuscripts] read ΕΞΕΡΕΣΕΩΣ. Codex B has the correction ΑΙ placed at the left above the second *epsilon*. The interchange αι > ε occurred frequently in [manuscripts] after the second century and here it could have been due to the change of sound of the αι."³¹⁹ If the original reading of OG was ἐξαίρεσεως, de Hoop makes a compelling argument that G would have understood the term in his *Vorlage* to have been מַכָּרָה, derived from כָּרַת. The denotations "killing,"³²⁰ "taking out," or "removal"³²¹ for the Greek term ἐξαίρεσις do seem to be in line with the semantic range of root כָּרַת with its notions of cutting down and destruction. Martin Rösel suggests this reading as well, although he cautiously admits that this is speculative.³²² Ἐξαίρεω does occur in OG-Gen³²³ and it is a counterpart for נָצַל.³²⁴ Given that ἐξαίρεσεως αὐτῶν aptly describes murderous pillaging by Symeon and Leui of the Chorrithes, de Hoop's hypothesis of a reading of ἐξαίρεσεως αὐτῶν instead of ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν cannot be ruled out.³²⁵ As for כָּרַת, it appears eight times in Genesis and is rendered by ἀποθνήσκω (Gen 9.11), διατίθημι,³²⁶ ἐξολεθρεύω (Gen 17.14), and ἐκτρίβω (Gen 41.36). In fact, apart from the specialized use of διατίθημι to refer to making a covenant, G has chosen a different verb for each occurrence of כָּרַת (hence, mostly Greek verbs that express the notion of destruction or killing). It is thus conceivable that, in the case of Gen 49.5, G chose to render כָּרַת with yet another term, in this case ἐξαίρεσεως to signify the notion of removing or destroying. Because מַכָּרָה is a hapax legomenon and no Hebrew scholar is certain of its derivation and meaning,³²⁷ any "trials" with reference to this

³¹⁹ De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 102, n.124; cf. Peter Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 58-64.

³²⁰ E.g. Καὶ τῶν Θησέως ἄθλων ἓνα τοῦτον παραδιδόασιν τὴν τῆς ὑὸς ταύτης ἐξαίρεσιν ("And, according to tradition, the destruction of this sow was one of the labours of Theseus"). Strabo, *Geography. Volume 1: Books 1-2*, LCL 49, trans. Horace Leonard Jones (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917), 196-197, §8.6.22.

³²¹ That is, the entrails of victims. See Herodotus, *The Persian Wars, Volume 1: Books 1-2*, LCL 117, trans. A.D. Godley (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), 322-323, §2.40.2: ἡ δὲ δὴ ἐξαίρεσις τῶν ἰρῶν καὶ ἡ καὶ σὺς ἄλλη περὶ ἄλλο ἰρόν σφι κατέστηκε ("But in regard to the disembowelling and burning of the victims, there is a different way for each sacrifice"). Cf. LSJ, s.v. "ἐξαίρεσις."

³²² Martin Rösel, "Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta," *Biblische Notizen* 79 (1995): 59.

³²³ Gen 32.11(12); 37.21, 22.

³²⁴ The middle-passive meaning of "deliver" or "rescue" is in line with the semantic range of Hebrew נָצַל whereas the Greek verb's active denotation is compatible with the meaning of כָּרַת.

³²⁵ De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 102. Nonetheless, the translators of the LXX did *not* employ ἐξαίρεω for the root כָּרַת more than twenty times, as de Hoop has stated to support his claim. In fact, there are two infinitives listed in Hatch-Redpath which have similar spellings: ἐξαίρειν (ἐξαίρεω, which never has a counterpart of כָּרַת) and ἐξαίρειν (ἐξαίρω, which is a match for כָּרַת in at least 15 instances).

³²⁶ Gen 15.18; 21.27, 32; 26.28; 31.44.

³²⁷ In addition, the Greek text at this juncture cannot be ascertained as to whether it read as ἐξαίρεσεως αὐτῶν or ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (as in Wevers' edition).

Hebrew term cannot be decisively determined. Yet given the strong likelihood that ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (or even ἐξαιρέσεως αὐτῶν) is an inexact rendering of whatever מכרתיהם might have originally meant, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *rescripting*.

4.2 Symeon and Leui (v. 6)

<p>בסדם אל תבא נפשי בקהלם אל תחד כבדי כי באפם הרגו איש וברצנם עקרו שור</p>
<p>May I never come into their council; may I not be joined to their company— for in their anger they killed men, and at their whim they hamstrung oxen.</p> <p>My soul shall not enter in their company, My glory shall not rejoice in their gathering; For in their anger they slew a man, In their wantonness they hamstrung a bull.³²⁸</p>
<p>εἰς βουλήν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔλθοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἥπατά μου, ὅτι ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἀπέκτειναν ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον.</p>
<p>May my soul not come into their council, and may my inward parts not press in on their company, because in their anger they killed men and in their passion they hamstrung a bull.</p>

Βουλή is quite a rare word in the Pentateuch, appearing only here in OG-Gen³²⁹ where it is a suitable match for this singular instance of *דב* in Genesis as both denote “counsel” or “a council.” The Greek term frequently refers to a formal setting such as a council of elders or a senate,³³⁰ although there are instances in which it denotes any council that takes decisions (e.g. Herodotus, *Historiae* 4.165).³³¹ Because εἰς βουλήν αὐτῶν is parallel to ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν, “council” seems the most appropriate English equivalent in context.³³²

³²⁸ Translation of verse by de Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 97.

³²⁹ Elsewhere in the Greek Pentateuch, βουλή occurs in Num 16.2 (σύγκλητοι βουλῆς = דבֿרֵי אִיזִרָה) and Deut 32.28 (βουλή = נצח).

³³⁰ LSJ, s.v. “βουλή.”

³³¹ ἡ δὲ εἶχε αὐτῇ τοῦ παιδὸς τὰ γέρεα ἐν Κυρήνῃ καὶ τὰλλα νεμομένη καὶ ἐν βουλῇ παρίζουσα (“[his mother Pheretime] held her son’s prerogative at Cyrene, where she administered all his business and sat with others in council”). Herodotus, *The Persian Wars, Volume II*, 370-371.

³³² Rendering the word in English as “counsel” would place more emphasis on their plan or deliberation.

The negative particle plus aorist optative μή ἔλθοι render אַל תבוא, a negated feminine jussive form expressing “a strong desire or wish that something not happen.”³³³ The optative mood occurs 23 times in OG-Gen where it usually (and quite appropriately) translates a Hebrew jussive or cohortative. Three of these instances appear in the Gen 49 poem (v. 6 [2x] and v. 8). As for ψυχή, it appears 41 times in OG-Gen as a default equivalent of the Hebrew noun נפש, and once, in Gen 41.8, as the counterpart to רוח. In Gen 14.21, G has chosen ἀνήρ for נפש. The lexemes נפש and ψυχή share a similar range of meanings (e.g. soul, life, self).³³⁴ In essence, Iakob is expressing his desire to distance his very self (ψυχή) from the council of Symeon and Leui, which is also Jacob’s wish in the source text.

In the second stich of this verse, the word order of the Hebrew is closely reflected in the Greek, yet the presence of the conjunction καί, which does not have a counterpart in the MT, interrupts the parallelism evident in the Hebrew poem by creating two coordinated μή clauses. There is no indication in *BHS* of any variant reading that has included a *vav* conjunction (i.e. וּבְקֶהֱלֶם). It seems quite possible that the translator himself opted to create two coordinated μή clauses,³³⁵ producing a longer unit of discourse than the arguably more disjunctive syntactical sequence of two separate μή clauses.³³⁶ As such, OG-Gen manifests both *expansion* and *destruction of rhythm* with respect to the lack of a conjunction in MT. Σύστασις, which occurs only here in OG-Gen, denotes a “friendship” or “alliance.”³³⁷ It renders קהל, which in its three other occurrences in OG-Gen is translated by semantically equivalent συναγωγή.³³⁸ Thus, σύστασις is a marked choice that indicates G’s careful consideration of the context; the “company” of Symeon and Leui was a vengeful alliance forged to destroy the Chorrites. With the connotation of “alliance,” OG-Gen exhibits the “trial” of *clarification*.

G chooses the aorist optative ἐρείσαι as the counterpart to תהד. The puzzling Hebrew syntax in the MT³³⁹ consists of a feminine form of the verb יהד — i.e. תהד — which would indicate that its subject כבד would also be feminine (*HALOT*).³⁴⁰ The *BHS* editor suggests that G read יחר instead of יהד. This would be in line with James Barr’s proposal that the Greek reading should be ἐρίσαι (from ἐρίζω,

³³³ Ronald J. Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, 3rd ed., ed. John C. Beckman (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 2007, §184.

³³⁴ BDB, s.v. “נֶפֶשׁ;” LSJ, s.v. “ψυχή.”

³³⁵ The following reading indicates that another Greek translator (i.e. ὁ ἑβραῖος) subsequent to G was working with a *Vorlage* that was similar to that of G (in that it may have included a *vav* conjunction) or, alternatively, that ὁ ἑβραῖος may have chosen to add a Greek conjunction: ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃ ἡ ψυχή μου καὶ ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτῶν μὴ χρονίσῃ.

³³⁶ It bears mentioning that while here, the inclusion of καὶ connects two parallel phrases, in v. 2, the lack of a Greek counterpart (καὶ) for the coordinating *vav* conjunction in the MT seems to accent the parallelism.

³³⁷ LSJ, s.v. “σύστασις.”

³³⁸ Gen 28.3; 35.11; 48.4.

³³⁹ Wevers’ assessment is that the “Hebrew text cannot be read as it stands.” Wevers, *Greek Text*, 823.

³⁴⁰ BDB describes כבד as a masculine noun, while it cites its occurrence in Gen 49.6 as feminine.

“strive”; “contend”; “vie with”³⁴¹) rather than ἐρείσαι as it appears in the Göttingen edition.³⁴² If such was the case, says Barr, G would likely have read יחר (based on the root חחר and connected with the verb forms תתחרה and מתחרה) rather than יחר.³⁴³ Barr’s interesting theory cannot be adopted mainly because ἐρείσαι does not fit the context but rather seems to express the *opposite* of what appears in the Hebrew poem. In other words, “may my inward parts not vie with their company” suggests that Iakob’s unwillingness to strive against the company of Symeon and Leui is because Iakob *approves* of their actions, which is clearly not the case. Barr’s interpretation that Iakob wishes to “not be involved in the kind of competition [i.e. the notion of striving or vying with] to excel which prevails in such a group [that has evil purposes]”³⁴⁴ seems quite strained. Hence, Wevers’ prudent decision to opt for ἐρείσαι, which draws a “neat parallel”³⁴⁵ between the first and second stich of verse 6, is well-reasoned.

How G read the *Vorlage* for his choice is not clear³⁴⁶ because the semantic compatibility between ἐρείδω and יחר (assuming this is the root of the Hebrew verb) is not immediately discernible. Instead of employing εἰς plus an accusative substantive for the preposition ב plus substantive that appears earlier in the verse, G opts for ἐπί plus an articulated dative construction. With the preposition ἐπί, the Greek verb ἐρείδω denotes “press hard” or “exert pressure,”³⁴⁷ conveying the sense of Iakob’s aversion to “pressing in” on (i.e. willfully aligning himself with) the murderous company of his sons. The notion of inward parts “pressing in” on an alliance seems somewhat incongruous. Perhaps this is why scholars such as Barr have sought to account for the Greek text by positing other possible readings. The meaning of the Greek is admittedly not as natural³⁴⁸ as if the same verb (ἐρείδω) had been employed with an accusative direct object (i.e. σύστασιν), which would signify “[may my soul] not support their company.” It was likely G’s concern to replicate the form of the Hebrew poem that resulted in his inclusion of a Greek preposition (ἐπί) as a counterpart to ב. To be sure, it is natural Greek syntax, yet the introduction of the preposition changed the meaning of the Greek verb, resulting in a case that Berman would term a “weakness,” a “weakness” that could be attributed to what Toury calls “linguistic interference.” Even so, if one understands the notion of pressing hard as “uniting together,” then one

³⁴¹ LSJ, s.v. “ἐρίζω.”

³⁴² James Barr, “EPIZQ and EPEIQ in the Septuagint. A Note Principally on Gen. XLIX. 6,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 19, no. 2 (Autumn 1974), 198-215. See also the note in BHS at Gen 49.6.

³⁴³ Barr, “EPIZQ and EPEIQ,” 203-205.

³⁴⁴ Barr, “EPIZQ and EPEIQ,” 206.

³⁴⁵ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 823.

³⁴⁶ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 823.

³⁴⁷ LSJ, s.v. “ἐρείδω.”

³⁴⁸ Barr, “EPIZQ and EPEIQ,” 201.

might consider this to be a transformation of *situational translation*, in which case “the same situation is described from a different angle.”³⁴⁹ In any case, since the meanings of יָהַר and ἐρείδω are not identical, the result is some measure of *qualitative impoverishment*.

Greek ἥπαρ, which appears only here in OG-Gen, is formally parallel to ψυχὴ in the first stich. Its Hebrew counterpart is כָּבֵד, vocalized in the MT as כְּבֹדִי (“my glory”).³⁵⁰ Wherever the term “glory” (כָּבֵד) appears in Genesis, it typically refers to prosperity. In Gen 31.1, for example, the assertion by Laban’s sons וּמֵאִשֶׁר לָאֲבִינוּ עָשָׂה אֶת כָּל הַכֶּבֶד הַזֶּה (“he has gained all this wealth from what belonged to our father”) is suitably rendered as καὶ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν πεποίηκεν πᾶσαν τὴν δόξαν ταύτην “and he has made all this glory from what was our father’s.” In that context, Jacob’s/Iakob’s glory refers to his accumulation of wealth. Joseph uses the phrase כָּבֹדִי (“my glory”) to describe his position of prosperity and power in Egypt (Gen 45.13), and this is appropriately rendered in Greek as τὴν δόξαν μου. In the context of Gen 49.6, the Hebrew term constitutes “a poetic expression for the spirit (as the ‘glory’ or noblest part of man).”³⁵¹ The consonants כָּבֵד can be vocalized in various ways. For example, elsewhere in OG-Gen, G renders the adjective כָּבֵד (“heavy,” “burdensome”)³⁵² as an adjective (e.g. πλούσιος “rich,”³⁵³ μέγας “great,”³⁵⁴ ἰσχυρός “strong”³⁵⁵) or as the verb ἐνισχύω (“prevail”).³⁵⁶ For the verb כָּבֵד, the Greek renderings are μέγας (18.20) and the superlative form of ἐνδοξος (34.19) respectively. Moreover, כָּבֵד the adjective and כְּבֹד the noun (“liver”)³⁵⁷ are both vocalized in the same way. Notwithstanding, G has evidently read the text as “my liver” (כְּבֹדִי) and has chosen to render this as τὰ ἥπατά μου, which connotes the seat of emotions.³⁵⁸ Consequently, OG-Gen exhibits some measure of *destruction of networks of signification* with respect to the consonants כָּבֵד. OG-Gen also involves a change of accidens (singular to plural ἥπατα), resulting in the “trial” of *destruction of linguistic patternings*. In the Greek text, the poetic device of metonymy consequently places some emphasis on the emotional/mental state of Iakob as he conveys his strong aversion to the actions of Symeon and Leui. The anger and passion of Symeon and Leui are the antithesis of what Iakob deems to

³⁴⁹ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 79.

³⁵⁰ Cf. de Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 97: “my glory [shall not rejoice in their gathering].”

³⁵¹ Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, 83. Cf. Psalm 16.9 (parallel to heart); 33.12; and 57.8.

³⁵² BDB, s.v. “כָּבֵד.”

³⁵³ LSJ, s.v. “πλούσιος.” Cf. Gen 13.2.

³⁵⁴ LSJ, s.v. “μέγας.” Cf. Gen 50.11.

³⁵⁵ LSJ, s.v. “ἰσχυρός.” Cf. Gen 41.31; 50.10.

³⁵⁶ LSJ, s.v. “ἐνισχύω.” Cf. Gen 12.10; 43.1; 47.4, 13.

³⁵⁷ BDB, s.v. “כְּבֹדִי.”

³⁵⁸ LSJ, s.v. “ἥπαρ.” Cf. *BHS* apparatus, note 6b.

be honourable behaviour. Emotional connotations associated with the word ψυχή might be inferred since ψυχή is parallel to ἥπατα.

Θυμός is quite a rich term that signifies spirit or soul as “the principle of life, feeling and thought, esp[ecially] of strong feeling and passion.”³⁵⁹ Θυμός³⁶⁰ is the counterpart to נַחַשׁ in Gen 27.45 and 49.7 and it is a suitable match. G’s choice of ἀνθρώπους to render נַחַשׁ indicates that G read the Hebrew as a collective, which has necessitated a change of accident with the singular נַחַשׁ being represented by a plural Greek counterpart. This is an example of *anaphoric translation* (also known as *intertextual translation*) because it has evidently been “influenced by a related passage in the same book.”³⁶¹ The reference to the killing of ἀνθρώπους pertains to the mass slaughter and pillage that took place as described in Gen 34.25-31. Accordingly, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *destruction of linguistic patternings* due to the change of accident (ἀνθρώπους for נַחַשׁ). Ἀπέκτειναν is an exact equivalent for הָרַג. The verb ἀποκτείνω occurs twenty times in OG-Gen and, apart from Gen 18.25, 37.18, 38.7, 42.37 where it is the counterpart to מוֹת, it serves as the default equivalent for הָרַג. Unlike the situation in the Hebrew *Vorlage* (cf. verse 5), the reference to killing men in v. 6 is the only indication in vv. 5-7 that the two brothers’ actions were murderous and violent.

The semantic range for ἐπιθυμία includes “desire, yearning,” “passion,” “appetite”³⁶² and it is G’s choice to translate רָצוֹן, whose semantic range includes “goodwill, favour, acceptance, will” and “desire.”³⁶³ This is the only instance of רָצוֹן in Genesis. The overlap in meaning between the Greek and Hebrew terms is the concept of “desire.” רָצוֹן implies the notion of volition whereas ἐπιθυμία is associated with “passion.” Given the fact that the connotative value of ἐπιθυμία differs from that of רָצוֹן, *qualitative impoverishment* is the result of G’s rendering.

Νευροκοπέω (hamstring, hough”)³⁶⁴ is a fairly rare word, attested as early as the third century BCE (P.Cair. Zen.3.59462)³⁶⁵ before its five occurrences in the LXX.³⁶⁶ Here the Greek aorist renders the plural verb form עָקַר (piel, עָקַר) and it is a suitable counterpart to the Hebrew. Ταῦρος refers

³⁵⁹ LSJ, s.v. “θυμός.”

³⁶⁰ Or its verbal cognate θυμώω, cf. Gen 30.2; 39.19; 44.18.

³⁶¹ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 82.

³⁶² LSJ, s.v. “ἐπιθυμία.”

³⁶³ BDB, s.v. “רָצוֹן.”

³⁶⁴ LSJ, s.v. “νευροκοπέω.”

³⁶⁵ καὶ τὴν γυναῖκά μου ἐξεκαλεῖτο φ[άμενο]ς νευροκοπήσειν καὶ ἐμὲ προεκαλεῖτο (And my wife appealed against the threat to hamstring [the sow] and I challenged [it]), Papyri.info, accessed October 9, 2024, [https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.cair.zen:3:59462?rows=3&start=160&fl=id,title&fq=collection:ddbdp&fq=\(ddbdp_series:p.cair.zen+OR+hgv_series:p.cair.zen+OR+dclp_series:p.cair.zen\)&fq=\(ddbdp_volume:3+OR+hgv_volume:3+OR+dclp_volume:3\)&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=161&t=231](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.cair.zen:3:59462?rows=3&start=160&fl=id,title&fq=collection:ddbdp&fq=(ddbdp_series:p.cair.zen+OR+hgv_series:p.cair.zen+OR+dclp_series:p.cair.zen)&fq=(ddbdp_volume:3+OR+hgv_volume:3+OR+dclp_volume:3)&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=161&t=231). English translation mine.

³⁶⁶ Gen 49.6; Deut 21.4,6; Jos 11.6, 9.

specifically to a “bull” and is an acceptable rendering of שׁוֹר, which besides denoting “a head of cattle, bullock, or ox,” it is also a symbol of “property, spoil of war.”³⁶⁷ Tov has suggested a reading of σιτευτόν instead of ταῦρον (based on scribal revision of שׁוֹר to אָבוֹט),³⁶⁸ a hypothesis that Wevers duly dismisses since it has no textual support and is thus “speculative.”³⁶⁹ The notion of a hamstrung bull might reflect another tradition concerning the actions of Simeon and Levi at Shechem.³⁷⁰ Even so, G may have construed ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἀπέκτειναν ἀνθρώπους in the previous stich and ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον in the present stich as parallel phrases that refer to one and the same act (i.e. the massacre of the Chorrites in Gen 34). The Chorrite tribe could symbolically be interpreted as the bull that Symeon and Leui hamstrung. In this regard, it is noteworthy that, while NRSV has understood שׁוֹר as a collective noun, G has rendered it as a singular noun. G may not have regarded “bull” to be a symbol of the Chorrites, but was rather just concerned, as he frequently was, with a faithful isomorphic rendering of his *Vorlage*.

4.3 Symeon and Leui (v. 7)

<p>ארור אפם כי עז ועברתם כי קשתה אחלקם ביעקב ואפיצם בישראל</p>
<p>Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel! I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.</p>
<p>ἐπικατάρατος ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν, ὅτι αὐθάδης, καὶ ἡ μῆνις αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐσκληρύνθη· διαμεριῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰακώβ, καὶ διασπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰσραήλ.</p>
<p>Cursed be their anger, because it is self-centered, and their wrath, because it has grown hard! I will divide them in Iakob and scatter them in Israel.</p>

The verse is structured in four stichs. The first two stichs form a parallel syntactic and semantic pair as do the last two stichs. Ἐπικατάρατος ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν, ὅτι αὐθάδης is a nominal clause, reflecting

³⁶⁷ BDB, s.v. “שׁוֹר.” In Gen 32.15(16), ταῦρος translates פר (“bull”). BDB, “פר.”

³⁶⁸ Emanuel Tov, “The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the ‘Alterations’ Inserted Into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 15 (1984): 79-80.

³⁶⁹ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 823, fn. 10. Wevers suggests that the notion of hamstringing bulls may have reflected another tradition concerning Simon and Levi’s actions at Shechem. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 823.

³⁷⁰ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 823.

the Hebrew word order and syntax. The adjective ἐπικατάρατος appears in early Greek inscriptions *IK Strat. III 1500* (425-400 BCE)³⁷¹ and *Sinuri 8* (350-340 BCE),³⁷² but in the Greek literary corpus, it appears for the first time in the LXX where it occurs six times in OG-Gen³⁷³ and nineteen times in Deuteronomy. Ἐπικατάρατος consistently renders the *qal* passive participle אָרַר.³⁷⁴ As is the case in Gen 49.6, θυμός is the counterpart of הָא. G has employed αὐθάδης to render עַז as he has done in Gen 49.3, a choice which results in *rescripting*. Rouben's action (i.e. defiling his father's couch) was different than that of Symeon and Leui whose anger had been murderous. Even so, for the translator, the actions of the oldest three brothers exhibit self-centredness. G evidently seems concerned with highlighting the weak moral character of the three elder brothers and the fact that all three chose not to honour their father, Iakob. Furthermore, as the word αὐθάδης suggests, they did not consider the impact of their actions on their extended family. Jacob/Iakob had rebuked his sons for the fact that their reckless rampage had gravely endangered him and his entire household (cf. Gen 34.30).

Μῆνις is a synonym for θυμός and, as James Aitken notes, the Greek term is “so well known from the opening line of the *Iliad* [1.1].”³⁷⁵ Elsewhere in the LXX, it appears only in Num 35.21, where it renders אֵיבָה, and in Sir 27.30 and 28.5. Its Hebrew counterpart in Gen 49.7 is עֲבֵרָה, which means “overflowing rage, fury” in the context of Gen 49.7.³⁷⁶ Hence, μῆνις is a fitting match for עֲבֵרָה. Nonetheless, G has chosen not to render קָשָׁתָה with an adjectival form like σκληρά as the translator of 1 Rgns / 1 Sam 5.7 later did. This choice would have created a neat parallelism between two adjectives (αὐθάδης and σκληρός), a translation strategy that would have generated the deforming tendency of *ennoblement* (an attempt to enhance or improve what appears in the source text). Virtually all modern

³⁷¹ ...ὃς ἂν ἀδικήσῃ, ἐπικατάρατος ἔστω ἀπὸ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ θεῶν (Whoever wrongs, let him be cursed by Demeter and the gods). *Searchable Greek Inscriptions*, The Packard Humanities Institute, <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/search?patt=%E1%BC%90%CF%80%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%AC%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82> (accessed May 5, 2024, 4:00pm). Translation mine.

³⁷² [ἐὰν δ]έ τις ταῦτα παραβαίνει ἢ ἄκυρα ποιῇ, [ἐπικα]τάρατος ἔστω αὐτός τε καὶ τὰ τοῦ[του] [πάν]τα ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου. (If he violates these or invalidates them, let him be cursed and everything that is his from this god). *Searchable Greek Inscriptions*, The Packard Humanities Institute, <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/search?patt=%E1%BC%90%CF%80%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%AC%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82> (accessed May 5, 2024, 4:30pm). Translation mine.

³⁷³ Gen 3.14, 17; 4.11; 9.25; 27.29; 49.7.

³⁷⁴ In Gen 5.29 and 12.3, a form of the middle/passive Greek verb καταράομαι, a cognate of ἐπικατάρατος, translates other forms of the Hebrew verbal root אָרַר.

³⁷⁵ James Aitken, “The Literary Attainment of the Translator of Greek Sirach,” in *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 150, ed. Jean-Sébastien Rey and Jan Joosten (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 119. Μῆνις occurs some twenty times in Homer (e.g. *Iliad* 1.75, 422, 488; 5.34, 178; *Odyssey* 2.66; 3.135), eleven times in Aeschylus (e.g. *Suppliques* 162; *Agamemnon* 155, 701), five times in Euripides (e.g. *Heraclidae* 762; *Electra* 1261), and four times in Sophocles (e.g. *Ajax* 656; 757; *Oedipus tyrannus* 698) before its eight occurrences in the writings of historian Herodotus (e.g. *Historiae*. 7.134.2; 7.137.2, 8, 10, 14).

³⁷⁶ BDB, s.v. “עֲבֵרָה.”

translations have chosen an adjectival counterpart and the ancient translator “ἄλλος” (a translator presumably subsequent to G) employed one as well in rendering יָצַח as δυνατός.³⁷⁷ In contrast, G’s concern to replicate, as much as possible, his *Vorlage* by selecting an equivalent to פָּשַׁח in the same word class (i.e. a verb) evidently overrode any inclination towards effecting a clear parallelism. G may also have wished to differentiate semantically between σκληρός ≈ יָתַר (Gen 49.3) and σκληρύνω ≈ פָּשַׁח (v. 7) in which case both σκληρύνω and פָּשַׁח have a similar semantic range.³⁷⁸ Since σκληρύνω is a cognate of σκληρός, the effect is the creation of wordplay in vv. 3 and 7 of OG-Gen. This translation “miracle” is not present in the *Vorlage* and probably occurred by happenstance. Σκληρύνω does not appear elsewhere in OG-Gen. However, in Exodus, it is a verb employed to describe the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart.³⁷⁹ G opted not to select χαλεπός (“hard to deal with, cruel, harsh, stern”),³⁸⁰ a word that frequently appears in Homer’s poetry and also collocates nicely with μῆνις (e.g. *Iliad* 13.624-625).³⁸¹ Indeed, ἐσκληρύνθη, which is first attested in Gen 49.7, does not occur in conjunction with μῆνις elsewhere in Greek literature and is evidence of G’s exacting “work on the *lettre*” (literal translation). In this regard, the “otherness” of his source text—the Foreign—has apparently been preserved in his translation.

Διαμερίζω is an appropriate choice to render קָלַח root 1 since they are equivalent in meaning and διαδίδωμι is again a fitting match for the same Hebrew root in v. 27 of the Gen 49 poem.³⁸² Iakob vows to divide and scatter Symeon and Leui because of their self-centeredness and murderous wrath. The alliteration and assonance involving the parallel Greek verbs and their objects — διαμεριῶ αὐτούς and διασπερῶ αὐτούς — create a noteworthy poetic effect and, again, this is likely a coincidence since both Greek verbs merely replicate the meaning of their respective Hebrew counterparts.³⁸³ Assonance is also present in their respective Hebrew counterparts קָלַח and חָפַצ. Besides Gen 49.7, διαμερίζω

³⁷⁷ “Cod. VII in marg. Manu 2^{da}. Mox ad μῆνις Cod. X in marg. scholium habet.” Frederick Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1875), 70, fn. 15.

³⁷⁸ Moreover, σκληρός is connected with Ioseph in the OG-Gen narrative (Gen 42.7, 30) when Ioseph speaks harshly (σκληρά = פָּשַׁח) to his brothers.

³⁷⁹ Σκληρύνω = *piel* קָח: Exod 4.21; 7.22; 8.15; 9.12; 9.35; 10.20, 27; 11.10; 14.4, 8, 17. Σκληρύνω = *hiphil* פָּשַׁח: Exod 7.3; 13.15. Σκληρύνω = *hiphil* דָּבַח: Exod 10.1.

³⁸⁰ LSJ, s.v. “χαλεπός.”

³⁸¹ ...οὐδέ τι θυμῷ Ζηνὸς ἐριβρεμέτεω χαλεπὴν ἐδείσατε μῆνιν ξεινίου (“and had no fear in your heart of the harsh wrath of loud-thundering Zeus”). Homer, *Iliad. Volume II: Books 13-24*, LCL 171, trans. A.T. Murray, rev. William F. Wyatt (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925), 48-49, §13.624-625.

³⁸² However, in Gen 14.15, the only instance of קָלַח root 1 in Genesis, semantic differentiation results in *destruction of networks of signification* because the meanings of ἐπιπίπτω and קָלַח are quite different.

³⁸³ One indication of intentionality on the part of G would be if the Greek verbs were not semantic equivalents of the source text.

elsewhere renders the *niphal* stem of פלג (Gen 10.25). Διασπείρω occurs four times in OG-Gen³⁸⁴ where its Hebrew counterpart, which has the same meaning, is always פָּרַץ.³⁸⁵ As it turns out, Iakob's sobering words regarding the prospects of his sons Symeon and Leui came to pass: the tribe of Symeon was absorbed into the allotment of Ioudas (Josh 19.9) and the priestly tribe of Leui received no portion of territory (Josh 13.14).³⁸⁶

4.4 Summary: Symeon and Leui Pericope (vv. 5-7)

An overview of the “trials” in vv. 5-7 is as follows:

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
5*	שמעון	Συμεών	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
*	לוי	Λευί	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	כלי	Συνετέλεσαν	Rescripting Destruction of linguistic patternings Expansion (implicit “they”) Destruction of rhythm
	חמס	ἀδικία	Destruction of networks of signification (macro level) Qualitative impoverishment
	מכרתיהם	ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν OR ἐξαιρέσεως αὐτῶν	Rescripting
6	בסדם אל תבא נפשי בקהלם אל תחד כבדי	εἰς βουλὴν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔλθοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου, <u>καὶ</u> ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἥπατά μου,	expansion destruction of rhythm
	בקהלם	ἐπὶ τῇ <u>συστάσει</u> αὐτῶν	Clarification
	תחד	ἐρείσαι	Qualitative impoverishment
	כבדי	τὰ ἥπατά μου	Destruction of networks of signification Destruction of linguistic patternings (singular to plural)
	איש	ἀνθρώπους	Destruction of linguistic patternings

³⁸⁴ Gen 11.4, 8, 9; 49.7.

³⁸⁵ Only once in Genesis does G opt for the Greek verb διασπάω to render פָּרַץ (Gen 10.18).

³⁸⁶ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 824.

			(singular to plural)
	וברצנם	καὶ ἐν τῇ <u>ἐπιθυμίᾳ</u>	Qualitative impoverishment
7	עז	αὐθάδης	Rescripting

Berman's negative analytic again provides, at a glance, a clear synopsis of the relationship between OG-Gen and the *lettre* of the Hebrew poem in terms of its adequacy, indicating the various "trials of the Foreign" that have been the result of the translation process. Vv. 5-7 manifest noteworthy alteration of meaning which is mostly a consequence of the transformations כלי – συνετέλεσαν and חמס – ἀδικία, along with G's treatment of מכרתיהם. OG-Gen's depiction of the two brothers tones down the references to weapons and violence that are mentioned in the *Vorlage*, diminishing the vivid imagery of the Hebrew poem. *Rescripting* has decreased the intensity of Symeon and Leui's rage. Their anger is not strong (עז) or fierce, but rather self-centered (αὐθάδης). OG-Gen places emphasis on the delinquent brothers' actions as a criminal act or violation of moral sensibilities—an injustice (ἀδικία)—and this is in keeping with G's shaping of the general theme of the patriarch's words to his three eldest sons up to this point.³⁸⁷

G's choice of συνετέλεσαν for כלי has completely altered the rhythm of the poem. In place of the terse parallelism typical of biblical Hebrew verse,³⁸⁸ G has created an almost prose-like Greek line by employing a finite verb plus object plus prepositional phrase functioning adverbially, which has resulted in rationalizing *expansion*. This deforming tendency was probably induced by G's efforts to produce a meaningful translation of the verse, despite the difficulties of the term מכרתיהם. Again, this is evidence of the translator's drive, in the Bermanian sense, to overcome any untranslatability in his *Vorlage*.

Iakob promises to give to the sons of Ioseph the place called Sikima (Σίκιμα), which he "took from the hand of the Amorrites with [his] dagger and bow" (Gen 48.22). Σίκιμα is a replacement form for שכם (Shechem), which is transliterated as Συχέμ (Sychem) in Gen 34 in the account of Symeon and Leui's slaughter of the males of that place, including the man named Sychem/Shechem who had sexually assaulted their sister. It is therefore possible, given the fact that Gen 48.22 appears just a few

³⁸⁷ Nevertheless, if de Hoop's reading of ἐξαπρέσσεως αὐτῶν is accepted, it would restore to some degree the emphasis on the brothers' recourse to violence.

³⁸⁸ The most popular theory regarding the observable structure of Biblical Hebrew verse is that it "centers on the notion of two contiguous terse lines of verse which exhibit parallelism in either meaning or in form." John Scott Redd Jr., "Constituent Postponement in Biblical Hebrew Verse" (PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 2012), 10, <http://hdl.handle.net/1961/10273>.

verses before the Symeon and Leui pericope, that the translator of OG-Gen, in consideration of his translating *horizon*, took pains to distance Iakob from the mass murder of the house of Sychem by rendering שכם in two distinct ways.³⁸⁹ If so, OG-Gen could manifest a further layer of *destruction of networks of signification* as well as evidence that G has taken into consideration not only the immediate context but also the wider expositional narrative of OG-Gen. Such an anaphoric (or intertextual) translation strategy is unmistakably demonstrated by G's rendering of שׂאִי with ἀνθρώπους in v. 6, indicating his awareness of the Gen 34 narrative.

³⁸⁹ Συχέμ and Σίκιμα. Σίκιμα also appears in Gen 33.18 and 35.4-5 and could possibly designate a region rather than a particular city. For further discussion of Sychem versus Sikima, see Robert J.V. Hiebert, "Translating a Translation: The Septuagint of Genesis and the New English Translation of the Septuagint Project," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51, ed. Bernard Taylor (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 279-281.

CHAPTER 5. GENESIS 49.8-12: IOUDAS

5.1 Ioudas (v. 8)

יהודה אתה יודוך אחיך ידך בערף איביך ישתחוו לך בני אביך
Judah, your brothers shall praise you; your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies; your father's sons shall bow down before you.
Ἰούδα, σὲ αἰνέσασιν οἱ ἀδελφοί σου· αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐπὶ νότου τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου· προσκυνήσουσιν σε οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς σου.
Ioudas, may your brothers praise you; your hands be ^b on the back of your enemies; your father's sons shall do obeisance to you. ^b Or shall be

Iakob now addresses his fourth eldest son and G appropriately places Ἰούδας in the vocative case, indicating that he is not merely translating in a word-by-word fashion. Ἰούδας is an inflected transcription of יהודה, a name derived from the Hebrew verb ידה root 2 (Gen 29.35),³⁹⁰ which in the *hiphil* denotes “give thanks, laud, praise.”³⁹¹ This transcription preserves the foreignness of the Hebrew name to some extent, yet Leia explains the significance of naming her son Ioudas as νῦν ἔτι τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαι κυρίῳ (“Now yet again with respect to this I will *acknowledge* the Lord”) as opposed to the Hebrew derivation of the name יהוה את יהוה הפעם אודה (“This time I will *praise* the LORD”). The significance of Judah's name thus evinces a measure of *qualitative impoverishment* in OG-Gen. G has not chosen ἐξομολογέομαι (“admit, acknowledge”)³⁹² to render ידה in Gen 49.8 as he did in the only other instance in OG-Gen of this verb (29.35). Indeed, elsewhere in the LXX, ἐξομολογέω is most commonly matched with ידה. Nor does G adopt the verb ἐξαγορεύω (“make known, declare”)³⁹³ as have the other translators of the Greek Pentateuch.³⁹⁴ Instead, G selects αἰνέω, a verb which prior to OG-Gen had appeared most frequently in epic poetry.³⁹⁵ While Gen 49.8 contains the sole instance of αἰνέω in the Pentateuch, it appears 137 times in the LXX where it renders ללל in the vast majority of

³⁹⁰ Noteworthy is the footnote in NETS (Gen 29.35) indicating that Wevers' edition reads Ἰούδα and not Ἰούδας.

³⁹¹ BDB, s.v. “יד.”

³⁹² LSJ, s.v. “ἐξομολογέομαι.”

³⁹³ LSJ, s.v. “ἐξαγορεύω.” Cf. Aquila: σοὶ ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν; ὁ ἐβραῖος: σοὶ ἐξομολογήσονται.

³⁹⁴ Lev 5.5; 16.21; 26.40; Num 5.7.

³⁹⁵ Homer, *Iliad* 3.20, 461; Hesiod, *Theogonia* 662; *Op.* 643 (praise of a ship); Pindar, *Olympionikai* 4.14; 7.16 (praise not of gods, but humans).

cases. It is often employed in connection with the praise of the Israelite deity. The αἰνέω = יָדָה equivalence is relatively infrequent in the LXX, occurring only eleven times. יָדָה is frequently used in the Psalms where it is always directed towards God. It is also God who is to be praised or confessed in Gen 29.35 whereas in Gen 49.8, it is Judah. This may be the reason why G settles on the verb αἰνέω instead of ἐξομολογέω, rendering the *hiphil* imperfect of יָדָה as an aorist optative (αἰνέσαισαν). In doing so, G has employed Smyth's category of an optative of wish that refers to the future.³⁹⁶ Rather than being a command or exhortation, "it is a more remote expression of will; the speaker feels that he has less control over its fulfilment."³⁹⁷ Iakob is thus expressing a strong desire that Ioudas be recognized by his brothers,³⁹⁸ which is a different nuance of meaning from G's choice of a future verb (i.e. προσκυνήσουσιν) for an imperfect (i.e. יִשְׁתַּחֲוּ) that occurs later in this verse, where he proclaims that all of Ioudas's brothers will do obeisance before him. Noteworthy is G's flexibility and interpretive subtleties during his work on the *lettre* since optative or future indicative verbs are both a valid construal of a Hebrew imperfect verb. Even so, OG-Gen evinces "trials" in the loss of the artful alliteration occurring between the words יהודה, יודוך, and ירך (or יָדִיךְ, see below). Also, the wordplay in the Hebrew between יודוך and the name יהודה (the latter also appears in v. 9) is difficult to retain in a translation and thus has not been replicated in OG-Gen. The consequent deformations are *qualitative impoverishment* which results from *destruction of networks of signification* (in connection with the Gen 29.35 etymology of יהודה as noted above).

Departing from his frequent serial fidelity in terms of word order, it appears that G has chosen to not include a Greek equivalent for אֵתָהּ, which is present in the MT and likely also was in G's *Vorlage*. Here, אֵתָהּ is a dislocated constituent of the phrase יודוך אחיך and specifies the referent in the first clause (as does the name, Judah).³⁹⁹ G has fronted the object pronoun in his translation, which does give the pronoun some prominence, changing the word order. This inversion manifests the "trial" of *destruction of linguistic patternings*. The use of the second person pronoun emphasizes Jacob's shift from the third person pronouns which Jacob used to refer to Simon and Levi (vv. 5-7) to a more personal direct communication for Judah (a son of blessing) with second person pronouns. Even though

³⁹⁶ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1814.

³⁹⁷ Kenneth Leslie McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verbs in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*, Studies in Biblical Greek 5 (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 85, §10.1.

³⁹⁸ Diego Pérez Gondar, "La bendición de Judá en el testamento de Jacob: Gn 49, 8-12, su interpretación en el contexto intertestamentario y su recepción neotestamentaria," *Estudios bíblicos* 75, no. 3 (2017): 364.

³⁹⁹ This type of syntax is described as a dislocated constituent (which is resumed in the main clause) in Christo H.J. van der Merwe, Jacobus A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 2nd ed. (London: T&T Clark, 2017), §48.1. It is also known as a *casus pendens* (nominative absolute). Williams, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*, §4.7b.

Judah is his fourth eldest son, Jacob's use of the pronoun **אֵתָהּ** accentuates his choice of Judah over and above his brothers and is therefore not a trivial detail. The absence of a Greek counterpart to **אֵתָהּ** has the effect of being less emphatic and its omission thus results in noteworthy *quantitative impoverishment*. In fact, G most often includes a second person pronoun counterpart in similar syntactical contexts in OG-Gen.⁴⁰⁰ G's decision to not include one in Gen 49.8 is thus a marked translation choice, likely induced by the fact that the inclusion of the Greek pronoun **σύ** might have seemed syntactically awkward if placed before the phrase **σὲ αἰνέσαισαν**, which is an inversion of **יִדְדִּי**. The Greek word order thus replicates the *lettre* of the *Vorlage* in having a pronoun precede the main verb.

In the nominal clause **αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐπὶ νώτου τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου**, Iakob declares that Ioudas's brothers praise him as one who triumphs over his adversaries. The plural noun in the phrase "your hands" (**αἱ χεῖρές σου**) is an indication that G's *Vorlage*, at this juncture, may have been similar to the Samaritan Pentateuch (**יְדָיָהּ**).⁴⁰¹ The change of accident with the plural **χεῖρες** for the singular **יד** in the MT would constitute *destruction of linguistic patternings*, which perhaps casts Ioudas in a slightly more powerful stance with both of his hands subduing his enemies. Greek **νώτον** ("back," of people or animals)⁴⁰² is the counterpart to **שֵׁכֶם** root 1 ("shoulder")⁴⁰³ in Gen 9.23. However, in Gen 49.8, **νώτος** renders **עֵרָה** ("back of neck, neck").⁴⁰⁴ *Rescripting* is the consequence of G's substituting one part of the body for another (semantic modification). The fact that the phrase **<τὰ> νῶτα τοῖς ἐχθροῖς** appears in Aeschylus's⁴⁰⁵ writings bears witness to the fact that this collocation was found in Greek non-translational literature prior to OG-Gen's production. Thus, G's choice of rendering "back" rather than "neck" of Ioudas's enemies is possibly an accommodation to that kind of precedent. As for **ἐχθρός**, it is a suitable equivalent for **אֵיב** just as it is for **צַר** root 2 in the only other instance of **ἐχθρός** in OG-Gen (Gen 14.20). The reference to the LORD giving the backs of the enemies to Daid appears in 2 Rgns /

⁴⁰⁰ In five instances in OG-Gen, G does not include a Greek pronoun for **אֵתָהּ**, but rather an existential verb (Gen 3.11, 19; 23.13; 29.15; 32.17 [18]). There are seven examples where G includes both an existential verb and pronoun (Gen 13.14; 23.6; 27.18, 21, 24, 32; 29.14). In 32 instances, he does include a Greek pronoun counterpart (Gen 3.14, 15; 4.7, 11; 6.18, 21; 7.1; 8.16; 13.15; 15.15; 16.13; 17.9 (2x); 20.7; 21.26; 22.12; 24.44; 26.29; 28.13; 30.26, 29; 31.43, 44, 52; 32.12 [13]; 38.23; 41.40; 43.8; 45.10, 11, 19; 49.3).

⁴⁰¹ Skinner, *Genesis*, 519.

⁴⁰² LSJ, s.v. "**νώτον**."

⁴⁰³ BDB, s.v. "**שֵׁכֶם**."

⁴⁰⁴ BDB, s.v. "**עֵרָה**." Other equivalents for **עֵרָה** in the LXX include **ἀντήν** (e.g. Josh 7.8, 12) and **τράχηλος** (e.g. Deut 10.16; 31.27).

⁴⁰⁵ Aeschylus (6-5 BCE), *Fragmenta*, Tetralogy 25, Play A, fragment 201, lines 2-3.

2 Sam 22.41 (cf. Psa 17.41[18.40]). In this sense, OG-Gen 49.8 could be interpreted as an allusion to a Davidic king who would triumph over his enemies.

The word order of the clause προσκυνήσουσιν σε οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς σου reflects exactly that of its *Vorlage*. The Hebrew counterpart of the third plural future active indicative form of προσκυνέω is ישתחוּ, a verb form that most modern scholars have interpreted as the *hishtaphel* imperfect of חוה.⁴⁰⁶ John Emerton argues that the traditional view that השתחוה ought to be parsed as the *hitpaal* of the root שחה should be maintained; the forms השתחוה and שחה both have a weak third consonant and they share in common the letters *shin* and *khet*. Furthermore, the definitions of השתחוה (“bow down, prostrate oneself”) and שחה (“bow down”),⁴⁰⁷ which is how the latter term appears in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew, are similar.⁴⁰⁸ Convincing as this may seem, Emerton’s account fails to explain the presence of *vav* in the verb השתחוה.⁴⁰⁹ Therefore, it is more likely that השתחוה derives from חוה, root 2. This rare Hebrew root (which subsequently vanished) was analogous in form and meaning to the Ugaritic verb *ḥwy*⁴¹⁰ which also has the form *yšthwy* (“he prostrates himself”).⁴¹¹ חוה presumably denoted the meanings of “bowing down” and the action of coiling oneself like a snake.⁴¹² In any case, השתחוה is unsurprisingly the default equivalent in all 23 instances that the Greek verb προσκυνέω appears in OG-Gen. Προσκυνέω, which NETS renders as “do obeisance,” can express the notion of prostrating oneself in Near Eastern fashion before a king or ruler.⁴¹³ The image of all the brothers doing obeisance to one of the brothers harkens back to various instances in Genesis in which one son is given prominence over the other(s) as the father’s heir or as having the birthright.⁴¹⁴ These include Isaak’s blessing of Iakob (Gen 27.29) and Ioseph’s peculiar dream (37.7-10). In Gen 49.8, however, it is Ioudas who receives this honour.

5.2 Ioudas (v. 9)

גור אריה יהודה

⁴⁰⁶ Waltke and O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 360, fn. 34.

⁴⁰⁷ BDB, s.v. “שָׁחָה.”

⁴⁰⁸ John A. Emerton, *Studies on the Language and Literature of the Bible: Selected works by J.A. Emerton*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 165, ed. Graham Davies and Robert Gordon (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 89.

⁴⁰⁹ The *hitpaal* form of שחה should be השתחח. Cf. Horst Dietrich Preuss, “חוה, *ḥwh*,” in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. Johannes Botterweck (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), 4:249.

⁴¹⁰ Preuss, “חוה, *ḥwh*,” 249.

⁴¹¹ Preuss, “חוה, *ḥwh*,” 249.

⁴¹² Graham Davies, “A Note on the Etymology of *HIŠTAḤWĀH*,” *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (January 1979): 494. Davies does cite two instances in Akkadian that suggest the possibility that the meaning “bowing down” (that is, the contracting of part of a human body) might also be included among the range of meanings for the Hebrew root חוה.

⁴¹³ LSJ, s.v. “προσκυνέω.” Greek words that express the notion of bowing or bending forward include κύπτω and ὑποκύπτω (which does not appear in the LXX).

⁴¹⁴ Cf. Gen 25.23; 27.29; 37.5-11; 42.6; 43.26-28; 50.18.

מטרף בני עליית כרע רבץ כאריה וכלביא מי יקימנו
Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, you have gone up. He crouches down, he stretches out like a lion, like a lioness—who dares rouse him up?
σκούμνος λέοντος Ἰούδα· ἐκ βλαστοῦ, υἱέ μου, ἀνέβης· ἀναπεσὼν ἐκοιμήθη ὡς λέων καὶ ὡς σκούμνος· τίς ἐγερεῖ αὐτόν;
A lion's whelp ^c you are ^c , Ioudas; from a shoot, my son, you went up. When you reclined, you slept like a lion and like a whelp. Who will rouse him? ^c Lacking in Greek

With his rendering of the nominal clause in the first stich of v. 9, G exhibits again a concern to replicate the word order as he has done in other verses of the poem. G chooses to employ the vocative case (Ἰούδα) as in v. 8. The Hebrew context does not necessarily require a vocative interpretation (thus, NRSV⁴¹⁵), yet G has evidently taken into account the second person personal pronoun in the second stich. A copular verb is not supplied in the Greek text, although most often G does insert a second person singular copular verb in such Hebrew nominal clauses.⁴¹⁶ Iakob addresses his son directly, characterizing him as a lion's whelp. Σκούμνος⁴¹⁷ appears only here in OG-Gen as the semantic equivalent of גור. The second time it occurs in this verse, it renders לביא (lion[ess]).⁴¹⁸ This instance of semantic leveling results in *rescripting* since σκούμνος is an exact equivalent of גור, but not of לביא. G evidently renders the latter term as σκούμνος and avoids the awkward redundancy of ὡς λέων καὶ ὡς λέων (= כאריה וכלביא). As a polyvalent symbol in the Hebrew Bible, the lion carries various connotations which “seem to be dependent on the aspects of *threat* and *power*.”⁴¹⁹ It is well known

⁴¹⁵ Cf. de Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 114.

⁴¹⁶ A second person singular copular verb is supplied in Gen 3.9, 11, 19; 4.6 (in this case, the verb is γινομαι); 12.11; 23.6; 24.23, 47, 60; 27.18, 24, 32; 29.14, 15) while for the following Hebrew nominal clauses, no copular verb (in the second person singular) is inserted: Gen 3.14; 4.11; 26.29; 49.3.

⁴¹⁷ Σκούμνος occurs three other times in the Pentateuch, the Hebrew counterparts being לביא (Num 23.24; 24.9) and גור (Deut 33.22). In Deut 33.22, the lion metaphor refers to Dan. Aquila employs σκύλαξ, which means “young dog, puppy” (LSJ, s.v. “σκύλαξ”) but it also can refer to a “whelp” (cf. Homer, *Odyssea* 9.289; 12.86; Herodotus, *Historiae*. 3.32).

⁴¹⁸ BDB, s.v. “לְבִיָּא,” “לְבִיָּא.” DCH, Vol. 4, s.v. “לְבִיָּא.” “לְבִיָּא.”

⁴¹⁹ Brent A. Strawn, *What is Stronger Than a Lion?: Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 26-27.

that, in the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Assyria, and Persia, lion imagery came to represent royal power and authority.⁴²⁰ Greek poetry also employs the metaphor of a lion's whelp to depict men with a regal air of might.⁴²¹ If Ioudas is a lion's whelp, then Iakob has also portrayed himself as a lion since Ioudas is his offspring. As such, the image of a whelp also evokes the notion of progeny and future generations, an idea that will be further developed in v. 10. A lion cub has youthful vigor, yet a whelp is dependent on its pride for at least the first two years of its life during which time it learns skills of survival such as hunting.⁴²² Thus, Martin Rösel rightly observes that G's replacing the figure of a lioness (לביא) with a lion cub (σκύμνος) diminishes the threat one would face in confronting two adult lions, yet his suggestion that G may be harmonizing this verse with Micah 5.8⁴²³ is an interesting but speculative possibility.

The Greek text depicts Ioudas as a lion's whelp who went up "from a shoot" (ἐκ βλαστοῦ). Βλαστός denotes a young branch springing up from the main branch of a tree.⁴²⁴ The term occurs three other times in the Pentateuch,⁴²⁵ rendering נצה ("blossom,"⁴²⁶ Gen 40.10) and פרה ("bud, sprout, shoot,"⁴²⁷ Num 17.23). Its counterpart in the MT of Gen 49.9 is טָרֵף, which denotes prey. G was clearly familiar with the root טרף as he has chosen suitable equivalents in Gen 37.33 (θηρίον) and Gen 44.28 (θηριόβρωτος),⁴²⁸ and in Gen 49.27 where it describes a wolf (i.e. Benjamin) devouring its prey. Θηριόλωτος is the counterpart to טרפה, an "animal killed/torn by a wild animal"⁴²⁹ in Gen 31.39, Exod 22.31(30), and Lev 7.14. While bearing in mind that in the phrase φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος "an olive leaf, a dry twig" in Gen 8.11—where κάρφος is the counterpart to the only other occurrence of the term טרף in OG-Gen (עלה זית טרף "a freshly plucked olive leaf")—one cannot help but notice that the image of Ioudas as a lion's whelp⁴³⁰ rising up from a shoot marks a striking departure from the Hebrew *lettre*.

⁴²⁰ Benjamin S. Arbuckle, "Animals in the Ancient World," in *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Daniel T. Potts (Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 1:217-218; Gideon R. Kotzé, "Lion Imagery in 1 Maccabees 3:4," *Journal for Semitics* 24, no. 1 (2015): 327.

⁴²¹ Cf. Euripides, *Andromacha* 1170; *Rhesus* 380. This image can also be employed for women. LSJ, s.v. "σκυμνός."

⁴²² George B. Schaller, *The Serengeti Lion: A Study of Predator-Prey Relations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 358.

⁴²³ Rösel, *Die Interpretation*, 62.

⁴²⁴ LSJ, s.v. "βλαστός."

⁴²⁵ It has no equivalent in Exod 38.15 (37.18).

⁴²⁶ DCH, s.v. "[נצה]" and "נצה."

⁴²⁷ BDB s.v. "פרה."

⁴²⁸ John Lee argues that the Greek term was created by the translator when the expression is used by Iakob to refer to the presumed death of Ioseph by a wild beast. Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch*, 189.

⁴²⁹ Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch*, 189.

⁴³⁰ Since the reference to the shoot is immediately preceded by the vocative form Ἰούδα and then immediately followed by υἱέ μου, it is actually Ioudas who is the specific referent. Hiebert in comments to the author, September 29, 2024.

Tov is probably correct in deducing that “most likely, the translator was influenced by Aramaic, where רֶשֶׁת is the regular word⁴³¹ for ‘branch,’”⁴³² and thus “represent[ed] these three letters as רֶשֶׁת , ‘branch’ (as in Gen 8,11 and Ezek 17,9).”⁴³³ Wevers’ suggestion that the translator’s intended meaning is “from being a cub (i.e. a shoot), my son, you have grown up” is reasonable and perhaps Tov had a similar meaning in mind when he presumed that G “misunderstood the context.”⁴³⁴ Even so, it seems doubtful that G failed to understand his *Vorlage*. Throughout the HB, the lion is cast as a predator and the images of a lion and its prey most often appear together.⁴³⁵ Moreover, Judah/Ioudas has just been portrayed as a militant victor in v. 8, with his conquering hand(s) on the neck/back of his enemies, much like a lion subduing its prey. In addition to the aforementioned citations of the various appearances of רֶשֶׁת in Genesis along with its colligation with lion imagery in the HB, Aquila’s $\alpha\pi\omicron\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$ (“[F]rom conquest, taking of prey, my son, you went up”)⁴³⁶ and Symmachus’s $\epsilon\kappa\ \theta\eta\rho\iota\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$ (From capture of wild beasts,⁴³⁷ my son, you went up) indicate that these ancient translators accurately interpreted the context. It thus seems remarkable that G could have “misunderstood” it. Suffice it to say, G’s decision to render רֶשֶׁת as $\epsilon\kappa\ \beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ during his work on the *lettre* is not only remarkable, but it was possibly also a calculated choice. Reasons for G’s departure from the Hebrew meaning will be further discussed in the summary of the Ioudas pericope (see below).

At any rate, the Greek text evokes the softer image of a whelp going up from a shoot instead of a menacing lion going up from its prey as in the MT of v. 9. The metaphors of a new branch and a young lion seem to coincide, emphasizing the youth of the lion rather than its power. Consequently, OG-Gen strikingly manifests *rescripting* (since “branch” represents a completely different semantic field than “prey”) and *destruction of networks of signification* (the network between a lion and its prey and the other instances of root רֶשֶׁת [= prey] in OG-Gen). The counterpart of $\alpha\acute{\nu}\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$ is $\epsilon\lambda\iota\tau$, the same Greek verb ($\alpha\lambda\upsilon\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$) that occurs twice in v. 3 with reference to Rouben, who was brought down by his father’s rebuke. In contrast to the Greek text’s depiction of Ioudas rising up from a young plant,

⁴³¹ DCH and BDB gloss the adjective רֶשֶׁת as “fresh, freshly-plucked” and “fresh-plucked,” respectively. When used as a noun in Ezek 17.9, רֶשֶׁת can be inferred in context to mean “fresh leaf.” DCH, s.v. “ רֶשֶׁת .” BDB s.v. “ רֶשֶׁת .”

⁴³² Tov, “Trial and Error,” 461.

⁴³³ Tov, “Trial and Error,” 461.

⁴³⁴ Tov, “Trial and Error,” 461.

⁴³⁵ Cf. Num 23.24; Deut 33.20; Judg 14.5-6; 1 Kings 13.24-26; Job 4.11; 38.39; Psalms 7.2; 17.12; Isa 5.29; 31.4; Ezek 19.3, 6; 22.25; Hos 5.14; 13.8; Amos 3.4; Mic 5.8; Nah 2.12.

⁴³⁶ Wevers’ translation. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 825, fn. 16.

⁴³⁷ LSJ, s.v. “ $\theta\eta\rho\iota\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$.”

Skinner eloquently describes the motif implied in the Hebrew poem as “the lion’s ascent, after a raid, to his mountain fastness, where he rests in unassailable security.”⁴³⁸

Ἀναπίπτω, denoting “fall back,” “recline,”⁴³⁹ occurs only here in the Pentateuch and four other times in the LXX.⁴⁴⁰ Its Hebrew counterpart, כרע, means “bow down, crouch, fall to one’s knees, collapse,”⁴⁴¹ while paralleling verbs expressing the notions of lying down (Gen 49.9, רבץ; Num 24.9, שכב), worshipping (Esth 3.2, 5; שחא, *hithpael*), bending down (Isa 46.1, 2, קרס) and falling down (Judg 5.27, נפל). Effecting good Greek syntax, G constructs a clause in which ἀναπεσών is subordinate to ἐκοιμήθης as opposed to the MT’s employment of the finite verb כָּרַע, which is the counterpart to the Greek participle.⁴⁴² The second person singular verb ἐκοιμήθης, denoting “fall asleep” in the passive voice,⁴⁴³ is G’s rendering of the third person singular verb רבץ (“stretch oneself out, lie down”).⁴⁴⁴ This change of accidens from the third to second person singular likely originated with G and constitutes a rationalizing harmonization with ἀνέβης, which is the only other second person verb in the Ioudas pericope. The resulting “trial” is *destruction of linguistic patternings*. The actions of the lion are described as having taken place in the past, a translation move that is in keeping with the default choice of Greek aorists for Hebrew perfect verbs.⁴⁴⁵ Elsewhere in OG-Gen, the equivalents of κοιμάω are שכב⁴⁴⁶ and לין.⁴⁴⁷ As for רבץ, it occurs four other times in Genesis and is rendered by ἡσυχάζω (“be at rest,”⁴⁴⁸ Gen 4.7) and ἀναπαύω (“rest,”⁴⁴⁹ Gen 29.2; 49.14), while in Gen 49.25 ἐχούσης πάντα (“containing everything” [NETS]) interprets רבצת (“that lies” [NRSV]). The *horizon* of the translator would include his awareness that the first half of Num 24.9 (κατακλιθεὶς ἀνεπαύσατο ὡς λέων καὶ ὡς σκύμνος “He lay down and rested like a lion and like a whelp” [NETS] ≈ כרע שכב כארי וכלביא “He crouched, he lay down like a lion, and like a lioness” [NRSV]) contains an intertextual allusion to the second half of Gen 49.9. The respective counterparts to Gen 49.9 and Num 24.9 in the MT differ only

⁴³⁸ Skinner, *Genesis*, 591. Cf. Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, 385.

⁴³⁹ LSJ, s.v. “ἀναπίπτω.”

⁴⁴⁰ Idt 12.16; Tob 2.1; Sir 25.18; 32.2.

⁴⁴¹ DCH, s.v., “כרע.”

⁴⁴² Wevers cites Aquila (κάμψας κατακλίθης) and Symmachus (ὀκλάσας ἡδράσθης) as following the same pattern as G. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 825, fn. 17.

⁴⁴³ LSJ, s.v. “κοιμάω.”

⁴⁴⁴ BDB, s.v. “רבץ.”

⁴⁴⁵ Robert J.V. Hiebert, “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 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 57.

⁴⁴⁶ “Lie down.” HALOT, s.v. “שָׁכַב.” Gen 19.3(4); 32.33(2x), 34, 35(2x); 26.10; 28.11(2°); 30.15, 16; 34.2, 7; 35.21(22); 39.7, 12, 14, 17; 47.30.

⁴⁴⁷ “Remain (over) through the night.” HALOT, s.v. “לִין.” Gen 24.54; 28.11(1°); 31.54; 32.13(14), 21(22).

⁴⁴⁸ LSJ, s.v. “ἡσυχάζω.”

⁴⁴⁹ LSJ, s.v. “ἀναπαύω.”

in regard to the verb that follows כרע. Whereas in Gen 49.9 it is רבץ, in Num 24.9 it is שכב. Both Greek passages liken an individual to a lion and a lion's whelp and place the animals in a position of rest. In fact, the behavior of a lion is such that it may rise to hunt even though it spends most of its time reclining in rest.⁴⁵⁰ G assumes that this refers to rousing (ἐγείρω) the lion from sleep. G's depiction of a sleeping lion instead of a lion that is stretched out is a departure from the lion's posture depicted in the MT of Gen 49.9. Hence, G's strategy in representing כרע רבץ as ἀναπεσὼν ἐκοιμήθης results in *qualitative impoverishment*.

With the future indicative of ἐγείρω, G chooses a suitable equivalent for יקימנו in the phrase מי יקימנו that includes an imperfect verb: the *hiphil* of קום means "raise up = rouse, stir up."⁴⁵¹ Iakob's rhetorical question suggests that one only dares rouse the fearsome lion at one's own peril. In addition to its appearance in Gen 49.9, ἐγείρω renders יקץ "awake"⁴⁵² in Gen 41.4 and 41.7. Ἐγείρω is a marked translation choice since G's default equivalent of קום is ἀνίστημι,⁴⁵³ which is the same verb that the translator of Num 24.9 has employed in the phrase τίς ἀναστήσει αὐτόν = מי יקימנו. Elsewhere in OG-Gen, G has translated קום as ἵστημι,⁴⁵⁴ διατίθημι (9.17), ἐξάνιστημι (18.16; 19.1), εἰσέρχομαι (19.35), ὑπάρχω (23.20), συσάγω (37.35), and ἤκω (41.30). Therefore, with respect to G's choice of a range of Greek verbs for Hebrew קום, the outcome involves a good degree of semantic differentiation. G does not attempt to reproduce the poetic device of alliteration in Gen 49.9 (the sound of /r/ in גור אריה; מטריך; כרע רבץ כאריה) and its consequential onomatopoeia that mimics a lion's roar. As such, OG-Gen manifests *qualitative impoverishment*.

5.3 Ioudas (v. 10)

לא יסור שבט מיהודה
ומחקה מבין רגליו
עד כי יבא שילה
ולו יקחת עמים

The scepter shall not depart from Judah,
Nor the ruler's staff from between his feet,
Until tribute comes to him;⁴⁵⁵
And the obedience of the peoples is his.

⁴⁵⁰ Schaller, *The Serengeti Lion*, 119-128.

⁴⁵¹ BDB, s.v. "קום."

⁴⁵² BDB, s.v. "יקץ."

⁴⁵³ Gen 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; 31.3, 17, 35; 32.23; 35.1, 3; 37.7; 38.8, 19; 43.8, 13, 15; 44.14; 46.5; 49.9.

⁴⁵⁴ Gen 6.18; 9.11; 17.7, 19, 21; 23.17; 26.3.

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. NRSV, Gen 49.8, fn. b, for the alternative readings: "until he comes to Shiloh," "until he comes to whom it belongs," or "until Shiloh comes."

οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν.
A ruler shall not be wanting from Ioudas and a leader from his thighs until the things stored up for him come, and he is the expectation of nations.

The future indicative of ἐκλείπω suitably renders the imperfect form of סור.⁴⁵⁶ Despite the semantic overlap of the meaning “depart” between ἐκλείπω and סור,⁴⁵⁶ the sense of “wanting” assigned in NETS fits the context best⁴⁵⁷ given the fact that οὐκ ἐκλείψει also governs the second stich (καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ). Translating ἐκλείπω in the first stich as “depart” would result in the second stich having a meaning (i.e. that a leader will *not* be born) that would be contrary to what the context demands. Iakob, is, in fact, predicting that a leader *will* be born. Besides this only instance of ἐκλείπω = סור, other counterparts of ἐκλείπω in OG-Gen are חרב root 1 (8.13[2x]), בצר root 3 (11.6), חדר root 1 (18.11), כלל (21.15), גוע (25.8, 17; 35.29; 49.33), עוף (25.29, 30), להה (47.13), תמם (47.15, 18), and אפס (47.15, 16), which is evidence of significant semantic levelling for this range of Hebrew terms and thus, in some of these instances, of *destruction of networks of signification* at a macro level. Conversely, various Greek equivalents for סור are ἀποκαλύπτω (Gen 8.13), ἐκκλίνω (19.2, 3), διαχωρίζω (30.32), διαστέλλω (30.35), αἶρω (35.2), περιαιρέω (38.4, 19; 41.42), and ἀφαιρέω (48.17), which show a good degree of semantic differentiation and thus G’s attentiveness to each context.

G employs ἄρχων for שבט in Gen 49.10 and this Greek term occurs ten other times in OG-Gen as the counterpart to שר,⁴⁵⁸ משר root 2,⁴⁵⁹ נשיא root 1,⁴⁶⁰ לאם,⁴⁶¹ שליט,⁴⁶² and מלך.⁴⁶³ *Destruction of networks of signification* is the result at a macro level since, in each of these instances, ἄρχων conveys the general meaning “ruler,” but lacks the signifying particularity of each of these Hebrew terms. The

⁴⁵⁶ LSJ, s.v. “ἐκλείπω”: “fail, be wanting,” “forsake, desert,” “leave off, cease.” BDB, s.v. “סור”: “turn aside,” “depart.”

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 825; cf. *Il ne manquera pas de chef issu de Juda [ni de guide issue de ses cuisses jusqu’à ce que vienne ce qui lui est réservé]*. Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse*, vol. 1, *La Bible D’Alexandrie* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986), 308.

⁴⁵⁸ Gen 12.15; 47.5(6).

⁴⁵⁹ Gen 24.2; 45.8.

⁴⁶⁰ Gen 25.16; 34.2.

⁴⁶¹ Gen 27.29.

⁴⁶² Gen 42.6.

⁴⁶³ Gen 49.20.

only other instances of שבט in OG-Gen appear in Gen 49: שבטי ישראל \approx φυλὴ ἐν Ἰσραήλ (v. 16) and שבטי ישראל שנים עשר \approx οἱ ἑκατὼβ δώδεκα (v. 28). Parallel to ἄρχων \approx שבט is the present participle ἡγούμενος (“leader”) that is employed to render the *poel* participle מחקק, “one who makes decrees”⁴⁶⁴ or “commander’s staff.”⁴⁶⁵ Taken as “sceptre” and “commander’s staff,” respectively, the terms שבט and מחקק are examples of metonymy.⁴⁶⁶ Instead of finding equivalents for the Hebrew figurative language, G chooses to make it explicit that these symbols (שבט and מחקק) represent a single individual, a descendant of Ioudas, who will be a ruler and a leader. Consequently, this *clarification* also manifests *qualitative impoverishment* since the poetic metonymy in the Hebrew *lettre* is not retained. The compound preposition מִבֵּין, which appears only here in OG-Gen, is rendered simply as ἐκ. There is thus slight *omission* of the meaning “between” (בֵּין) which results in the “trial” of *quantitative impoverishment*. G has employed μηρός for רגל, which is a transformation of semantic modification. In this instance, OG-Gen exhibits *destruction of expressions and idioms* since the Hebrew word usually refers to the feet or legs but it can also be a euphemism for male genitalia. This euphemism⁴⁶⁷ may not have been understood by a Greek audience and so G’s choice of moving up from the feet to the thighs enables the implied reader to correctly infer that the passage is referring to the birth of the future leader.

Ἔως ἄν⁴⁶⁸ plus subjunctive (here, ἔλθῃ) is used “of an event at an uncertain future time,” meaning “until, till”⁴⁶⁹ or “as long as.”⁴⁷⁰ It is with this construction that G begins the Greek subordinate clause that renders the enigmatic phrase עד כי יבא שילה. ἔως ἄν is an acceptable rendering of עד כי with both expressions meaning “until”⁴⁷¹ and conveying the sense of a turning point in the future. The choice of ἀπόκειμαι (“be laid up in store,” “be reserved for”),⁴⁷² appearing here in the form of an arthrous neuter plural present participle, makes one wonder what sorts of things G supposes are

⁴⁶⁴ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 825.

⁴⁶⁵ חקק literally means “cut in, inscribe, decree” (BDB, s.v. “חִקַּק”).

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Num 21.18, Ps 60.9 and 108.9.

⁴⁶⁷ Some scholars question whether the Hebrew wording here refers to the euphemism. For example, see Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 654 fn. 10 and 659 fn. 26. In the latter note, Hamilton refers to the bas relief of the Persian king Darius on the throne with his mace between his feet (James B. Pritchard, ed., *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), illustration number 463.

⁴⁶⁸ G’s use of the Greek conditional particle ἄν is evidence of G’s accommodation to Greek idiom (cf. Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch*, 137-138).

⁴⁶⁹ LSJ, s.v. “ἔως.” The only other occurrences in OG-Gen are in Gen 24.14 (no Hebrew counterpart) and Gen 24.19 (= עד כא). In both instances, the phrase ἔως ἄν is rendered as “until” in NETS.

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2410.

⁴⁷¹ The fact that Gen 49.10 begins with a negative clause makes translating ἔως ἄν as “until” (a particular future point) rather than “as long as” (a duration or period of time) a more natural and thus preferable interpretation. Cf. fn. 470.

⁴⁷² LSJ, s.v. “ἀπόκειμαι.”

being laid up in store and why. Moreover, who is the intended recipient of these things? The third person masculine personal pronouns that appear throughout this verse (αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ, αὐτός) undoubtedly refer back to ἄρχων and ἡγούμενος in the first and second stichs. The phrase τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ constitutes G's attempt to decipher the most puzzling part of the verse, שִׁילָה,⁴⁷³ and may reflect a reading of שִׁלָּה.⁴⁷⁴ According to Tov, “שִׁלָּה used separately or with the inclusion of a pronominal suffix as in (שִׁלָּהוּ) שִׁלָּה was not yet in use at the time of Jacob's blessing or when the book of Genesis was composed. However, this linguistic information does not invalidate the retroversion, for at the time of the translation שִׁלָּה was used in places where biblical Hebrew employed – אֲשֶׁר לְ.”⁴⁷⁵ This retroversion is thus indicative of G's ancient understanding of Hebrew lexicology and syntax rather than the modern interpretations of Biblical Hebrew philology.⁴⁷⁶ For a Hebrew retroversion of the Greek phrase, one that is “supported by S and T^{O,N} and by the Midrash Rabba,”⁴⁷⁷ Tov has suggested שִׁלָּהוּ (שִׁלָּהוּ) לְהָ. His compelling proposal contrasts with another possible retroversion: “שִׁלָּהוּ לְ, ‘so long as tribute is brought to him.’”⁴⁷⁸ It seems that the strategy employed by G to deal with “untranslatability” (which in v. 10 applies to the issue of rendering the perplexing term שִׁילָה) is to use a generic word plus a statement of form. That is, in the phrase “the things stored up,” the generic word is “things” and the form of these “things” is that they are “stored up.”⁴⁷⁹ As there is no exact semantic Hebrew equivalent for the arthrous participle τὰ ἀποκείμενα and this rendering of שִׁילָה is “paraphrastic,”⁴⁸⁰ the consequent “trial” is that of clarifying *expansion*.

G has chosen the pronoun αὐτός as the subject of a nominal clause. It usually renders הוּא, but here its parallel is לוֹ which is usually parsed as a preposition plus a third masculine singular

⁴⁷³ Scholarly conjectures concerning how to decipher the enigmatic שִׁילָה are legion. Included among the many proposals are the notions that שִׁילָה: 1) designates a ruler; 2) refers to the village Shiloh; and 3) consists of שִׁי לָה (where שִׁי would be glossed as a tribute or gift). For extension discussion of these and other proposals, cf. de Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 122-139.

⁴⁷⁴ The readings of Aquila (καθὸ αὐτῷ) and Symmachus (ὃ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ) seem to interpret שִׁילָה as שִׁלָּה + לוֹ. Cf. Wevers, *Greek Text*, 826, fn. 20. Cf. *BHS* apparatus, note 10b.

⁴⁷⁵ Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 86.

⁴⁷⁶ Tov, *The Text-Critical Use*, 85-86.

⁴⁷⁷ Tov, *The Text-Critical Use*, 86, fn. 17. Cf. Leo Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 67-69. In Targum Onkelos and Targum Neofiti, the reading is מְשִׁיחָא דְדִילִיָּה הִיא מְלִכּוּתָא [מְלִכָּא] דְּיִתִּי [זְמַן] דְּיִתִּי “until [the time King] Messiah comes, to whom belongs the Kingdom/ship.” De Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 122.

⁴⁷⁸ “NEB, cf. NRSV and NJPS and thus the Midrash collections *Yalkut Shim'oni* and *Lekah Tov*.” Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3, fn. 2.

⁴⁷⁹ “Lots of valuable things” = treasure (“things” = generic word and “lots of valuable” = form of these things) or “that which smokes and is fragrant” = incense. Mildred L. Larson, *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998), 183.

⁴⁸⁰ de Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 123.

pronominal suffix (meaning “belonging to him” or “of him.”).⁴⁸¹ Thus, the Greek rendering exhibits *destruction of linguistic patternings*. The Greek syntax is such that προσδοκία ἐθνῶν is construed as the predicate of the nominal clause, whereas יקֶהֶת עַמִּים in the MT is the subject. The consequence is that αὐτός, which refers back to the ruler-leader, is given prominence. As for προσδοκία, which is the term chosen to render יקֶהֶת, it seems to be an indicator of the fact that the Hebrew counterpart was difficult for the translator to interpret.⁴⁸² In the MT, יקֶהֶת עַמִּים is pointed as יִקְהֶת עַמִּים. GKC cites Gen 49.10 and Prov 30.17 (the only other instance of the word יקֶהֶת in the MT) as passages that exhibit the *daghesh forte dirimens*, an orthographic/phonological marker that allows a *shewa* to be more audible by strengthening or sharpening the consonant (in this case, the *qoph*).⁴⁸³ The term יקֶהֶת can be taken to mean “obedience.”⁴⁸⁴ According to Tov’s plausible interpretation of the Greek text, προσδοκία was likely “derived from the root קוה, ‘to hope’, ‘to expect’, taken as a verbal form. In the translator’s mind, the singular verbal form יקֶהֶת was governed by a plural noun עַמִּים.”⁴⁸⁵ The consequent deformation of G’s selection of προσδοκία as the counterpart to יקֶהֶת is to be explained as *rescripting*. The source text places emphasis on the peoples’ subjugation to the ruler (“the obedience of the peoples is his”) whereas the Greek portrays the leader as the nations’ expectation. In the five instances that Greek ἔθνος is used to render עַם,⁴⁸⁶ it is a marked translation choice since λαός is the default counterpart to עַם.⁴⁸⁷ Elsewhere in OG-Gen, עַם is variously translated as γένος,⁴⁸⁸ πολίτης,⁴⁸⁹ and Αἰγύπτιοι.⁴⁹⁰ With the choice of ἔθνος instead of λαός in Gen 49.10, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *clarification*. In fact, ἔθνος appears 37 times in OG-Gen, where it is the default equivalent (27x) of גוי. There may be several reasons for G’s decision to select ἔθνος instead of his default of λαός for עַם. Firstly, Larry Perkins notes that the λαός = עַם equivalency is also the default in Greek Exodus.⁴⁹¹ Citing Orsolina Montevicchi’s observation that, in Homer’s *Iliad*, the word λαός most frequently refers

⁴⁸¹ Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, §270.

⁴⁸² Tov, “Trial and Error,” 461.

⁴⁸³ GKC §20h; §20hN².

⁴⁸⁴ Skinner, *Genesis*, 521; BDB, s.v. “יקֶהֶת;” Tov, “Trial and Error,” 461; Wevers, *Greek Text*, 826.

⁴⁸⁵ Tov, “Trial and Error,” 461.

⁴⁸⁶ Gen 17.16; 27.29; 28.3; 48.4; 49.10.

⁴⁸⁷ Gen 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.

⁴⁸⁸ Gen 11.6; 17.14; 25.17; 26.10; 34.16; 35.29.

⁴⁸⁹ Gen 23.11.

⁴⁹⁰ Gen 47.23.

⁴⁹¹ Larry Perkins, “Israel’s Military Characterization in Greek Exodus,” in *Die Septuaginta—Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 361. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund, eds. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 557.

to military forces⁴⁹² (in the context of referring to a leader over a group of people), Perkins suggests that the Exodus translator seemed to be well aware that the semantic range of the word λαός included its “usage with a military register,”⁴⁹³ a usage that he apparently exploited in certain contexts. It is possible that the translator of Genesis was also aware of the usage of λαός in a military context and sought to avoid this nuance in Gen 49.10 by employing the word ἔθνος. In other words, since the coming one is to be “the expectation of nations” (ἐθνῶν) and not “the expectation of peoples” (λαῶν), one need not infer that this ruler-leader is a military commander. Secondly, in other cases where G employs ἔθνος for עַם instead of λαός, God promises Abraam that “kings of nations (ἐθνῶν) shall come from [his wife]” (Gen 17.16), and Isaak blesses Iakob in saying that nations (ἔθνοί) would be subject to him (Gen 27.29) and that Iakob “shall become gatherings of nations” (ἐθνῶν) (Gen 28.3). Iakob later recounts this latter blessing to Ioseph (Gen 48.4). In doing so, Iakob seems to link this with a dream he had had while journeying to Haran (Gen 28.10-22). In this dream, God promised Iakob that his “offspring shall be like the sand of the earth, and it shall widen out to the sea and to the southwest and to the north and to the east, and all the tribes (φυλαί; cf. MT מִשְׁפָּחָה) of the earth shall be blessed in [him] and in [his] offspring” (Gen 28.14). Ultimately, this is similar to God’s blessing of Abram (Gen 12.3b, φυλαί; cf. MT מִשְׁפָּחָה). Thus, G’s selection of the term ἔθνος in Gen 49.10 could indicate G’s awareness of God’s promise to bless the nations through Abram’s offspring, since various iterations of this theme occur throughout the Genesis narrative. In any case, the linkage between the signifiers within v. 10 has been notably impacted, especially by G’s replacement of the poetic figures (metonymy) with more generic terms of rulership. OG-Gen and MT in v. 10 depict a scenario in somewhat different ways. In OG-Gen, there will be no lack of a ruler-leader from Ioudas until “the things stored up for him come,” whereas the Hebrew text predicts that the scepter and ruler’s staff will not leave Judah until the arrival of tribute.⁴⁹⁴ Despite some interpretive ambiguity, both texts suggest that a Judean figure will rule over nations.⁴⁹⁵

5.4 Ioudas (v. 11)

אסרי לגפן עירה ולשרקה בני אתנו

⁴⁹² Perkins, “Israel’s Military Characterization,” 557; cf. Orsolina Montevocchi, “LAOS, Linee di una ricerca storico-linguistico,” in *Acts du XVème Congrès International de Papyrologie IV*, Jean Bingen and Georges Nachtergaele, eds. (Bruxelles: Fondation Egyptologique Reine Elisabeth, 1979), 52.

⁴⁹³ Perkins, “Israel’s Military Characterization,” 558.

⁴⁹⁴ As indicated in fn. 455 (above), this interpretation is by no means certain as there are alternative readings for Hebrew שִׁלֹה that have been suggested: “until Shiloh comes,” “until he comes to Shiloh,” or “until he comes to whom it belongs.”

⁴⁹⁵ For discussion regarding messianic images in Gen 49.8-12, see page 104 of the present thesis.

כבס ביין לבשו ובדם ענבים סותה
Binding his foal to the vine And his donkey's colt to the choice vine, He washes his garments in wine And his robe in the blood of grapes.
δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἔλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ· πλυνεῖ ἐν οἴνῳ τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς τὴν περιβολὴν αὐτοῦ·
Binding his foal to a vine and his donkey's foal to the tendril, he shall wash his robe in wine and his garment in the blood of a bunch of grapes;

As in the other verses in this poem, OG-Gen here replicates the word order of its *Vorlage*. The participle δεσμεύων is an appropriate semantic match for אָסר (“tie, bind”),⁴⁹⁶ which is also a participle. Δεσμεύω is used as an equivalent for אָלם in the only other occurrence of δεσμεύω in the Pentateuch (Gen 37.7).⁴⁹⁷ In 49.11, אָסרי, a singular construct form exhibits the *hireq compaginis* case ending that has been added to אָסר so as to give the word more “dignity”⁴⁹⁸—a stylistic effect that is fitting for a Hebrew poem. This expressive nuance in the Hebrew *lettre* is lost in translation and thus OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *qualitative impoverishment*. Ἄμπελος is the semantic equivalent of גָּפֶן and it is employed in all three contexts where the Hebrew word appears in OG-Gen.⁴⁹⁹ With the prepositional phrase πρὸς ἄμπελον, G has replicated לְגָפֶן, although “vine” in Greek is anarthrous, in which case the “trial” at this juncture is *quantitative impoverishment*. The πῶλος = עֵיר equivalence (ה is a masculine pronominal suffix) occurs also in Gen 32.15(16). עֵיר denotes a male donkey that is young and full of vigour.⁵⁰⁰ Donkeys appear in scriptural traditions as symbols of service, suffering, and humility. Moreover, Gen 49.11 seems to allude to Zech 9.9 (see the discussion in the summary of the Ioudas pericope below).

The participle δεσμεύων in the first stich also governs the following one, yet G has chosen the simple dative case to render the preposition ל preceding the noun שְׂרָקָה (i.e. τῇ ἔλικι) rather than the preposition πρὸς plus accusative in the parallel phrase πρὸς ἄμπελον when translating לְגָפֶן. The

⁴⁹⁶ BDB, s.v. “אָסר.”

⁴⁹⁷ BDB, “bind,” s.v. “אָלם.”

⁴⁹⁸ GKC, §90, l and m.

⁴⁹⁹ Gen 40.9, 10; 49.11.

⁵⁰⁰ BDB, s.v. “עֵיר.”

preposition $\pi\rho\acute{o}s$ never collocates with $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta$ in extant Greek literature prior to the production of OG-Gen.⁵⁰¹ Thus, G's choice not to render the second appearance of the preposition λ could very well be an accommodation to render an acceptable Greek text. The consequence of this translation move is *destruction of linguistic patternings*, since the parallelism of the source text *lettire* is not reflected by identical syntactical structures to render לִגְנָן and לְשִׁרְקָה . $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta$ refers to the tendril of a vine⁵⁰² and, according to LSJ, is a poetic word. It occurs only here in the LXX. Its Hebrew counterpart is the *hapax legomenon* שִׁרְקָה , a term whose cognates are associated with the colour red.⁵⁰³ BDB defines שִׁרְקָה as “choice vine.”⁵⁰⁴ שִׁרְקָה (“sorrel”)⁵⁰⁵ occurs in Zech 1.8 to describe the colour of horses (= $\psi\alpha\rho\acute{o}s$) and in Isa 16.8 (no Greek counterpart) a Hebrew term with the same spelling denotes “vine-tendrils or clusters.”⁵⁰⁶ שִׁרְקָה in Isa 5.2 (= $\sigma\omega\rho\eta\chi$)⁵⁰⁷ and Jer 2.21 ($\alpha\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\nu$, “a fruitful vine,” NETS) means “choice species of vine.”⁵⁰⁸ Thus, the Hebrew poet may have chosen the rare word שִׁרְקָה , with its connoted reddish hue, as a means of evoking vivid and colourful imagery, given that v. 11 also makes reference to wine and the image of washing garments in the blood of grapes. In such case, OG-Gen would evince a measure of *qualitative impoverishment* with respect to the *lettire* of the Hebrew poem. Although G aptly recognizes “the unusual (ancient) case endings of אֶסְרִי and בְּנִי ,”⁵⁰⁹ he does not fully distinguish between עִירָה and בְּנֵי אֲתָנוֹ (“his donkey’s colt”).⁵¹⁰ In the latter case there is semantic levelling due to the repetition of the word $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron s$ (“foal”) as the counterpart to בְּנֵי and thus *destruction of networks of signification*. The repetition of $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron s$ in OG-Gen results in poetic repetition and gives rise to alliteration involving the words $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron s$ and $\pi\lambda\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota$, which does not occur in the *Vorlage*.

Since a future tense is conceivably implicit in the context,⁵¹¹ G departs from his default of rendering Hebrew perfect verbs with Greek aorist verbs. He suitably chooses the future indicative of $\pi\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omega$ —a verb that also governs the following stich—as the counterpart to the *piel* perfect verb כָּבַס . כָּבַס occurs only here in Genesis. $\Sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\eta$ occurs seven times in OG-Gen.⁵¹² Only in v. 11 is it the

⁵⁰¹ The only exception occurs in the writings of Archimedes (e.g. *De lineis spiralibus* 2.32.17; 2.34.16, 17, 19, 21) where the Doric counterpart to $\pi\rho\acute{o}s$, which is $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}$, appears with $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta$. This form of the preposition never occurs in the LXX corpus.

⁵⁰² LSJ, s.v. “ $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta$.”

⁵⁰³ BDB, s.v. “ שִׁרְקָה , II.”

⁵⁰⁴ BDB, s.v. “ שִׁרְקָה .”

⁵⁰⁵ BDB, s.v. “ שִׁרְקָה , I.”

⁵⁰⁶ BDB, s.v. “ שִׁרְקָה , II.”

⁵⁰⁷ The Greek is a transcription of the Hebrew.

⁵⁰⁸ BDB, s.v. “ שִׁרְקָה , I.”

⁵⁰⁹ Tov, “Trial and Error,” 457.

⁵¹⁰ Tov, “Trial and Error,” 457.

⁵¹¹ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 826.

⁵¹² Gen 27.15 (= בָּגַד , root 2); 35.2 (= שְׂמֵלָה); 41.14 (= שְׂמֵלָה), 42 (= בָּגַד , root 2); 45.22(2x) (= שְׂמֵלָה); 49.11 לְבוּשׁ .

counterpart to לבוש (לְבוֹשׁ), which signifies a “garment” or “clothing.”⁵¹³ LSJ defines στολή as a garment or robe,⁵¹⁴ and it is not clear whether this clothing is associated with a particular status or office. Like στολή, περιβολή also signifies “covering, garment,”⁵¹⁵ though what might, perhaps, be distinctive of a περιβολή is that it is a garment wrapped around the body. Its Hebrew counterpart is סוּת, yet another *hapax legomenon*, which appears here with a masculine singular suffix and which is glossed by BDB as “vesture.”⁵¹⁶ In any case, G selects two different Greek terms to reflect the fact that there are two distinctive items in the source text. Since the meaning of the Hebrew term סוּת is unknown, employment of Berman’s negative analytic cannot be carried out.

The term σταφυλή (“bunch of grapes”)⁵¹⁷ represents a *clarification* of the more generic Hebrew term עֵנָב. According to Gordon Wenham, “the territory of Judah is famed for its grapes, but in this era there will be such a grape harvest that it will not matter if the tethered royal donkey eats them and people wash their clothes in wine. Gen 49.12 either takes this picture of abundance further or is a description of the king’s beauty.”⁵¹⁸ Indeed, if one washes one’s clothes in grape skins, a robe of purple is produced. This was the color of robe worn by royalty. It is well-known that “[c]olored clothing was the preference of elite in the Ancient Near Eastern societies.”⁵¹⁹ Although it was the Phoenicians who developed the technique to produce the costly “true purple dye,” which was made from murex sea snails and used in the vestiture of royalty, plant-based dyes were also used to color and decorate fabrics.⁵²⁰ At any rate, it is possible that the Hebrew poet creatively combined the image of grapes with the washing of fabrics so as to bring to mind a robe of royal color. This image is also retained in OG-Gen. Evidently, Ioudas’s descendant is to usher in a regal rulership of gladness, wealth, and abundance.

5.5 Ioudas (v. 12)

חכלילי עינים מדין ולבן שנים מחלב
His eyes are darker than wine, And his teeth whiter than milk.

⁵¹³ BDB, s.v. “לְבוֹשׁ, לְבוֹשׁ.”

⁵¹⁴ LSJ, s.v. “στολή.”

⁵¹⁵ LSJ, s.v. “περιβολή.”

⁵¹⁶ BDB, s.v. “סוּת.”

⁵¹⁷ LSJ, s.v. “σταφυλή.”

⁵¹⁸ Gordon J. Wenham, “Genesis,” in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D.G. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), § Last Days of Jacob and Joseph (J, E, P) (48.1-50.26), <https://search-ebscohost-com.twu.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=2159669&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

⁵¹⁹ Naama Sukenik et al., “Early evidence of royal purple dyed textile from Timna valley (Israel),” *PLOS (Public Library of Science) ONE* 16, no. 1 (January 2021): § Observation on the early iron age society of Timna Valley, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245897>.

⁵²⁰ Sukenik et al., “Early evidence of royal purple,” § Observation on the early iron age society.

χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ οἴνου, καὶ λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ἢ γάλα.

his eyes are gladdening from wine, and his teeth are more white than milk.

Gladdening (χαροποιοί) the eyes of this ruler-leader who is the expectation of nations, wine continues to be a prevalent image in this stich with its connotations of wealth and prosperity. The counterpart of χαροποιός is חכלילי, which is yet another *hapax legomenon*. It derives from the root חכל, linked to terminology in cognate languages meaning “be confused” or “barbarousness” (Arabic) and “be gloomy,” “dark,” or “darkness” (Assyrian).⁵²¹ The only other time besides Gen 49.12 that the root occurs in the HB is Prov 23.29 (חכללות), which BDB defines as “dul[l]ness, of eyes in drunkenness.”⁵²² Therefore, חכלילי (which the Masoretes point as חֲכָלִילִי) may describe eyes that are dark or dull from wine. Rahlfs’ edition contains the spelling χαροποί, the nominative plural adjective form of χαροπός, which LSJ defines as “glassy, glazed, dull” in relation to the eyes of a wine drinker.⁵²³ This gloss is based solely on its appearance in Gen 49.12. In fact, the meaning of χαροπός in Classical Greek literature is dubious. It has been used in contexts that describe eyes as “flashing, bright” (e.g. Theocritus, *Idylls* 20.25) or as the colour “bluish-grey.”⁵²⁴ Alternatively, it may mean “fierce” when attributed to a lion.⁵²⁵ Perhaps it was partly because of the lion metaphor and similes in Gen 49.9 that some Greek manuscripts adopted χαροποί instead of χαροποιοί. Evidently, the similarity in spelling of the two words led to the copyists’ variant due to haplography. Although both readings are textually plausible, Wevers cites “all the oldest witnesses (A B F M)” in support of χαροποιοί as well as the principle that the most difficult reading is the most likely reading, given how easily a copyist might simplify χαροποιοί to χαροποί.⁵²⁶ Χαροποιός, prior to its appearance in Genesis 49.12, is attested only in Pythagoras.⁵²⁷ It does not occur in papyri or Greek inscriptions, but does appear in writings that postdate OG-Gen.⁵²⁸ Based on the evidence cited above, it is unlikely that χαροποιοί is the semantic equivalent of חכלילי. As such, OG-Gen again exhibits *rescripting* but also *qualitative impoverishment*

⁵²¹ BDB, s.v. “חכל.”

⁵²² BDB, s.v. “חֲכָלִילִי.” למי חכללות עינים (“Who has redness of eyes” [NRSV]) in Prov 23.29 is rendered as τίνος πέλαιοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (Ra) (“Who has bloodshot eyes” [NETS]).

⁵²³ LSJ, s.v. “χαροπός.”

⁵²⁴ Aristotle, *Historia animalium* 492a3; Lucian, *Dialogi mortuorum* 1.3. LSJ, s.v. “χαροπός.”

⁵²⁵ E.g. Homer, *Odyssea* 11.611; Hesiod, *Theogonia* 321.

⁵²⁶ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 827.

⁵²⁷ Cf. *Fragmenta astrologica* 11,2 124.12; 11,2. 136.1. Carlo Oreste Zuretti, *Codices Hispanienses [Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 11.2]* (Brussels: Lamertin, 1934), 124, line 12 and 136, line 1.

⁵²⁸ E.g. Josephus et Aseneth, *Confessio et precatio Aseneth* 22.7.5, (ii CE); Hippolytus, *De antichristo* 7.11 (iii CE); Athanasius, *Vita Antonii* 67.29 (iv CE).

since the contrasting shades of dark (חַלְלִילִי) eyes and white (לָבָן) teeth are not captured in OG-Gen. Even so, G has produced a contextually interpretative translation, depicting this ruler-leader as striking in appearance and enjoying the benefits of prosperity.

The rest of Gen 49.12 contains a fairly straightforward translation of each semantic item. The first occurrence of what is a comparative מִן in the Hebrew text is interpreted as a genitive of source (ἀπὸ οἴνου) to fit the semantic context, with the consequence of *destruction of linguistic patternings*. The addition of the possessive genitive of the third person personal pronoun (αὐτοῦ) in the phrases οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ and οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ to indicate that the referent is Ioudas are both instances of clarifying *expansion*, and are evidence of G's concern for cohesion at this juncture and for rendering an acceptable Greek text.

There is a change of both 'accidence' and syntax involving the plural adjective λευκοί, functioning as the predicate of οἱ ὀδόντες, in contrast to the singular adjective לבן in a bound construction with שָׁנִים. Λευκοί is not a comparative adjective. Even so, G has recognized the comparative use of מִן, employing the phrase ἢ γάλα to render מִחֶלֶב. The comparative particle ἢ occurs four other times in OG-Gen.⁵²⁹ In OG-Gen 49.12, only the last stich involves a comparative, while in the MT, there are two comparative constructions. Since the Greek text does not replicate the parallelism of the source text, the result (as stated above) is *destruction of linguistic patternings*.

5.6 Summary: Ioudas Pericope (vv. 8-12)

In view of Rösel's claim that "der Übersetzer seiner Vorlage keine Gewalt antut" ("the translator does no violence to his source text"),⁵³⁰ Berman's negative analytic constructively brings to light the various "trials" which the Hebrew *lettre* has undergone during the translation process, as follows:

⁵²⁹ Gen 19.9; 29.19; 29.30; 38.26.

⁵³⁰ Rösel, *Die Interpretation*, 64. Rösel further qualifies his statement: "sondern daß er im Gegenteil dem hebräischen Text Wort für Wort folgt, allerdings bestimmte grammatikalische Entscheidungen und Zuordnungen anders vornimmt, als dies heutiger Wissenschaft zulässig scheint" ("...but that, on the contrary, he [G] follows the Hebrew text word for word, although he makes certain grammatical decisions and assignments differently than seems permissible to modern science"). Rösel, *Die Interpretation*, 64. I acknowledge the assistance of John Maxa for his translation of German texts cited in this thesis into English.

Trials of the Foreign

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
8*	יהודה	Ἰούδα	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	יודוך	σὲ αἰνέσαισαν	Qualitative impoverishment (alliteration) Destruction of networks of signification (wordplay) Destruction of linguistic patternings (inversion of Hebrew pronominal suffix)
	אתה	-	Quantitative impoverishment
	יד	χεῖρες	Destruction of linguistic patternings: singular to plural (MT, but not SP).
	בערף	ἐπὶ νότου	Rescripting
9	מטרף	ἐκ βλαστοῦ	Rescripting Destruction of networks of signification (root טרף in MT Genesis)
	לביא	Σκύμνος	Rescripting
	רבץ	ἐκοιμήθης	Destruction of linguistic patternings (change of accidens from 3 rd to 2 nd person) Qualitative impoverishment (different stance of lion)
	כרע; מטסף; גור אריה רבץ כאריה	σκύμνος λέοντος; ἐκ βλαστοῦ; ἀναπесὼν ἐκοιμήθης ὡς λέων	Qualitative impoverishment (the sound of /r/; alliteration and onomatopoeia)
10	שבט	ἄρχων	Destruction of networks of signification Clarification Qualitative impoverishment (loss of metonymy)
	מחקק	ἡγούμενος	Clarification Qualitative impoverishment (loss of metonymy)
	מבין	ἐκ	Quantitative impoverishment
	רגליו	τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ	Destruction of expressions and idioms

	[עד כִּי־בא] שילה	[ἕως ἄν ἔλθῃ] τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ	Expansion
	ולו [יקהת עמים]	καὶ αὐτὸς [προσδοκία ἐθνῶν]	Destruction of linguistic patternings
	יקהת	Προσδοκία	Rescripting
	עמים	ἐθνῶν	Clarification
11	אסרי	Δεσμεύων	Qualitative impoverishment
	לגפן	πρὸς ἄμπελον	Quantitative impoverishment (indefinite in Greek)
	לגפן עירה ולשרקה בני אתנו	πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἔλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ	Destruction of linguistic patternings (parallelism of ל)
	לשרקה	τῇ ἔλικι	Qualitative impoverishment (nuance of reddish colour)
	בני אתנו	τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ	Destruction of networks of signification (semantic leveling)
	סותה	τὴν περιβολὴν αὐτοῦ	Undetermined meaning
12	חכלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ [αὐτοῦ]	Rescripting Qualitative impoverishment (contrast of dark shade of eyes with the whiteness of milk)
	חכלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>	Expansion
	לבן־שנים	λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες <u>αὐτοῦ</u>	Expansion
	מיין / מחלב	ἀπὸ οἴνου / ἢ γάλα	Destruction of linguistic patternings

By and large, G follows the general word order of the Hebrew *lettre* and the fact that this tendency can be clearly discerned distinguishes it as a translation (rather than a pure commentary) in its very essence. Despite the best efforts of any translator's "work on the *lettre*," translating poetry will inevitably manifest deformations, most notably those of *qualitative impoverishment*. This tendency can be seen in the Ioudas pericope regarding the virtual impossibility of replicating poetic features such as Hebrew wordplay, alliteration, and onomatopoeia. In other instances, the general meaning may be similar, but a distinctive nuance found in the source text, such as the particular posture or stance of a figure (e.g. ἔκοιμήθης / רָבַץ) or a particular connotation (e.g. the evocative reddish colour of שֶׁרָקָה) is not conveyed in OG-Gen. Apart from *qualitative impoverishment*, the most significant deformations of OG-Gen are

expansion, *destruction of linguistic patternings*, and five important occurrences of *rescripting*. It is in v. 10 where the most noteworthy *expansion* occurs. G, as with all translators who have tried to interpret the Ioudas pericope, must confront the “untranslatability” of the enigmatic שִׁילָה. G’s rendering of שִׁילָה exemplifies Berman’s observation that when a translator is faced with “untranslatability,” translation can momentarily merge into commentary. Translation and commentary both involve “work on the *lettre*” and they are inseparable, says Berman, “to the point that it is impossible to say that one ‘precedes’ the other.”⁵³¹ In essence, “commentary occupies a space-in-between translation and original and is thus situated as close as possible to what is being *said* in the original text.”⁵³² As a space-in-between original and translation, commentary may help reveal what a translator believes is being said in the *Vorlage*, which may not necessarily be the same as its semantic meaning.⁵³³ In the case of שִׁילָה, the paraphrastic *expansion* “the things stored up for him” (τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ) offers only a tiny glimpse into G’s interpretative framework. G stops short of providing any extra detail as to what the phrase may be referring to.⁵³⁴ Wevers sums up the challenges of interpreting the Greek text: “The Greek is almost as mysterious as שִׁילָה. Two questions need an answer: who is referred to in αὐτῷ, and what are τὰ ἀποκείμενα. Is the αὐτῷ an expected Messiah?...And what are the things held in reserve? The perquisites [sic] of royalty [cf. Targum Onqelos]? Or possibly spoils, tribute?”⁵³⁵ Whatever these “things” refer to, when they finally come into fruition, the ruler-leader is expected to come. The other instances of *expansion*, along with most of the examples of *destruction of linguistic patternings*, pertain to G’s concern for cohesion. For instance, the referent of the subject pronoun αὐτός and masculine singular possessive adjectives is apparently the future leader-ruler, this descendant of Ioudas the lion. G’s primary preoccupation is thus not to stick to the word order and/or word class of the Hebrew *lettre*, but to render a legible Greek text.

As for the examples of *rescripting*, while the rendering χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ [αὐτοῦ] in v. 12 probably came about from G’s uncertainty about the exact meaning of חִכְלִילֵי עֵינַיִם, G’s choice of ἐκ βλαστοῦ for מִטָּרֶךְ in v. 9 marks a much more striking departure from the meaning of the *Vorlage*. At

⁵³¹ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 76.

⁵³² Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 76.

⁵³³ For another example of a LXX translator’s “work on the *lettre*” momentarily giving way to commentary, see my discussion in Karlana M. Cagnoli, “The Tree of the Sacred Text: Reflections on Greek Exodus in Dialogue with Antoine Berman,” in *Themes and Texts, Exodus and Beyond: Essays in Honour of Larry J. Perkins*, eds. Robert J.V. Hiebert, Jonathan Numada, Dongshin Don Chang, and Kyung S. Baek, Library of Second Temple Studies 101 (London: T&T Clark, 2024), 99-100.

⁵³⁴ Cf. Rösel, *Die Interpretation*, 64. “Wegen der Treue des Übersetzers zu seiner Vorlage wurden dabei die Bezüge nicht weiter expliziert.” (“Because of the translator’s loyalty to his original, the references were not further explained.”)

⁵³⁵ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 826.

the very least, G may have drawn from his linguistic *horizon* (that is, his knowledge of the Aramaic word טַרְמָא) in assigning the meaning “leaf” or “branch” to the Semitic root טרף, despite knowing full well the meaning of “prey” for the Hebrew root טָרַף. Wevers aptly discerns that G’s achievement in selecting a term from botany is “to get rid of the notion of Judah ferociously tearing at his prey.”⁵³⁶ Some diminishment of aggression is interesting given that references to violence have also been toned down in the Symeon and Leui pericope (vv. 5-7). Possibly, G wishes to discourage violence in his own people and/or avoid giving a potentially non-Jewish readership any notions that a Jewish population living in Palestine or the Diaspora might be violent or troublesome.

Some scholars have suggested that the translator may have linked Gen 49.9 conceptionally with passages in the HB⁵³⁷ that refer to the figure of a branch (e.g. Isa 11.1-10; Zech 3.8; 6.12; Jer 23.5),⁵³⁸ the one who is to be a righteous descendant of David upon whom the Spirit of the LORD rests. He shall reign as king, shall build the LORD’s temple, Israel “will dwell in safety” (Jer 23.6), “the nations shall inquire of him, and his dwelling shall be glorious” (Isa 1.10b). In making such linkages, G may have been interpreting Gen 49.9 as messianic, drawing from his literary *horizon* (that is, the Jewish Scriptures), and this would constitute an anaphoric translation technique. *Rescripting* is also evident in G’s rendering יְקִהָה (“obedience”) as προσδοκία (“expectation”). As stated earlier, it is plausible that G simply read יְקִהָה as a nominal form of the Hebrew root קִיָּה, in which case προσδοκία would be quite an unexceptional counterpart. Nonetheless, Pérez Gondar discerns veiled eschatological language in v. 10, pointing out that there is a semantic link between ἀπόκειμαι and προσδοκία.⁵³⁹ The notion that Gen 49.8-12 refers to “a messianic hope to be rooted in the tribe of Judah”⁵⁴⁰ conceivably has a basis even in the Hebrew text. The MT of Gen 49.8-12 is a rich composite of distinctive images and symbols that eventually emerge as messianic ideals or expectations in Jewish Scripture and tradition. To cite a few examples, the portrayal of Judah as a lion, a conquering, regal victor to whom enemies submit and people obey, evokes Davidic messianic imagery.⁵⁴¹ In v. 11, the words עֵיִרָה (“his foal”) and בְּנֵי אֲתָנֹו

⁵³⁶ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 825.

⁵³⁷ Cf. Rösel, *Die Interpretation*, 61-62; Pérez Gondar, “La bendición de Judá,” 366-367.

⁵³⁸ “A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. The spirit of the LORD shall rest on him” (Isa 11.1-2a); “Now listen, Joshua, high priest, you and your colleagues who sit before you! For they are an omen of things to come: I am going to bring my servant the Branch” (Zech 3.8); “Thus says the LORD of hosts: here is a man whose name is Branch: for he shall branch out in his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD” (Zech 6.12); “The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety” (Jer 23.5-6a).

⁵³⁹ Pérez Gondar, “La bendición de Judá,” 370.

⁵⁴⁰ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 826.

⁵⁴¹ Cf. commentary on verse 8, above.

(“his donkey’s colt”) are reminiscent of language found in Zechariah 9.9: “Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on a donkey, on a colt (עֵיר), the foal of a donkey (בֶּן אֶתְנָן).” This humble king “shall command peace to the nations; his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth” (Zech 9.10). In the light of such intertextuality, the Hebrew text of Gen 49.8-12 most definitely invites a messianic interpretation.

The hypothesis that the Greek text conveys a more explicit messianic reading of the Ioudas pericope than its *Vorlage* is supported by the fact that in v. 10: a) the terms “ruler” and “leader” pointedly refer to a specific individual, a descendant of Ioudas; b) the prominence of the personal pronoun αὐτός, in comparison to the possessive construction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* (לוֹ), reinforces the references to this particular ruler-leader; and c) the terms τὰ ἀποκείμενα and προσδοκία in the phrases ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ and καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἔθνων seem to place emphasis on a future hope/expectation. Besides all this, G’s rendering of ἐκ βλαστοῦ in v. 9 and, finally, even the phrase ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν in v. 1, provide the rationale for an eschatological interpretation. It is this accumulation of what Rösel terms “einzelner klassischer messianischer Elemente”⁵⁴² (“individual classical messianic elements”) that generates a seemingly enhanced messianic reading of OG-Gen.

Even so, G’s concern for cohesion and coherence as well as his preoccupation with rendering a sensible translation have already been discerned in his “work on the *lettre*” of Gen 49.3-7 (e.g. his practice of looking for parallels and patterns so as to circumvent unknown words or other perplexing textual issues; his harmonizing of second person or third person verbs/pronouns). By and large, G’s approach to the Ioudas pericope does not seem to be any different than that exhibited in prior verses in his striving to produce a judicious rendering of a difficult *Vorlage*. OG-Gen 49.8-12 undoubtedly contains perceptibly more eschatological nuances than its source text. Nonetheless, whether G was simply trying to navigate a challenging text or whether he was taking pains to purposefully shape a messianic reading of the text cannot be conclusively determined.

⁵⁴² Rösel, *Die Interpretation*, 64.

CHAPTER 6. GENESIS 49.13-15: ZABOULON AND ISSACHAR

6.1 Zaboulon (v. 13)

זבולן לחוף ימים ישכן והוא לחוף אניות וירכתו על צידן
Zebulun shall settle at the shore of the sea; he shall be a haven for ships, and his border shall be at Sidon.
Ζαβουλὼν παράλιος κατοικήσει, καὶ αὐτὸς παρ' ὄρμον πλοίων, καὶ παρατενεῖ ἕως Σιδῶνος.
Zaboulon by the sea shall settle, and he shall be near a haven of ships, and he shall extend as far as Sidon.

After his extended blessing of Ioudas, Iakob briefly articulates a maritime future for his son Zaboulon. Zebulun/Zaboulon appears before Issachar in Gen 49.13-15 and Deut 33.18-19,⁵⁴³ yet Issachar is listed as the fifth son and Zebulun/Zaboulon the sixth in Gen 30.17-20, 35.23 and 46.13-14 as well as in other Pentateuchal genealogies.⁵⁴⁴ Ζαβουλὼν is undeclined and is a transcription of זבולן, a name derived from זבד (“bestow upon, endow with”)⁵⁴⁵ and זבל (“exalt, honour”)⁵⁴⁶ (Gen 30.19-20). Leia’s declaration while naming her son provides a rationale for the meaning of the Hebrew name.⁵⁴⁷ G chooses παράλιος—which, like its cognate πάραλος, means “by the sea”⁵⁴⁸—and it serves as the counterpart to the prepositional phrase ימים לחוף in Gen 49.13 (cf. Deut 1.7). Deut 33.18-19 contains the only other instance of παράλιος in the Pentateuch and it renders חול (“sand,” Deut 33.19b).⁵⁴⁹ In Gen 49.13, the plural ימים in ימים לחוף should, says de Hoop, be taken as “a *pluralis extensitatis*, the ‘wide sea’, *i.e.* the Mediterranean.”⁵⁵⁰ G’s παράλιος reflects this interpretation, which is similar to παραθαλασσίος (“seashore,” Jer 47.7) but is at variance with αἰγιαλὸν θαλασσῶν (“the shore of seas,” Judg 5.17). As such, OG-Gen exhibits the “trial” of *clarification*. The two occurrences of חוף (לחוף; ימים; לחוף אניות) in Genesis are found in 49.13 and de Hoop deduces that חוף is “an inward curving beach,”⁵⁵¹ noting the morphological relation of חוף to חפף (“enclose, surround cover”).⁵⁵² This notion is

⁵⁴³ Evidently, there is some relationship between the Hebrew poems of Gen 49 and Deut 33.

⁵⁴⁴ Exod 1.3; Num 1.8-9, 26(28), 28(30); 26.19(23), 22(26).

⁵⁴⁵ BDB, s.v. “זָבַד.”

⁵⁴⁶ BDB, s.v. “זָבַל”; cf. Skinner, *Genesis*, 389

⁵⁴⁷ Δεδωρηταί μοι ὁ θεὸς δῶρον καλόν· ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ αἰρετιεῖ με ὁ ἀνὴρ μου (“God has given a good gift to me; at the present time my husband will choose me”) which does not have exactly the same meaning as זבדני אלהים אחי זבד טוב הפעם (“God has endowed me with a good dowry; now my husband will honor me”) (Gen 30.19-20).

⁵⁴⁸ LSJ, s.v. “παράλιος.”

⁵⁴⁹ Moyses describes Zaboulon as being suckled by “the trade of those living by the seacoast” (Deut 33.19).

⁵⁵⁰ De Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 149.

⁵⁵¹ De Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 148

⁵⁵² BDB, s.v. “חָפַף.”

not expressed in OG-Gen, which may evince slight *qualitative impoverishment*. Κατουκέω, an appropriate semantic equivalent for שכן, occurs 44 times as the counterpart to יָשַׁב, also translating שָׁכַן eight times and גֹּר once (Gen 47.4). Consequently, OG-Gen manifests a degree of semantic leveling at a macro level due to the fact that κατουκέω is chosen to render three different Hebrew lexemes that refer to dwelling in the land, though no *destruction of networks of signification* results.

For the preposition ל in the second stich of Gen 49.13, G opts for παρά, which stands parallel to the preposition in the compound word παράλιος (παρά + ἄλς) in the first stich, while πλοῖον is an obvious equivalent for אניה. Ὅρμος appears only here in the Pentateuch, where it is a suitable counterpart to חֹרֶף.⁵⁵³ Denoting “anchorage, esp[ecially] the inner part of harbour” or, in a metaphorical sense, a ship’s “haven, place of shelter or refuge,”⁵⁵⁴ ὄρμον πλοίων is quite an appropriate rendering of חֹרֶף אֲנִיּוֹת. G did not choose the same equivalent for חֹרֶף in its two occurrences in v. 13 with the consequence that the repetition of חֹרֶף in the first two stichs is not explicitly replicated. De Hoop notes that such repetition in consecutive cola “is a very common phenomenon, not only in Hebrew, but also in ancient Oriental poetry in general.”⁵⁵⁵ In not reflecting the *lettre* of its *Vorlage* in this respect, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *qualitative impoverishment*, especially if one perceives an onomatopoeic effect for חֹרֶף which seems to evoke the sound of sea waves reaching the seashore.

G’s employment of παρατείνω,⁵⁵⁶ which appears elsewhere in the Pentateuch in Num 23.28 as the counterpart to שָׁקַף (“to overhang, look out and down”),⁵⁵⁷ involves a change of word class from a noun (יִרְכָּה) plus third person masculine singular pronominal suffix to a third person future singular finite verb (παρατενεῖ). In place of the somewhat terse nominal clause וִירְכָּתוּ עַל צִידֵן, καὶ παρατενεῖ ἕως Σιδῶνος is a clearly defined and rather prose-like Greek rendering. The consequent deformation is *destruction of linguistic patternings*, though G competently conveys the general sense of his *Vorlage*. The Hebrew noun יִרְכָּה denotes “extreme parts, recesses”⁵⁵⁸ and the Greek verb expresses the notion of spatially extending or stretching out. Striking is the repetition of the sound /pa:r/ (παράλιος; παρ’;

⁵⁵³ It occurs just once more in the LXX (4 Macc 13.6).

⁵⁵⁴ Cf. Euripides, *Hecuba* 450: τῷ δουλόσυνος πρὸς οἶκον κτηθεῖς ἀφίξομαι; ἢ Δωρίδος ὄρμον αἶας (“To whose house shall I pass as chattel slave? Shall I come to harbor in a Doric land?”). Euripides, *Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba*, LCL 484, ed. and trans. David Kovacs (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 438-439. Cf. LSJ, s.v. “ὄρμος.”

⁵⁵⁵ De Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 149-150.

⁵⁵⁶ LSJ, s.v. “παρατείνω,” “stretch out along,” “extend.”

⁵⁵⁷ BDB, s.v. “שָׁקַף.”

⁵⁵⁸ BDB, s.v. “יִרְכָּה” or “יִרְכָּה.”

παρατενεῖ) as well as the alliteration of /p/ (including πλοίων) and /k/ (κατοικήσει; καί) in this verse, which has serendipitously created the pleasing poetic effect of alliteration.

Ἔως parallels the MT's על, though the Hebrew *Vorlage* for G may have been עד, which appears in some Hebrew manuscripts and is attested in the Peshitta and the Vulgate.⁵⁵⁹ The presence of the latter Hebrew preposition may have been determinative in the choice of the Greek term to render ירכה. Σιδῶνος, the genitive form of Σιδῶν, is a Hellenized form.⁵⁶⁰ Since it is declined, it is not simply a transcription of צידן. Σιδῶν appears in early Greek literature⁵⁶¹ as well as 27 times in the LXX, three occurrences of which are in the Pentateuch.⁵⁶² This ancient Phoenician city on the coast of Tyre was well-known for its importance in commercial trade on the Mediterranean Sea. Josh 19.10-16 describes the bulk of Zaboulon/Zebulun's allotment of territory as inland. Nonetheless, Deut 33.18-19 depicts Zaboulon/Zebulun (along with Issachar) as not only profiting from the riches of the sea, but also, in the Hebrew text at least, calling the people to an inland mountain⁵⁶³ (the coastline is a maritime plain)⁵⁶⁴ so that they may offer sacrifices of righteousness.

6.2 Issachar (v. 14)

יששכר חמר גרם רבץ בין המשפתיים
Issachar is a strong donkey, lying down between the sheepfolds;
Ἰσσαχάρ τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν ἀναπαυόμενος ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν κλήρων·
Issachar desired the good, resting between the allotments;

In OG-Gen, Iakob describes Issachar as seeing the goodness and richness of his allotted land, which he sets forth to labour and till (v. 15). Ἰσσαχάρ is the undeclined subject of the main clause and the transcription of יששכר, Leia's fifth son's name (Gen 30.17-18), which has a dubious etymology. Skinner suggests that "the name is resolved either into אִישׁ שָׂכָר, 'man of hire,' or into שָׁכָר, 'there is a reward.'"⁵⁶⁵ G's rendition seems to reflect the former of Skinner's proposals: Ἰσσαχαρ, ὃ ἐστὶν Μισθός

⁵⁵⁹ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 828.

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. Thackeray, *Greek Grammar*, 166.

⁵⁶¹ E.g. Homer, *Odyssey* 15.425, Herodotus, *Historiae* 2.116.

⁵⁶² Gen 10.51, 19; 49.13.

⁵⁶³ The identity of the mountain is undetermined, although it may have been Tabor or Carmel. Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), § The Blessing of Zebulun and Issachar (vv.18-19), fn. 33, <https://search-ebscohost-com.twu.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1058547&site=eds-live&scope=site>. Cf. S.R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of Deuteronomy*, International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), 409.

⁵⁶⁴ Yehuda Karmon, "The Geography of Israel: Ancient and Modern," *The Journal of Education Sociology* 36, no. 8 (April 1963): 363.

⁵⁶⁵ Skinner, *Genesis*, 389.

“Issachar, which is Hire” (Gen 30.18). G’s choice of the (arthrous) substantive (τὸ καλόν is an indication that, instead of חמר, he has read חמד (“desire, delight”).⁵⁶⁶ Although the Hebrew letters *resh* and *dalet* are known to have caused some confusion among ancient scribes,⁵⁶⁷ it is more likely that G was trying to make sense of a difficult Hebrew text than that חמד appeared in his *Vorlage* in place of חמר since no other ancient versions attest to a reading of חמד. Assuming that G’s *Vorlage* read חמר (donkey) as in the MT, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of *rescripting* as well as *expansion* with the added definite article. Perhaps G preferred to construe חמר as חמד since Gen 49.11 has just described Ioudas’s binding of a donkey to a vine and, more importantly, because the word “donkey” could connote plebeian notions of hard labor or servitude. Depicting a son of Israel as a slave could have been perceived negatively, given Israel’s history of subjugation to Egypt and other nations. If so, Greek κάλος as a rendering of חמד effectually removes this potentially unfavorable imagery with reference to Issachar.⁵⁶⁸

The consonants גרם of the MT are in agreement with the Samaritan Pentateuch (גרים).⁵⁶⁹ Based on text-critical evidence, de Hoop’s conclusion that all versions of MT, including OG-Gen, had a *Vorlage* identical to the MT at this juncture seems well-founded.⁵⁷⁰ With respect to G’s choice of ἐπιθυμέω to render גרם, Tov has suggested that G actually read גרס for גרם, since the translator of Ps 118(119).20 has rendered גרס as ἐπιποθέω: גרסה נפשי לתאבה—ἐπεπόθησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τοῦ ἐπιποθεῖν.⁵⁷¹ This, however, does not seem that feasible given the fact that, as Wevers has rightly noted, the translator of the Psalter employs a completely different verb in place of ἐπιθυμέω, namely, ἐπιποθέω.⁵⁷² Instead, Wevers sensibly deduces that G’s rendering of ἐπιθυμέω is probably due to the translator speculating “on חמד as ‘to covet, desire.’”⁵⁷³ In any case, G’s selection of a Greek counterpart that has a different meaning from גרם results in the “trial” of *rescripting*. Alternatively, one cannot discount the possibility that G chose to adopt the meaning of the Aramaic verb גָּרַם (“bring about”).⁵⁷⁴ In so doing, the phrase “he brought about (גָּרַם) delight (חֶמֶד)” may easily be interpreted as “he desired

⁵⁶⁶ BDB, s.v. “חֶמֶד.”

⁵⁶⁷ Tov, *The Text Critical Use*, 113.

⁵⁶⁸ Indeed, other versions of the MT seemed to struggle with the metaphor that likens Issachar to a donkey. Cf. fn. 570.

⁵⁶⁹ Gen 49.14, *BHS* apparatus, note 14a.

⁵⁷⁰ De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 152. Peshitta *gbr’ gnbr’* (“strong man”); Targum Onkelos עחיר בנכסין (“rich in possessions”); Targum Neophyti שבט תקיף (“strong tribe”); Targum Pseudo-Jonathan חמד באריתא (“desires the law”); Vulgate *asinus fortis* “strong donkey.” Translations of the citations are those of de Hoop.

⁵⁷¹ Tov, *The Text Critical Use*, 69-70.

⁵⁷² Wevers, *Greek Text*, 828.

⁵⁷³ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 828.

⁵⁷⁴ BDB, s.v. “גָּרַם.”

the good” (τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν) by applying the transformation reversal of cause and effect.⁵⁷⁵ In other words, Issachar first desired the good and this resulted in his bringing about delight. Duly taking into consideration G’s tendency to replicate his *Vorlage* quantitatively in his translation, one might include that the Aramaic meaning of “to bring about” could reasonably stand in as a semantic representation of Semitic root גרם. That G possibly had recourse to Aramaic words in other contexts (e.g. טרף in Gen 49.9) adds credence to this proposition. In the HB, the consonants גרם appear as גָּרַם root 1 (Num 24.8; Ezek 23.43), meaning “break bones, break”⁵⁷⁶ and גָּרַם root 2 (Zeph 3.3), which might be glossed as “lay aside, leave.”⁵⁷⁷ The cognate noun גָּרַם (“bone, strength, self”)⁵⁷⁸ occurs in Gen 49.14, 2 Kings 9.13, Prov 17.22, and Job 40.18, while in Dan 6.25, the Aramaic term גָּרַם (“bone”) appears. The denotation “break bones” for Hebrew גרם seems nonsensical in the context of Gen 49.14. Tov’s interpretation of גרם as depicting a “bony” donkey is possible⁵⁷⁹ while NRSV’s “strong donkey” accords with the long-standing, yet still debatable, tradition that גָּרַם should be glossed as “strong, sturdy.”⁵⁸⁰

The word καλός is employed 41 times in OG-Gen where, besides frequently rendering טוב, it is also a counterpart to יפה,⁵⁸¹ חמד,⁵⁸² and בריא.⁵⁸³ Semantic leveling is thus a feature of OG-Gen with respect to these various Hebrew adjectives that convey a positive value or characteristic. OG-Gen thus manifests the “trial” of *destruction of networks of signification* at a macro level in such cases. Furthermore, καλός is not an exact rendering of יפה, חמד, or בריא. A Platonic connotation need not be assigned to καλός throughout OG-Gen, *pace* Harl,⁵⁸⁴ as the Greek term is G’s typical rendering of various Hebrew terms that have positive attributes or associations.

⁵⁷⁵ This type of transformation is a “T[arget] L[anguage] rendering [which] does not reflect exactly the same situation as the source text, but a situation which logically precedes the situation described in the S[ource T[ext]] or results from it.” Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 66.

⁵⁷⁶ BDB, s.v. “גָּרַם.”

⁵⁷⁷ BDB, s.v. “I. [גָּרַם].” *HALOT* glosses this occurrence as “gnaw or break bones” but indicates it could be a text correction. *HALOT*, s.v. “גָּרַם.”

⁵⁷⁸ BDB, s.v. “גָּרַם.”

⁵⁷⁹ Tov, “Trial and Error,” 462.

⁵⁸⁰ Along with the interpretations found in various ancient versions (cf. fn. 570), this tradition is continued in the writings of medieval scholars such as David ben Abraham al-Fāsī, Rashi, Ibn-Ezra, Rashbam, and Sforzo. De Hoop, *Genesis* 49, 152. De Hoop also cites similar phrases in Arabic: “*ḥimār ġirmin* “strong ass” and *fars ġirmin* “strong horse.”

⁵⁸¹ Gen 12.14; 29.17; 39.6; 41.2, 4, 18.

⁵⁸² Gen 27.15; 49.14.

⁵⁸³ Gen 41.20.

⁵⁸⁴ “La LXX qualifie Issakhar avec une expression abstraite laudative que l’on peut qualifier de <<platonicienne>> : <<il a désiré le beau>> [ou <<le bien>> *tò kalón*]. “The LXX qualifies Issakhar with a laudatory abstract expression that can be described as ‘platonic:’ he desired the beautiful (or ‘the good’ *tò kalón*)” [translation mine]. Harl, *La Genèse*, 310.

In Gen 49.9, רבץ is translated as κοιμάομαι while in v. 14, G employs ἀναπαύω (in the form of the participle ἀναπαυόμενος) with its middle-passive meaning “take one’s rest, sleep.”⁵⁸⁵ As in v. 9, OG-Gen here exhibits *qualitative impoverishment*, since the resting posture of Issachar in OG-Gen has a different nuance than the MT’s depiction of Issachar as stretching out or lying down. Ἀνὰ μέσον appears 59 times in Genesis, each time as a counterpart to the Hebrew preposition בין. This Greek prepositional phrase is a suitable equivalent for בין, as Polybius’s use of it (and that of any number of other Greek authors) will attest.⁵⁸⁶ The term משפּתִים, pointed in the MT as a dual form and rendered as κλήρων, likely presented a challenge for G, as it has for every translator of this passage. The meaning of משפּתִים is obscure inasmuch as its only other occurrence is found in MT Judg 5.16. Various glosses for it have been proposed, including “fireplaces,”⁵⁸⁷ “sheepfolds,”⁵⁸⁸ and “two saddle-bags (of a pack-animal).”⁵⁸⁹ Like G, the translator of Judges struggled to understand משפּתִים as is evident in the A text where the word is simply transcribed as μωσφαθαιμ. Noting that the Hebrew letters שׁ/שׂ are sometimes interchanged by scribes or translators, Tov remarks in regard to this transcription that “the translator of Judges derived משפּתִים from שׁפּה-lip (the equivalence שׁפּה-χεῖλος occurs frequently elsewhere in the LXX).”⁵⁹⁰ G’s choice of κλήρων⁵⁹¹ reflects a reading of משפּתִים (“judgments”)⁵⁹² in which the fourth letter is *tet* rather than *tav*. This Greek rendering could be considered a transformation of reversal of cause and effect, since making a judgment could result in the allotment of land. Even so, as there is a lack of a semantic correlation between κλήρων and משפּתִים, OG-Gen exhibits the “trial” of *rescripting*.

6.3 Issachar (v. 15)

וירא מנחה כי טוב ואת הארץ כי נעמה ויט שכמו לסבל ויהי למס עבד
[and] ⁵⁹³ he saw that a resting place was good, and that the land was pleasant; so he bowed his shoulder to the burden, and became a slave at forced labor.
καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν ὅτι καλή, καὶ τὴν γῆν ὅτι πίων, ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὦμον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πονεῖν, καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀνὴρ γεωργός.

⁵⁸⁵ LSJ, s.v. “ἀναπαύω.”

⁵⁸⁶ “Ἀνὰ μέσον is an acceptable counterpart to בין (e.g., Οἱ δ’ Ἀπασιάκαι κατοικοῦσι μὲν ἀνὰ μέσον Ὀξου καὶ Τανάιδος [“The Apasiacae live between the rivers Oxus and Tanais” Polybius, *Hist.* 10.48; trans. Shuckburgh]).” Hiebert, “In the Beginning,” 26.

⁵⁸⁷ Tov, *The Text Critical Use*, 189. BDB, s.v. “משפּתִים.”

⁵⁸⁸ The definition “sheepfolds” is derived from its association with fireplaces or ash-heaps in use among sheepfolds. BDB, s.v. “משפּתִים.”

⁵⁸⁹ HALOT, s.v. “משפּתִים.”

⁵⁹⁰ Tov, *The Text Critical Use*, 189.

⁵⁹¹ LSJ, s.v. “κλήρος”: “casting of lots, drawing of lots”; “that which has been assigned by lot, allotment of land.”

⁵⁹² BDB, s.v. “משפּתִים.”

⁵⁹³ The NRSV has not included a counterpart to the Hebrew conjunction *vav*.

and when he saw the resting place—that it was good, and the land—that it was rich, he subjected his shoulder to toil and became a tiller of the ground.

The conjunction καί and the participle ἰδὼν translate the *vav*-consecutive preterite וַיִּרְא, resulting in a change of syntactic function involving a circumstantial participle clause in OG-Gen as opposed to the Hebrew finite verb with its embedded third person singular subject. This is another example of the “trial” of *destruction of linguistic patternings*. The word ἀνάπαυσις is G’s selection as the counterpart to מנוחה (“resting place”).⁵⁹⁴ In OG-Gen, ἀνάπαυσις is arthrous, in which case *the* resting place refers specifically to Issachar’s allotted land. Consequently, OG-Gen manifests the “trial” of clarifying *expansion* with respect to the MT. Wevers suggests that G’s reading of the first two lines of v. 15 may have influenced his interpretation of v. 14 in that “[t]he word ἀνάπαυσιν for מנוחה ‘rest’ [in v. 15] is reflected in the choice of ἀναπαυόμενος for רבץ in v. 14; so too καλή for טוב [in v. 15] is echoed in τὸ καλόν (for חמר) [in v. 14].”⁵⁹⁵ In the strong likelihood of such influence,⁵⁹⁶ G’s efforts to create an aesthetically pleasing Greek text has occasioned the “trial” of *ennoblement*. Taken collectively, these translation choices thus transcend the word level.

G selects the adjective πῖον (“rich,” “plenteous,” “abundant”)⁵⁹⁷ to render the Hebrew verb נָעַם (“be pleasant, delightful, lovely”).⁵⁹⁸ The resulting “trial” is *clarification*, since the quality of richness or abundance more specifically denotes what is meant by the notion of what is pleasant about the land. As for the only other occurrence of πῖον in OG-Gen, its counterpart is the adjective שָׁמֵן “fat, rich”⁵⁹⁹ (Gen 49.20). The default equivalent for γῆ is אֶרֶץ, as it is in the majority of the 360 instances that γῆ appears in OG-Gen. Other equivalents for γῆ are אֲדָמָה,⁶⁰⁰ שָׂדֶה,⁶⁰¹ and עֵפֶר.⁶⁰² In six instances, there are no counterparts in the MT,⁶⁰³ which means that OG-Gen manifests *expansion* at the macro level. Seeing that the land was rich, Issachar would respond by cultivating the land. As G puts it, “he subjected (ὑπέθηκεν) his shoulder to toil,” whereas in the MT, the arguably more vivid image is of

⁵⁹⁴ BDB, s.v. “מְנוּחָה.”

⁵⁹⁵ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 828.

⁵⁹⁶ This influence is likely, even though ἀναπαύω is notably also used to render רָבַץ in Gen 29.2.

⁵⁹⁷ LSJ, s.v. “πῖον.”

⁵⁹⁸ BDB, s.v. “נָעַם.”

⁵⁹⁹ BDB, s.v. “שָׁמֵן.”

⁶⁰⁰ Gen 1.25; 2.6, 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(4x), 20, 22(2x), 23(2x), 26(2x).

⁶⁰¹ Gen 3.1, 14; 47.24.

⁶⁰² Gen 3.14, 19(2x); 18.27; 26.15.

⁶⁰³ Gen 1.14; 24.7, 8; 35.27; 45.9; 46.27.

Issachar bowing (נט, “incline, bend”)⁶⁰⁴ his shoulder to a burden. OG-Gen thus displays a measure of *qualitative impoverishment*. Ὑποτίθημι appears three times in OG-Gen. In Gen 28.18 and 48.19, its counterpart is שׂי, while here in Gen 49.15 its aorist form translates the *qal vav*-consecutive preterite form of נט. There is no Greek counterpart to the conjunction that appears in the MT, and this is due to the fact that the participle ἰδὼν that begins the verse is subordinate to the main verb ὑπέθηκεν.

Consequently, besides the aforementioned “trial” of *destruction of linguistic patternings*, OG-Gen exhibits *quantitative impoverishment* and, since the Hebrew text is a poem, *destruction of rhythms*. נט appears eight other times in Genesis, and it is rendered by ἵστημι (Gen 12.8; 33.19), ἐπικλίνω (Gen 24.14), πηγνυμι (Gen 26.25; 35.16[21]), ἀφικνέομαι (Gen 38.1), ἐκκλίνω (Gen 38.16), κατέχω (Gen 39.21), and ὑποτίθημι (Gen 49.15). As for the four instances of ὄμος in OG-Gen,⁶⁰⁵ its equivalent is predictably שׂש root 1. The εἰς τό plus infinitive construction occurs only four times in OG-Gen.⁶⁰⁶ Εἰς can be used to express a goal, purpose, or intention.⁶⁰⁷ This kind of infinitival construction displays quite natural Greek syntax and occurs only in Gen 30.38 and 49.15, where in both contexts εἰς could be conceived as a counterpart to the preposition ל. Πονέω (“work hard at,” “suffer,” “toil, labour”)⁶⁰⁸ occurs only here in Gen 49.15 where it is an appropriate match for the only instance of סבל (“bear a heavy load”)⁶⁰⁹ in Genesis.

There are 51 instances of the term ἀνὴρ in OG-Gen, and its default equivalent, as can be expected, is שׂא (47 times). Besides that, ἀνὴρ renders שׂנפ in Gen 14.21 and בעל in Gen 20.3.⁶¹⁰ Issachar is described as ἀνὴρ γεωργός (“a tiller of the ground”), a collocation that prior to the LXX occurs in Aesop (vi BCE),⁶¹¹ Thucydides (v BCE),⁶¹² and Plato (v-iv BCE).⁶¹³ This is in contrast to ἄνθρωπος γεωργός γῆς ≈ שׂא אדם in Gen 9.20, a collocation that is not attested in extant non-biblical

⁶⁰⁴ BDB, s.v. “נט.”

⁶⁰⁵ Gen 21.14; 24.15; 24.45; 49.15.

⁶⁰⁶ Gen 30.38; 32.8(9); 43.21; 49.15.

⁶⁰⁷ E.g. ἡ σὴ πατρίς εἰς σὲ ἀποβλέπει (“your country looks for help to you”), Xenophon *Hellenica* 6.1.8. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1686d and §2009.

⁶⁰⁸ LSJ, s.v. “πονέω.”

⁶⁰⁹ BDB, s.v. “סבל.”

⁶¹⁰ There are no Hebrew counterparts for ἀνὴρ in Gen 20.2 and 47.5.

⁶¹¹ ἀνὴρ γεωργός μέλλον (a future [male] farmer). Aesop, *Fabulae* 42.1.1. Translation mine.

⁶¹² ἄνδρες γεωργοὶ καὶ οὐ θαλάσσιοι (“who are tillers of the soil and not seaman”). Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1-2*, LCL 108, trans. C.F. Smith (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919), 246-247, § 1.142.7.2. This is an interesting citation because it contrasts men who till the land with seafarers, which is much like the contrast between Zaboulon (associated with the sea) and Issachar (tiller of the land).

⁶¹³ οἷον ἐὰν φυτεύων γεωργὸς ἀνὴρ (“as a farmer who plants something”). Plato, *Charmides. Alcibiades I and II. Hipparchus. The Lovers. Theages. Minors. Epinomis*, LCL 201, trans. W.R.M. Lamb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927), 278-279.

Greek literature. Besides these instances of γεωργός in OG-Gen, it appears seven other times in LXX poetic and prophetic literature.⁶¹⁴ In Gen 49.15, the counterpart to ἀνήρ γεωργός is מַס עֶבֶד. מַס usually signifies a collective body of labourers.⁶¹⁵ In Josh 16.10 and 1 Kings 9.21, for which there are no equivalents to מַס in their respective Greek texts, the expression לַמַּס עֶבֶד has been glossed as “a slaving labour-band” (BDB). Wevers interprets it in connection with Gen 49.15 as “an indentured worker, one who works at forced service, or for tribute.”⁶¹⁶ The Hebrew poem’s network of signification includes the image of a servile donkey, the phrase אִישׁ שָׂכָר (“man of hire”) that is likely to be associated with the etymology of the name יִשְׂשָׁכָר (Gen 30.18), and the term מַס עֶבֶד. However, with references to the land and to Issachar’s subjecting his shoulder to toil, G has chosen to characterize Issachar as a farmer. OG-Gen exhibits the “trial” of *rescripting*, since “a tiller of the ground” (NETS) is a far cry from “a slave at forced labor” (NRSV), and this results in *destruction of networks of signification*⁶¹⁷ with reference to the donkey metaphor and the meaning of Issachar’s name. Furthermore, in the MT the patriarch’s metaphors for his sons are a lion’s whelp (Judah), a donkey (Issachar), a snake (Dan), a doe (Naphtali), and a wolf (Benjamin). In OG-Gen, there are no animal metaphors for Issachar or Nephthali. Consequently, OG-Gen manifests yet another level of *destruction of networks of signification*.

The verb γίνομαι appears 200 times in OG-Gen and its default equivalent is הָיָה.⁶¹⁸ Rather than his usual rendering of καί plus the aorist middle indicative form ἐγένετο for the *vav*-consecutive preterite form וַיְהִי, in Gen 49.15 (as in Gen 39.5[2°] and 41.13) G employs the aorist passive indicative form ἐγενήθη. Issachar becomes a tiller of the ground once he has seen the richness of the land and the goodness of his allotment. Susan Brayford perceptively discerns that instead of classifying this son as a “strong-boned ass” (חֲמֹר גֶּרֶם), G “more benevolently characterizes him as ‘one who longed for the good.’ He also upgrades Issachar’s occupation; in [OG-Gen], he is called a ‘man who tills the ground,’ instead of the more menial ‘indentured servant’ (לַמַּס-עֶבֶד).”⁶¹⁹ Therefore, G portrays Issachar in a more favorable light than is the case in his Semitic *Vorlage*.

6.4 Summary: Zaboulon and Issachar Pericopes (vv. 13-15)

An overview of the “trials” in vv. 13-15 is as follows:

⁶¹⁴ WisSal 17.16; Amos 5.16; Joel 1.11; Jer 14.4; 28.23; 38.24; 52.16.

⁶¹⁵ BDB, s.v. “מַס.”

⁶¹⁶ Wevers, *Greek Text*, 829.

⁶¹⁷ In fact, any instance of *rescripting* results in some measure of *destruction of networks of signification*. This thesis makes mention of key examples of such destruction of signifying networks.

⁶¹⁸ It renders הָיָה 151 times. Cf. Hiebert, “In the Beginning,” 21-22.

⁶¹⁹ Susan Brayford, *Genesis*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 446.

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
13*	זבולן	Ζαβουλών	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	לחוף ימים	Παράλιος	Clarification (Quantitative impoverishment, חוף)
	לחוף ימים לחוף אניות	παράλιος παρ' ὄρμον πλοίων	Qualitative impoverishment (חוף 1° not explicitly translated; loss of possible onomatopoeia)
	ירכתו	παρατενεῖ	Destruction of linguistic patternings
14*	יששכר	Ἰσσαχάρ	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	חמר	τὸ καλόν	Rescripting Expansion (addition of definite article)
	גרם	ἐπεθύμησεν	Rescripting
	רבץ	ἀναπαυόμενος	Qualitative impoverishment
	המשפטים	τῶν κλήρων	Rescripting
15	וירא	καὶ ἰδὼν	Destruction of linguistic patternings
	מנחה	τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν	Expansion (addition of definite article)
	נעמה	Πίον	Clarification
	חמר/[חמד] / טוב	τὸ καλόν / καλή	Ennoblement (?)
	רבץ / מנחה	ἀναπαυόμενος / τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν	
	חמר / ויט שכמו / מס עבד	τὸ καλόν ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὄμιον αὐτοῦ ἀνὴρ γεωργός	Destruction of networks of signification
	חמר	τὸ καλόν	Destruction of networks of signification regarding animal metaphors (vv. 9, 14, 17, 21, and 27).
	ויט שכמו	ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὄμιον αὐτοῦ	Qualitative impoverishment Quantitative impoverishment (absence of conjunction) Destruction of rhythms (absence of conjunction)
	מס עבד	ἀνὴρ γεωργός	Rescripting Destruction of networks of signification

The depictions of Zebulun/Zaboulon in the MT and OG-Gen are almost identical in meaning despite the “trials” of *clarification* and (slight) *qualitative impoverishment* (deformations that result from G’s choice of παράλιος for (לחוף ימים) and *destruction of linguistic patternings* (G’s rendering of ירכתו as παρατενεῖ). For the latter deformation, G is evidently not determined to rigidly adhere to the word classes of his *Vorlage*, yet G’s adjustments in v. 13 do not transcend the word level. G exhibits some concern to preserve the word order of his text, just as he has in the previous verses of Gen 49. The translation of ימים ירכתו לחוף זבולן as Ζαβουλὼν παράλιος κατοικήσει demonstrates that, despite the inherent flexibility of Greek syntax, this word order still evinces Semitic influence and therefore is foreign in its essence.

As for the Issachar pericope, OG-Gen has a completely different interpretation of Issachar’s future in comparison to that of its *Vorlage*. Besides G’s apparent aversion to the idea of depicting Issachar as a donkey, many deformations seem to have been triggered by the difficulties of interpreting the meanings of terms such as המשפטים, מס עבד, and possibly גרם. Again, G has sought parallels and patterns to guide and inspire the translation of his *Vorlage*, such as the notions of resting and the goodness of the land, thus portraying Issachar favourably as a farmer. OG-Gen significantly exhibits the “trials” of *rescripting*, *qualitative impoverishment*, and *destruction of networks of signification* due to the reworking of some of the material in vv. 14-15. The instance of *ennoblement* noted in the chart above further suggests that G may have shaped these verses to appeal to a Greek audience.

6.5 Synopsis: Berman’s “Trials” in Gen 49.1-15

Analysis of OG-Gen 49.1-15 has entailed working on the *lettre* of the source text, essentially (re)translating it to discern “the manner in which poetry and thought operate within.”⁶²⁰ This is necessary for assessing G’s translation work on the *lettre*. Appendix 1 lists the deformations exhibited in OG-Gen 49.1-15 while Appendix 2 presents an inventory of each deformation. The latter inventory is summarized immediately below, ranging from the greatest to least number of deformation occurrences:

OG-Gen 49.1-15: Trials of the Foreign	Occurrences
<i>Qualitative Impoverishment</i>	25 (*eliminating Hebrew names reduces this total to 17)
<i>Destruction of linguistic patternings</i>	18

⁶²⁰ Berman, Berman, and Sommella, *The Age of Translation*, 28.

<i>Rescripting</i>	16
<i>Destruction of underlying networks of signification</i>	12
<i>Quantitative Impoverishment</i>	10
<i>Expansion</i>	9
<i>Clarification</i>	8
<i>Destruction of rhythms</i>	4
<i>Destruction of expressions and idioms</i>	2
<i>Rationalization</i>	1
<i>Ennoblement and popularization</i>	1
<i>Destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization</i>	undetermined
<i>Effacement of the superimposition of languages</i>	undetermined

The deformations of *destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization* and *effacement of the superimposition of languages*, as noted above in chapter 2, have not been evaluated due to the significant challenge of discerning these nuances in an ancient language. It is not surprising that *qualitative impoverishment* emerges as a prominent deformation in OG-Gen 49.1-15. This deforming tendency is manifested in virtually any translation, given the difficulty of transmitting the real essence of words or phrases from one language to another, and this is especially true for the translation of a poetic text. Features of the Hebrew *lettre* such as wordplay, irony, alliteration, onomatopoeia, and metonymy are not replicated in OG-Gen. Even so, several noteworthy instances of alliteration⁶²¹ not found in the Hebrew *lettre* do appear in OG-Gen and these “miracles” are attributed to probable happenstance. As for other examples of *qualitative impoverishment*, various elements intrinsic to the Hebrew *lettre* (e.g. proper nouns, specific nuances or connotations of a word) are lost in translation.

Destruction of linguistic patternings is ranked next to *qualitative impoverishment* in the inventory. There is a relationship between linguistic patternings and G’s concern for clarity and the intelligibility of his translation product. Furthermore, since Gen 49.3-15 contains the direct speech of Iakob to his sons, could this be a case in which direct speech might call for “more naturalness than narrative discourse”⁶²² or, for that matter, poetry? Quite possibly so. G is willing to reconfigure a phrase or reassign a word class if it will help him achieve the aims of cohesion and coherence. Berman might regard this as a rationalizing contraction. The deformation of *clarification* has a similar effect.

⁶²¹ These include ἀθροίσθητε καὶ ἀκούσατέ (v. 2), διαμεριῶ αὐτούς / διασπερῶ αὐτούς (v. 7), and παράλιος / παρ’ / παρατενεῖ / πλοίων as well as κατοικήσει / καί (v. 13).

⁶²² Cf. van der Louw, *Transformations*, 152.

Likewise, several instances of *quantitative impoverishment* (which may sometimes overlap with *destruction of linguistic patternings*) result from the elimination of a Hebrew preposition, conjunction, or definite article. G generally prefers an intelligible rendering to a mere quantitative representation of it. With respect to *expansion*, which is exemplified by the addition of definite articles or pronouns, G is not averse to transgressing his proclivity for serial fidelity. Regarding these aforementioned “trials,” *destruction of rhythms* appears much later in the summative chart, yet one should not underestimate the impact (an impact which is impossible to numerically quantify) of the translation process on a poem’s intrinsic sense of rhythm and movement.

In at least one of G’s struggles with “untranslatability,” he has opted for translation-commentary (i.e. his rendition of שילה). Such instances offer a brief glimpse into the potential *horizon* of G, as was discussed in chapter 5. Finally, although the *destruction of underlying networks of signification* ranks fourth in the summative chart, any alteration to a *lettre* ineluctably impacts all relationships between signifiers. Even so, several specific networks of signification in the Hebrew *lettre* that were not retained in OG-Gen have been noted in verse discussions (e.g. Hebrew root און [v. 3]; the various Hebrew lexemes pertaining to sin and wrongdoing [v. 5]; the network associated with Hebrew root כבד [v. 6]; networks associated with certain Hebrew proper nouns; various Hebrew words connected to the notion of rulership [e.g. ἄρχων in v. 10]; animal metaphors in Gen 49).

Rescripting ranks third in the chart above, yet its impact on the “Self-Same” of the Hebrew *lettre* is probably the most significant of all the “trials.” With *rescripting*, the meaning of the Hebrew text has been completely altered. The Greek text thus expresses a different reality in regard to Rouben and Issachar, who are now portrayed in a more negative and positive light, respectively, and the two delinquent brothers, Symeon and Leui, whose murderous violence has been somewhat toned down. Similarly, the threat of Ioudas, the lion’s whelp, has been diminished. Most of these instances of *rescripting* have been the result of G’s contending with “untranslatability,” that is, difficulties inherent in G’s *Vorlage* or in the translator’s misunderstanding of, and/or uncertainty about, the meaning of the text. G was surely aware that his translation choices in such cases were not exact semantic reproductions of the Hebrew poem. He could have resorted to transliteration, as he did on occasion in OG-Gen (e.g. σαβέκ = סבך, Gen 22.13),⁶²³ yet transliterating the several *hapax legomena* and/or rare Hebrew words would have rendered an incoherent and confusing Greek text. G’s priority was apparently to circumvent untranslatability in order to produce a generally sensible translation. Any

⁶²³ For other examples of transcriptions in OG-Gen, cf. Hiebert, “To the Reader of Genesis,” 3.

reservations G might have had about the prospect of altering the meaning of his *Vorlage* (which was the sacred scripture of his people) were apparently overruled by his determination to complete his translation mandate.

One question to consider is whether or not these particular examples of *rescripting* might be regarded as equivalent to commentary—that is, a reflection of how G (and his community) intentionally analyzed and interpreted their Hebrew Scripture. There is no easy answer, partly because any translator’s attempt to convey the results of analysis and interpretation (i.e. commentary) through translation has its limits. “[T]he transfer of meaning that [translation] enacts is incomplete,” says Berman, “and distortional.”⁶²⁴ This is especially true at a word level. A starting point for addressing such issues involves the attempt to determine whether G’s work on the *lettre* is an act of communication or, conversely, whether it is simply the *transmission* of a literary text. Berman’s negative analytic—reflected in the list of deformations of Gen 49.1-15—can be instrumental in providing insight into these dynamics. In its positive analytic (that is, G’s transmitting “the Foreign” of his Hebrew *lettre*), OG-Gen 49.1-15 exhibits some tendency towards serial fidelity and (sometimes) isomorphism. In such cases, G constrains himself. Following the word order of the Hebrew *lettre* frustrates any production of an “Amplified Greek Version” of the Jewish Scriptures, which would be the hallmark of a commentary. A case in point is the question as to whether or not G’s choice of ἐκ βλαστοῦ for מִטְּחֵה in Gen 49.9 constitutes a commentary that involves allusions to messianic texts. Noteworthy in this regard is G’s rendering of נַפְתָּלִי אֵילָה שְׁלַחָה (“Naphtali is a doe let loose”) as Νεφθαλι στέλεχος ἀνειμένον (“Nephthali is a stem let loose”) in Gen 49.21. This instance of the *rescripting* of אֵילָה to produce a botanical image was the result of G’s approach to resolving a translation difficulty. The possibility that G had no particular messianic connotation in mind with ἐκ βλαστοῦ in v. 9 is just as real as it is with στέλεχος in v. 21. Employing Berman’s negative analytic elucidates the fact that ἐκ βλαστοῦ reflects the morphological dimension rather than the semantic dimension of its underlying Semitic *lettre*. It is important to keep in mind that assigning extended interpretative intent (commentary) to single words or phrases can be quite speculative, whereas transformative *expansion* (and/or significant *destruction of signifying networks* in a given context) offers more scope for commentary. At any rate, Berman’s negative analytic facilitates discerning where a LXX translator sought to transmit elements of the *lettre* and in what ways his “work on the *lettre*” may pass over the barely distinguishable line between translation and commentary.

⁶²⁴ Antoine Berman, “Criticism, Commentary and Translation: Reflections based on Benjamin and Blanchot,” trans. Luise von Flotow, in *Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, ed. Mona Baker (London: Routledge, 2009), 1:106.

Another aspect of Berman's analytic to highlight is what will in the present thesis be called a "zoom factor." As stated in chapter 2 (p. 23), conclusions drawn from application of Berman's analytic can be distorted "if every 'deformation' is assigned the same level of significance;" both the intensity and the frequency of deformations must be considered. In this regard, the "zoom factor" presupposes that the smaller the textual extract from a larger work, the greater the number of deformations that are likely to be included in the analysis. Yet as additional extracts from the larger work (in this case, OG-Gen) are assessed in the process of "zooming-out," researchers will be able to discern more precisely those "deformations that create tension with some integral aspect of the original" (cf. p. 23) as well as the frequency of such deformations. As such, there will be a process of filtering out deformations and assigning greater importance to those that are more intense and/or frequent. The distinctive profile of a translator's "work on the *lettre*" will therefore continue to emerge.

In chapters 1 and 2 of this thesis, it was noted that LXX texts display varying degrees of dependence on their respective source texts and that it is necessary to nuance the interlinear paradigm to explain examples of peculiar dependency ("one step beyond literalism")⁶²⁵ on a Semitic *Vorlage* and also the various phenomena associated with freer translations. Regarding this nuancing, Berman's conceptual framework can refine the vitally important groundwork laid by the creators of the interlinear paradigm⁶²⁶—a paradigm that was conceived of as a metaphor, a heuristic tool for principled study and exegesis of translations in the LXX corpus.⁶²⁷ The task of assessing any translator's "work on the *lettre*" (and thus the textual-linguistic makeup of the translation product) is best understood as the process of analyzing the ever-present genetic relationship of the translation to the entire being-in-language (*lettre*) of its *Vorlage*. This genetic relationship constitutes the true essence of *any* translation, ancient or modern, whether it was meant from the outset to serve its readership as a text that was independent from its source, or it was understood to have some kind of subservient relationship to its source text. The interlinear paradigm might therefore be redefined as a "genetic paradigm," thus eliminating any notions that a metaphor for LXX study is a theory of origins or that it must be confined to vertical/horizontal (i.e. interlinear) dimensions, or even to a dynamic of subservience. A paradigm that conceives of the entire and multi-dimensional being-in-language of a *Vorlage* in terms of the genesis of a translated text in every aspect of its (re)formulation and deformation is a useful conceptual

⁶²⁵ Pietersma, "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited," in *A Question of Methodology*, 375.

⁶²⁶ This groundwork is important because it has given rise to "Guidelines for Contributors to the society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint" and "Preamble" to the Guidelines. These contain critical presuppositions for methodologically sound exegesis and analysis of LXX translations.

⁶²⁷ Pietersma, "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited," in *A Question of Methodology*, 374.

tool for principled LXX studies. The present investigation has sought to model such a genetic paradigm, applying Berman's "trials of the Foreign" to the analysis of OG-Gen 49.1-15. Berman's analytic has provided constructive descriptors for analyzing the processes and tendencies of a translation's production.

Another key question to consider is whether OG-Gen 49.1-15 is a foreignizing translation. Does G employ "a technique that was knowingly, and constructively, Hebraized," thus paying "homage to Hebrew in the very process of 'going Greek?'" This, says Tessa Rajak, is what LXX translators did when producing "as a type" translations that were foreignized rather than domesticated to the target culture.⁶²⁸ The combined impact of "trials of the Foreign" that a translation may exhibit can shed light on its degree of foreignization or domestication. On the one hand, G tends to follow the word order of his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Yet when one observes "trials" such as *quantitative impoverishment* and *expansion* that are evident in OG-Gen 49.1-15, it is clear that G's priority was not to maintain rigid isomorphic adherence to his *Vorlage*. Furthermore, the high number of *rescripting* tendencies and *destructions of linguistic patternings* (often accommodations to natural Greek syntax) undermine the notion that OG-Gen 49.1-15 is an example of foreignization. In fact, G's priority of producing a generally coherent text inclines more in the direction of *domestication*, which is indicative of G's effort to render an acceptable Greek product.

⁶²⁸ Rajak, *Translation and Survival*, 130-131. She adds that this process of going Greek while paying homage to Hebrew gave witness to "crucial elements in the constructed identity of an Alexandrian Jew." Rajak, *Translation and Survival*, 133.

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

This thesis has investigated the efficacy of Berman's negative analytic for conducting research on the production history of a LXX text. As noted in chapter 2, the fundamental point of departure in assessing an ancient translation is "confronting" a translation with its *Vorlage's lettre*. This has been achieved by preparing a philological commentary on OG-Gen 49.1-15, on the basis of which it has been possible to discern and analyze the various patterns and anomalies of G's translation process. Vital to the task of elucidating the essence of the Hebrew *lettre* and determining how a LXX text has diverged from it at micro and macro levels has been the availability of statistical information. Detailed textual analysis is therefore an aspect of this thesis that distinguishes it from other investigations that have applied Berman's negative analytic to modern literary works. Moreover, it has been deemed to be beneficial to add *rescripting* to Berman's analytic as another valid "trial of the Foreign."

Van der Louw has observed that "translation procedures have not changed over 2000 years. Modern linguistic labels can be applied to ancient translations with surprising ease."⁶²⁹ The same can be said about Berman's negative analytic. Throughout this thesis, it has been demonstrated that Berman's deformations provide serviceable categories for analyzing and describing a translator's "work on the *lettre*" and thus a translation's literalness or adequacy—in other words, how faithful (or unfaithful) a text is to its *Vorlage*. Yet are Berman's deformations merely the inverse of van der Louw's transformations? In fact, no. Transformations focus mainly on the micro level (i.e. translation strategies employed to address problems in a specific context). However, Berman's deformations also take into account the entire, intricately-interwoven tapestry of the *lettre* at both the micro and the macro level, and they are also operative in the analysis of some critical elements (e.g. *networks of signification, ennoblement, rhythms*) that are distinctly different from van der Louw's analytical objectives. Of equal importance, Berman's negative analytic offers a synopsis of what has compromised the realization of the "Foreign"—a *lettre's* Self-Same—in a translation, with the understanding that a *positive* analytic would be a translation's faithfulness to the quality and quantity of a source text's signifiers (including its vernacular networks), as well as to its networks of signification, its rhythms, its expressions and idioms, etc.

One challenge regarding the employment of this research tool is the multi-faceted and multi-layered nature of the hermeneutical enterprise that is involved in assessing deforming tendencies. Sometimes, a given textual phenomenon may justifiably be categorized in accordance with several

⁶²⁹ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 57.

deformations. This is understandable given the complex interdependent relationships of the various elements that encompass a *lettre*. There may sometimes be grey areas when it comes to distinguishing between *qualitative impoverishment*, *rescripting*, and *destruction of networks of signification*. This may be attributable in part to the fact that a *lettre* is intrinsically interwoven as a systematic whole. Any alteration in meaning will invariably impact potential or possible hidden networks of signification. A researcher may highlight a deforming tendency while there may also be other coincident deformations in effect. For example, while the employment of both δέ and ἵνα to render the conjunction *vav* in OG-Gen 49.1-2 was classified as *clarification*, such translation choices could also conceivably have been described as *rationalization*. The decision to classify τὴν στρωμνὴν οὗ ἀνέβης (v. 4) as *rationalization* is linked to the fact that several deforming tendencies that contributed to this deformation are apparent in this Greek rendering. There is sometimes tension between attempting to give expression to the several deforming manifestations or to concisely summarize what seems to be the overarching “trial” in a word or phrase. When a researcher wrestles with this tension, Berman’s analytic can function as an investigative tool. In any case, it was already observed in chapter 2 (Methodology) that Berman’s analytic does entail hermeneutical considerations that will result in differences between researchers regarding choices of classification and/or emphasis. Such variations, however, can stimulate further scholarly discussion and thus deeper understanding.

A second type of challenge encountered while applying Berman’s analytic to Gen 49 specifically has to do with the investigation of Hebrew *hapax legomena*, rarely attested Greek words, or words in dubious text-critical readings in either the Hebrew *Vorlage* or its translation. This difficulty is exemplified in OG-Gen 49.5 by G’s choice of ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (or alternatively ἐξαίρεσεως αὐτῶν) to translate the obscure term מִכְרַתֵּיהֶם. Neither the LXX translators nor their translation notes are on hand to provide insight or clarity regarding their translation decisions. Moreover, as previously mentioned, proper assessment of an ancient translation’s vernacular network and its unique juxtaposition of languages is challenging. This is not to say that, at some point in the future, scholars may have the resources and data necessary to elucidate further such subtleties. At any rate, these limitations do not significantly diminish the efficacy of Berman’s analytic for LXX research.

Berman’s analytic is a promising investigative tool that can be effectively employed in LXX research. In future LXX investigations, it would be helpful to replace the descriptor “destruction,” which appears in some of Berman’s categories, with the more neutral term “deformation” (e.g. *deformation of linguistic patternings*; *deformation of expressions and idioms*). Furthermore, the focus could be on analyzing deformations of other sections of text in OG-Gen, providing a more complete

portrait of G's "work on the *lettre*." Berman's negative analytic will be particularly interesting for LXX texts that are thought to be freer translations of their respective *Vorlagen* (e.g. Isaiah, Job, or Proverbs). The results of such analyses could be compared to daughter translations of the LXX and could possibly also be contrasted with targumic texts, for example, as a means of discerning the difference(s) between translation and commentary. Additionally, deforming tendencies could be assessed in other Greek versions of the HB (such as "the Three") or in possible citations of the HB/LXX in Josephus, Philo, the New Testament, and/or patristic writings.

To conclude, this thesis constitutes another example of how Translation Studies can constructively provide analytical tools and insights for the study of ancient texts, complementing van der Louw's transformations and prior work done on the interlinear paradigm. LXX scholars who continue to tap into Translation Studies will undoubtedly discover even more means and methods of tracking the sometimes elusive yet intriguing trail of the LXX translators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Carbon, an-Mathieu, Saskia Peels-Matthey, and Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge. *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)*. <http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be>.
- Euripides. *Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba*. LCL 484. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Field, Frederick. *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1875.
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars, Volume I: Books 1-2*. LCL 117. Translated by A.D. Godley. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars, Volume II: Books 3-4*. LCL 118. Translated by A.D. Godley. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Homer. *Iliad. Volume II: Books 13-24*. LCL 171. Translated by A.T. Murray and revised by William F. Wyatt. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/>
- <https://www.papyri.info>.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Karl Elliger, Hans Peter Rüger, and Adrian Schenker, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *The Online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon*. Irvine: University of California, 2011.
<http://www.tlg.uci.edu/lsj>.
- Müller, Karl. *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum (FHG)*. Vol. 2. Paris: Didot, 1841-1870.
- Pantelia, Maria C. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae®: A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. University of California, Irvine. <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Plato. *Charmides. Alcibiades I and II. Hipparchus. The Lovers. Theages. Minors. Epinomis*. LCL 201. Translated by W.R.M. Lamb. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Strabo. *Geography. Volume 1: Books 1-2*. LCL 49. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1-2*. LCL 108. Translated by C.F. Smith. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Wevers, John William. *Genesis. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

Zuretti, Carlo Oreste. *Codices Hispanienses [Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 11.2]*. Brussels: Lamertin, 1934.

Secondary Sources: Biblical and Related Studies

Abraham, Kathleen. "Hebrew Names." In *Personal Names in Cuneiform Texts from Babylonia (c. 750–100 BCE): An Introduction*, edited by Caroline Waezegggers and Melanie M. Groß, 139–165. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Aitken, James. "The Literary Attainment of the Translator of Greek Sirach." In *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*, edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey and Jan Joosten, 95–126. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 150. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Arbuckle, Benjamin S. "Animals in the Ancient World." In *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*. Vol. 1, edited by Daniel T Potts, 201–219. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Barr, James. "Common Sense and Biblical Language." *Biblica* 49 (1968): 377–387.

—. "EPIZΩ and EPEIΔΩ in the Septuagint. A Note Principally on Gen. XLIX.6." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 19, no.2 (Autumn 1974): 198–215.

Black, Matthew. "The Semitic Element in the New Testament." *The Expository Times* 77 (1965–1966): 20–23.

Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Brayford, Susan. *Genesis. Septuagint Commentary Series*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Brock, Sebastian. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* (1978): 69–87.

—. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint." *Old Testament Studies* 17 (1972): 11–36.

Buchanan, George Wesley. "Eschatology and the End of Days." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

20, no. 3 (1961): 188-193.

Büchner, Dirk, ed. *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 67. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2017.

Cagnoli, Karlana M. "The Tree of the Sacred Text: Reflections on Greek Exodus in Dialogue with Antoine Berman." In *Themes and Texts, Exodus and Beyond: Essays in Honour of Larry J. Perkins*, edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert, Jonathan Numada, Dongshin Don Chang, and Kyung S. Baek, 89-103. Library of Second Temple Studies 101. London: T&T Clark, 2024.

Conybeare, Frederick C., and St. George Stock. *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. 1905. Expanded and reprinted, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Cooley, Jeffrey L. "Judean Onomastic Hermeneutics in Context." *Harvard Theological Review* 112, no. 2 (2019): 184-208. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816019000051>.

Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., and David Noel Freedman. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975.

Davies, Graham. "A Note on the Etymology of *HISTAH^AWĀH*." *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (January 1979): 493-495.

Davila, James R. "4QGen-Exod^a." In *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XII: Qumran Cave 4/VII*, edited by Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, 7-30. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Deissmann, Gustav Adolf. *Bible Studies: Contributions chiefly from papyri and inscriptions, to the history of language, the literature and the religion of Hellenistic Judaism and primitive Christianity*. Translated by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901.

Dillmann, August. *Die Genesis*. 4. Aufl. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1882.

Driver, Samuel. *The Book of Genesis*. London: Methuen, 1907.

Driver, Samuel. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of Deuteronomy*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Emerton, John A. *Studies on the Language and Literature of the Bible: Selected works by J. A. Emerton*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 165. Edited by Graham Davies and Robert Gordon. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. "Reactions to the Panel on Modern Translations." In *Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1988*, edited by Bernard

- A. Taylor, 233-240. Society for Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- . *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Gehman, Henry S. "Hebraisms of the Old Greek Version of Genesis." *Vetus Testamentum* 3, no. 2 (April 1953): 141-148.
- . "The Hebraic Character of the Septuagint." *Vetus Testamentum* 1, no. 2 (April 1951): 81-90.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis übersetzt und erklärt*. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Vol. 1.1. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Harl, Marguerite, ed. *La Genèse*. Vol. 1 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986.
- . "La Bible D'Alexandrie 1. The Translation Principles." In *Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1988*, edited by Bernard A. Taylor, 1981-1997. Society for Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Hiebert, Robert J.V. "Genesis: To the Reader." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 1-6. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . "Genesis." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 6-42. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . "The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis." In *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, 85-103. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . "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*, edited by Dirk Büchner, 17-67. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2017.
- . "Ruminations on Translating the Septuagint of Genesis in the Light of the NETS Project." In *"Translation is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, 71-86. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- . "Translating a Translation: The Septuagint of Genesis and the New English Translation of the Septuagint Project." In *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, edited by Bernard Taylor, 263-284. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

- . “Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version.” *Bulletin for the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33 (2000): 76-93.
- Holmstedt, Robert. “Hypotaxis.” In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by Geoffrey Khan, 220-222. Vol. 2, G-O. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Hoop, Raymond de. *Genesis 49 in Its Literary and Historical Context*. 1999. Reprint, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- . “The Meaning of *phz* in Classical Hebrew.” *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 10 (1997): 16-26.
- Joüon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rev. ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006.
- Karmon, Yehuda. “The Geography of Israel: Ancient and Modern.” *The Journal of Education Sociology* 36, no. 8 (April 1963): 363-370.
- Kirk, Allison. “Word Order and Information Structure in New Testament Greek.” PhD diss. Leiden University, Netherlands, 2012. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157>.
- Kooij, Arie von der. “Comments on NETS and La Bible D’Alexandrie.” In *Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1988*, edited by Bernard A. Taylor, 229-231. Society for Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Kotzé, Gideon R. “Lion Imagery in 1 Maccabees 3:4.” *Journal for Semitics* 24, no. 1 (2015): 326-351.
- Lee, John A.L. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . *The Greek of the Pentateuch: Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2011-2012*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Loader, William R.G. *Sexuality and Gender*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.
- Louw, Theo A.W. van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Martin, Michael Wade. “Does Ancient Hebrew Poetry Have Meter?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 140, no. 3 (2021): 503-529. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jbl.2021.0024>.
- McKay, K.L. *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Merwe, Christo H.J., van der, Jacobus A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: T&T Clark, 2017.

- Montevecchi, Orsolina. "LAOS, Linee di una ricerca storico-linguistico." In *Acts du XVème Congrès International de Papyrologie IV*, edited by Jean Bingen and Georges Nachtergaele, 52-67. Bruxelles: Fondation Egyptologique Reine Elisabeth, 1979.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- . "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model." In *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 221-235. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2008.
- Pérez Gondar, Diego. "La bendición de Judá en el testamento de Jacob: Gn 49, 8-12, su interpretación en el contexto intertestamentario y su recepción neotestamentaria." *Estudios biblicos* 75, no. 3 (2017): 355-383.
- Perkins, Larry. "The Greek Exodus Translator's [or Translators'] Rendering of אֱלֹהִים." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 82 (2020): 17-37.
- . "Israel's Military Characterization in Greek Exodus." In *Die Septuaginta—Orte und Intentionen 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014*, edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund, 550-563. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Pietersma, Albert. "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited." In *A Question of Methodology: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor, 359-378. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- Pietersma, Albert. "A New English Translation of the Septuagint." In *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*, edited by Bernard A. Taylor, 217-228. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- . "Messianism and the Greek Psalter: In Search of the Messiah." In *A Question of Methodology: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor, 243-270. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- . "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." In *A Question of Methodology: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor, 143-170. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- . "A Response to Muraoka's Critique of Interlinearity." In *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma, Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor, 315-337. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- . "The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles." In *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, edited by Dirk Büchner, 3-16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2017.

- Preuss, Dietrich Horst. “הוּוֹה, *hwh*.” In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 4, edited by Johannes Botterweck, 248-256. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- Prijs, Leo. *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Rajak, Tessa. *Translation and Survival. The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Redd, John Scott, Jr. “Constituent Postponement in Biblical Hebrew Verse. PhD diss. The Catholic University of America, 2012. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1961/10273>.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. *How the Bible is Written*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2019.
- Rösel, Martin. “Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta.” *Biblische Notizen* 79 (1995): 54-70.
- Rubin, Aaron. “Genesis 49:4 in Light of Arabic and Modern South Arabian.” *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 499-502.
- Runge, Steven. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
- Ryle, Herbert. *The Book of Genesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Sanders, Ed. 2013. “Sexual Jealousy and *Erôs* in Euripides’ *Medea*.” In *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, edited by Ed Sanders, Chiara Thumiger, Christopher Carey, Nick. J. Lowe, 41-57. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Schaller, George B. *The Serengeti Lion: A Study of Predator-Prey Relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Skinner, John. *Genesis*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910.
- Smith, Jannes. *Translated Hallelujahs: A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on Select Septuagint Psalms*. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. *Genesis*. Anchor Yale Bible. Yale: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Steiner, Richard C. “Does the Biblical Hebrew Conjunction -וֹ Have Many Meanings, One Meaning, or No Meaning at All?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119/2 (2000): 249-267.

- Steudel, Annette. “אֶחָרִית הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 16. 2 (62) (1993): 225-246.
- Strawn, Brent A. *What is Stronger Than a Lion?: Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005.
- Sukenik, Naama, Zohar Awar, Erez Ben-Yosef, David Iluz, Orit Shamir, and Alexander Varvak. “Early evidence of royal purple dyed textile from Timna valley (Israel).” *PLOS ONE* 16, no. 1 (January 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245897>.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900.
- . *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901.
- Taylor, Bernard A., ed. *Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1988*. Society for Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909. Reprint Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2008.
- Tov, Emanuel, “Gen 49 in the Septuagint – Trial and Error.” In *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide. Text-critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne*, edited by Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, 455-469. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 269. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- . “Loan-words, Homophony, and Transliterations in the Septuagint.” *Biblica* 60 (1979): 216-236.
- . “The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the ‘Alterations’ Inserted Into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 15 (1984): 65-89.
- . *The Septuagint of Genesis as the First Scripture Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- . *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Turner, Nigel. “The Unique Character of Biblical Greek.” *Vetus Testamentum* 5, no. 2 (April 1955): 208-213.
- Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

- Waltke, Bruce, and Michael O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, ID: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wenham, Gordon J. "Genesis." In *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, edited by James D.G. Dunn, 32-71. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003. <https://search-ebscohost-com.twu.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=2159669&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Edited and expanded by John C. Beckman. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Zuckermann, Ghil'ad. *Language Contact and Lexical Enrichment in Israeli Hebrew*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Secondary Sources: Translation Studies and Linguistics

- Berman, Antoine. "Criticism, Commentary and Translation: Reflections based on Benjamin and Blanchot." Translated by Luise von Flotow. In *Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, edited by Mona Baker, 92-113. Vol. 1. London: Routledge, 2009.
- . *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. Translated by S. Heyvaert. New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- . *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.
- . "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited and translated by Lawrence Venuti, 284-297. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Berman, Antoine, Isabelle Berman, and Valentina Sommella, *The Age of Translation: A Commentary on Walter Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator"*. Translated by Chantal Wright. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. "Berman and Toury: The Translating and Translatability of Research Frameworks." *Controversy in Translation Studies* 16, no. 1 (1st semester 2003): 93-120.
- Connor, Peter. "Reading Literature in Translation." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 425-437. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today* 11, no. 1 (1990): 9-26.
- Halliday, Michael. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.

- Hodges, Peter. "The Application of Berman's Theory as a Basis for Target Text Evaluation." *The AALITRA Review: A Journal of Literary Translation* 11 (May 2016): 48-49.
- Jafari, Zahra, and Amin Karimnia. "A Survey of Poetry Translation According to Antoine Berman's (1985) Text Deformation System: A Case Study of English Translation of Book II of *Mathnavi Manavi*." *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* 2, no. 2 (2015): 54-65.
- Kashifa, Afsheen. "Deforming Tendencies in the Urdu Translation of *The Old Man and the Sea*." Master's thesis, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, 2018.
- Larson, Mildred L. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998.
- Lefevere, André. *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977.
- Nida, Eugene. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.
- Sadeghi, Shaghayagh, and Bahram Mowlaie. "Contrastive Analysis of Political News Headlines Translation According to Berman's Deformative Forces." *Journal of Language and Translation* 8, no. 3 (September 2018): 31-43.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Perry Meisel and Haun Saussy. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Tasdan, Elif. "L'Étranger Strange to its Translation: Critical Analysis of the Turkish Translation of *L'Étranger* From Berman's Perspective," *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching* 5, no. 2 (June 2017): 314-323.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Benjamins Translation Library 4. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995.
- Uktolseya, Christy Maya. "Destruction of *Bekisar Merah*: Antoine Berman's Deforming Tendencies in *The Red Bekisar*." *K@ta: A Biannual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature* 19, no. 2 (December 2017): 41-47.
- Vamenani, Fahimeh, and Moslem Sadeghi. "An Examination of Berman's Negative Deformation Tendencies on [the] Persian Translation of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* Novel." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 7, no. 5 (September 2018): 135-143.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

APPENDIX 1

Trials of the Foreign: Gen 49.1-15

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
1	וּיקְרָא (ו)	δὲ	Clarification Destruction of linguistic patternings
*	יַעֲקֹב	Ἰακώβ	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	אֶל בָּנָיו	τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ (i.e. no preposition)	Quantitative impoverishment (negligible)
	וַאֲגִידָה לָכֶם	ἵνα ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν	Clarification (ἵνα purpose clause) Destruction of linguistic patternings
	לָכֶם	ὑμῖν	Destruction of linguistic patternings (negligible)
	אֲשֶׁר	τί	Destruction of linguistic patternings (negligible)
	בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים	ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν	Destruction of expressions and idioms
2	וּשְׁמַעוּ	ἀκούσατε	Quantitative impoverishment (no counterpart to <i>vav</i>) Destruction of linguistic patternings (no counterpart to <i>vav</i> ; no parataxis) Destruction of rhythms
	אֶל	-	Quantitative impoverishment (negligible)
*	יִשְׂרָאֵל	Ἰσραὴλ	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
3*	רְאוּבֵן	Ῥουβὴν	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	וּרְאִשִּׁית אוֹנִי	καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου,	Rescripting Destruction of underlying networks of signification (אין)

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
	יתר שאת	σκληρὸς φέρεισθαι	Rescripting (יתר) Destruction of underlying networks of signification (תותר-יתר [vv. 3-4]) Rescripting (שאת) Destruction of linguistic patternings (substantive to infinitive)
	ויתר עז	καὶ σκληρὸς αὐθάδης	Rescripting (יתר) Destruction of underlying networks of signification (תותר-יתר [vv. 3-4]) Rescripting (עז)
4	פחז(ת)	ἐξύβρισας	Qualitative impoverishment (wordplay, <i>double entendre</i>)
	תותר	ἐκζέσης	Qualitative impoverishment Destruction of underlying networks of signification (תותר-יתר [vv. 3-4])
	-	ἐπὶ	Expansion (negligible)
	משכבי	τὴν κοίτην	Quantitative impoverishment (change of accidance [plural MT and singular OG-Gen])
	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνὴν οὗ ἀνέβης	Quantitative impoverishment (missing first person possessive suffix in יצועי) Destruction of linguistic patternings (addition of adverb οὗ, so change of syntactic function [subordinate clause]); change of accidance (3 rd person to 2 nd person verb) Rationalization Expansion (addition of οὗ) Destruction of rhythms
5*	שמעון	Συμεών	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
*	לוי	Λευί	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
	כלי	συνετέλεσαν	Rescripting Destruction of linguistic patternings Expansion (implicit “they”) Destruction of rhythm
	חמס	ἀδικία	Destruction of networks of signification (macro level) Qualitative impoverishment
	מכרתיהם	ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν OR ἐξαιρέσεως αὐτῶν	Rescripting
6	בסדם אל תבא נפשי בקהלם אל תחד כבדי	εἰς βουλὴν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔλθοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἥπατά μου,	expansion destruction of rhythm
	בקהלם	ἐπὶ τῇ <u>συστάσει</u> αὐτῶν	Clarification
	תחד	ἐρείσαι	Qualitative impoverishment
	כבדי	τὰ ἥπατά μου	Destruction of networks of signification Destruction of linguistic patternings (singular to plural)
	איש	ἀνθρώπους	Destruction of linguistic patternings (singular to plural)
	וברצנם	καὶ ἐν τῇ <u>ἐπιθυμίᾳ</u>	Qualitative impoverishment
7	עז	αὐθάδης	Rescripting
8*	יהודה	Ἰούδα	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	יודוך	σὲ αἰνέσαισαν	Qualitative impoverishment (alliteration) Destruction of networks of signification (wordplay) Destruction of linguistic patternings (inversion of Hebrew pronominal suffix)
	אתה	-	Quantitative impoverishment
	יד	χεῖρες	Destruction of linguistic patternings: singular to plural (MT, but not SP).
	בערף	ἐπὶ νώτου	Rescripting

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
9	מטרף	ἐκ βλαστοῦ	Rescripting Destruction of networks of signification (root מטר in MT Genesis)
	לביא	σκύμνος	Rescripting
	רבץ	ἐκοιμήθης	Destruction of linguistic patternings (change of accident from 3 rd to 2 nd person) Qualitative impoverishment (different stance of lion)
	כרע; מטרף; גור אריה רבץ כאריה	σκύμνος λέοντος; ἐκ βλαστοῦ; ἀναπασών ἐκοιμήθης ὡς λέων	Qualitative impoverishment (the sound of /r/; alliteration and onomatopoeia)
10	שבט	ἄρχων	Destruction of networks of signification Clarification Qualitative impoverishment (loss of metonymy)
	מחקק	ἡγούμενος	Clarification Qualitative impoverishment (loss of metonymy)
	מבין	ἐκ	Quantitative impoverishment
	רגליו	τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ	Destruction of expressions and idioms
	[עד כִּי־יבא] שילה	[ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ] τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ	Expansion
	ולו [יקהת עמים]	καὶ αὐτὸς [προσδοκία ἐθνῶν]	Destruction of linguistic patternings
	יקהת	προσδοκία	Rescripting
	עמים	ἐθνῶν	Clarification
11	אסרי	δεσμεύων	Qualitative impoverishment
	לגפן	πρὸς ἄμπελον	Quantitative impoverishment (indefinite in Greek)
	לגפן עירה ולשרקה בני אתנו	πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἔλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ	Destruction of linguistic patternings (parallelism of ל)

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
	לשרקה	τῇ ἔλικι	Qualitative impoverishment (nuance of reddish colour)
	בני אתנו	τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ	Destruction of networks of signification (semantic leveling)
	סותה	τὴν περιβολὴν αὐτοῦ	Undetermined meaning
12	חכלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ [αὐτοῦ]	Rescripting Qualitative impoverishment (contrast of dark shade of eyes with the whiteness of milk)
	חכלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ	Expansion
	לבן-שנים	λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ	Expansion
	מין / מחלב	ἀπὸ οἴνου / ἢ γάλα	Destruction of linguistic patternings
13*	זבולן	Ζαβουλών	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	לחוף ימים	παράλιος	Clarification (Quantitative impoverishment, חוף)
	לחוף ימים לחוף אניות	παράλιος παρ' ὄρμον πλοίων	Qualitative impoverishment (חוף 1° not explicitly translated; loss of possible onomatopoeia)
	ירכתו	παρατενεῖ	Destruction of linguistic patternings
14*	יששכר	Ἰσσαχάρ	Qualitative impoverishment? (lack of signifying/iconic richness)
	חמר	τὸ καλόν	Rescripting Expansion (addition of definite article)
	גרם	ἐπεθύμησεν	Rescripting
	רבץ	ἀναπαυόμενος	Qualitative impoverishment
	המשפטים	τῶν κλήρων	Rescripting
15	וירא	καὶ ἰδὼν	Destruction of linguistic patternings
	מנחה	τὴν ἀνάπαισιν	Expansion (addition of definite article)
	נעמה	πίων	Clarification

vv.	Hebrew	Greek	Negative Analytic
	חמר/[חמד] / טוב רביץ / מנחה	τὸ καλόν / καλή ἀναπαυόμενος / τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν	Ennoblement (?)
	חמר / ויט שכמו / מס עבד	τὸ καλόν ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὥμον αὐτοῦ ἀνὴρ γεωργός	Destruction of networks of signification
	חמר	τὸ καλόν	Destruction of networks of signification regarding animal metaphors (vv. 9, 14, 17, 21, and 27).
	ויט שכמו	ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὥμον αὐτοῦ	Qualitative impoverishment Quantitative impoverishment (absence of conjunction) Destruction of rhythms (absence of conjunction)
	מס עבד	ἀνὴρ γεωργός	Rescripting Destruction of networks of signification

APPENDIX 2

Inventory of Deformations: Gen 49.1-15

1. Rationalization – TOTAL 1

v.	Hebrew	Greek
4	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνήν οὗ ἀνέβης

2. Clarification – TOTAL 8

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
1	ויקרא (ו)	δέ
1	ואגידה לכם	ἵνα ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν
6	בקהלם	ἐπὶ τῇ <u>συστάσει</u> αὐτῶν
10	שבט	ἄρχων
10	מחקק	ἡγούμενος
10	עמים	ἐθνῶν
13	לחוף ימים	παράλιος
15	נעמה	πίων

3. Expansion – TOTAL 9

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
4	-	ἐπὶ
4	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνήν οὗ ἀνέβης
5	כלי	συνετέλεσαν
6	בסדם אל תבא נפשי בקהלם אל תחד כבדי	εἰς βουλὴν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔλθοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου, <u>καὶ</u> ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἥπατά μου,
10	[עד כי יבא] שילה	[ἕως ἃν ἔλθῃ] τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῶ
12	חלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>
12	לבן שנים	λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες <u>αὐτοῦ</u>
14	חמר	τὸ καλόν
15	מנחה	τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν

4. Ennoblement and popularization – TOTAL 1

v.	Hebrew	Greek
15 ⁶³⁰	חמד/[חמד]/ טוב רבץ / מנחה	τὸ καλόν/καλή ἀναπαυόμενος / τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν

5. Qualitative Impoverishment – TOTAL 25 (*eliminating Hebrew names reduces this total to 17)

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
1*	יעקב	Ἰακώβ
2*	ישראל	Ἰσραήλ
3*	ראובן	Ῥουβήν
4	פחז(ת)	ἐξύβρισας
4	תותר	ἐκζέσης
5*	שמעון	Συμεών
5*	לוי	Λευί
5	חמס	ἀδικία
6	תחד	ἐρείσαι
6	וברצנם	καὶ ἐν τῇ <u>ἐπιθυμία</u>
8*	יהודה	Ἰούδα
8	יודוך	σὲ αἰνέσαισαν
8	בערף	ἐπὶ νώτου
9	רבץ	ἐκοιμήθης
9	כרע רבץ כאריה; מטסף; גור אריה	σκύμνος λέοντος; ἐκ βλαστοῦ; ἀναπесῶν ἐκοιμήθης ὡς λέων
10	שבט	ἄρχων
10	מחקק	ἡγούμενος
11	אסרי	δεσμεύων
11	לשרקה	τῇ ἔλικι
12	חכלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ [αὐτοῦ]
13*	זבולן	Ζαβουλών
13	לחוף ימים לחוף אניות	παράλιος παρ' ὄρμον πλοίων

⁶³⁰ This is qualified as merely a possible instance of *ennoblement*.

14*	יששכר	Ἰσσαχάρ
14	רבץ	ἀναπαυόμενος
15	ויט שכמו	ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὄμῳ αὐτοῦ

6. Quantitative Impoverishment - TOTAL 10

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
1	אל בניו	τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ (i.e. no preposition)
2	ושמעו	ἀκούσατε
2	אל	-
4	משכבי	τὴν κοίτην
4	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνήν οὗ ἀνέβης
8	אתה	-
10	מבין	ἐκ
11	לגפן	πρὸς ἄμπελον
13	לחוף ימים	παράλιος
15	ויט שכמו	ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὄμῳ αὐτοῦ

7. Destruction of rhythms – TOTAL 4

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
2	ושמעו	ἀκούσατε
4	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνήν οὗ ἀνέβης
5	כלי	συνετέλεσαν
6	בסדם אל תבא נפשי בקהלם אל תחד כבדי	εἰς βουλήν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔλθοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου, <u>καὶ</u> ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἥπατά μου,

8. Destruction of underlying networks of signification – TOTAL 12

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
3	יתר	Σκληρός
3	ויתר	καὶ σκληρός
3	עז	αὐθάδης
4	תותר	ἐκζέσης
5	חמס	ἀδικία
6	כבדי	τὰ ἥπατά μου
8	יודוך	σὲ αἰνέσαισαν
9	מטרף	ἐκ βλαστοῦ
10	שבט	ἄρχων

11	בני אתנו	τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ
15	חמר / וַיֵּט שְׁכֵמוֹ מִסַּעַבְדֵּי	τὸ καλόν ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὄμον αὐτοῦ ἀνὴρ γεωργός /
	חמר	τὸ καλόν (animal metaphors in vv. 9, 14, 17, 21, and 27)

9. Destruction of linguistic patternings – TOTAL 18

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
1	(ו) ויקרא	δέ
1	ואגידה לכם	ἵνα ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν
1	לכם	ὑμῖν (no preposition)
1	אֲשֶׁר	τί
2	ושמעו	ἀκούσατε
3	שאת	Φέρεσθαι
4	יצועי עלה	τὴν στρωμνήν οὗ ἀνέβης
5	כלי	συνετέλεσαν
6	כבדי	τὰ ἥπατά μου
6	איש	ἀνθρώπους
8	יודוך	σὲ αἰνέσασαν
8	יד	χεῖρές
9	רבץ	ἐκοιμήθης
10	ולו [יקהת עמים]	καὶ αὐτὸς [προσδοκία ἐθνῶν]
11	לגפן עירה ולשרקה בני אתנו	πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἔλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ
12	מיין / מחלב	ἀπὸ οἴνου / ἢ γάλα
13	ירכתו	παρατενεῖ
15	וירא	καὶ ἰδὼν

10. Destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization - Undetermined

vv.	Hebrew	Greek

11. Destruction of expressions and idioms – TOTAL 2

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
1	באחרית הימים	ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν

10	רגליו	τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ
----	-------	-----------------

12. Effacement of the superimposition of languages - Undetermined

vv.	Hebrew	Greek

13. Rescripting – TOTAL 16

vv.	Hebrew	Greek
3	יתר	σκληρός
3	שאת	φέρεισθαι
3	ויתר	καὶ σκληρός
3	עז	αὐθάδης
5	כלי	συνετέλεσαν
5	מכרתיהם	ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν OR ἐξαιρέσεως αὐτῶν
7	עז	αὐθάδης
8	בערף	ἐπὶ νώτου
9	מטרף	ἐκ βλαστοῦ
9	לביא	σκύμνος
10	יקהת	προσδοκία
12	חכלילי עינים	χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ [αὐτοῦ]
14	חמר	τὸ καλόν
14	גרם	ἐπεθύμησεν
14	המשפתים	τῶν κλήρων
15	מס עבד	ἀνὴρ γεωργός