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This dissertation examines the function in Biblical Hebrew (H) and translation into Greek in the Septuagint (G) of 'ayyeh, yesh, 'ôd, 'ên, and hinneh, which belong to a H form-class called "predicators of existence".

A translator-centered study, it addresses one aspect of the matrix used to characterize translation technique—namely, consistency of rendering. It asks how each word functions in H in order to determine how the translators may have understood it. It then discusses its translation in every passage where the usual rendering was not used (book by book).

Each word has a usual rendering; these can be divided between those which entail a form of eimi and those which do not, reflecting both the nature of the syntagms within which these words occur, and their primary functions.

'ayyeh (pou eimi) yesh (eimi), and 'ên (ou eimi) are primarily syntagmatic predicators of existence and only secondarily, if at all, adverbs.

'ôd is usually represented by eti, which entails both its functions of continuance and repetition. hinneh, which functions as a deictic predicator syntagmatically and as a discourse-level particle supra-syntagmatically, is usually rendered by idou, which recognizes its function in deixis, but not in discourse.

The characterization of the translation technique of the individual books of G which resulted from this study was compared to, and found basically to agree with, the results of other such studies, indicating the appropriateness and value of studying only one aspect of the matrix of characterization. Brief excurses address (1) the need for caution in asserting the unity of the translation of the Minor Prophets in light of this study; and (2) the benefit of studying the translation of synonyms assists both G and H lexicology.
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DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Representation of the Hebrew Predicators of Existence in the Septuagint

by Frederic C. Putnam

This dissertation examines the function in Biblical Hebrew (H) and translation into Greek in the Septuagint (G) of 'ayyeh, yesh, 'ôd, 'ên, and hinneh, which belong to a H form-class called "predicators of existence".

A translator-centered study, it addresses one aspect of the matrix used to characterize translation technique--namely, consistency of rendering. It asks how each word functions in H in order to determine how the translators may have understood it. It then discusses its translation in every passage where the usual rendering was not used (book by book).

Each word has a usual rendering; these can be divided between those which entail a form of eimi and those which do not, reflecting both the nature of the syntagms within which these words occur, and their primary functions.

'ayyeh (pou eimi) yesh (eimi), and 'ên (ou eimi) are primarily syntagmatic predicators of existence and only secondarily, if at all, adverbs.
`âd is usually represented by ēti, which entails both its functions of continuance and repetition. Hinneh, which functions as a deictic predicator syntagmatically and as a discourse-level particle suprasyntagmatically, is usually rendered by ìdou, which recognizes its function in deixis, but not in discourse.

The characterization of the translation technique of the individual books of G which resulted from this study was compared to, and found basically to agree with, the results of other such studies, indicating the appropriateness and value of studying only one aspect of the matrix of characterization. Brief excurses address (1) the need for caution in asserting the unity of the translation of the Minor Prophets in light of this study; and (2) the benefit of studying the translation of synonyms assists both G and H lexicology.
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\[
\text{we`attah,}
\text{lô 'asher 'ahab 'otanû}
\text{úbëdamô gë'alânû}
\text{rëxatsanû mexaTTo'tênu}
\text{wayya'as 'otanû}
\text{limë lakîm}
\text{wekohë'nîm l'elohîm 'abîw;}
\text{lô}
\text{hakkabôd we'ha'oz}
\text{lë'îlam 'îlamîm.}
\text{'amen.}
\]
CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ........................................... i
Abbreviations ............................................... vi

INTRODUCTION ............................................. 1

CHAPTER ONE: 'ayyeh ....................................... 2

'ayyeh in H .................................................. 3
Summary ...................................................... 4

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE .................................... 5
Usual Rendering ............................................. 5
Renderings of 'ayyeh in G ................................ 5
pou in G ..................................................... 6
Synonyms of 'ayyeh in G .................................. 6
'ay/'ey and Combinations ................................ 6
'ay ............................................................ 6
'ey-zeh ...................................................... 6
'ey-mizzeh ................................................ 6
'ey-lazot .................................................. 6
'ephoh ....................................................... 6
Summary ...................................................... 7

CHAPTER TWO: yesh ......................................... 8

yesh in H .................................................... 9
Summary ...................................................... 10

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE .................................... 11
Usual Rendering ............................................. 11
Renderings of yesh in G .................................. 11
Summary ...................................................... 12

CHAPTER THREE: 'ôd ......................................... 13

'ôd in H ..................................................... 14
'Tôd with Affixes .......................................... 14
Summary ...................................................... 15
CHAPTER FOUR: 'ên

.TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE
Usual Rendering
Renderings of 'ên in G
Renderings of 'ên with Affixes
Synonyms of 'ên in G
'ephes
Summary

.hinneh in H
.hinneh with Pronominals
Summary

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE
Usual Rendering
Renderings of hinneh in G
Renderings of hinneh with Affixes
Synonyms of hinneh in G
hen
'reeh
idou in G
Summary

CONCLUSION

BIBLIOGRAPHY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table/Graph</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
<td>Distribution of 'ayyeh.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 1.1.1</td>
<td>'ayyeh: Occurrences</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 1.1.2</td>
<td>'ayyeh: Frequency</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.2</td>
<td>Renderings of 'ayyeh.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 1.2.1</td>
<td>'ayyeh: Summary of Renderings</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 1.2.2</td>
<td>'ayyeh: Renderings by Book</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 1.2.3</td>
<td>'ayyeh: Usual Rendering by Book</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.1</td>
<td>Distribution of yesh.</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 2.1.1</td>
<td>yesh: Occurrences</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 2.1.2</td>
<td>yesh: Frequency</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.2</td>
<td>Renderings of yesh.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 2.2.1</td>
<td>yesh: Summary of Renderings</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 2.2.2</td>
<td>yesh: [Eim] &amp; Other Renderings</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 2.2.3</td>
<td>yesh: Usual Rendering by Book</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.3</td>
<td>Forms of [E] Used to Render yesh</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 2.3.1</td>
<td>yesh: Forms of [E]</td>
<td>106a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1</td>
<td>Distribution of 'od</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 3.1.1</td>
<td>'od: Occurrences</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 3.1.2</td>
<td>'od: Frequency</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2</td>
<td>Renderings of 'od</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 3.2.1</td>
<td>'od: Summary of Renderings</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 3.2.2</td>
<td>'od: Renderings by Book</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 3.2.3</td>
<td>'od: Usual Rendering by Book</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1</td>
<td>Distribution of 'en</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 4.1.1</td>
<td>'en: Occurrences</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 4.1.2</td>
<td>'en: Frequency</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2</td>
<td>Renderings of 'en</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 4.2.1</td>
<td>'en: Summary of Renderings</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 4.2.2</td>
<td>'en: Renderings by Book</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 4.2.3</td>
<td>'en: Usual Rendering by Book</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 5.1</td>
<td>Distribution of hinneh.</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 5.1.1</td>
<td>hinneh: Occurrences</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 5.1.2</td>
<td>hinneh: Frequency</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.2</td>
<td>Renderings of hinneh.</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 5.2.1</td>
<td>hinneh: Summary of Renderings</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 5.2.2</td>
<td>hinneh: Renderings by Book</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph 5.2.3</td>
<td>hinneh: Usual Rendering by Book</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASFDHL</td>
<td>ANNALES ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM FENNICAE, DISSERTATIONES HUMANARUM LITTERARUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>THE ANCHOR BIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJSLL</td>
<td>AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AFROASIATIC LINGUISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDB</td>
<td>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, eds. HEBREW-ENGLISH LEXICON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>BIBLIA HEbraica stuttgartensia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIB</td>
<td>BIBLICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOSCS</td>
<td>BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>THE BIBLE TRANSLATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>CURRENT TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTiL</td>
<td>Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Greek Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKC</td>
<td>GESENIUS'S HEBREW GRAMMAR, edited by Kautsch and translated by Cowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbAT</td>
<td>HANDBUCH ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT</td>
<td>HANDKOMMENTAR ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>INTERPRETER'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDBS</td>
<td>IDB, SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOSCS</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNSL</td>
<td>JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBL³</td>
<td>Koehler and Baumgartner, eds., HEBRÄISCHE LEXICON (3rd edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Minor Prophets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTAT</td>
<td>OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN TRANSLATION AND TEXTLINGUISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTS</td>
<td>OUDESTAMENTISCHE STUDIEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>REVUE BIBLIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBT</td>
<td>THE BIBLE TRANSLATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>VETUS TESTAMENTUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>WORD BIBLICAL COMMENTARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>ZEITSCHRIFT FUR DIE ALTTESTAMENTLICHE WISSENSCHAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSGS</td>
<td>ZEITSCHRIFT FUR VERGLEICHENDE SPRACHFORSCHUNG AUF DEM GEBIETE DER INDOGERMANISCHEN SPRACHENNAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLICAL REFERENCES</td>
<td>TRANSLITERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn Genesis</td>
<td>'aleph (alpha)</td>
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<td>shewa (ps)</td>
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</table>
| Zc Zechariah        | xateph-patax (w)
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| Jb Job              | segol, tsere    |
| Pr Proverbs         | xireq           |
| Ru Ruth             | gibbuts         |
| SS Song             | shewa           |
| Qo Qohelet          | xateph-patax    |
| La Lamentations     | tsere-yod       |
| Es Esther           | xireq-yod       |
| Dn Daniel           | shureq          |
| Ez Ezra             | xvii            |
| Ne Nehemiah         |                  |
| C1 1 Chronicles     |                  |
| C2 2 Chronicles     |                  |
understanding of the Hebrew text from which he worked. In order to discern the reasons for his choice of means by which to represent H, therefore, I analyze the meanings which he could have ascribed to H. 6

The next step is to describe and attempt to explain both its usual representation in G and other renderings used by the translators. 7 In several cases it is also necessary both to discuss the use and translation of a word's synonyms in H, and to ask whether or not a particular word in G may have been used as an emphatic insertion by the translators.

The results of this study enable me to arrange the units of G on a continuum from "consistent" to "inconsistent"--an assignment which I also compare to the typologies of other studies that rank the units of G on the more general continuum from "literal" to "free".

THE TYPOLOGY OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE
"Typology" here refers to our attempt to characterize the methods of the translators of G on the basis of a

---

6 This does not, of course, obviate the need for and value of studying the LXX as a text in its own right (Muraoka, ibid.). It merely clarifies this approach's role in the study of translation technique.

7 The latter on a case-by-case basis, working through the units of G.
reconstruction of those methods. This reconstruction is an important step in the textual criticism and retroversion of G. Further, since different translators dealt differently with their Vorlage, it is necessary to discuss the translation technique, not of G, but of the units of G, if this discussion is to further the process of retroversion.

Therefore the units of G are generally classified with regard to translation technique along a continuum ranging from "literal" to "free". This is often taken to imply "good" to "poor", but these terms must be understood as descriptive, not prescriptive: "literal" translators were no better or worse than those who were

---

8 We can attempt to reconstruct both the work of the original translators and that of their revisers; this dissertation addresses the former only.

The question of which text we try to reconstruct is also addressed in Tov, TCU (30-34, 40-46, esp. the literature cited on 42). On the nature of textual criticism and retroversion cf. further Anneli Aejmalaeus, "What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?" ZAW 99 (1987):58-89, esp. 58-65.

9 I use "unit" as a neutral term that may refer to books or to larger or smaller sections putatively the work of one translator (e.g., MP).

On the need to discuss the translation technique of the units of G separately cf. Aejmalaeus, "What Can We Know" (63f).

10 Cf. Barr's discussion of the common [mis]understanding of these terms (TYPOLOGY, 279f). See also Tov's careful discussion of these terms (TCU, 50-66).
"free".  The placement of a book along this continuum, however, does indicate a greater or lesser degree of statistical certainty in reconstructing its Vorlage by helping the textual critic who is weighing the value of variant readings in G and H.

The characterization of a translation unit, however, does not foreordain the choice of a particular reading, since in itself the characterization represents merely the sum (or average) of individual readings. G may well reflect H in 96% of Qo, but this does not mean that we may presume to prefer the reading of G over that of H at any point by 24:1. Although characterization certainly denotes tendencies in the relative value of G and H in a given unit, each instance must still be approached individually, without reference to the character of the whole, since a given text may either contribute to that overall characterization or work

---

11Cf. Lyons, LANGUAGE: Translation is relative to the purpose for which a particular translation is intended and to the assumed background of those who will use it. It is for this reason that so-called literal translation is at times more appropriate than free translation. . . . [Literal translation is] the kind of translation which fails to make adjustments for differences of symbolism and metaphor in the two languages [and is an example of the] more or less deliberate use of loan-translation ... (326).
against it (by being part of the 4%). The certainty of a particular reading is not, therefore, determined by the nature of the unit within which it lies. The logical sequence is precisely opposite.¹²

Another potential misunderstanding of the characterization of style is that literal and free entail a value judgment concerning the "accuracy" of a translation--how well the translator represented his Vorlage.¹³ Characterization of a particular unit as "literal" or "free" should be a nearly mechanical (at best statistical) computation of the ways in which the translator represented the individual and several elements of his Vorlage.¹⁴ If not, it may be based on educated hunches, or become, at worst, anecdotal. A translator who used one word in G to render a word in H

¹²"Weather reports" provide an apt analogy. A "100% chance of showers" does not mean that the Lord will flip a switch, but that every time meteorological conditions have been what they are today, there have been showers; "50% chance" means that on half of the days with similar conditions, etc.

¹³Cf. the fifth element in Tov's typological matrix (above), although "how well" (here) implies more than simply lexical choice.

was consistent; one who used several renderings was less so.\textsuperscript{15}

This dissertation shows that consistency—admittedly incomplete as a basis for typologizing a unit\textsuperscript{16}—nonetheless produces results generally consonant with other studies that assess translation technique.

\textbf{THE PREDICATORS OF EXISTENCE}

When 'ayyeh, 'ên, hinneh, yesh, and 'ôd are mentioned in the grammars and lexica of H, it is usually under the

\textsuperscript{15}For an extended discussion of consistency as it relates to "literal" and "free" cf. Barr, TYPOLOGY (305-14).

the degree to which a word in the source text is translated by one word in the translation (lexical equivalent), relative to the total number of occurrences of the word in the source text.

\textsuperscript{16}"Incomplete" in that it addresses only one of the elements that Tov identifies as entailing the multi-dimensional matrix that enables us to typify the translation of a given unit (TCU, 54-60).

Barr, TYPOLOGY, discusses the relationship between consistency and "literalism" extensively (305-314).
rubric of adverb or particle, but never, to my knowledge, are they discussed as a syntactical group.

A study of the predicators of existence and their clauses is, properly speaking, an examination of a type of verbless clause, since they normally occur in clauses without finite verbal forms. Despite extensive work on the verbless (or nominal) clause in H, this analysis has not been undertaken. Nor has the translation technique used to render the predicators of existence as a group been studied.

In classifying them I have adopted the theory of

17 This is not entirely incorrect because ever since Aristotle "distinguished words which have meaning in isolation and those which are merely grammatical tools" (Stephen Ullman, SEMANTICS: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF MEANING [London: Blackwell & Mott, 1962; reprint ed., New York: Barnes & Noble, 1979]:3), words which are, at first sight, neither nouns nor verbs have been lumped into the category of particles. It is also a half-truth because some of the predicators of existence function both as adverbs and, in other passages, as predictors of adverbs.

18 Cf. Andersen, VERBLESS CLAUSE, 23: "Analysis of the clauses in which they occur "needs to be separated from [the analysis of] verbless [clauses], even though they are interrelated by important transformations."

This dissertation is not a study in transformational grammar, nor does it attempt to solve the problems of verbal origins and development, for which cf., i.a., Carleton T. Hodge, "Reflections on Verbs 'To Be'," AFROASIATIC LINGUISTICS 2 (1975):69-75.

19 The exception is hinneh: cf., e.g., Martin Johannessohn, "Das biblische kai idou in der Erzählung samt seiner hebräischen Vorlage," ZSGS 66 (1939):145-195; 67 (1942):30-84.
"form-class", which in rests in turn on that of inter-
substitutability.\textsuperscript{20}

The concept of inter-substitutability was developed
to expedite phonemicization of phonological structures
within languages—especially allophones, and then
extended to other aspects of linguistic research. The
inter-substitutability of two or more linguistic
elements is determined by analyzing their distribution\textsuperscript{21}
in order to determine the degree to which they are

\textsuperscript{20}Cf. Robert P. Stockwell, "The Counterrevolution:
Generative Grammar"; in READING ABOUT LANGUAGE, edited
by Laird & Gorrell (New York: Harcourt, Brace,
Jovanovich, 1971): 217-224:
"Grouping by classes is a result of
similarity in the way words combine
with other words ... [A class
represents] "the various
intersections of the syntactic
features required for the
description of the way words can
combine in [a] language. . . . [Any
words] "with the same set of
syntactic features [are] identical
in [their] combinatory behavior
(total intersection of syntactic
features) ... [and] would be similar
to the extent that they shared any
of these syntactic features (partial
intersection)" (221).

\textsuperscript{21}John Lyons, LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS: AN
INTRODUCTION (Cambridge: University Press, 1981): "... the
distribution of an entity is the set of contexts in
which it occurs throughout the sentences of a language"
(85).
synonymous or to which they share the same function (distribution):22

Two or more entities have the same distribution if and only if they occur in the same environment—i.e. they are substitutable for one another, intersubstitutable—in all contexts (subject to the condition of well-formedness).23

A form-class therefore consists of a group of words, all of which have the same syntactic function.24 Entities can also overlap or be in complementary distribution.25 On these bases, the words discussed in

22"To the extent that languages are rule-governed systems, every linguistic entity that is subject to the rules of a language-system [= Saussure's langue] has a characteristic distribution" (Lyons, LANGUAGE, 86).

23Lyons (LANGUAGE, 86). He uses "entity" because "the notion of distribution ... is relevant ... in phonology, ... grammar and semantics" (85).

24Lyons, LANGUAGE: "Though there is an intrinsic connection between the meaning of forms and their distribution, it is their distribution alone that is of direct concern to the grammarian. [In studying grammatical theory, we] must be able to think of the distribution of forms independently of their meaning" (111f).

Their relative syntactic synonymity is interpreted distributionally. Words that are intersubstitutable have the same distribution and therefore share the same syntactic function (Lyons, ibid., 111).

Thus morphology does not necessarily determine syntactical function or class (although it can certainly be a guide), since usage precedes structure in determining syntactical classification. [This ties in nicely with the concept of translator-centered analysis of translation technique.]

25Lyons, ibid. Although the predicators of existence are largely inter-substitutable, their distribution is neither synonymous nor complementary, but overlapping.
this dissertation belong to a form-class, that of "predicators of existence." ²⁶

'ayyeh, 'ên, hinneh, yesh, 'ôd have been called "particles", ²⁷ since in most schemata this includes all words other than nouns and verbs but which, for that very reason is relatively meaningless except on a "macro-grammatical" level.

When the predicators of existence have a pronominal subject, it is normally suffixed according to a regular, albeit incomplete, paradigmatic structure. This sets them off syntactically from both particles and most other forms in H. ²⁸ Their function differs from that of most particles, which tend to complement the main clause. The predicators of existence are indispensable components of the syntactical core, and cannot be removed without changing, often significantly, the sense of the sentences within which they occur.


²⁷ E.g., GKC (§§99-105); also above.

²⁸ Cf. the suffix-conjugation of the verb, suffixed subjects on infinitives absolute, and subjective genitives used with participles.
They are often called "adverbs"29, but the traditional definition of an adverb as a "word that modifies a verb" does not describe their syntactic context, since they usually occur in verbless clauses.30

They have also been called "nouns" or "nominal verbs",31 on the basis of their putative etymology, but this does not recognize their function(s) in H.

Francis I. Andersen designated yesh, ᴾḏ, and hinneh "quasi verbals,"32 but since they entail none of

29 GKC (§100o), under "Particles"; Jouyon, GRAMMAIRE, discusses 'ayyeh under "Adverbes interrogatifs" (§102i), and the other members of the class as "Adverbes avec suffixes" (§102k).

30 Hinneh and ᴾḏ both function much more frequently as adverbs than as predicates of existence; they belong to the form-class because of their intersubstitutability with the other members in certain syntagms.

31 Heinrich Ewald, SYNTAX OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; translated by James Kennedy (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1879): "The whole family of particles which, without being verbs, yet have their meaning, and which may therefore be briefly designated nominal-verbs, consists of nouns (except such words as hinneh "behold", and 'ayyeh "where?") originally in the construct state, which require their proper complement" (§286h).


32 Francis I. Andersen, THE HEBREW VERBLESS CLAUSE IN THE PENTATEUCH, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974): "Besides verbal and verbless clauses, Hebrew has a class of clause in which predication is manifested by such quasi verbals as yes, ᴾḏ, hinne, etc." (23).

He explains his choice of this term: "Because they have paradigms, with pronoun suffixes (inflections, if
the morphological characteristics of the Hebrew verbal paradigm,\(^\text{33}\) and principally predicate existence, a more accurate description of their function is "predicators of existence"\(^\text{34}\).

As this dissertation demonstrates, the members of the group merely assert or inquire about the existence\(^\text{35}\) or non-existence of a substantive subject: hinneh and yesh refer to present locative and temporal existence ("Here is/are ..." "There is/are ...," "There exist[s] ..." ); 'ayyeh inquires about present locative existence ("Where is/are ...?"); êd predicates continuing existence ("... still is/are/ exist[s]" ); ên predicates lack of existence ("There is/are no(t) ..." ).

\(^{33}\) "Verbal paradigm" here refers to the sets of finite forms of the verb which occur in the matrix formed by the intersections of the inflectional (grammatical) categories of tense, person, number, gender, etc. Cf. Matthews, MORPHOLOGY (67).

\(^{34}\) This term was coined, so far as I know, by Lambdin in INTRODUCTION (§§133, 135-137). He identifies these words as the members of this class (although he does not appeal to the concept of form-class).

\(^{35}\) Andersen (private communication, 11 November 1985) twice mentions their predicative function in his discussion of the term "quasi verbal" (above).
An important characteristic which they share—indeed, the primary morphological characteristic that differentiates them from other particles—is the suffixation of their pronominal subject (above). 36

The predicators of existence meet the general linguistic criteria of "function words":37 they belong to a small class and their distribution is strongly determined by the syntactic rules of H, i.e., their syntactical distribution is relatively circumscribed.

"To" is an a function word in English in sentence (a):

(a) I want to go home
(b) *I want go home

36 These are not the only non-verbal predicates in H, nor are they the only words with suffixed pronominal subjects (cf., e.g., infinitives construct). They are non-verbs that normally function as the predicate of the clause within which they lie, but without the semantic content of full words (verbs, nouns, adjectives). Other predicates are usually either descriptive or classificatory (Andersen, VERBLESS CLAUSE, 32), while these predicate existence "tout court" (Jolion, GRAMMAIRE, §154k), the different words emphasizing different facets of that existence.

37"Linguists sometimes draw a distinction between full words, belonging to the major parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs), and so-called function words of various kinds, including [in English] the definite article, prepositions, conjunctions, the negative particle . . . such function words belong to classes of small membership and their distribution tends to be very strongly determined by the syntactic rules of the language, and very often they play the same role as inflectional variation does in other languages" (Lyons, LANGUAGE (158)).
"To" adds no information to (a), but is essential to its grammatical well-formedness; its absence means that (b) is not well-formed, even though (b) may communicate. 38

"To" meets the requirement of English "want [+ verb]."
The sentence cannot be considered well-formed without it, but "to" adds no semantic content.

The content of the predicators of existence has not been widely discussed, probably because these words do not have wide ranges of meaning: function words tend to be less lexical than full words, 39 although it will become clear that the several of the predicators of existence lie among the more lexemic function words.

This dissertation therefore contributes to the lexica of both H and G, as well as to the discussion of consistency as it relates to translation technique.

38 (b) may not communicate accurately, however, since without "to" (b) cannot specify who will or should go.

39"It is generally accepted that function words are less lexical than full words (including most adverbs), and that they are lexical in varying degrees. In the limiting case, where a function word must occur in a given syntactic construction, it has no lexical meaning at all [as, e.g., the word "to" in "He likes to eat."]

But between the limiting case of purely grammatical words, without lexical meaning, and full lexemes at the other extreme, there are many subclasses of function words, which, without being full lexemes, contribute some measure of lexical meaning to the sentences in which they occur" (Lyons, ibid.).
METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

Certain assumptions underly this study. I assume that each translator knew both Hebrew and Greek, probably more fully and idiomatically than we. If the translators knew at least some of the nuances of H, we too must be familiar with the various ways in which a word was used in H in order to understand the basis of the translators' choice of a particular rendering in general as well as in a given passage. The uses and meanings of each Hebrew word therefore form the basis for evaluating the translation equivalent used in any given passage of G. Study of syntax in G should involve "a detailed comparison between the Hebrew and Greek texts."^40

The translation equivalent(s) of a particular word cannot be analyzed simply on the basis of the total occurrences of the word in H. If the meaning of a word varies widely, it would be meaningless to say that it is rendered by five or more equivalents in Greek since the equivalent used in each passage could be that required by the meaning or function which the Hebrew word has in that passage. If, on the other hand, the meaning of a Hebrew word varies widely, but a single translation equivalent is used in every or nearly every passage in which it occurs, we might conclude that the translator

^40 Aejmelaus, PARATAxis (1).
was more concerned to represent the Hebrew form than the nuances of its meaning. In either case, understanding the use(s) of H allows us to estimate more accurately the extent of the translators' understanding of the uses of the Hebrew term,\textsuperscript{41} and the degree to which he attempted to reproduce that in his translation.

I also assume that the goal of all translation, including that of G, is the representation of the meaning and intent of the source in the receptor language. This implies that the translators of G expressed the meaning of H as they understood it in the way in which they thought Greek most closely represented that meaning.\textsuperscript{42}

I therefore investigate and describe the function of each predicator of existence before analyzing its translation, especially the choice of the usual rendering. This analysis examines not only the semantic choices involved in rendering H into G, but the syntactic and grammatical choices as well, especially if other words were available.


\textsuperscript{42} Cf. again Lyons's statement: Translation is relative to the purpose for which a particular translation is intended and to the assumed background of those who will use it (Lyons, LANGUAGE (326)).
I then examine the renderings of the word in each book of G, and (especially) analyze those passages in which the usual equivalent is not found. Conclusions characterize each book's position on the "consistent - inconsistent" continuum"; each chapter's text ends with a discussion of the translation of the predicator of existence.

Statistical information regarding each word's occurrence in H and translation in G may be found in the tables and graphs following each chapter.43

A NOTE ON THE TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM

The transliteration system is an adaptation of that used by CATSS.44 The main difference is in the use of lower-rather than upper-case letters, and the substitution of some smaller signs (e.g., \( \_ \) for \( \) ) in order to maintain relative scale. Some less transparent symbols are also replaced with [largely] phonetic equivalents (e.g., sh

---

43 I consider the predicators of existence in order from the least to the most frequent. Statistics for occurrences for all words are taken from a comparison of lexica (BDB, KBL3) and concordances (Even-Shoshan, Mandelkern). In the course of my study I have needed to correct some of these references; these have been incorporated into the totals without remark. Restored readings, however, are noted at first mention.

44 For information on this project see, i.a., Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, "Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies" BIOSCS 14 (1981):22-40; and frequent articles in BIOSCS.
for $. The differences between the two systems, in alphabetical order, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>CATSS</th>
<th>Herein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEBREW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aleph</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tet</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayin</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsade</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shin</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eta</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theta</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psi</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathing marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smooth</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rough</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These charts do not list the upper- vs. lower-case letters, since these correspond.
Chapter One: 'ayyeh

'ayyeh is the least common predicator of existence, occurring fifty-five times in seventeen biblical books,\(^1\) including three occurrences in Hosea (13.10, 14 [bis]), where I restore 'ayyeh for 'ehi\(^2\). This number does not include Job 15.23, where I read 'ayyah "vulture, eagle" for 'ayyeh.\(^3\)

'ayyeh has cognates in several Semitic languages;\(^4\) within H 'ayyeh is related to 'ay "Where?"\(^5\)

---

1See Tables 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.

2These are sometimes read as lcs jussive (hayah), but this fits neither the syntax, nor the context. G also recognized that these function as 'ayyeh, rendering all three by pou.

3This is based on evidence from the versions, especially G, and on the syntax and semantics of BH. The H root n dü implies aimless wandering, not intentional searching or seeking. In addition, without inserting "saying" before 'ayyeh, the syntax does not fit any other occurrences of 'ayyeh, which always fronts its clause. Cf. also Dhorme, JOB, ad loc.

4Cf. Akk. ayyanu, Syr. 'ayka, Ar. 'ayna, Eth. 'aytē; all "where?"

FUNCTION IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

'**Ayyeh fronts** the clauses in which it occurs, and is followed immediately by its subject, which is usually

6 "Fronting" describes the relocation of an element to the beginning of the clause in which it occurs. The reconstructed progression, typical of "wh-words" in English (i.e., who, which, what, etc.), is: "The man is there" > "The man is where?" > "Where is the man?"

Another example from English shows the normalization of the fronted word to the (grammatical) status of subject (nominative): "You are speaking to him" > "You are speaking to whom?" > "Whom are you speaking to?" (NB: archaically, "To whom speakest thou?") > "Who are you speaking to?"

Cf. the normally clause-terminal position of sham "there" in H.

7 'Ayyeh is preceded by the conjunction ten times; it follows its subject only in Zc 1.5, where proleptic 'apotēkem is "resumed" by the pronoun following 'Ayyeh: 'apotēkem 'Ayyeh hem "Where are your ancestors?"

8 C. Brockelmann, **HEBRÄISCHE SYNTAX** (Neukirchen: Moers, 1956):§80e. There are five exceptions: Jg 6.13; 9.38; Is 19.12; Ps 115.2; Jb 17.15.

In Jg 9.38 and Jb 17.15 'Ayyeh is followed by 'ephō. Brockelmann suggests that in these passages 'ephō "strengthen[s] the interrogative" (ibid., §55b), although it is probably impossible to determine emphasis in a language without living speakers (pace Muraoka): 'Ayyam 'ephō xakme 'Where, then, are your wise (men)?" (Is 19.12); 'Ayyeh 'ephō pika 'Where, then, is your mouth?" (Jg 9.38); 'Ayyeh 'ephō tīqwatī 'Where, then, is my hope?" (Job 17.15).

In Jg 6.13 its subject is modified by kol which therefore comes between 'Ayyeh and its subject as a preposed modifier: 'Ayyeh kol-niphlē��ayw ... "Where are all his wonderful deeds ..."

In Ps 115.2 it is followed by na' (lacking in 4QPs b), a unique combination.

In all of these cases the "intervening" form is either bound to the preceding 'Ayyeh or the following word, and the subject of 'Ayyeh is the next structural element. The rule of an immediately following subject is therefore still correct.
definite (nominal or pronominal), or participial. Whenever its subject, which is usually third person, is pronominal, it is indicated by a pronominal suffix.

When discussed in traditional grammars 'ayyeh is usually termed an adverb or particle, the point of primary interest to grammarians being its "verblike" function and occurrence with suffixed pronominal subjects. 'Ayyeh has two main functions: to ask about

---

9 There are seven exceptions: La 2.12; Na 2.12; Jb 21.28 (2xx); Is 33.18 (3xx).

10 'ayyeh with a participial subject occurs only in Is 33.18 (3xx) and 63.11 (2xx).

11 Gn 3.9: 'ayyeka "Where are you?" is the only exception.

12 Jouon, GRAMMAIRE (§102k). It occurs with 2ms (once: Gn 3.9, above), 3mp (2xx: Is 19.12; Na 3.17), and 3ms (5xx: Ex 2.20; 2K 19.13; Mi 7.10; Jb 14.10; 20.7). This distribution merely fits the larger patterns of person and gender in BH.

There are three apparent exceptions to this rule. In 2K 19.13 the suffix "anticipates" (so BDB, 32), and therefore apposes, the noun to which it refers: 'ayyo melek hamat "Where is he--the king of Hamath?" In the parallel passage (Is 37.13) 'ayyeh occurs without the pronominal suffix; this suggests that little if any emphasis should be placed on the presence of the apposed suffix in 2K 19.13.

This same anticipatory apposition between the nominal subject and pronominal [subject] suffix of 'ayyeh occurs in Is 19.12 'ayyam 'ephoh xëxameka and Mi 7.10 'ayyo YHWH 'eloheka.

13 E.g., GKC:§1000; Jouon, GRAMMAIRE, discusses 'ayyeh under both "Adverbes interrogatifs" (§102i) and "Adverbes avec suffixes" (§102k). Ewald, SYNTAX, calls them "nominal-verbs" (§286h).
the location of a person or thing, and to assert the nonexistence of its subject.14

In "real" questions--those asking for information--'ayyeh asks "Where is/are ...?" about the present (static)15 location of its subject:

'yekha
Where are you?  

'yeyeka sara ishteka
Where is Sara your wife?  

'we'yeh ben 'adoneka
... Where is your master's son?

'ayyeh

It inquires neither about direction (e.g., "Whither ...?" or "Whence ...?") nor activity (e.g., "Where is X doing Y?").16 It also refers only to location at the

14In rhetorical questions, which exist "mainly to give a chance to assert the presupposition behind [the question]." Joseph Grimes, "Kinds of Information in Discourse" KIVUNG 4 (1971):70.

15Cf. Joüon, GRAMMAIRE: "'ayyeh [=] où (sans mouvement) ..." (§102i).

16Na 3.17 we1o'-noda' meqomo 'ayyam "Their place is not known--where are they?" or "Their place, where they are, is not known."

'ayyam is sometimes added to the beginning of v. 18 and usually emended to 'eyk "How?" (cf., e.g., Th. H. Robinson and F. Horst, DIE ZWÖLF KLEINEN PROPHETEN HAT, 14 [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1954].166 and John M. P. Smith, et al., A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH, AND JOEL, ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911].352f) or 'ey ma on the basis of LXX (cf. the apparent ambivalence of BHS, ad loc.).

It seems more reasonable, however, to retain it at the end of v. 17 as a rejoinder: "Their place is not known--where is it?" Cf., e.g., the discussion in D. W. Nowack, DIE KLEINEN PROPHETEN, HAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897):245, who strongly disagrees with J. Wellhausen (DIE KLEINEN PROPHETEN
moment of asking, never meaning or implying "Where will X be?" or "Where was X?"

'ayyeh is also used rhetorically in questions which imply that the subject of 'ayyeh does not exist. This use occurs mainly in poetry, especially in questions about (a) deity:

'ayyeh 'eloheka
Where is your God? (Ps 42.4
(= 42.11; 79.10)

'ayyeh-na' 'elohehem
Where is their God?

'ayyam 'epo' xekameka
Where then are they--your wise men?

w'e'ayyeh 'eloheka 'asher 'asîta lak
Where now are your gods which you made for yourselves?

'ayyeh sopher 'ayyeh shogel
Where is the scribe? Where is the one who weighs?

'ayyeh sopher 'et-hammídálím
Where is the one who counts the towers?

'ayyeh 'elohe xamat w'e'arpad
Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad?

'ayyeh 'elohe sepharvayim hena' w'e'ivvah
Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivvah?

'ayyô melek-xamat ûmelek 'arpad ûmelek la'ir
Where is he--the king of Hamath and the King of Arpad and the king of the city of

[Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1963]:165) on the question of number in this verse, but does not emend or change the text.
Rhetorical questions with 'ayyeh also occur in prose:

we'ayyeh kol-niphe'otaw 'asher sippurul-lanu 'abotenu ... Jg 6.13
And where are all his wonderful deeds which our fathers have recounted to us ... ?

'ayyeh 'epho' pika 'asher to'mar ... Jg 9.38
Where is your mouth that said ... ?

In his speech (Is 36.12-20 = 2K 19.28-35) Sennacherib's field commander warns the Jerusalemites that no other god had yet been able to deliver his people from Assyria. Why then should they trust in Hezekiah or YHWH? This may be a real question--the kings and their gods perhaps being exiled to another part of Assyria's empire; wherever they were, they were not in their own cities, protecting their people. These occurrences of 'ayyeh typify its rhetorical use. 17

SUMMARY

'ayyeh occurs only in verbless questions that inquire about the present static location of their subjects, meaning "In what place is/are ... [at this time]?," a question that might or might not expect an answer. 18

17 An interesting example is 'ayyeka Where are you? (Gn 3.9). Was YHWH truly ignorant of Adam's whereabouts?

18 It may seem strange, or at best careless, to say of a word which does not necessarily assume the existence of its subject that it predicates existence. 'ayyeh functions, however, as the predicate of the clauses and sentences in which it occurs, and refers to
TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

USUAL RENDERING

'ayyeh is represented by pou [e] 19 (41xx), pou alone (11xx),20 and once each by ouketi [e] (Job 14.10) and ouai (Na 3.17). It is not represented in Is 63.11.

pou is therefore the main semantic element used to render 'ayyeh (52/55xx [94.6%]).21

What alternatives were open to the translators?22

The preferred form in Classical Greek, poi "Whither?", occurs, however, only once in G (a disputed reading in Jr 2.28), where it patently stands for pou.23 No other locative adverb in Greek is as non-specific as pou,24

the locative existence (potential or assumed) of its subject.

19 Hereafter, [e] represents "a[ny] form of the verb eimi."

20 Which incidentally proves that pou could occur in verbless constructions.

21 See Chart 1.2.1.


24 This lack of specificity probably reflects its origin: Pou was originally an indefinite local adverb "somewhere", which became by extension an interrogative, after a long use in pre-LXX Greek as a particle implying doubt. Denniston, GREEK PARTICLES (490-5).
nor does any other regularly refer to simple location without implying motion. *pou* was, therefore, the most apt translation equivalent available to the translators, and that which they naturally and consistently used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Locative Particles&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dir/Indir Interrog.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pothen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translators generally rendered *'ayyeh* by *pou* [e], rather than *pou* alone. *Pou* occurs with and without a verbal form in both pre- and post-G Greek, as well as in G itself (cf. eleven times in which *pou* alone renders *'ayyeh*, as well as other occurrences of *pou* in which it does not represent *'ayyeh*). The translators may have used this combination (*pou* [e]) because they recognized *'ayyeh*, or at least the clauses in which it occurred, as inherently verbal and therefore chose, as a rule, to represent this aspect of its function. They also

---

<sup>25</sup>Adapted from Herbert Weir Smyth, GREEK GRAMMAR (Cambridge: Harvard, 1963):§346.
recognized its inherent "presentness," using the present tense of [e] in every case.

'ayyeh is always rendered by pou [e] in Jg (2xx), Jr (6xx), Ma (3xx), and Ps (5xx), and in Ex, Ek, Jl, and Zc, where it occurs only once.

'ayyeh is never rendered by pou [e] in 2S (2xx), or Ho (3xx), or in Mi and La, in which it occurs only once. In each of these books it is rendered by pou [alone]. G has two unique renderings of 'ayyeh: ouai (Na 3.17) and ouketi [e] (Jb 14.10).

RENDERINGS OF 'AYYEH IN G

'ayyeh occurs five times in Genesis. Four times it is rendered by pou [e]:

wayyo'mer lô 'ayyeka
kai eipen autw Adam pou ei?

'ayyeh ha'ânashim 'âsher-ba'û 'eleka hallaylah
pou eisin hoi andres hoi eiselthontes pros se
ten nukta?

wê'ayyeh hasseh lê `elah
pou estin to probaton to eis holokarposin?

'ayyeh haqqêdes Shah hi' ba`ênayim 'al-hadderek
pou estin he porne he genomene en Ainán epi
tes hodou?

Each inquires about the present location of a person or animal, and each is rendered by pou plus a present form of [e] (inflected for grammatical concord with its subject).
Once in Genesis 'ayyeh is rendered by pou alone

'ayyeh sarah 'ishteka
pou Sarra he gune sou?

which probably reflects the form of Abraham's answer:

wayyo'mer hinneh ba'ohel
idou en te skene

rather than the form of the question in H, since he answers with a non-verbal clause that uses a[no]ther predicator of existence. This rendering certainly evidences the subtlety with which the translator of Genesis is usually credited.

In Exodus 2.20, its only other pentateuchal occurrence, 'ayyeh is rendered by pou [e]. Upon being told that they had returned from watering the flocks earlier than usual because an Egyptian had helped them, Jethro asked his daughters:

wayyo'mer 'el-benotayw we'ayyo
kai eipen tais thugatrasin autou Kai pou esti?

Here as elsewhere, the pronominal suffix is not represented by a separate translation unit--pou does not occur in G in constructions using pronouns only (i.e., kai pou autos).

In Judges 'ayyeh occurs twice--both are rendered by pou [e]. Gideon complains against the angel's assertion of YHWH's presence and beneficence, and Zebul taunts Gaal to act on his words and go out to fight:
'ayyeh occurs twice in 2 Samuel, where it is rendered by pou alone. David, fleeing from Absalom, asks Ziba, Mephibosheth's erstwhile servant

we 'ayyeh ben 'adoneka 2Sa 16.3a
Kai pou ho huios tou kuriou sou

and Absalom's servants ask the woman who had hidden Ahimaaz and Jonathan

'ayyeh 'axima'ats winatan 2Sa 17.20a
Pou Aximaas kai Iwnatan

Apparently the translator of S2 did not feel the same need to represent the verbal aspect of 'ayyeh (by pou [e]).

Three of its four occurrences in 2 Kings parallel passages in Isaiah. In all three 'ayyeh is rendered by pou [e]:

'ayyeh 'elohê xêmat we 'arpad 'ayyeh 'elohê sepharwayim 2Kg 18.34(2xx)
(= Is 36.19)
pou estin ho theos Aimath kai Arfad? kai pou estin ho theos Sepfarim?
"ayyeh\textsuperscript{26} melek-x\textsuperscript{em}at ûmelek 'arpad ûmelek la\'ir se\textsuperscript{phr}wayim hena\' w\textsuperscript{i}wwah 2Kg 19.13

(= Is 37.13)
pou estin ho basileus Aimath kai ho basileus Arfad? kai pou estin Sepfarouain, Ana kai Aua?

In the non-parallel passage pou alone represents 'ayyeh, when Elisha, having picked up Elijah's mantle, strikes the water with it and cries out:

'ayyeh YHWH 'elohê 'elijahû 'aph-hû' 2Kg 2.14
Pou ho theos Eliaou affo?\textsuperscript{27} pou appears alone here perhaps because the translator wished to reflect the emphatic nature of the question, but, not knowing how to render 'ap-hû, used a non-verbal adverbial predication.

'ayyeh occurs eleven times in Isaiah, where it is rendered by pou [e] (8xx) and pou alone (2xx).\textsuperscript{28} It is not represented in 63.11 (first occurrence).

libb\textsuperscript{e}ka yehgeh 'émah 'ayyeh sopher 'ayyeh shoqel 'ayyeh sopher 'et-hammigdalîm Is 33.18 (3xx)
he psyxe humwn meletesei fobon Pou eisin hoi grammatikoi? Pou eisin hoi sumbouleuontes? Pou estin ho arithmwn?

\textsuperscript{26}Is 37.13 reads 'ayyeh .... Since the rendering of 'ayyeh in G does not distinguish between forms of 'ayyeh with and without pronominal suffixes, it is not possible to determine which of the forms is original, especially in light of the occasional use of final -h as mater lectiones for -e.

\textsuperscript{27}affo for 'aph-hû' indicates the translator's uncertainty concerning how to render this form.

\textsuperscript{28}Three are listed with K2, above.
The weight which the usual rendering exerted on the translator can be seen in 63.15b where, after rendering 'ayyeh by pou [e] 63.15a, the translator simplified the syntax of the second half of the verse by adding pou [e] (the full complement of the usual rendering) and hoti, making hēmōn me`eka wēraxmeka the subject of pou [e] rather than of hit'appaqû, which was thus relegated to an inferential clause:

\[ 'ayyeh qin'atka ūgebungroteka hēmōn me`eka \]
\[ wēraxmeka 'elay hit'appaqû \]
\[ pou estin ho zēlos sou kai he isxus sou pou estin to plethos tou eleous sou kai ton oiktirmon sou? \]

\[ 'ayyeh is rendered twice by pou alone, and once is not represented. \]
\[ wē'ayyeh xēmat hammetsiq \]
\[ kai nun pou ho thumos tou thlibontos se? \]

In Is 36.19, where 'ayyeh occurs twice, its second occurrence is probably rendered with pou alone due to ellipsis: 29

\[ 'ayyeh 'elohē xēmat wē'arpad 'ayyeh 'elohē sepharwayim \]
\[ pou estin ho theos Emath kai Arfad? kai pou ho theos tes poleos Sepfarim? \]

'ayyeh is not represented in its first occurrence in Is 63.11:

\[ 29In 33.18, on the other hand, the translator, in order to maintain the strong formal parallelism of H, represented 'ayyeh each time as pou [e]. \]
wayyizkor yêmê-'ôlam mosheh `ammô
'ayyeh hamma`âlem miyyam 'et ro`ê tso'nô
'ayyeh hassam bêqirbô 'et-ruâx qodshô
Is 63.11 (2xx)
kai emnesthe hemeron aionion ho anabibasas ek
tes ges ton poimena ton probaton; pou estin ho
theis en autois to pneuma to hagion?

G interpreted mosheh as a substantive participle (rather
than as "Moses"). The preposition 'et therefore had to
be interpreted as the direct object marker, leading to
divergent meanings between the two versions, including a
minus in G which encompasses the first occurrence of
'ayyeh, and which probably reflects parablepsis due to
the translator's anticipation that the source from which
the shepherd would be "drawn out" would follow the
occurrence of mashah:

The translator of Isaiah rendered 'ayyeh regularly
by pou [e], the two occurrences of pou without [e] being
explained contextually.

In all six of its occurrences in Jeremiah 'ayyeh is
rendered by pou [e]. In each passage [e] is present
tense, inflected for number. E.g.:

\[\text{welô} '\text{amêrû} '\text{ayyeh} \text{YHWH} \text{hamma}^{'\text{âleh}} \text{'otanû} \text{me'arets} \text{mitsrayim} \]
Jr 2.6
\[\text{kai ouk eipan pou estin kurios ho anagagon} \text{hemas ek ges Aliguptou} \]

\[\text{wel'ayyeh} '\text{êloheka} '\text{'asher} '\text{asîta lak} \]
Jr 2.28
\[\text{kai pou eisin hoi theoi sou hous epoiesas} \text{seauto} \]
The translator of Jeremiah was thus absolutely regular in representing 'ayyeh.

'ayyeh occurs once in Ezekiel (13.12), where it is rendered by pou [e]:

wehinneh naphal haqqîr hâlo' ye'amer 'âlêkem 'ayyeh haTTîx 'âsher Taxtem Ek 13.12
kai idou peptoken ho toixos kai ouk erousin pros humas pou estin he aloiphe humwn hen eleipsate

In the Minor Prophets 'ayyeh occurs eleven times. It is rendered by pou [e] (6xx), pou alone (4xx), and once by ouai (Na 3.17). This percentage of the usual rendering is well below that of G as a whole, but within the range found between individual books or sections of G:

30 So Kethib; Qere reads we'yô (with a 3ms suffix), probably to avoid lack of concord between the plural subject and singular suffix.

31 See chart, following page.

32 See the excursus "Is MP a Translation Unit" in the Conclusion (below).
### Renderings of 'ayyeh in MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>pou [e]</th>
<th>pou</th>
<th>Unq</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Hosea\(^{33}\) (3xx) 'ayyeh is rendered by pou alone:

'ayyeh malk[^e]ka 'ephô' weyôšî'ka b[^e]kol-'areka  
Ho 13.10
pou ho basileus sou houtos? kai diaswsatw se in pasais tais polesin sou

'ayyeh d[^e]bareka mawet 'ayyeh qaTabka sh[^e]öl  
Ho 13.14 (2xx)
pou he dike sou, thanate? pou to kentron sou, hade?

'ayyeh occurs once in Micah, where it is also rendered by pou alone:

w[^e]tere' 'oyabti útekasseha bûshah  
Mi 7.10
ha'omra 'elay 'ayyô YHWH 'elohayik ...
kai opsetai he exthra mou kai peribaleitai aixsunen he legousa pros me Pou kurios ho theos sou?

---

\(^{33}\)Where I restore 'ayyeh for 'ehî.
'ayyeh is represented by pou [e] and ouai (once each) in Nahum:

'ayyeh mə'ôn 'ērayôt ūmir'eh hû' lakkephirim Na 2.12
pou esti to katoiketerion twn leontwn kai he nome he ousa tois skumnois, ...

In Na 3.17, a verse-terminal use with a pronominal suffix, it is rendered by ouai:

shemesh zarxa wênôdad wêlo'-nôda' mêqômô 'ayyam Na 3.17
'ayyam ho helios aneteile, kai aphelato, kai ouk egnw ton topon autes ouai autois

Here the translator read 'ayyam as 'ôyyam, which is unlikely, however, since the interjection 'ôy "Woe!" occurs nowhere else with pronominal suffixes. G did not join 'ayyam to the following verse, but interpreted it as a "parting shot" at Nineveh's guards, before turning to Assyria's nobles and lords (v 18).

In Zechariah, where 'ayyeh occurs once, and uniquely with a following pronoun rather than a pronominal suffix, it is rendered with the usual rendering, but without a separate indication of the presence of the pronoun:

'âbôtēkem 'ayyeh hem Zc 1.5
hoi pateres humwn pou eisi

In Psalms 'ayyeh is always rendered by pou [e] (five times), three of which are the same ('ayyeh 'ēloheka),
although the introductory formulae are different in Pss 42 and 79:

'ayyeh 'êloheka Pss 42.4, 11 (41.4, 11) 
Pou estin ho theos sou? (= 79.10 [78.10])

'ayyeh xâsadeyka hari'shonîm 'àdonay Ps 89.50 
pou eisin ta elee sou ta arxaia, kurie?

'ayyeh-na' 'êiohehem Ps 115.2 (113.10) 
Pou estin ho theos autwn?

'ayyeh is rendered by pou [e] in five of its six occurrences in Job:

we'ayyeh 'ephô tiqwatî Pou oun mou eti estin he elpis? 
Jb 17.15

ro'ayw yo'mêrû 'ayyô hoi de idontes auton erousin Pou estin? 
Jb 20.7

kî to'mêrû 'ayyeh bêt-nadîb we'ayyeh 'ochel mishkënôt rësha'îm 
hoti ereite Pou estin oikos arxontos? 
ki pou estin he skepe twn skenwmatwn twn asebwn? 
Jb 21.28 (2xx)

we'lo'-'amar 'ayyeh 'êloâh 'osay ... Pou estin ho theos ho poiesas me, ...
Jb 35.10

kai ouk eipen Pou estin he theos sou? 
Jb 14.10

The second35 unique rendering of 'ayyeh, used in Jb 14.10, is ouketi [e]:

we'geber yamût wayyexëlash wayyigwa` 'adam 
wê'ayyô Jb 14.10
aner de teleutesas wxeto peswn de brotos ouketi estin

34 21.28-33 were not part of G (under asterisk in Jerome, Syro-hexaplar [not v. 32]).

35 In addition to ouai (Na 3.17, above).
This may be another misread passage (reading \( w^{\text{e}}'\text{ayy}\text{o} \) as \( w^{\text{e}}'\text{ayin} \); ouketi renders 'ayin in a not insignificant number of passages),\textsuperscript{36} although this more likely reflects contextual exegesis.\textsuperscript{37}

Despite its usual characterization as a free translation unit, Job is thus regular in rendering 'ayyeh.

'ayyeh occurs once in Lamentations, where it is rendered by pou alone:

\[
\text{l}^\text{e}'\text{immotam yo'}^\text{m}^\text{e}^\text{r}^\text{o} '\text{ayyeh dagan wayayin} \quad \text{La } 2.12 \\
\text{tais metrasin autwn eipan Pou sitos kai oinos?}
\]

\textsuperscript{36}It is barely possible, however, that, since brotos "mortal man" occurs only in Job, where it is used primarily in contexts that contrast man with God (4.17; 9.2; 10.4; 33.12), or express man's transience (14.1, 10; 34.15), the translator may have intended to represent this latter meaning, which it has in 14.7-12, by ouketi "After he falls, he is no longer," rather than by the rhetorical pou estin "Where is he?" in the mistaken assumption that the indicative is stronger than the (rhetorical) interrogative. I believe this alternative much weaker than a simple misreading of H as it stands.

\textsuperscript{37}I am indebted to Emanuel Tov for this suggestion.
POU IN G

In studying translation technique we must determine
whether or not the majority of the occurrences of the
usual translation equivalent represent the [Hebrew] word
being studied, because if, for example, most occurrences
of 'ayyeh were rendered by pou, but pou also rendered
many different Hebrew words so that it represented
'ayyeh in only a minor percentage of its occurrences, we
might reasonably conclude that its use as the usual
translation equivalent of 'ayyeh was coincidental.

Pou occurs about one hundred times in the canonical
books—in fifty-two of these passages it represents
'ayyeh. In addition to 'ayyeh, pou represents 'anah
(18xx, 'an once), 'ephoh (9xx), 'ekah (4xx, 'ek once),
and 'ey (3xx), as well as being a G plus (at least nine
times).

Pou therefore represents 'ayyeh more often than it
represents any other Hebrew word. It does, however,
have a much broader meaning and function than 'ayyeh.
Pou is often used with fientive verbs38 although it
never occurs in such verbal contexts when rendering
'ayyeh. When pou occurs with a verb other than [e], the

38 Some examples of each: with verbs signifying (1)
motion: Gn 16.8; 32.18(17); 37.30; Dt 1.28; Jos 2.5;
8.20; Jg 19.17; Is 10.14; 2S 2.1; Zc 2.6; Jr 15.2; Ps
139(138).7a, b; SS 6.1a; (2) action: Gn 37.16; 2K 6.6;
Ob 5; Jr 3.2; Ru 2.19 (2xx); SS 1.7 (2xx); (3) both: 2S
13.13; Is 10.3; Zc 5.10.
tense of that verb is present (10xx), aorist (9xx), future (6xx), and perfect (once). It is therefore especially striking that G consistently renders 'ayyeh with pou plus the present tense.

pou does not require a verb in its clause, as is demonstrated by its use in non-verbal clauses to render 'ayyeh and other Hebrew words. The regularity with which it is found with [e] when rendering 'ayyeh, therefore (74.6%), suggests that the translators understood 'ayyeh or the clauses in which it occurs to have verbal connotations in H. Since Greek, like Hebrew, does not require the presence of a verb for explicit predication, the regular use of [e] in conjunction with pou to render 'ayyeh further supports this conclusion.

---

39 Either with [e], e.g., Gn 4.9; Dt 32.37; Is 26.16; Is 49.21; Jb 38.4; or without [e], e.g., Jg 8.18; Is 19.22; 2S 9.4; 2K 6.13; Jr 36.19 (43.19).
SYNONYMS OF 'ayyeh IN G

'ay, an interrogative adverb meaning "where?", occurs thirty-one times, twenty-seven in combination with other particles, and is closely related to 'ayyeh in both morphology and function. When combined with other elements, the resulting interrogative locative expressions are usually described as synonyms of 'ayyeh and translated "Where?"

This section examines first 'ay, then its combinatory forms and their translation into G in order to ascertain whether or not the translators distinguished between them.

'ay

'ay normally contracts to 'ê. It occurs four times absolutely (i.e., not in composition), in nominal clauses which it fronts and means "Where is ...?"

'ay functions as a complete synonym of 'ayyeh, and therefore as a predicator of existence. No syntactical or semantic condition hinders their complete

\[40\text{Cf. BDB, ad loc.}\]

\[41\text{'ay (< PS *'ay) is related to Ugaritic 'iy, Arabic 'ayyu, and Akkadian 'ay(y)akam (KBL}\text{3}\text{:36).}\]

\[42\text{Ibid., cf. Gn 4.9; Dt 32.37; 1 S 26.16; Pr 31.4 (Q).}\]
intersubstitutability. \(^{43}\) Compare the examples of 'ayyeh (above) with:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{'ê hebel 'ahika} & \quad \text{Gn 4.9} \\
\text{Pou estin hàbel adelpos sou?} \\
\text{'ê 'ëlohêmo} & \quad \text{Dt 32.37} \\
\text{Pou eisin hoi theoi autwn} \\
\text{'ê-xânît hammelek ...} & \quad \text{1S 26.16} \\
\text{to doru tou basilews kai ho fakos tou hudatos} \\
\text{pou estin ta pros kefales autou?} \\
\text{'ey shekar} & \quad \text{Pr 31.4}
\end{align*}\]

In three of these clauses (all of which occur in books in which 'ayyeh does not occur), 'ay is rendered by pou plus a present form of [e],\(^{44}\) the only passages in which 'ay in any of its permutations is so rendered. This indicates that the G translators interpreted 'ay, when it occurred alone, like 'ayyeh.

\(^{43}\) "Two forms have the same syntactic function function if, and only if, they have the same distribution (i.e., are intersubstitutable) throughout the ... sentences of the language" Lyons, LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS (111).

\(^{44}\) In Pr 31.4 G and H cannot be aligned.
'ê-zeh

'ê-zeh (< 'ê + zeh), is usually translated "Where is ...?" and occurs in both verbal (7xx) and nominal (10xx) clauses. Its subject is usually impersonal.45 It is rendered by poios in all but one passage (Jb 38.24), where it is rendered by pothen.

The semantic content is the same as, but the syntax of 'ê-zeh differs so markedly from, that of 'ay and 'ayyeh that they are not intersubstitutable. It occurs in verbal clauses, and tends not to have a personal subject; in the single passage in which its subject is pronominal (and incidentally personal), it departs further from syntactic synonymity with 'ayyeh in that its pronominal subject is not suffixed, but independent.

The translators of G recognized these differences. Neither poios nor pothen ever renders 'ayyeh, nor is it apparent that either would, in any given case, be an appropriate rendering.

'ê-mizzeh

'ê-mizzeh occurs in three verbal and six nominal clauses. It is an explicitly directional combination of 'ê and mizzeh (< *min-zeh), usually translated "Whence?" "From where?" It is followed immediately by its

45 Es 7.5, where Ahasuerus asks 'ey-zeh hû' 'asher-mela'ô ... is the only passage in which 'ey-zeh occurs with a personal subject.
pronominal subject four times. Twice a noun intervenes between 'é-mizzeh and its pronominal subject, which is never suffixed.

'é-mizzeh is rendered by pothen seven times and poios twice. The passages rendered by poios are those in which a noun intervenes between 'é-mizzeh and its subject. Its translation thus overlaps that of 'é-zeh, but is completely different from that of 'ayyeh since, as noted above, neither poios nor pothen ever renders 'ayyeh.

'é-mizzeh differs from 'ayyeh in function. Like 'é-zeh, it occurs with both verbal predicates and non-suffixed pronominal subjects. There is some semantic overlap with 'ayyeh in that both are locative, but its usage is not close enough to that of 'ayyeh for them to be more than partial synonyms, which is reflected in G.

---

46 The two third-person examples are indirect questions: Jg 13.6 'ey-mizzeh hû'; 'ey-mizzeh hema. These are the only times that 'ey-mizzeh occurs in indirect questions.

1S 30.13 and 2S 1.13 both read 'ey-mizzeh 'attah, both times asked of an Amalekite by David.

47 In both cases the noun specifies the nature of the question: 2S 15.2 'ey-mizzeh `ir 'attah "From what city are you (have you come)?" Jn 1.8 'ey-mizzeh `am 'attah "From what people are you (do you come)?"

48 Note the inversion between the usual translation equivalents used to render these two combinations. This shows that the translators possessed a considerable degree of familiarity with the uses and meaning of the particles as well as with the text and its meaning.
'ē-lazo't
This combination, "Why/On what basis...,” occurs only in Jr 5.7 (a verbal sentence), and where it is rendered by poios.

'ephoh
'ephoh "where?" (10xx)49 is a partial synonym of 'ayyeh compounded from 'ay "where?" and locative poh "here, in this place."50 Although BDB says that it occurs "with a verb [contrast 'ayyeh],"51 it occurs in more non-verbal (six)52 than verbal clauses.53

'ephoh resembles 'ayyeh by asking "Where?" about

49 Gn 37.16; 2S 9.4; Jg 8.18; 1S 19.22; Is 49.21; Jr 3.2; 36.19 (43.19); Jb 4.7; 38.4; Ru 2.19.

50 I. Eitan ("Hebrew and Semitic Particles," AJSLL 44 [1928]: 177-205), argues for an Egyptian origin of 'ephoh: "These considerations would point to a comparison of poh rather with the Egyptian demonstrative pronoun pa (= p'), 'this' (also pw), the root f containing a basic idea of remoteness ('that,' 'then,' or 'there'). ... Primitive Hebrew seems to have been hesitating in the choice of a proper particle for 'here,' and ... it may finally have borrowed an Egyptian word that would leave room for no mistake" (197f).

51 BDB, ibid.

52 2S 9.4; Is 49.21; Jr 36.19; Jg 8.18; 1S 19.22; Gn 37.16.

53 All four verbs are perfect: Jr 3.2; Jb 4.7; 38.4; Ru 2.19.
static location,\textsuperscript{54} but differs in that it both refers to past time and occurs in verbal contexts.\textsuperscript{55}

'ephoh occurs pleonastically,\textsuperscript{56} as well as in questions that ask "Where is ... doing ...?"\textsuperscript{57} Both uses are foreign to 'ayyeh. 'ephoh fronts the clauses in which it occurs; once it follows a [proleptic] pronoun. When its subject is pronominal,\textsuperscript{58} both independent pronouns and the pronominal element indicated by the verbal form occur.

\textit{pou} renders 'ephoh nine times, \textit{pote} once (Jb

\textsuperscript{54}Its meaning is debated in Jg 8.18, but it is probably best rendered "Where are... ?" BDB suggests "What kind of... ?" because of Zebach's and Salmuna's answer to Gideon's question: "They were just like you--king's sons in appearance" (Jg 8.18b). It is possible, however, that their answer was deliberately evasive. Rather than answer Gideon's question about his brothers (which they knew would result in their execution) they tried to mollify him by flattery.


\textsuperscript{55}Jr 3.2; Jb 4.7; 38.4; Ru 2.19.

\textsuperscript{56}Brockelmann, SYNTAX: "Das Fragewort kann auch durch die Interjektion 'ephoh verstärkt werden." Cf. Gn 27.33; Is 19.12; Jg 9.38" (855b).

\textsuperscript{57}Gn 37.16 'ephoh hem ro`îm "Where are they tending [the sheep]?

\textsuperscript{58}Four times: Gn 37.16; 2S 9.4; Is 49.21; Jr 36.19 (43.19), three of which are the subjects of finite verbs, expressed within the verbal form: Ru 2.19; Jr 3.2; Jb 38.4.
4.7). Unlike 'ayyeh, however, 'ephoh is usually rendered by pou without [e].

Although it does not occur often enough in BH to have great statistical significance, its syntactical distinction from 'ayyeh was recognized by the G translators.

This section demonstrates the translators' ability to discern semantically and syntactically "close" forms. They did not equate all forms beginning with 'y- by rendering them in the same way, which would make the usual rendering of 'ayyeh merely part of a larger (and much less exact) pattern. When 'ay occurs by itself (not in combination with another particle), its meaning and function cannot be distinguished from those of 'ayyeh, nor did the translators distinguish them. In its combined forms, however, 'ay differs significantly from 'ayyeh semantically and syntactically, which the translators recognized, and distinguished—even in the case of such infrequent words.

59 pote is an interrogative with two functions: a temporal adverb or an intensifier). L-S, s.v. "pote."

60 Four of six occurrences in verbless clauses are translated without a verb in G: Jg 8.18; 1S 19.22; 2S 9.4; Is 49.21; Jr 36.19 (43.19), which demonstrates that the translators did not feel that pou required a verbal context.

61 The translators may not have thought about this at all, but the consistent rendering of 'ay by [e] shows that they understood the two forms in much the same way, even if only subconsciously.
SUMMARY

'ayyeh is normally rendered by pou, usually together with a form of the present tense of [e] (75%), which indicates that the translators recognized its basic predicate function, as well as its semantic function to inquire exclusively of present location. No contextual, grammatical, or syntactic element common to those passages in which 'ayyeh is rendered by pou alone explains the origin of this, as contrasted to the usual, rendering.

Suffixed 'ayyeh\(^{62}\) was not treated any differently by the various translators (67\%).\(^{63}\) This is below the overall average for 'ayyeh (75%), but is not significantly different, especially since both unique "renderings" arose out of [mis]interpretation of H, not from a particular philosophy of or approach to translation [of 'ayyeh].

'ayyeh is always rendered by pou [e] in Jr (6xx), Ps (5xx), Ma (3xx), and Jg (2xx), and in Ex, Ek, Jl, and Zc (in each of which it occurs only once).

\(^{62}\) Contrast that of yesh+sfx, below.

\(^{63}\) Cf.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'ayyeh w/sfx</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>pou [e]</th>
<th>pou</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>Usual (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is never rendered by pou \([e]\) in Ho (3xx), 2S (2xx), or in Mi or La (in which it occurs only once). In these books it is rendered only by pou.

In Gn, K2, Is, and MP it is rendered by both pou \([e]\) and simple pou, although the usual rendering in each book is the usual rendering of G as a whole. It is striking that in MP, an alleged translation unit, individual books use one rendering or the other--none uses both. The use of pou in La (one occurrence of \'_ayyeh\') is also surprising in light of the consistency with which \'_ayyeh\' is rendered by pou \([e]\) in Jr (6xx; 100%).

---

\[64\] Cf. the excursus in the Conclusion (below).
TABLES AND GRAPHS: 'ayyeh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>'ayyeh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>20613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>16713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>9886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>11040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>12284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>16943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>21836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>18730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>2381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>3128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>14363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>19587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>8351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>305634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>'ayyeh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1
Occurrences of 'ayyeh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>'ayyeh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>0.024%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>0.006%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>0.020%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.018%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>0.033%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>0.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>0.027%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>0.126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>0.104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>0.072%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.358%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>0.032%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>0.342%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>0.077%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>0.026%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>0.072%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>0.018%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENT** 76% 20% 4% <1%

**KEY**

| 1 pou [e] | 3 Unique |
| 2 pou     | 4 ---    |
Chart 1.2.1
'ayyeh: Summary of Renderings

- pou [e] (75%)
- Unique (4%)
- pou (20%)
Chapter Two: yesh

yesh,¹ the biblical predicator of existence par excellence, occurs 140 times in H, including S2 14.19 and Mi 6.10.²

FUNCTION IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

yesh, usually translated "There is/are ...";³ predicates

¹yesh < PS *'itay), cf. Ugaritic 'it = *'îtê (Cyrus Gordon, UGARITIC MANUAL §12,4); cf. Nöldeke (MANDÄISCHE GRAMMATIK, §213), for a diachronic description of [yesh] in the Semitic languages.

²In these passages I read 'ish as yesh.

³"There" in this construction in English is non-deictic: its only function is to fulfill the requirement that every English verb have an expressed subject (except imperatives and interjections). This use of "there" is therefore an excellent example of a non-lexemic function word in English. E.g., in the sentence "There is a draft in here," "there" is is not a relative locative, and therefore non-deictic, whereas "here" is deictic.

Deictic [Greek deiknumi] expressions are referring forms (e.g., pronouns, relative adverbs) which can be fully understood only if the hearer/reader knows the temporal and spatial context of their use. Thus "He saw her there" has meaning beyond its immediate syntax only if we know to whom "he" and "her" refer, and where "there" is.
the existence of an indefinite subject. It is called the Hebrew copula, equivalent to non-deictic English "There is/are," but should probably not be so described, however, since "copula" refers to forms used to link two entities--usually in order to specify that one identifies, defines, or otherwise modifies the other (thus the syntactical categories of predicate nominative

4 The only definite subject that occurs with yesh is YHWH (3xx):

\begin{align*}
\text{'aken yesh YHWH bammaqôm hazze} & \quad \text{Gn 28.16} \\
\text{hâyesh YHWH b'eqirbenû 'im-'ayin} & \quad \text{Ex 17.7} \\
\text{weyesh YHWH 'imannû welammah mētsa'tnû kol-zôt} & \quad \text{Jg 6.13}
\end{align*}

In each case, the point is the LORD's presence with the speaker(s).

Cf. Heinrich Ewald, SYNTAX OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, translated by James Kennedy (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879): "yesh is always followed by indefinite nouns, and these, too, in the singular; far more rarely is yesh construed with a definite noun" (§299a).

5 Takamitsu Muraoka (EMPHATIC WORDS AND STRUCTURES IN BIBLICAL HEBREW [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985]): "as far as the meaning of the words goes, it is yesh, ... that [is] the exact Hebrew counterpart[s] of the Indo-European copula" (77). He goes on to warn against the "careless use of the misleading term "copula" applied to yesh ..." (ibid.) because he finds yesh pleonastic and therefore emphatic (79).

6 Cf., i.a., GKC: "... yesh includes the idea of being in all tenses, ..." (§1521); Jouon, GRAMMAIRE: "L'adverbe d'existence yesh il y a exprime d'abord l'existence dans le lieu, à savoir la presence, puis, par extension, l'existence tout court. Il en est de même du fr. il y a et de l'ital. c'è (= hic est)" (§154k).
and adjective). That this is not the function of yesh in H will become obvious from the following analysis.

yesh occurs only in non-verbal sentences. Jacob exclaimed upon awakening from his dream

*yesh YHWH bammaqôm hazzeh*  
YHWH is in this place!  

Gn 28.16

Saul, seeking to destroy David, vowed

*wëhayah 'im yeshnô ba'arets wëxippastî 'otô*  
bëkol 'alëphê yëhûdah*  
If he is in the land, I will search him out among all the tribes of Judah.

S1 23.23

It normally precedes its subject, but may be separated from or even follow it:

*wë'im-yesh-bî 'awôn hûmîtenî 'attah*  
If there is [any] guilt in me, kill me yourself  

S1 20.8

*hôtsî 'am-'iwwer wë'ênayim yesh*  
Lead out a people who have eyes, but are blind  

Is 43.8

When its subject is pronominal, it is always suffixed\(^8\)--the distinguishing mark of the predicators of existence--but these pronominal subjects are relatively

\(^7\)Contrast the usual syntax of 'ayyeh (above). Cf., e.g., Gn 24.23; 43.7; 44.19f; Is 20.8; Is 21.5; Is 43.8; Jg 19.19.

\(^8\)They are sometimes explained as verbal forms on the basis of yeshnô (Jouon, §154k) which occurs four times (De 29.14; Isa 14.39; 23.23; Est 3.8), but to impute any aspect of "verbal government ... is at least inadmissible for forms (like 'ayvô, bë'ôdî) which are evidently connected with noun-suffixes; even for the other forms it is questionable" (GKC:§100p).

Brockelmann suggests that in these passages "wofur iesennu zu lesen sein wird" (GRUNDRISS DER VERGLEICHENDEN GRAMMATIK DER SEMITISCHEN SPRACHEN, two volumes, 1908; reprint ed., New York: Georg Olms, 1982).
infrequent,⁹ and their distribution within the paradigmatic matrix quite limited.¹⁰

**yesh** is used in several different ways in H:¹¹ absolutely in [elliptic] answers to questions, to predicate locative or "relational"¹² existence,¹³ to

⁹6.43% (9/140xx), lower than half the relative frequency of 'èn (13.05%) or 'ayyeh (14.29%) with suffixes.

¹⁰3ms (4xx), 2ms (3xx), 2mp (2xx). Joüon, GRAMMAIRE: "de yesh ... seulement yeshka yeshkem Gn 24.49, h³yeshkem Dt 13.4, et la forme anormale, bien que probablement authentique, yeshnô Dt 29.14; 1 S 14.39; 23.23; Esth 3.8, avec un nûn d'origine analogique" (§102k).

I have borrowed the concept of "matrix" from P. H. Matthews, MORPHOLOGY: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF WORD-STRUCTURE, CTL, edited by W. Sidney Allen, et al. (Cambridge: University Press, 1974):

"The framework of intersecting morphosyntactic categories is the main contribution of what may reasonably be called the traditional model of description ... the Word and Paradigm [WP] model. The word is its central unit, and the grammatical words are the minimal elements in the study of syntax ... the intersecting categories form a framework or matrix within which the paradigm of a lexeme may be set out" (67).

¹¹Muraoka, EMPHATIC WORDS, analyzes the syntagms in which yesh occurs (100f), but some of his categories overlap, or seem somewhat artificial—or perhaps overanalytic. E.g., he separates yesh + nomen determinatum + loc. (his category #9; Gn 28.16 'axen yesh YHWH bammaqôm hazze; and Ex 17.7) from yesh + nomen indeterminatum + adv. (his category #22; 2Kg 2.16 yesh 'et 'abadexa x'missîm î'nashîm; 2Kg 3.12; and Jr 27.18). I believe that these should be combined as locatives.

¹²Further, below.
introduce the subject or object of a following verbal (with or without the relative 'asher), and in both (future) conditions and real questions as well as contrary-to-fact conditions and rhetorical questions.

It occurs without an expressed subject only in elliptical affirmative replies to questions--only to questions asked with yesh,14 where it indicates agreement, representing simply "Yes" or "It/ There is":

-wayyo'mer hăyesh dabar me'et YHWH wayyo'mer yirmiyahu yesh Jr 37.17 [Zedekiah] said,"Is there a word from the LORD?" And Jeremiah said,"Yes [There is a word from the LORD]."

-hăyesh bazzeh haro'eh [12] watta~āneynah 'ôtam watto'marna yesh hinneh lēphaneka 1 Sa 9.11f "Is the seer here?" and they answered them, "Yes, [the seer is here]. There he is--right in front of you."

13 This is not philosophical predication, "divorced from identification, classification, or localisation, [that] would be tautologous" (A. F. L. Beeston, "Reflections on Verbs 'To Be'." JSS 29 [1984]:10), since yesh primarily predicates localised existence.

14 "Many utterances are composed of parts which are linguistically equivalent to whole utterances occurring elsewhere." Zellig S. Harris, METHODS IN STRUCTURAL LINGUISTICS (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1951; reprinted as Structural Linguistics, 1961):14; quoted in John Lyons, INTRODUCTION TO THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968):172.
wayyo'mer 'elaw hāyesh lebabka yashar
ka'āsher lebabī 'im-lebabka wayyo'mer
yāhōnadab yesh

2 Kg 10.15b

[Jehu] said to him, "Is your heart as honest
[toward me] as mine is toward yours?"

Jehonadab said, "Yes [my heart etc.]."

`yesh occurs in situation-specific contexts, often
with an adverbial or prepositional locative phrase. 16
The preposition characteristically, though by no means
exclusively, used in this construction is `be-": 17

15 The fourth absolute occurrence of `yesh is Jr
23.26--a difficult verse

`ad matay hāyesh beleb hannēbi'im nibbe'ē
hashsheqer Unēbi'ē tarmet libbam

Jr 23.26

This can perhaps be interpreted as "How long (will this
continue)? Is it in the mind of the prophets who
prophecy lies and the prophets of the deceitfulness of
their own hearts, that they will make my people forget
my name ...?"--the "it" being the dream that they claim
to have had. The question is rhetorical (below).

16 All
occurrences with 3ms suffix are locative:

yeshnō poh

Dt 29.14

kî 'im-yeshnō bīyonatan bēnī ... 1S 14.39

'im-yeshnō ba'arets ...

1S 23.23

yeshnō 'am-'exad ... bèn ha`ammim

Es 3.8

17 With `be (among many examples): Gn 42.1, 2; Nu
22.29; S1 17.46; K1 18.10; K2 5.8.

With poh: hāyesh 'ish poh (Jg 4.20), cf. S1 21.9;
S2 9.1; K2 10.23.

With Sham: 'im-yesh goy umamlēka 'āsher ... sham
(K1 18.10).

With `im: hāyesh YHWH 'immanū (Jg 6.13), cf. Gn
43.4; 44.26; Nu 9.20f; Dt 29.14; S1 21.4; K2 2.16;
10.23; Jr 27.18; Es 3.8.
[wayyar' ya'aqob kî] yesh sheber b'emitsrayim
Gn 42.1 (=42.2)
[Jacob saw that] there was18 grain in Egypt

lû yesh xereb b'yadî
Nu 22.29
If there were (had been) a sword in my hand

'im yesh goy umamlakah 'asher lo'-shalax
'adonî sham ... Kî 18.10
... if there is a nation or kingdom to which
my master has not sent

yesh occurs with lamed + object to predicate
possession or ownership:

yesh lî rab
Gn 33.9
I have plenty.

yesh lî kol
Gn 33.1119
I have everything [that I need]

This construction is also used for other relationships:

yesh lanû 'ab zagen
Gn 44.20
We have an elderly father

yesh sakar lip'ulatkem
2 Ch 15.720
Your labor has a reward [= There is a reward
for your labor; a subjective genitive]

yesh + lamed should probably be understood as existence
in various relationships, rather than strict possession,

18The past tense here is due to English sequence of
tenses in indirect discourse.

19Cf., further, Gn 39.4, 5 (2xx); 43.7; 44.19, 20;
Jg 19.19b.

20This clause may reflect a proverbial saying: yesh
sakar l+sfx b/l [p'1/m']. Cf.

kî yesh sakar lip'ulatek
Jr 31.16

yesh-lahem sakar Tob ba'âmalam
Ec 4.9

Contrast w'en-'ôd lahem sakar (Ec 9.5).
since sons do not own their father, nor does labor possess a reward.21

yesh predicates the existence of the subject or object of a following participle or verb, which is often linked to its predicate by a relative marker:22

yesh hebel 'asher na-'asah ... yesh tsaddiqim 'asher magia-'alehem ... weyesh resha'im shemmagia-'alehem Qo 8.14

There is something futile which is perpetrated upon the earth: there are righteous men who are repaid according to the deeds of the wicked; there are wicked men who are repaid according to the deeds of the righteous.23

It also occurs in this construction without the relative:24

yesh tsaddiq 'obed betsidqo weyesh rasha' ma'arik bera'atô Qo 7.15

There is a righteous man who perishes in his righteousness, and a wicked man who lives long in his wickedness.


It could be procrusteanated into a "dative" of interest, relation, possession, all of which might then fall under the general heading of "dative of reference."

22 Cf. Dt 29.14; La 1.12; Ec 1.10 (where yesh introduces the direct object of 'amar); Ne 5.2-4.

23 NB: This is equivalent to saying "Something meaningless is perpetrated upon the earth: some who are righteous are repaid according to the deeds of the wicked; some who are wicked are repaid according to the deeds of the righteous." This "generic" use of yesh is related to its occurrence with indefinite subjects.

24 In Ec 5.12 and 10.5 it introduces verbal objects.
The other examples of this construction are either conditional or deliberative (and therefore implicitly conditional) clauses:

\[ 'im\text{-yeshka-na} \text{ matslî}x \text{ darkî} \ldots \text{ Gn 24.42} \]

If you are prospering my mission

\[ h\text{âyishkem} \ 'oh\text{êbîm} \ 'et-YHWH \ 'êlohekem \text{ Dt 13.4} \]

whether you love the LORD your God

\[ \text{yesh occurs with conditional or interrogative particles forty-six times.}^{26} \ 'im \ (if) \text{ precedes six of the nine suffixed occurrences of yesh; five of which have participial predicates. In these passages the suffix on yesh indicates the pronominal subject of the participle. yesh+sfx therefore occurs primarily in combination with 'im in conditional clauses,}^{27} \text{ which Joüon interprets as volitional conditions,}^{28} \text{ but this} \]

---

\[ ^{25} \text{Ec is the only biblical book in which this construction is not conditional (cf. Gn 43.4; Jg 6.36; Ps 58.12).} \]

\[ ^{26} \text{hâysh (21xx), 'im yesh (20xx), 'ûlay yesh and lû yesh (2xx each), and h\text{â}ki-yesh (once).} \]

\[ ^{27} \text{If Dt 13.4 is seen in this light, seven of the nine passages in which yesh appears with a suffix have some sort of conditional function (five of these have participial predicates).} \]

\[ ^{28} \text{Joüon, GRAMMAIRE: "Dans la protase d'une proposition conditionnelle yesh ou 'ên avec le participe exprime la disposition (ou la non-disposition) de la volonté à faire une chose: Gn 43.4, 5. Avec yesh: Gn 24.42, 49; 43.4; Jg 6.36" (§1841).} \]
interpretation is more probably contextual than due to the presence of yesh. He suggests, e.g.:

\[ '\text{im-yeshka-na} m\text{atsli}^\text{a}x d\text{arki}^\text{a} \]  
\[ \text{Gn 24.42} \]
If you intend to prosper my journey ...

\[ '\text{im-yeshka m}\text{e}^\text{shalle}^\text{a}x 'e^\text{t-axi}n\text{u} 'i^\text{ttan}\text{u} \]  
\[ \text{Gn 43.4} \]
If you intend to send our brother with us ...

These passages are more likely simple conditions (i.e., future conditions capable of fulfillment or non-fulfillment, at least in the mind of the speaker):

\[ '\text{im-yeshka mosh}\text{i}^\text{a}^\text{a} 'e^\text{yad}\text{i} 'e^\text{t-yisra}'e^\text{el} \]  
\[ \text{Jg 6.36} \]
If you are going to deliver Israel by my hand ...

\[ '\text{im-yeshkem '}\text{6s}^\text{i}m x^\text{esed we'm}\text{e}^\text{met 'e'}^\text{t-} 'a^\text{don}\text{i} \]  
\[ \text{Gn 24.49} \]
If, therefore, you are dealing honestly and faithfully with my master ...

29 Cf. Muraoka, EMPHATIC WORDS: "The aspect of readiness pointed out by Jolion seemingly stems from the general meaning of the context in which a given statement is made, for his view cannot explain adequately why the very words signifying existence are chosen to express "la disposition (ou non-disposition) de la volonté à faire une chose." (77f).

Muraoka then suggests that yesh [and 'en] "emphatically indicate the fact that a state of things or behaviour of a certain man or men is actually as one wants or expects it to be, or as one thinks it should be, because the primary meaning of yesh is 'existence,'" for, he says, the feature of actual [non-]realization derives from that meaning (i.e. 'existence' or 'non-existence') (78), and therefore interprets these passages as "If Thou dost prosper my way [as I naturally expect on the basis of my master's assurance, ...]". This, however, is still essentially a contextual, not syntactic or grammatically required or based interpretation.

30 "If you intend to deal faithfully and honestly with my master ... (Gn 43.4); "If you intend to deliver Israel by my hand ..." (Jg 6.36).
hₐyishkem 'ohₑbîm 'et-YHWH 'êlohekem Dt 13.4 [the LORD your God is testing you in order to find out] whether you love the LORD your God ...

ki 'im-yeshnô beyonatan beⁿî 1Sa 14.39 
Even if it [the offence] is in Jonathan my son

wêhayah 'im-yeshnô ba'arets 1Sa 23.23
... if he is [anywhere] in the land ...

'îm also occurs with yesh rhetorically, and (as a negative) in oaths:

'îm-yesh-Ta`am bêrîr xalamût Jb 6.6
Is there any taste in the juice of purslane?

'îm-yesh-milîn hₐshîbenî Jb 33.32
If there are any words, answer me!

xay-YHWH 'êloheyka 'îm-yesh-lî ma`ôg ki 'im-lo' kaph-qemax bakad ûmê`aT-shemen batstsapaxat Kî 17.12
As YHWH your God lives, I do not have a cake—only a handful of meal in a jar and a little oil in a jug.

hₐyesh (interrogative) occurs twenty-two times, half of which are requests for information, half of which are rhetorical, where it questions the existence of its subject.³²

hₐyesh bêt-'abîk maqôm lanû lalîn Gn 24.23
Is there [in] your father's house a place where we may spend the night?

³¹Cf. Gn 44.19.

³²This rhetorical use is essentially the same as that of 'ayyeh (above).
h^yesh lakem 'ax
Do you have a brother?

h^yesh YHWH b^eqirbenu 'im 'ayin
Is the LORD among us or not?

h^yesh 'el^ôh mibbal`aday
Is there a(ny) god besides me?

h^yesh b^ehablê haggôyîm magshîmîm
Is there among the gods of the nations one who sends rain?

SUMMARY

yesh predicates the existence of its subject in a particular location or relationship, not its absolute existence. It is not a narrative device, occurring only in quotations (direct and indirect), never in the mouth of the narrator (unlike, e.g., hayah), and asserts or asks about the present and actual existence of its subject, or, used rhetorically, questions its existence.35 Whenever yesh has a pronominal subject,

---

33 Cf. Gn 44.19. This question (Gn 43.7) was obviously real to the brothers, and was probably real to Joseph as well, since after his sojourn in Egypt he would wonder whether or not his father and [full] brother were still alive.

The other real questions: Nu 13.20; Dt 13.4 (also deliberative); Jg 4.20; 1S 9.11; 2K 4.13; 10.15a; Jr 23.26; 37.17a.

34 Cf. other rhetorical uses: Mi 6.10; Ps 14.2 (= 53.3); Jb 5.1; 6.30; 25.3; 38.28.

35 yesh should be interpreted as a substantive only in Pr 8.21:

l^ehanxîl 'ôh^abay yesh we^ôts^ôrôtêhem 'amalle'  
Pr 8.21

to profit those who love me with prosperity,
that subject is suffixed.  It does not function as a copula, and is not therefore deictic.

The syntax and semantic content of *yesh* indicate that it should be regarded as a member of the same form-class as 'ayyeh.

36 Cf. on 'ayyeh, above, which followed the same pattern.

37 Contra Eitan ("Particles"): "... of the English expression 'there is,' *yesh* translates much more the first member which is demonstrative than the verb 'is' that would need no rendering in [Biblical] Hebrew" (I:188f).
TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

USUAL RENDERING

*yeš* is usually rendered by G using [forms of] *eimi* ([e]; 108xx = 81.2%). Three verses in which it occurs are minuses in G (Pr 18.24; 20.15; La 3.29), in three passages *yeš* is not represented, even though G and H are parallel (JgA 18.14; K2 2.16; Jr 31.17), and in three texts G and H cannot be aligned with any degree of certainty--specific identification of elements, at least, is uncertain (Jb 25.3; Pr 3.28; 13.23).

The representation of *yeš* by [e] can be further broken down into the actual forms of [e] used, which are present (95xx), future (7xx: all 3sfi), imperfect (3xx: all 3sii), and a participle (Dt 29.14).

Based on the analysis of *yeš* above, [e] was used as the usual rendering either because the translators viewed *yeš* as an essential, not pleonastic, syntactic element, or because they wanted to leave no element of H unrepresented, especially in those books characterized by a literal translation technique, such as Qo.

*yeš* is always represented by [e] in Ps (6xx), Ne, C2, and S2 (4xx each), K1, Is, and Ru (2xx each), and Ex and C1, where it occurs only once.

---

38 I recognize that it may be anachronistic to think that the translators considered pleonasm as a linguistic phenomenon.
yesh is rendered by several forms other than \([e]\) in G: pronoun, \(huparxw\) (5xx each); \([exw]\), \(men\) \(oun\) (2xx each);\(^{39}\) and \(nun\) (Gn 31.29), \(apokrinomai\) (Sl 14.39), \(airw\) (Mi 2.1), \(katoikew\) (Jn 4.11), \(hupokeimai\) (Jb 16.4), and \(huparcis\) (Pr 8.21).\(^{40}\)

It is never rendered by \([e]\) in Mi (2xx), Jn, Ma, and Es (in each of which it occurs once).\(^{41}\)

RENDERINGS OF YESH IN G\(^{42}\)

Thirteen of twenty-one occurrences of yesh in Genesis are rendered by \([e]\) (3spi (9xx), 3sii (2xx), and 3ppi and 3pps (once each)). It is also rendered by \(exw\), (2xx), and \(huparxw\) and \(kai\ nun\) (once each). yesh is not represented (4xx), the following participle in each case having been rendered by a finite verb, making its representation superfluous (Gn 24.42, 49; 43.4; 44.26).

The 3spi renderings include:

\[
hayesh \text{ bêt-} '\text{abîka maqôm \text{lanû} lalîn G} \text{n 24.23}
\]
\[
e'i\ \text{estin para \text{tw patri sou topos hemin katalusai?}
}\]

\(^{39}\)Since \(men\) represents yesh (2xx) only in Gn (with and without \(oun\)) I consider this a "unique rendering".

\(^{40}\)yesh occurs thirteen times in Pr, but is rendered in only ten (18.24 and 20.15 are minuses in G; in 13.23 the text of G does not parallel H).

\(^{41}\)It is thus never rendered by \([e]\) in MP (4xx).

\(^{42}\)This section focusses on the "other" renderings since, given the predictability of the usual rendering, it is more instructive to discuss "other" renderings in searching out the translators' technique.
wayyo'mer [Jacob] 'aken yesh YHWH bammaqôm
hazzeh
kai eipen hoti estin kurios en tw topw toutw

wayyo'mer 'esaw yesh lî rab 'āxî
eipen de Esau Estin moi polla, adelphé; ...

hen 'ādonî lo' yada` 'ittî mah-babbayit wēkol
'āsher-yesh-lô natan bēyadî
Ei ho kurios mou ou ginwskei di' eme ouden en
tw oikw autou kai panta hosa estin autw edwken
eis tas xeiras mou

wayyar' ya`aqob kî yesh sheber bēmitsrayim
Gn 42.1 (= 42.2)
Idwn de Iakwb hoti estin prasis [42.2: sitos]
en Aiguptw ...

hāyesh lakem 'ax
ei estin humin adelphos?

Gn 43.7

In two parallel texts yesh is represented by 3sii
of [e], which may be for consistency with the narrative
(which requires a past tense):

wayyaphqidehu `al-bētō wē-al-kol 'āsher yesh
lô natan bēyadî
Gn 39.4 (= 39.5a)
kai katestesen auton epi tou oikou autou kai
[39.5a: + epi] panta hosa ên autw

Once yesh is rendered by 3pps of [e], which is
grammatically required by the future condition:

'ālay yesh xāmishshîm tsaddîqîm bētōk ha'îr
ha'aph tispeh wēlo'-tissa' lammagôm lēma`an
xāmishshîm hatstsaddîqîm 'āsher bēqirbaH
Gn 18.24

ean wsin pentekonta dikaioi en te polei,
apoleis autous? ouk aneseis panta ton topon
heneken twn pentekonta dikaiwn ean wsin en
aute?

43 The other passages in Genesis might seem to
require a past tense, but are in fact quotations, not
narrations, which in Greek require the tense of the
original quotation, not the "sequence of tenses"
expected in, e.g., English or French.
The translator repeated the condition at the end of the verse, thus implying that fifty righteous did not exist in Sodom; he used ṣin to render 'asher in the second half of the verse.

**yesh** is represented by exw twice in Genesis. Once it renders an idiom without exact equivalent in G:

```text
waydabber 'ittam le'mor 'im-yesh 'et-
naphshêkem liqbor 'et-meti milliphênay ... Gn 23.8
kai elalesen pros autous Abraam leg WN Ei exete te psyke humwn hwste thapsai ton nekron mou,
```

The other passage in which exw represents yesh is striking in that it is one of only two passages in G in which yesh + 1 in the sense of possession or ownership is rendered by exw. The translator of Genesis, as G generally, renders this consistently by [el] + [dative] pronoun:

```text
'adonay sha'al 'et-'abadayw le'mor hâyesh lakem 'ab 'ô 'ax Gn 44.19
kurie, su erwtesas tous paidas sou legwn Ei exete patera e adelphon?
```

---

44 The other is Nu 22.29, below.

457xx in Genesis (33.9, 11; 39.4, 5a, 8; 43.7; 44.20, above), and regularly throughout G. The "dative of possession" is a normal construction in pre-LXX Greek, and should certainly not be considered a Hebraism, in light of its broad extra-LXX usage. Cf. Smythe, GREEK GRAMMAR, where it is subsumed under the general topic "dative of interest" (§1474-80), which is essentially the same as the function of yesh le- (above). G probably uses this construction since it is far more fluid than [exw], allowing a variety of relationships to be expressed most efficiently.
It is also appropriate to mention at this point a passage in which "asher yesh" + 1 is rendered by a substantive participle:

*wayhî birkat YHWH bëkol-'asher yesh 1Ô babbayit ûbassadeh*  
*Gn 39.5b*  
kai egeneth eulogia kuriou en pasin tois huparxousin autw en tw oïkw kai en tw oïrw.*

Here *huparxw* has its frequent connotation of possession or property.

When *yesh* is followed by a participle the participle is usually represented by a verb and *yesh* not represented in G. In two of these cases the pronominal suffix on *yesh*, which identifies the subject of the participial action, is represented by a personal pronoun:

*YHWH 'Èlohê 'àdonî 'abraham 'im-yeshka-na' matslîåx darkî 'àsher 'anokî holek 'aleha ...*  
*Gn 24.42*  
*Kurie ho theos tou kuriou mou Abraam, ei su euodois ten hodon mou, hen nun egw poreuomai ep' auten, ...*  
*we'attah 'im yeshkem 'osîm xesed ...*  
*Gn 24.49*  
ei oun poieite humeis eleos ...*

Although in 43.4 the translator seems to use *men* oun to acknowledge the presence of *yesh*, this example actually falls within the same pattern, whereby *yesh+sfx* followed by a participle is rendered by a finite verb that represents the action of the participle and adopts the pronominal subject of *yesh* as its own.46

46 Cf. Dt 13.4; JgA 6.36; contrast Ne 5.2-4 (below).
Here, in contrast to Gn 24.42 and 49, the pronominal suffix is not separately represented, being entailed in the verbal form.\(^{48}\)

In 44.26 the translator of Genesis made explicit the contrast between the two halves of this sentence by using adversative alla. He has also exegeted and specified the function of yesh: the question is not whether or not Benjamin is (will be) with them, but whether or not he will go down to Egypt with them.\(^{49}\)

\[\text{yesh} \text{ is rendered once by nun in an apparent attempt to represent each element of H, since the translator obviously understood the idiom:}^{50}\]

\(^{47}\) Cf. Gn 43.5:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wē'im 'ēnka mashle}^\text{a}x & \ldots \\
\text{ei de me apostelleis} & \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{48}\) This reflects the wide variation of renderings used to represent yesh+sfx (see under "Summary", below).

\(^{49}\) With the same delicate touch, he uses me and a conditional participle of \([\text{e}]\) to represent 'ēn at the end of this verse--making explicit the conditional nature of the disjunctive clause in H.

\(^{50}\) On this idiom, cf. Frank Moore Cross, 'ēl, TDOT 1.261. I have not had access to Simcha Kogut ('The Biblical Expression yesh/'ēn le'el yad, The
yesh lē'el yadî laʿasot `immakem ra` Gn 31.29
kai nun isxuei he xeir mou kakopoiesai se

The translator of Genesis was relatively free in rendering yesh ([e] = 62%). He therefore, being relatively sensitive to Greek nuance and style, used various means, including "burying" its representation within verbal forms other than [e], although he used [e] more than any other rendering.

yesh occurs once in Exodus, when the children of Israel grumbled at the lack of water at Massah and Meribah. Its occurrence in this deliberative (rhetorical?) question is rendered by [e] (3spi):

\[
\text{Ex 17.7} \\
\text{Ei estin kurios en hemin e ou?}
\]

In Numbers yesh occurs four times, where it is rendered by [e] three times (3sfi, 2xx; 3spi once) and exw (once). In his list of questions that the spies are to answer about the land Moses asks

\[
\text{Nu 13.20} \\
\text{ei estin en aute dendra e ou}
\]

Interpretation and Development of a Mistake," TARBIZ 57 (1987/88):435-44), who apparently supports Cross's redivision of the clause as yesh lo' lyad+ on the basis of a root l'y "be powerful".

For further examples of ei as a deliberative particle in both direct and indirect questions, cf. Conybeare and Stock, GRAMMAR (§100).
In the parallel constructions in Nu 9.20 and 21 the translator correctly interpreted *yesh 'asher yihyeh* as equivalent to an initial *wayhi* followed by a temporal clause (e.g., preposition + infinitive construct). The future of [e] in these verses should be interpreted as potential or habitual: "whenever [it would happen that]."

\[
\text{weyesh 'asher yihyeh he'anan yamîm mispar 'al hammishkan 'al pî YHWH yax'ânû we'al pî YHWH yissa'û} \quad \text{Nu 9.20}
\]
\[
\text{kai estai hotan skepase he nephele hemeras arithmû epi tes skenes, dia phwnes kuriou paremalousin kai dia prostatagmatos kuriou aparousin}
\]

\[
\text{weyesh 'asher yihyeh he'anan me'ereb 'ad boqer wêna'âlah he'anan babboqer wênasa'û 'ô yômmam walaylah wêna'âlah he'anan wênasa'û} \quad \text{Nu 9.21}
\]
\[
\text{kai estai hotan genetai he nephele aph' hesperas hews prwi kai anabe he nephele to prwi kai aparousin hemeras e nuktos}
\]

In a contrary-to-fact condition the translator's choice of *exw* presents the meaning, if not the form, of H.\textsuperscript{52} Balaam warns his ass that

\[
\text{lû yesh xereb bêyâdi kî 'attah hâragtîka} \quad \text{Nu 22.29}
\]
\[
\text{kai ei eixon maxarian en te xeiri mou ede an ecekentesa se}
\]

These renderings show that the translator of Numbers, like that of Genesis, did not feel constrained in his choice of equivalents, but based his translation on the requirements of both H and Greek.

\textsuperscript{52}This is the third passage in G where [exw] represents *yesh*; the other two are in Gn (above).
In Deuteronomy (4xx) yesh is rendered by [e] (3xx; 3spi (2xx); mdppp (once)) and once entailed in a verbal form.

yesh occurs in two negative purpose clauses in Dt 29.17, both of which are rendered by [e] (3spi):

pen-yesh bakem 'îsh 'ô-'îshsha ... pen-yesh bakem shoresh poreh ro'sh wêlâ'änah

me tis estin en humin aner e gune ... me tis estin en humin hriza anw phuousa en xole kai pikria

In 29.14, where Moses expands the scope of the covenant beyond those physically present, the translator used a substantive participle of [e] to represent the construction 'âsher yeshnô,⁵³ which is the only way in which the force of the construction could have been represented in G:

kî 'et 'âsher yeshnô poh 'îmmânî 'omed hayyôm liphnê YHWH 'êlohenû wê'et 'âsher 'ênennû poh 'îmmânî hayyôm alla kai tois hwde ousin meth' hemwn semeron enantion kuriou tou theou humwn kai tois me ousin meth' hemwn hwde semeron

In 13.4, Moses warns the people not to listen to false prophets or visionaries, because the LORD will use them to test Israel, as he states in this deliberative question:

hâyeshkem 'ohbîm 'et YHWH 'êlohekem bêkol lêhabkem ûbêkol naphshêkem ei agapate kurion ton theon humwn ec holes tes kardias humwn kai ec holes tes psuxes humwn

⁵³Just as he used a substantive participle with me to render 'âsher 'ênennû at the end of the verse.
The translator has represented the interrogative prefix by ei (and the rest of the combination -yeshkem 'ohbim) by a finite verb, but did not use a separate form to represent the pronominal suffix. 54

The translator of Deuteronomy used [e], but was free to render yesh in ways that were contextually accurate, even idiomatic (13.4).

In Judges (6xx) A and B 55 differ widely. 56 Judges A renders yesh by [e] (3spi) and huparxw (2xx each), yesh (with a following participle) by a finite verb once (6.36), and does not represent it once (18.14).

yesh is rendered by [e] only in its first two occurrences in Judges. Sisera directed Jael to protect him by standing at the entrance of the tent in order to fend off anyone who, pursuing him, might ask

... h³yesh-poh 'îsh
... Estin entautha aner?

54 Unlike Gn 24.42, 49. Cf. Gn 43.4; 44.26 (above); on suffixed forms of yesh see "Summary" (below).

55 Judges B renders yesh by [e] (Jg 4.20; 6.13; 18.14; 19.19 (2xx) all 3spi). Once (6.36) the translator represents the pronominal suffix rather than yesh itself.

56 The distribution of yesh in Jg raises the question of its dialectical use in Israel: It occurs in the mouth of a northern Canaanite (Sisera; 4.20), a Manassite (Gideon; 6.13, 36), a Danite (traveling through Ephraim; 18.14), and a Levite living in Ephraim (originally from Judah (19.19)).
The usual rendering also captures the essence of Gideon’s rhetorical question to the angel:

\[ \text{w}^\text{e}yesh \text{ YHWH} \ '\text{immanu} \ldots \ Jg \ 6.13 \\
\text{kai} \ \text{ei} \ \text{estin} \ \text{kurios} \ \text{meth} \ ' \text{hemwn} \ldots \]

\text{yesh} is rendered twice by \text{huparxw}, when the Levite responded (curtly?) to the old man of Gibeah who had offered his hospitality:

\[ \text{w}^\text{e}g\text{am} \ \text{teben} \ \text{gam} \ \text{misp\text{"o'}}} \ \text{yesh} \ \text{laxam\text{"oren\text{"}}} \ \text{w}^\text{e}g\text{am} \ \text{lexem} \ \text{w}^\text{e}y\text{ayin} \ \text{yesh li} \ldots \ Jg \ 19.19 \ (\text{twice}) \\
\text{kai} \ \text{ge} \ \text{axura} \ \text{kai} \ \text{xortasmata} \ \text{huparxei} \ \text{tois} \ \text{onois} \ \text{hemwn} \ \text{kai} \ \text{ge} \ \text{artos} \ \text{kai} \ \text{oinos} \ \text{huparxei} \ \text{moi} \ldots \]

This probably reflects \text{huparxw} with the connotation of ownership.\(^5^7\) Here again it is striking that the translator used verb + dative pronoun for possession, rather than \text{exw}.\(^5^8\)

As in Dt 13.4, Judges A renders the construction of \text{yesh+sfx + participle} by a finite verb, again showing a fine sensibility for the nuances of H:\(^5^9\)

\[ '\text{im yeshka m\text{"osh}\text{"a'}} \ \text{be}^\text{yad\text{"i}} \ \text{yisra\text{"el} \ldots} \ Jg \ 6.36 \]
\[ \text{ei} \ \text{swzeis en} \ \text{te} \ \text{xer\text{"i mou ton} \ \text{Israel} \ldots} \]

In Judges 18.14 \text{yesh} is not represented in G:

\[ \text{hay\text{"e}da\text{"em k\text{"i} yesh babbat\text{"im} ha\text{'}elleh} \ 'eph\text{"od} \ \text{\text{"ute}raph\text{"im} \ldots} \ Jg \ 18.14 \]
\[ \text{ei} \ \text{oidate} \ \text{hoti en} \ \text{tois oikois} \ \text{tou} \ \text{toois ephoud} \ \text{kai} \ \text{theraphim} \ldots \]

\(^5^7\)Cf. the normal use of the substantive participle of \text{huparxw} in the sense "belongings, property."

\(^5^8\)Cf. on Gn 44.19 (above).

\(^5^9\)JgB represents the pronominal suffix by a personal pronoun.
The translator of Judges A, therefore, was relatively inconsistent in representing yesh, using [e] in only one-third of the occurrences of yesh.

yesh occurs nine times in 1 Samuel, where it is rendered by [e] (8xx: 3spi (7xx), 3ppi (once)) and by apokrinomai (once; 14.39).

When the young women answered Saul, they did so with yesh and a separate hinneh-clause. Here, as in all of the absolute occurrences of yesh in answer to a question, [e] is used, which demonstrates the force exerted by the usual rendering on the translators' choice of rendering, since we might expect that in these passages, where yesh means simply "Yes," G would use nai instead.

\[
\text{hayesh bazzeh harc'eh} \\
\text{Ei estin entautha ho blepwn?} \\
\text{... yesh hinneh lephaneka} \\
\text{... Estin, idou kata proswpon humwn}
\]

The translator of 1 Samuel did not feel limited to using 3spi of [e] to represent yesh, however. In 21.5, Ahimelek answered David's request for provisions by stating that there was no bread which he was authorized to give out (i.e., to non-priests), but that

\[
\text{lexem qodesh yesh ...} \\
\text{artoi hagioi eisin; ...}
\]

---

60 Cf. K2 10.15b; Jr 37.17 (second occurrence).
Here the translator used 3ppi of [e] to effect concord with the plural form of artos "loaf" with which he rendered lexem, \(^61\) since to offer a single loaf to David and his entourage would have been an affront.

In 14.39 the translator also felt free to use a verbal form to represent yesh, when Saul swore to the people:

\[
\text{kî 'im yeshnō bēyōnatan bēnī mōt yamūt}
\]

hoti ean apokrithe kata Iwnathan tou huiou mou thanatw apothaneitai

He may have used apokrinomai to render yesh rather than a form of [e] (which would have filled the function) because he interpreted biyonatan as "against (rather than "in") Jonathan." He may also have wanted further to specify that God, not Saul, was about to render the verdict (thus "if he answers"). \(^62\) He used apokrinomai as a pun with the people's failure to respond to Saul's proclamation: God would answer Saul's question that the people had refused to answer. \(^63\)

\(^61\) Since lexem does not occur in the plural, but can have both singular and collective meanings, his interpretation is well within the bounds of translation regularity.

\(^62\) It is also possible that the subject of apokrithe is the lot, in which case G reads "if it answers."

\(^63\) It is also possible, based on the orthography of shin/'ayin and waw/he at Qumran, that this reflects a textual variant yeshnō/ya'aneh (graciously suggested to me by Emanuel Tov).
Thus, although the translator of 1 Samuel used a fairly consistent technique to render yesh, he was also able to interpret his text with sensitivity and even irony.

*yesh* occurs only four times in 2 Samuel. All four are rendered with [e] (3spi), as are both of its occurrences in 1 Kings.

In 2 Kings *yesh* occurs ten times, and is rendered by [e] (9xx; all 3spi). It is not represented in 2.16.

When the sons of the prophets in Jericho saw Elisha returning alone, they said to him:

> hinneh-na' yesh 'et-\'abadeka x\'amish\'im '\nash\'im b\(^2\)n\'e xayil ye\(\ell\)\'k\(\u03bc\) na' ...

It seems that the translator either overlooked *yesh*, which is unlikely given his regular technique in the rest of the book, or felt that it need not be represented, given the preceding cluster of particles.

---

64 Including S2 14.29, where I read *yesh* for *\'ish*; S2 9.1; 14.32; 19.29.

65 KL 17.12; 18.10.
yesh occurs only twice in Isaiah, where it is rendered by [e] (3spi).66

In Jeremiah, where yesh occurs ten times, it is rendered by [e] nine times (3spi (7xx), 3sfi and 3ppi (once each)). It is not represented due to ellipsis with the preceding verse (once; 31.17). The usual rendering:

... ūbaqeshū birēxōbōteyha 'im-timtē'ū 'īsh 'im-yesh 'ōseh mishpaT mēbaqqesh 'ēmūnah ...
Jr 5.1
... kai zetesate en tais plateiais autes, ean heurete andra, ei estin poiwn krima kai zetwn pistin, ...

The choice of the future in 23.26 is grammatically motivated by the preceding 'ad-matay (hews pote), which implies [is required by] futurity:

'ad-matay hāyesh bēleb hannēbi'īm nibbē'ē hashhashaqer ūnēbī'ē tarmit libbam  Jr 23.26
hews pote estai en kardia twn prophetwn twn prophetueontwn pseude kai en tw prophetuein autous ta thelemata kardias autwn?

Ishmael spared the lives of ten of the men who brought offerings from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria when they said to him

'al-tēmitenū kī-yesh-lanū maTmonīm bassadeh xīttīm ūse'orīm wēshemen ūdēbash  Jr 41.8 (48.8)
Me aneles hemas, hoti eisin hemin thesauroi en agrw, puroi kai krithai, meli kai elaios;

The translator used 3ppi for grammatical concord with the plural "treasures" hidden in the field.

66Is 43.8; 44.8.
**yesh** is not represented in 31.17 (38.17), due to ellipsis with its occurrence in the preceding [and parallel] verse, where it is rendered by [e] (3spi):

\[\text{kî yesh sakar liph}^\text{e}^\text{ullatek n}^\text{e}^\text{um-}Y\text{HWH w}^\text{e}^\text{shabû me'erets 'ōyeb} \text{ Jr 31.16 (38.16)}
\ho\text{ti estin misthos tois sois ergois, kai epistrepsouin ek ges exhwrn,}
\we\text{yesh-tiqwah l}^\text{e}^\text{axaritek n}^\text{e}^\text{um-}Y\text{HWH Jr 31.17 monimon tois sois teknois.}

The translator of Jeremiah, therefore, was regular in rendering **yesh**, although (as in the latter passage), he was sensitive to the subtleties of more literary Greek—using an ellipsis rather than mere repetition.

**yesh** occurs four times in the **Minor Prophets**. It is not rendered by [e].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yesh in MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bk Occ</strong></td>
<td><strong>huparxw</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TTL 4</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MP (%)</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All (%)</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Jonah (once) yesh is rendered by 3ppai of katoikew (the G plural allows grammatical concord with the subject): 67

\[ '\text{asher yesh-baH harbeh mishtêm-} \text{esrah ribbô 'adam ...} \]
\[ \text{Jn 4.11} \]
\[ \text{en he katoikousi pleious e dwdeka muriades anthrwpwn, ...} \]

In the "Woe" pronounced upon those who plotters and doers of evil (Micah 2.1) the translator [mis]interpreted the idiom (yesh le'el yad with a suffix ("it is in their power [to do so]")) as the reason for their action, rather than as a reflection of their ability, "rendering" yesh by ouk airw:

\[ \text{be'ôr habboqer ya'asûha kî yesh-le'el yadam} \]
\[ \text{Mi 2.1} \]
\[ \text{kai hama te hemera suneteloun auta, dioti ouk eran pros ton theon tas xeiras autwn} \]

In Micah 6.10, G read ha'esh where I read ha'yesh for ha'ish, interpreting this as a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer: "There is no house ..., is there?"

\[ \text{ha'yesh bêt rasha' 'otsërôt resha'} \]
\[ \text{Mi 6.10} \]
\[ \text{me pur kai oikos anomou thesaurou anomous ...} \]

In a curse aimed at the one who offers a blemished animal instead of the male suitable for sacrifice that

---

67 This may reflect a scribal variant (yesh-bah vs. yashêbah)---a rendering otherwise lost. This suggestion, graciously made by E. Tov, does not, however, seem to account for en he at the beginning of the clause.
he owns and has vowed to give, *huparxw* signifies not merely existence, but ownership:68

\[\text{wē'arūr nōkel wē'yesh bē'edró zakar wēnoder wēzobex mashxat la'donay} \]
\[
\text{Ma 1.14 kai epikataratos hos en dunatos kai huperxen en tw poimniw autou arsen kai euxe autou ep'}
\]
\[
\text{autw kai thuei diephtharmenon tw kuriw;}
\]

The translation technique of MP is thus rather far removed from that of the rest of G, even from those sections usually typified as free.

*yesh* occurs six times in Psalms, where it is rendered only by *[e]* (3spi).69 Ps 14.2 (13.2) = 53.3 (52.3)) is a good example of *yesh* in a deliberative, albeit indirect, question asking "whether there is anyone who understands, who seeks God":

\[
\text{YHWH mishshamayim hishqīph ʿal-bēnē-ʿadam lirēʿôt hā'yesh maskil dōresh 'et-ʿēlohim}
\]
\[
\text{Ps 14.2 (= 53.3)}
\]
\[
\text{kurios en tou ouranou diekupsen epi tous huious twn anthrwpwn tou idein ei estin suniwn e ekzetwn ton theon}
\]

In Job *yesh* (12xx) is represented by *[e]* (9xx; 3spi (6xx), and 3sii, 3pps, and 3ppi (once each)), and a pronoun (*tis*) and *hupokeimai* (once each). In 25.3 G and H cannot be aligned.

68 The aorist is gnomic ("proverbial"), not past.

69 Pss 7.4; 14.2 (13.2) = 53.3 (52.3); 58.12 (57.12); 73.11 (72.11); 135.17 (134.17).
hāye'akel taphel mibbēlī-melāx 'im-yesh-Ta'am berīr xallamūt

Jb 6.6
ei brwthesetai artos aneu halos? ei de kai estin geuma en hremasin kenois?

kī yesh lakkeseph môtsa' ûmaqôm lazzahab yazogqū

Jb 28.1
estin gar arguriw topos, hothen ginetai, topos de xrusiwm, hothen diebethai

The 3ppi of [e] occurs for the sake of concord with the subject of yesh:

'im-yesh-millīn hāshībenī dabber kī-xaphatstī
tsadēqeka

Jb 33.32
ei eisin logoi, apokritheti moj; laleson,
thelw gar dikaiwthenaı se.

The translator understood lo' yesh as the protasis of a contrary-to-fact condition, for which G requires a secondary tense, usually the imperfect. I see no reason to read lo' as lu'.

lo' yesh bēnēnū mōkīa

Jb 9.33
eithe en ho mesites ḫumwn kai elegxwn

The subjunctive of [e] is required by the grammar of the (future) condition:

'im yesh 'alayw mal'ak

Jb 33.23
ean wsin xilioi aggeloi thanatephoroi

In another contrary-to-fact condition, lū-yesh is rendered by ei + imperfect of hupokeimai, which occurs only here in the canonical books, but represents the meaning of H quite well:

70Cf. Dhorme, JOB (144). Jb 9.33 is the only occurrence of eithe in G, although Symmachus renders lū with eithe in 6.2 and 16.4--its other occurrences in Job. In 16.4, G rendered lū with ei (+ imperfect), in another contrary-to-fact condition (below).
'anokî kakem 'adabberah lû-yesh naphshëkem taxat naphshî ...

Jb 16.4
kagw kath' humas lalesw, ei hupekeito ge he psuxe humwn anti tes emes

yesh is once represented by the indefinite pronoun tis, when the translator wanted to make explicit the indefinite nature of the question "Is there anyone who will answer you?", although this could be also be described as a rendering of yesh + participle "within" a finite form of the verb:

qëra'-na' hâyesh 'ûneka wë'el-mî miqqëdoshîm tîphneh
epikalesai de, ei tis soi hupakousetai, e ei tîna aggelwn hagiwn opse.

In 25.3 hyesh has been paraphrased by G in such a way that an "equivalent" of yesh cannot be identified with any certainty:

hâyesh mispar ligëdûdayw
me gar tis hupolâboi hoti estín parelkusís peiratais

The translator of Job was thus fairly consistent in using [e] to represent yesh, within the bounds of the grammatical requirements of G.

In Proverbs yesh (13xx) is represented primarily by [e] (9xx; 3ppi and 3sfi (3xx each), 3spi (2xx), and a participle (mgspp; once)), but is also rendered by a

71 Note the sequence of the forms of [e] used to render yesh in Pr: two highly interpretive renderings (3.28; 8.21), then [e] 3ppi (11.24; 12. 18; 13.7), 3spi (14.12; 16.25), and 3sfi (19.18; 23.18; 24.14). Each rendering is used in consecutive occurrences of yesh
noun (huparcis once; 8.21). Two verses are minuses in G (18.24; 72 20.15); in 13.23 G does not reflect H. 73

The three renderings of yesh by 3ppi of [e] seem to represent an attempt by the translator to explicitly (grammatically) universalize these proverbs, which contain three consecutive occurrences of yesh:

yesh mēphazzer wēnōsaph 'ōd wēxōsek miyyosher 'ak-lēmaxsōr
Pr 11.24
eisin hoi ta idia speirontes pleiona poiouin, eisin kai hoi sunagontes elattonountai.

yesh bōTeh kēmadqrōt xareb ūlēshōn xākāmīn marpe'
Pr 12.18
eisin hoi legontes titrwskousin maxaira, glwssai de sophwn iwntai

yesh mit`assher wē`ēn kol mitrōshesh wēhōn rab
Pr 13.7
eisin hoi ploutizontes heautous medein exontes, kai eisin hoi tapeinountes heautous en pollw ploutw

yesh is rendered by 3sfi of [e] three times. In 19.18 this reflects the translator's interpretation of the second clause as result rather than cause:

yasser binka kī-yesh tiqwah wē'el hāmītō 'al-tissa' naphsheka
Pr 19.18
paideue huion sou houtws gar estai euelpis; eis de hubrin me epairou te psuxe sou.

(not counting passages in which either the verse is a G minus or the texts are not parallel). Does this suggest a translation "committee", each member working on a small section?

72 This refers to Pr 18.24b. I see no reason to read yesh for 'ish as the first word in the verse.

73 G translates H into a "clear-cut expression of the doctrine of theodicy." McKane, Proverbs (46).
In the other two, somewhat parallel, verses the future reflects the future condition:

\[\text{ki 'im yesh 'axrît wëtiqwatka lo' tikkaret Pr 23.18}
\]
\[\text{ean gar tereses auta estai soi ekgonà, he de elpis sou ouk apostesetai}
\]
\[\text{ken dë'eh xakmah lënaphsheka 'im-matsa'ta wë'yesh 'axrît wëtiqwatka lo' tikkaret Pr 24.14}
\]
\[\text{ean gar heures estai kale he teleute sou, kai elpis se ouk egkataleipsei.}
\]

In 3.28 the translator used a conditional participial clause to render the disjunctive clause with \(wë'yesh\), freely but idiomatically—even elegantly—representing H:

\['\text{al to'mer lë're'eyka lek washûb ûmaxar 'etten wë'yesh 'ittak Pr 3.28}
\]
\[\text{me eipes Epanelthwn epaneke kai aurion dwsw, dunatou sou ontos eu poiein}
\]

It seems that the translator used either \(dunatos\) or the participle of \([e]\) to render \(yesh\).

In Pr 8.21, the passage often cited to prove the substantive origin of \(yesh\), and an admittedly difficult text, the translator rendered \(yesh\) by means of a noun—the only time it is so rendered in G, but which seems to capture the essence of H:

---

74 See under "Function" (above). Pace Scott, who suggests that this be read as \(yosher\) (cf. R. B. Y. Scott, PROVERBS AND ECCLESIASTES. AB 18:67).

75 The difficulty lies not in the meaning of the individual words, nor in the meaning of the verse as a whole, but in explaining the syntax of this unique use of \(yesh\).
It seems that the translator has interpreted *yesh* by means of the parallelism with (substantive) *agathwn*, using *huparcis* because of its connotations of possession.

The translator of Proverbs consistently used [e] to render *yesh*, but with some degree of freedom in both grammar and idiom.

*yesh* occurs twice in Ruth, where it is rendered by [e] (3spi). In Lamentations 1.12 it is represented by [e] (3spi); La 3.29 is a G minus.

*yesh* occurs sixteen times in Qohelet, second only to Genesis (21xx) in number of occurrences, and the highest percentage of occurrence in H (.54%). It is rendered by [e] (15xx: 3spi (13xx); 3ppi (2xx)); once it is represented by a relative pronoun (hos 1.10).

Both occurrences of the plural (2xx) reflect grammatical concord with the subject:

---

76 Ru 1.12; 3.12.
The only rendering other than \[e\] in Qo is a relative pronoun (1.10). The translator interpreted (the noun) \(dabar\) as a participle, which then forced him to interpret \(yesh\) as some sort of "generalizing particle", perhaps because (unlike the other occurrences of \(yesh\) + participle) \(yesh\) lacks a suffix.\(^77\)

\[yesh\;dabar\;she'yo'mar\;r^e'eh-zeh\;xadash\;hû'\]

\(Qo\;1.10\)

hos lalæsei kai erei ñde touto kainon estin

The translator of Qo, again not surprisingly, shows a high degree of consistency in rendering \(yesh\)--the only exception (1.10) results from a different interpretation of \(H\).

In its only occurrence in Esther, suffixed \(yesh\) is rendered by \(huparxw\), when Haman informs King Artaxerxes that a unique people, scattered throughout his dominion, threatens the peace and prosperity of his realm:

\[wayyo'mer\;haman\;lammÌeka\;\'\text{a}xashwerôsh\;yeshnô\;\'am-'\text{e}ad\;m^e\text{phuzzar}\;\um^e\text{phorad}\;bên\;ha'ammîm\;b^e\text{kol}\;m^e\text{dînôt}\;malkûteka\]

\(Es\;3.8\)

kai elalesew pros ton basilea Artacercen legwn Huparxei ethnos eiesparmenon en tois ethnesin en pase te basileia sou, ...
In *Ezra* (2xx) it is rendered once by [e] (Ez 10.2; 3spi) and once, in a difficult text, may parallel *gennaw*: 78

kol 'elleh nasa'ū nashîm nokriyyōt weyesh mehem nashîm wayyasîmû banîm Ez 10.44
pantes houtoi elabosan gunaikas allotrias kai egennesan ec autwn huious. [Esl 10.44]

This verse summarizes the results of the preceding section (Ez 9-10), emphasizing the obedience of the people—that they would put away even those wives who had given them sons. The translator seems to have chosen an exegetical rendering of the second half that avoids the grammatical and syntactical anomalies of H, since the Greek verb is unmarked for gender.

*yesh* occurs in four syntactically parallel clauses in a span of four verses in *Nehemiah* (5.2-5; Es2 15.2-5), when the Jews who have been financially oppressed bring their complaint to Nehemiah. It is rendered by [e] all four times, although never by 3spi (3ppi (3xx), 3pii (once)):

wēyesh 'ašer 'omrîm banēnû ... Ne 5.2
kai esan tines legontes En huiois hemwн ...

78 Many commentators simply replace the second half (wēyesh ...) with Esi 9.36: pantes houtoi sunwkîsan gunaikas allogeneis kai apelusan autas sun teknois (cf., e.g., Jacob M. Meyers, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, AB 14:82).

The lack of agreement of gender between a masculine form of the verb and a feminine subject is not uncommon (unlike the opposite situation), however, and does not require a different text, nor should the repetition of facts already well known be surprising in a summary statement (contra Loring W. Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, ICC:351).
The translator used the imperfect to establish the general framework, the present forms are then "historic," reflecting that temporal framework. Here the combination yesh + participle is rendered by periphrastic participles (analytic tenses) in the first three passages, rather than by the finite verbs as elsewhere. In 5.5 the participle modifies thugaterwn as a predicate adjective.

The translator of Nehemiah seems to have felt that the analytic verbal form expressed the continual and iterative nature of the crowd's complaints more accurately than the [usual] rendering of yesh + participle by a finite form of the [G] verb.

In its sole occurrence in 1 Chronicles (29.3), yesh is rendered by [e] (3spi). It occurs four times in 2 Chronicles, where it is also rendered only by [e] (3spi (3xx), 3sfi (once)).

The future (3sfi) occurs appropriately at the end of a prophecy to King Asa from the LORD by the mouth of Hanani, after Asa bribed Ben-Hadad to break his treaty

79Gn 43.4; Dt 13.4; Jg 6.36 (above).
with Baasha (and thus relieve the military pressure which Israel was exerting on Judah), rather than rely on the LORD to deliver him:

\[ \text{kî me'attah yesh 'immak milxamôt} \]

\[ \text{apo tou nun estai meta sou polemos} \]

The translator of Chronicles consistently represented \text{yesh} by [e].
SUMMARY

yesh was rendered consistently by [e] in G (108xx = 81.2%), 80 except in Judges (33%) and MP (0%). 81 The general consistency of its translation value indicates that the understanding of its function in H suggested above was that of the translators also--yesh was used to indicate the present temporal existence of a person or thing (or actor) in a specific location, or to question whether or not its subject existed.

The forms of [e] used vary according to the requirements of G grammar and syntax, although 3spi occurs most frequently.

The greatest variety in renderings represent yesh with a pronominal suffix. These are probably the least regular because yesh+sfx tends to occur in conditional clauses, which require various verbal forms in Greek. Of nine occurrences with a (suffixed) pronominal subject, yesh is rendered by [e] only in Dt 29.14, where a participle in G represents the participle in H.

80 This does not count the passages in which yesh is not represented but G and H are otherwise parallel (JgA 18.14; K2 2.16; Jr 31.17), those which are minuses in G (Pr 18.24; 20.15; La 3.29), or those in which G and H are not parallel (Jb 25.3; Pr 3.28; 13.23).

81 yesh is always represented by [e] in Ps (6xx), Ne, C2, and S2 (4xx each), K1, Is, and Ru (2xx each), and Ex and Cl (once each). It is never rendered by [e] in Mi (2xx), or in Jn, Ma, and Es, in each of which it occurs only once.
The other participles are rendered with verbs, making representation of yesh syntactically superfluous (this is not, however, peculiar to its occurrence with a suffix).

yesh is always represented by [e] in Ps (6xx), Ne, C2, and S2 (4xx each), K1, Is, and Ru (2xx each), and Ex and C1, where it occurs only once.

yesh is not represented by [e] in 25 passages (19%), but is rendered by huparxw (5xx), exw (3xx), a pronoun (2xx), and various unique renderings (15xx, 5 of which occur in Gn). There does not seem to be any common denominator among these occurrences and their renderings that would explain this lack of consistency.

In Jg A, 18.14 is lacking.

Especially in the rendering of yesh+sfx with a participle by a finite verb (with or without a pronoun representing the suffixed subject of the participle, above), but cf. also 1 Sa 14.39; Es 3.8.

In five passages this yields a G minus (on all five, see discussions ad loc, above):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn 24.42</td>
<td>yesh+sfx P</td>
<td>PN V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn 24.49</td>
<td>yesh+sfx P</td>
<td>PN V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn 43.4</td>
<td>'im yesh+sfx P</td>
<td>ei [.] V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt 13.4</td>
<td>'im yesh+sfx P</td>
<td>ei V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg 6.36</td>
<td>'im yesh+sfx P</td>
<td>ei V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By a pronoun: Jb 5.1; Ec 1.10; by a particle: Gn 31.29; 44.26 (see above).
in representation. *yesh* is never rendered by [e] in Mi (2xx), or in Jn, Ma, or Es (once each).\(^{86}\)

When the usual rendering is broken down into the actual forms of [e] used (i.e., present, future, imperfect, participle),\(^{87}\) Genesis, Job, and Proverbs represent *yesh* most freely, whereas 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, and Psalms are the most literal. Proverbs is both exceptional ([e] 3spi only twice), and least consistent.

---

\(^{86}\)It is thus never rendered by [e] in MP (4xx). See the excursus "Is MP a Translation Unit?" in the Conclusion (below).

\(^{87}\)See Chart 2.2.5.
TABLES AND GRAPHS: yesh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>yesh</th>
<th>yesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>20613</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>16713</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>16408</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>14294</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>9886</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>13264</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>11040</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>13140</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>12284</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>16943</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>21836</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>14363</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>19587</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>18351</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>6915</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>5312</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>10746</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13315</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>305634</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2
Renderings of *yesh*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JgA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent 80% 3.7% 3.7% 2.2% 6.7% 4.4%

---

**Key**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>huparxw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt; G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

88NB: Five of these minuses are because the following participle was rendered verbally.

103
Chart 2.2.1
yesh: Summary of Renderings

- [e] (77%)
- w/o v (2%)
- [exw] (2%)
- Unique (10%)
- pron. (1%)
- [hup.] (4%)
- (4%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>[e]</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent | 88% | 6.5% | 2.8% | 2.8%
Graph 2.3.1

yesh: Forms of elmi

- Pres (88%)
- Unique (3%)
- Impf (3%)
- Fut (7%)
Chapter Three: ʿōd

ʿōd¹ ("again", "still", "yet") occurs 489 times in H,² primarily in finite verbal contexts (316xx; 65%), as well as in non-verbal contexts (20%), and syntagms with hayah (7%) and participles (8%).³

FUNCTION IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

ʿōd⁴ modifies the time or manner⁵ of the predicate of its clause by signaling that an action, state, or

---

¹ʿōd is derived from the verb ʿūd ("[re]turn, repeat," [Arabic ʿāda "return", ṣādat "habit; Ethiopic ṣōda "turn about" (C. van Leeuwen, "ad," THAT, II:210)]. Cf. Cross & Freedman, EARLY HEBREW ORTHOGRAPHY: A STUDY OF THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952): "The diphthong is uncontracted in Judahite", based on bʿwd in line 2 of the Siloam Inscription (50). This comment was pointed out to me by Dr. Stephen Geller.

²It does not occur in Ob, SS, or Ez.

³This differs considerably from the use and function of both ʿayyeh and yesh, but ʿōd functions like the other members of this group when it occurs in non-verbal syntagms.

⁴ʿōd may be classified as a constituent adverb. These "... modify clauses [by modifying] the predicate, that is, they specify the time, place, or manner of the predicated situation" (Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, INTRODUCTION TO BIBLICAL HEBREW SYNTAX (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990): #39.3.1d).

⁵"Scalar adverbs ... refer to grades of degree [mēʿōd, mēʿat] ... or ... identity of action [tamid]" (Waltke and O'Connor, INTRODUCTION: #39.3.1i).
situation may be or have been repeated ("again")\(^6\) or recur without interruption ("continually"). Combined with negative adverbs, it asserts the non-repetition of an action.

\`ôd indicates that an action is or is not repeated:

wayyeda` 'adam `ôd 'et-'ishtô  
Now Adam again knew his wife, ...  
Gn 4.25

wayyabo' mal'ak ha'êlohim `ôd 'el-ha'isshah  
and the Angel of God came to the woman again  
Jg 13.9

wayyoseph YHWH qêro' `ôd shêmû'el  
And YHWH again called, "Samuel!"  
S1 3.6

kî lî-ya'âseh `ôd `abdêka `olah we'zebax  
le'lohîm 'a-xerîm kî 'îm lYHWH  
for your servant will never again perform burnt offering or sacrifice to other gods—only to YHWH.  
K2 5.17

In this function \`ôd often occurs pleonastically with yasaph and an infinitive construct:

wayyoseph `ôd lêdabber 'elayw wayyo'mer ...  
He spoke to him again and said ...  
Gn 18.29

\(^6\)This repetition may be single or multiple. Repetition in H may be indicated in other ways: [yasaph] without `ôd, pa`am or pa`âmayim and in a hendiadys composed of, e.g., [shûb] with another verbal. These are outside the scope of this study, although a study of the renderings of formulae of repetition from H into G would certainly be worthwhile.

\(^7\)Continuity is indicated in other ways in H, especially by verbal hendiadys in which halak occurs as the first of two participles (Jo 1.11), two infinitives absolute (Gn 8.3), or as a participle followed by either an adjective (Ex 19.19; S2 3.1) or an infinitive absolute (Jr 41.6). In each case the second of the two is the primary predicate, made continuous by the preceding halak. This phenomenon would also be the subject of an interesting and profitable study of translation technique.
lo'-'osiph 'ôd rë'ôt paneyka Ex 10.29
[Moses said] "... I will never see your face again"

'ôd indicates continuance ("still") by qualifying the time of the action or state of its predicate:

'ashîrah lĕYHWH bëxayyay ['ăhalĕlah YHWH ...
146.2] 'azammĕrah le'lohay bĕ'ôdî Ps 104.33 (= 146.2)
I will sing to YHWH while I live; I will make
music to my God while I continue [to live]

... wë'ër'eh hâ'ôdam xayyîm Ex 4.18
so that I may see if they are still alive

wayyo'mer hâ'ôdennû xay 'axî hû' Kî 20(21).32
He [Ahab, king of Israel] said, "Is he still alive? He is my brother."

In this function 'ôd can also indicate overlap, especially in participial syntagms. This is common when a speaker is interrupted.

---

8 See on 'ôd ... xay (below).

9 Overlap is a sub-type of continuance which indicates that one action was not complete when the next began. Cf. Joseph E. Grimes, "Kinds of Information in Discourse" KIVUNG 4 (1971):64. For a slightly different interpretation of this syntagm, cf. Waltke and O'Connor, INTRODUCTION (#37.6d).

While you are still speaking there with the king I will come in after you ...

While he was still speaking with them the messenger suddenly came down to him and said

While they were still speaking with him, the king's servants arrived and quickly took Haman to the feast which Esther had prepared.

`êt may also indicate that a period of time will intervene before an event takes place. The length of this period of time is always specified.

He said to him, "Name her 'Not-pitied' I will no longer pity the household of Israel."  

In non-verbal contexts `êt indicates existence in the state defined by its predicate, which

11 Cf. in the immediate context: wehinneh `odennah medabberet 'im-hammelek wenatan hannabi' ba' "While she was still talking with the king, Nathan the prophet came in" (Kl 1.22); `odennu medabber wēhinneh yōnatan ben-'ebyat arakkohen ba' wayyo'mer ... "While he [Joab] was still speaking, Jonathan ben Abiathar the priest arrived and said ..." (Kl 1.42).

12 `êt here is a non-deictic adverb of the extent of time (cf. `olam "forever", rabbat "for a long time"). "Non-deictic" means that its meaning does not depend on either the context or cotext.
may be an adjective, [locative] prepositional phrase, or adverb:13

wayy'omer YHWH 'el-gid'ôn `ôd ha'am rab Jg 7.4
But YHWH said to Gideon, "There are still too many people"

`ôd frequently occurs with negative adverbs to indicate non-repetition or non-continuity.14 This construction, which accounts for nearly one-quarter of the total occurrences of `ôd,15 is especially common in the Latter Prophets,16 where the reader must decide whether it means that something will absolutely never happen again, or that a specific situation is happening no longer:

wêlo' yîlmêdû `ôd milxamah
nor will they study war any longer. Is 2.4

13Cf. Gn 44.14, above (sham); also with bê (7xx) and `im and bên (once each).

14The meaning of lo' ... `ôd ("no longer" or "never again"); i.e., does `ôd modify lo' or the predicate?) can be debated because determining the distribution of a negative is often troublesome. E.g., "You can't cook eggplant too long". Does this mean that eggplant may be cooked, but not too long (lest it be ruined), or that the length of time for which eggplant is cooked is immaterial? This discussion (and example) were brought to my attention in a paper by Merle M. Brubaker entitled "Semantics Investigation".

15This construction accounts for 26.3% of all biblical occurrences of `ôd (155xx).

1680% of the occurrences of this construction are in the Latter Prophets (124xx).
laken hinneh-yamîm ba'îm nê'um-YHWH wêlo'-yo'mêrû xay-YHWH
Therefore days are soon coming--a proclamation of YHWH--when they will no longer say 'As YHWH lives ..."

wêlo'-yisshama' òd qîl mal'akekeh Na 2.14
nor will the voice of your messenger be heard again

wêlo'-ya'âbor 'alêhem òd noges kî 'attah ra'îti bê'ênay Zc 9.8
Nor will an oppressor pass over them again, for now I have seen with my own eyes.

On the basis of its occurrences in the historical books this construction may emphasize the finish of an activity, not its non-recurrence:

wayyikkan'û happlishtîm wêlo'-yasôphû òd labô' bigebul yisra'el Sî 7.13
So the Philistines were humbled and no longer came into the territory of Israel

'òd denies existence in the formula 'ên 'òd (11xx), found first in Kî 8.60, then in the Latter Prophets: 18

lëma'an da'at kol-'ammê ha'aretz kî YHWH hû' ha'êlohim 'ên 'òd Kî 8.60
... that all the nations of the earth may know that YHWH is God--there is no other.

---

17Cf. Sî 10; 13f; 17-19; 23; 28-31; Sî 3, 5, 8). If Sî 7.13 is interpreted as an absolute statement, it might be assigned to the putative anti-monarchical document said to underlie parts of Sî 7-15. This, however, argues for a remarkably short-sighted (at best) author or editor, especially in light of the role which the Philistine incursions play in the plot of Sî 10-31. It probably means that that particular invasion was stopped, and was not repeated.

18It is nearly a refrain in Is 45-47 (8xx), where it appears with 'ên (6xx) and lo' and 'aphsî (once each). See under 'ên, below.
I am YHWH, and there is no other; there is no one else except me.

She said to her son, "Bring me another vessel," but he replied to her, "There is no other vessel."

`ôd with affixes

Unlike 'ayyeh, hinneh, and yesh, `ôd appears with prefixes other than the conjunction or interrogative marker. It occurs with two prepositions; both constructions indicate continuance. b`ôd occurs nineteen times:

\[\text{In just sixty-five years Ephraim will be shattered from (= as) a people.}\]

\[\text{I also withheld the rain from you while there were yet three months til the harvest }\ldots\]

---

19 In verbal clauses "while yet" or "[with]in yet"; in non-verbal clauses a predicative of continued existence.

20 In four of those nineteen passages it occurs with a pronominal suffix (Dt 31.27; Is 28.4; Pss 104.33; 146.2).
I will sing to YHWH while I live; I will sing to my God while I continue [to live] (= as long as I live).

Idiomatic min+’ōd occurs twice, both times with a 1cs suffix:

ha’elohîm haro’eh ‘otî me’ōdî ‘ad-hayyôm hazzeh Gn 48.15
the God who has shepherded me from my birth to this day ...

watto’mer ha’aton ‘el-bîl’âm ha’âlô’ ‘anokî ‘atonka ‘asher-rakabta ‘alay me’ōdî ‘ad-hayyôm hazzeh Nu 22.30
The donkey said to Balaam, "Am I not your she­ass upon whom you have ridden from my birth to this day?" 22

When the subject of ’ōd is pronominal, it is indicated by a pronominal suffix. 23 The distribution of this combination in the various types of syntagm is nearly an inversion of its general use, and corresponds roughly to the distribution of yesh and ’ayyeh: 24

21Cf. Dt 31.27: hen be’ōdennî xay ‘immakem, where the presence of xay specifies the nature of the continuance. In Ps 146.2 the same effect is created by the parallelism bèxayyay . . . bè’ōdî.

22Since donkeys are not ridden until they are one or two years old, Balaam’s makes its point via hyperbole.

233ms (21xx), 1cs (7xx), 2ms (5xx), 3fs and 3mp (2xx); 2fs and 1cp (once each). Its frequency with pronominal suffixes (7.98%; 39xx of 789xx) is comparable to that of yesh, but less than half that of ’ayyeh.

24With suffixes, ’ōd occurs in non-verbal (56.1%), participial (26.9%), and verbal clauses (12.2%). Unlike yesh and ’ayyeh, however, which are used only in quotations, ’ōd occurs in quotations, direct address, and as a narrative device (e.g., Gn 8.12, 21).
Suffixes with `ôd occur primarily with either xay or a participle (especially medabber). 25  `ôd+sfx xay (10xx) indicates that the subject continued to be alive at the time of the main verb:

wayshall exem me`al yitsxaq bênô bê`ôdennû xay Gn 25.6
... and he [Abraham] sent them away from Isaac while he [Abraham] was still living

wayyitqa`em bêleb `abshalôm `ôdennû xay bêleb ha`elah S2 18.14
... and he [Joab] thrust them into Absalom's heart while he was still alive in the heart of the oak

hâ `ôdennû xay
Is he [your elder father about whom you spoke] still alive?

---

25 On `ôd with medabber, see above. It occurs four times with xazag: as a participle (Ex 9.2; Jb 2.3, 9) and adjective (Js 14.11).

26 Cf. 'abikem `ôdennû xay "Our father is still alive" (Gn 43.28); ki `ôdka xay "for you are still alive" (Gn 46.30).
Unlike 'ayyeh and yesh, the pronominal suffixes used with ʿod occur together with their antecedents:27

\[ \text{we}^e\text{abraham} ~ ʿ\text{odennū} ~ ʿ\text{omed liphēnē} \text{YHWH} \text{Gn 18.22} \]

Now Abraham was still standing before YHWH

\[ \text{ubishēmoneh} ~ ʃ\text{hanīm} ~ 1\text{e}\text{malḵō wehū} ~ ʿ\text{odennū} ~ nā\text{ar hexel līdrōsh le'loḥē david 'abiw} \text{C2 34.3} \]

In the eighth year of his reign, while he was still a young man, he began to seek the God of David his ancestor

\[ \text{wayyabo}' ~ ʿ\text{ehūdah wē'exayw bētah yōseph wēhū} ~ ʿ\text{odennū} ~ ʃ\text{am wayyippēlū lēphanayw 'artsah} \text{Gn 44.14} \]

So Judah and his brothers went to Joseph's house while he was still there, and fell to the ground before him

\[ \text{habbasar} ~ ʿ\text{odennū} ~ ｂēn shinnēhem Terem yikkaret wē'aph YHWH xarah ba'am ...} \text{Nu 11.33} \]

Now the flesh was still between their teeth--it was not even cut off--when the anger of YHWH burned against the people ...

---

27 Two pronominal passages are anomalous in that a finite verb stands where the other passages lead us to expect a participle. In La 4.17, the suffix (reading -\ ah with K, rather than -nu with Q) on ʿod reflects the verbal suffix, even as it refers to the same subject: ʿodēnah tikleynah ʿēnēnū 'el-'ezratenū habel "Our eyes still failed [as they looked] in vain for our help". Jr 40.5 we'odennū lo'-yashūb wēshubah 'el-gēdāiyah ben-'aḫāgam ... (when he [Jeremiah] still did not go back), "Return, then, to Gedaliah ben Ahigam ..."
SUMMARY

Within the apparent diversity of this catalog, the basic function of `ôd in verbal syntagms in H is to extend an event by indicating its repetition ("again"), or a state by indicating its continuance ("still"). These two functions are related, the second probably as an extension of the first.

`ôd also indicates that a [specified] period of time will elapse before an event comes to pass or a state into existence ("In X [X = #] (days/years/...) Y will occur"), which is also a sort of extension--this time of the intervening time before the event, rather than of the event.

In non-verbal syntagms, where it functions as a predicator of existence, `ôd indicates that its [often pronominal] subject either continues in a state or persists in an action.

In combination with negative adverbs `ôd denies the extension of an action or state, or the continued existence, of its subject.
TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

USUAL RENDERING

The usual rendering of ʾōd is eti (322xx = 76.1%), which also occurs with [e] (21xx = 5%). ʾōd is also rendered by ouketi (40xx = 9.5%),\(^{28}\) [e] alone and hews (5xx each = 1.2% each), and palin (4xx = 1%). Unique renderings total 26 (6.1%); it is not represented in G in 66 passages (13.5%). eti is therefore the primary lexical component used to represent ʾōd in G (383xx = 90.6%).

Given "again as the basic meaning of ʾōd, we might expect its usual rendering to be palin "again". This is not the case. Why is eti, rather than palin, the usual equivalent of ʾōd?\(^{29}\) Both eti and palin connote repetition, but the idea of continuance or duration is foreign to palin.\(^{30}\) eti, however, can entail both

\(^{28}\)All but one of these occurrences fall in the Latter Prophets (Is, 5xx; Jr, 3xx; Ek, 15xx; MP, 16xx). The exception is in S2 (below). This number does not include those passages in which only the element -eti of ou/meketi represents ʾōd (12xx), which are instead included under the usual rendering.

\(^{29}\)This question was posed to me by E. Tov, who like me expected palin to be the usual translation equivalent of ʾōd.

\(^{30}\)Where palin can be aligned with a Hebrew form (29 of 50xx), it represents shûb (24xx) in a verbal hendiadys that shows repetition of the action described by the following verb (above), ʾōd (4xx; Gn 29.33; Ex 3.15; 4.6; Jb 6.29; I found nothing common to these passages to explain this rendering), and yasaph with an infinitive (Gn 8.10).
functions of `ôd, and is thus the most appropriate form available to the translators.

RENDERINGS OF `ôd IN G

`ôd occurs 54xx in Genesis. It is translated by eti (37xx; = 68.5%), eti [e] (3xx), [e] alone (2xx), and by palin, epi loipa, neotetos, pleiwn, heteros, and henika (once each). It is not represented seven times (6xx where H and G are otherwise parallel (4.25; 8.22; 29.30; 37.9; 45.26; 48.7); 37.5b is lacking in G). eti thus renders `ôd in 80.4% of the occurrences (37/46xx) in which it is represented in Gn.

\[\text{lo'-'osiph lēgallel `ôd 'et-ha'ādamah ba`ābur ha'adam} \]
\[\text{Gn 8.21} \]
\[\text{Ou prosthew eti tou katarassasthai ten gen dia ta erga twn anthrwpwn, ...} \]

In 45.28 Jacob's declaration becomes a conditional statement of intent:

\[\text{wayyo'mer yisra'el rab `ôd-yôseph bēnî xay} \]
\[\text{Gn 45.28} \]
\[\text{eipen de Israel Mega moi estin ei eti ho huios mou Iwseph ze} \]

The translator had some trouble deciding what to do with rab, which is difficult, although his interpretation is that followed in many modern translations. Here he represents `ôd + adjective by eti ... verb.

In 29.9 he rendered the construction found in Gn 18.22 (above) with a genitive absolute:
`ōdennū mēdabber 'immam wērāxel ba'ah Gn 29.9
eti autou lalountos autois kai Raxel he thugater Laban erxeto

In a parallel construction, with an adjective rather than a participle, the translator used a genitive absolute to represent \( be^{+} `ōd^{+} sfx + \) adjective. The pronominal suffix is represented by the independent pronoun (in genitive) that functions as the "subject" of the G participle:31

\[
\text{wayshallem me`al yitsxaq bēnō bē`ōdennū xay}
\]

Gn 25.6

\[
kai ecapesteilen autous apo Isaak tou huiou autou eti zwntos autou
\]

Again Joseph, after inquiring about Jacob's health, asks further:32

\[
\ldots \text{hā`ōdennū xay} \quad \text{Gn 43.2733}
\]

\[
\ldots \text{eti ze?}
\]

and they reply with the same words:

\[
\ldots \text{`ōdennū xay} \quad \text{Gn 43.28}
\]

\[
\ldots \text{eti ze}
\]

In the same construction, but without the suffix, eti occurs with a finite verb:

\[
\text{hā`ōd `ābīkem xay} \quad \text{Gn 43.7}
\]

\[
\text{Ei eti ho pater ēmwn ze?}
\]

---

31 Cf. Dt 31.27.

32 Note interesting (oxymoronic?) inversion in which Joseph first asks if their father is healthy, then asks if he is still alive.

33 Cf. Gn 45.3 for another variant on this question, and 46.30 for the same statement and rendering: ki `ōdka xay > eti gar su zes.
`ôd is represented by eti [e] in three passages. eti [e] + (periphrastic) participle occurs once: 34

\[ \text{wē'abraham} \ 'ôdennû \ 'omed liphēnē \ YHWH \ Gn 18.22 \]

Abraam de en eti hestekws enantion kuriou

In Gn 31.14, where `ôd is represented by eti [e], the translator specified that Rachel and Leah expected a negative answer to their complaint by representing the interrogative prefix with me (rather than leaving it "neutral" by using, e.g., deliberative ei):

\[ \text{hā`ôd lanû xeleq wēnaxâlah bēbêt 'abînû} \]

Gn 31.14

Me estin hemin eti meris e kleronomia en tw oikw tou patros hemwn?

Another variant on the syntagm found in 18.22 occurs when Judah and his brothers return to Joseph's house after Benjamin's arrest and find Joseph still there. Here `ôd+sfx 35 with an adverb is represented by eti [e] (genitive absolute); again the pronominal suffix determines the pronominal "subject" of the participle:

\[ \text{wayyabo' yēhûdah wē'exayw bèta yôseph wēhû'} \]

Gn 44.14

Eiselthen de Ioudas kai hoi adelphoi autoi pros Iwseph eti autou ontos ekei

34 Also known as an "analytic tense" (Conybeare & Stock, §72). This is the pattern used only by the translator of Nehemiah (5.2-5) in representing yesh in this syntagm. Cf. Ex 9.2 (below) for an example of a pattern similar to that used for yesh.

35 The suffix here reiterates a proleptically fronted pronoun in this adverbially disjunctive clause, which is most effectively represented by the genitive absolute.
It is not easy, however, to assign exact equivalents in this verse, probably because the translator found it difficult to represent the combination of a disjunctive pronoun (\(\text{wehû'}\)) and suffix on \(\text{`ôd}\).

In 19.12 \(\text{`ôd}\) is rendered by [e] alone; the difference between G and H is that of continuity ("Who of yours is still here?" vs. "Who of yours is here?"): \begin{align*}
\text{`ôd mi-1\ôka poh} \\
\text{Estin tís soi hwde ...?}
\end{align*}

\(\text{`ôd}\) is also rendered by [e] when Jacob asks his sons why they have brought disaster upon him by revealing Benjamin's existence to "the man": \begin{align*}
\ldots \text{1\ôhaggîd la'îsh h\ôd lakem 'ax} \\
\ldots \text{anaggeilantes tw anthrwpw ei estin humin adelphos?}
\end{align*}

This makes Jacob's question conform to Joseph's, as quoted by Jacob's sons in the next verse: \begin{align*}
\text{h\ôyesh lakem 'ax} \\
\text{ei estin humin adelphos}
\end{align*}

\(\text{`ôd}\) is represented by several renderings that are unique. In Gn 45.6, in contrast to the translator's normal custom of using one word for two, \(\text{`ôd}\) is rendered by \text{eti loipa}. This emphasizes the futurity of the years of famine by anticipating the future tense in the following relative clause: \begin{align*}
\text{we`ôd xamesh shanîm 'âsher 'ên-xarîsh weqatsîr} \\
\text{kai eti loipa pente ete, en hois ouk estal arotriasís oude ametos}
\end{align*}
Five verses later he renders the same construction (without the following relative clause) with simple eti:

\[
\text{kî `òd xamesh shanîm ra`ab eti gar pente ete limos} \quad \text{Gn 45.11}
\]

The idiom \text{min+`òd+sfx `ad-hayyôm hazzeh} "from [my] birth til today" is rendered fluently,\(^{36}\) although the translator may have read \text{me`ód} as \text{minn`ûray}:\(^{37}\)

\[
\text{ha`ëlohim haro`eh 'otî me`ôdî `ad-hayyôm hazzeh} \quad \text{Gn 48.15}
\]

ho theos ho trephwn me ek neotetos hews tes hemeras tautes, ...

The pronominal suffix is not represented due to the propensity of Greek not to use possessive forms with parts of one's body (here, by extension, one's life).

\text{henika} is used in a text where G conflates two verses--apparently to telescope (and thus equate) two events. It appears that the translator chose an exegetical translation rather than that his Vorlage differed significantly from H.\(^{38}\)

---

\(^{36}\)Cf. Nu 22.30 for the same representation of this idiom (there 2ms, below).

\(^{37}\)neotes represents either \text{no`ar} or \text{në`ûr} in 37 of its 47 occurrences in G. \text{no`ar} and \text{në`ûr}, in turn, are represented by \text{neotes} 2/4xx and 35/46xx, respectively.

\(^{38}\)35.16 (G) contains a conflation of vv. 16 and 21. 35.21 (G) then corresponds to 35.22 (H), and 35.22 (G) to 35.22b (H). Cf. a vertical (parallel) alignment of these texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35.16</th>
<th>35.21</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wayyis`û</td>
<td>wayyis`û</td>
<td>Aparas + de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Iakwb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mibbet `el</td>
<td>ek + Baithel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wayyeT</td>
<td>epecen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ohÔlîh</td>
<td>ten + skenen + autou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
henika, which in G usually represents either the conjunction ki or the prepositions ke- and be- when they introduce temporal clauses, is used here because H is misunderstood, especially the idiom kibrat-ha'arets, the first half of which was simply transliterated.

pleiwn, comparative of polus, corresponds to 'od once when Joseph again sees his father after twenty-two years and weeps on his shoulders:

wayyippol 'al-tsawwa'rayw wayyebk 'al-tsawwa'rayw 'od Gn 46.29 epepesen epi traxelon autou kai eklausen klauthmwn pleioni

If the translator used klauthmos to reflect Gn 45.2 (its only other occurrence in Genesis) then we could expect

| mehal'ah | epekeina |
| lmigdal- | tou + purgou |
| 'eder | Gader |
| 'od | egeneto + de |
| henika | eggisen |
| kibrat- | xabrattha |
| ha'arets | eis gen |
| labo' | elthein |
| 'ephrataha | Ephratha |

39 Cf., e.g., Gn 6.1; 12.11, 14; 16.16; 17.24, 25; 48.7 (all with bê-).

40 H: "While they were still some distance from the entrance to Ephratha ..." is not well represented by G: "When they approached xabrattha in the land [and were about?] to enter Ephratha ..." The translator may have used henika because he read 'od as 'ad, but this would not fit his usual pattern (above).

41 The second occurrence of 'al-tsawwa'rayw is not repeated in G, perhaps overlooked or elided due to its presence two words earlier.
him to have represented 'ôd with eti "again" rather than pleiwn "greatly". The cognate combination klaiw... klauthmos is not infrequent in G, and the greatly increased use of the cognate construction generally in Gn42 may have encouraged the translator to use that construction. He most likely understood 'ôd in the sense of m'od (Although polus/pleiwn usually renders rab) and used the cognate + pleiwn to emphasize the abundance of his sobbing rather than its continuity.

In Gn 29.33 the translator represented 'ôd by means of palin:

wattahar 'ôd watteleed ben ... Gn 29.33
kai sunelaben palin Leia kai eteken huion
deuteron tw Iakwb

To avoid misunderstanding and emphasize both that this was Leah's son, and that he was her second, the translator inserted both Leia and deuteron tw Iakwb.43

In 37.9 heteros corresponds to 'ôd, probably under the influence of 'axer/heteron in the preceding clause:44


43 Note that the other occurrences of this conception and birth formula are all rendered with eti (29.34, 35; 30.7, 19 (30.12 (H) parallels the G text of 29.33)).

44 This rendering is shared only with two clauses that are identical (Is 47.8, 10).
In seven passages in Gn there is no form that corresponds to 'ôd, although in six of these H and G are otherwise parallel. Gn 37.5b is a minus in G.

In some passages 'ôd may be a minus in G because it was not part of the translator's Vorlage, or because he felt that it was rendered superfluous by either the context or the connotation of the form modified by 'ôd. In Gn 29.30 he may have thought that 'axer alone entailed continuance, expressing seven [additional] years of service:

wayya`apod `immô `ôd sheba`-shanîm `اخرôt kai edouleusen autw hepta ete hetera Gn 29.30

The brothers' report to Jacob that Joseph lives(!) is rendered without representing 'ôd, perhaps since zaw, which represents the adjective, necessarily entails continuity: 47

45 The first occurrence of 'ôd may be a minus in G either because it was lacking in the translator's Vorlage or because it seemed redundant or superfluous in representing 'ôd ... 'axer.

46 Gn 4.25; 8.22; 29.30; 37.9; 45.26; 48.7. On 37.9, see above.

47 Although in essentially the same construction just two verses later 'ôd is represented by eti (Gn 45.28, above).
wayyaggidû lô le'mor 'ôd yôseph xay  Gn 45.26
kai aneggeilan autw legontes hoti Ho huios sou
Iwseph ze, ...48

Where the exact function of 'ôd was not clear the
translator left it out rather than merely fill in eti or
some other form:

'ôd kol-yêmê ha'arets zera' wêqatsîr ... lo'
yishbotû  Gn 8.22
pasas tas hemeras tes ges sperma kai
therismos, ... ou katapausousin.

In Gn 48.7 beêôd is not represented, probably
because of the distortion of the text caused by the
introduction of hippodromos:49

wa'anî bêbo'î mippaddan metah 'alay raxel
beêrets kêna'an badderek beêôd kibrat-'erets
labô' 'ephratah  Gn 48.7
egw de henika erxomen ek Mesopotamias tes
Surias apethanen Raxel he meter sou en ge
Xanaan eggizontos mou kata ton hippodromon
xabrahtra tes ges tou elthein Ephrath

'ôd is not represented in 4.25, which stands
contrary to the conception and birth formulas connected
with the births of Jacob's children (above), where the

48Although 'ôd is not represented, the rest of the
verse is consistent with the translator's pattern of
using a verb to represent an adjective (above). It is
thus possible that the translator's Vorlage lacked 'ôd,
although I think it more difficult to explain its
insertion into H.

49beêôd parallels kata ton hippodromon, but 'ôd is
a G minus. In 48.7b hippodromos corresponds to 'ephrat.
It appears that the translator did not identify 'ephrat
with 'ephratah (cf. 35.16, 19; 48.7a, in all of which
'ephratah is rendered as Ephratha), but rendered it with
hippodromos, which was then read back into the parallel
passages. G might suggest that the translator read
beêad (which would be unique to this passage in H).
translator was careful to represent `ôd each time that it occurred:

\[\text{wayyeda` `adam `ôd `et-`ishtô} \quad \text{Gn 4.25}\]
\[\text{Egnw de Adam Euan ten gunaika autou}\]

Genesis therefore shows some variation in rendering `ôd, although eti is the usual rendering (76.6%). The translator also did not represent `ôd, or translated it emphatically (29.33).

`ôd occurs thirteen times in Exodus, where it is rendered by eti (11xx)\textsuperscript{50} and palin (2xx).

Some examples of the usual rendering:

\[\text{`ôd më`at ûsëgalunî} \quad \text{Ex 17.4}\]
\[\text{eti mikron kai katalithobolesousin me}\]

Although eti was used in 4.18, the translator rendered the deliberative question with ei for the interrogative prefix and used 3ppi of zaw for the adjective, determining the person and number of the verbal form from the pronominal suffix on `ôd:

\[\text{we`er`eh ha`ôdam xayyîm} \quad \text{Ex 4.18}\]
\[\text{kai opsomai ei eti zwsin}\]

This is not, however, as free as it might seem at first glance, since it is the best way to represent the meaning and force of H in Greek.

\textsuperscript{50} Including two passages where `ôd is represented by the second element of [ouk]eti (10.29; 36.6).
In a parallel translation\(^{51}\) the combination `ôd + participle is rendered by eti + finite verb, with the pronominal suffix of `ôd again determining the person and number of the verbal form:

\[
\text{wë`ôdka max^aزيq bam \hspace{1cm} Ex 9.2}
\]

\[
\text{all' eti egkrateis autou, ...}
\]

Twice in Exodus `ôd is represented by palin. The same general formula introduces a direct address in both verses:

\[
\text{wayyo'omer `ôd 'elahim 'el-mosheh \hspace{1cm} Ex 3.15}
\]

\[
\text{kai eipen ho theos palin pros Mwusen ...}
\]

\[
\text{wayyo'omer YHWH lô `ôd \hspace{1cm} Ex 4.6}
\]

\[
eipen de autw kurios palin ...}
\]

In Ex 10.29, the translator represented lo' yasaph `ôd (inf) with ouketi with a passive verb. `ôd here appears as the second half of ouketi, although this probably entails yasaph as well:

\[
\text{lo' 'osiph `ôd rë`ôt paneyka \hspace{1cm} Ex 10.29}
\]

\[
\text{ouketi ophthesomai soi eis proswnpon}
\]

When Moses told the people to stop bringing materials for the tabernacle the translator similarly used meketi to represent `al ... `ôd,\(^{52}\) representing `ôd with the second element of the compound negative adverb:

\[
\text{---}
\]

\(^{51}\)The same pattern is followed in 9.17 (oun is not part of the rendering of `ôd--it represents the summary force of the verse).

\(^{52}\)me- rather than ou- is due to the imperative.
With the exception of the two occurrences of *palin*, therefore, the translator of Ex used only the usual rendering (*llxx* = 84.6%), albeit also in compound forms (*2xx* = 15.4%).

*`ôd* occurs four times in *Leviticus*, where it is rendered by *eti* (*2xx*) and by *ouketi* and *[e]* (once each).

In a non-verbal clause it is rendered by *[e]*; *tis* specifies the indefinite nature of the condition (which requires the subjunctive):

\[
\text{`im-`ôd rabbôt basshanîm ... } \quad \text{Lv 25.51}
\]

\[
ean \text{ de tini pleion twn etwn e, ...}
\]

The laws concerning redemption of land consecrated to YHWH say that one who consecrates property but does not redeem it or sells it to another has lost forever his opportunity to redeem it for himself:

\[
\text{lo' yigga'el `ôd}
\]
\[
\text{ouketi me lutrwsetai auton } \quad \text{Lv 27.20}
\]

Here *ouketi me* corresponds to *lo' ... `ôd*, the additional negative emphasizing the permanence of his loss of the right of redemption.

The translator of Lv was thus fairly consistent in representing *`ôd* (*3xx* = 75%).
In Numbers ʿōd (9xx) is rendered by eti (5xx), eti [e] (2xx), and neotetos (once; 22.30). It is not represented in Nu 18.5.

It is rendered by eti alone in verbal clauses but not in the others, showing that the translator may have drawn some distinction between the different constructions in which he found ʿōd.

ʿōd is represented by eti [e] twice, once in an initial disjunctive clause with a fronted subject reiterated by the pronominal subject affixed to ʿōd:

habbasar ʿōdennū bēn shinnēhem ... Nu 11.33
ta krea eti en en tois odousin autwn ...

Whoever refuses ritual purification after touching a corpse will be cut off; here eti and [e] are separated by the length of the clause:

ʿōd Tum'atō bō Nu 19.13
eti he akatharsia autou en autw estin

In both of these passages the idea of continued existence is especially prominent, which is probably why the translator used [e] in addition to eti.

Balaam's she-ass asked if she had ever behaved in such a way before. The translator rendered idiomatic meʿōdka54 according to its sense, rather than formally:

53 Nu 8.25; 18.22; 32.15.

54 Only here and Gn 48.15 (1cs suffix), where ʿōd is also rendered with neotetos.
hālō' 'anokī 'atonka 'asher-rakabta 'alay me'ōdkā 'ad-hayyōm hazzeh Nu 22.30
Ouk egw he onos sou, eph' hes epebaines apo neotetos sou hews tes semeron hemeras?

`ōd is not represented in one passage in Nu; perhaps because the translator felt it superfluous given the accompanying hayah (rendered by [el]):

welo'-yihyeh `ōd qetseph `al-ḇēnē yisra'el Nu 18.5
kai ouk estai thumos en tois huiois Israel

The translator of Nu rendered `ōd relatively consistently as eti, using [e] when required by the nature of the clause (2xx), interpreting an idiom, and choosing not to represent it when to do so seemed superfluous to the requirements of G.

Deuteronomy contains fifteen occurrences of `ōd, rendered without exception by eti. `ōd itself is represented by eti in 31.27, but the construction bē+`ōd+sfx with an adjective is rendered by eti and a genitive absolute, with an independent pronoun that represents the pronominal suffix. The translator used a concessive genitive absolute in order to represent the duration implied by the preposition bē affixed to `ōd:

hen bē`ōdennī xay 'immakem hayyōm mamrīm hēyītem `im-YHWH Dt 31.27
eti gar emou zwntos meth' humwn semeron parapikrainontes ete ta pros ton theon
The stylized formula\textsuperscript{55} 'ên `ôd is, as normally in G, rendered by ouk [e] eti. ouk [e] represents 'ên, and eti represents `ôd:

\begin{equation*}
\text{YHWH hû' ha'elohîm 'ên `ôd millêbaddô kai ouk estin eti plen autou}
\end{equation*}

Dt 4.35\textsuperscript{56}

The translator of Dt rendered `ôd with absolute regularity.

`ôd occurs five times in Joshua, where it is rendered by eti (3xx),\textsuperscript{57} and eti [e] and oudemia (once each). Unlike Numbers, the renderings do not reflect the type of clause.

It occurs once with the preposition be- where the translator represented the sense by rendering the following participle paratactically with a verb, rather than subordinating the `ôd-clause by means of a participle or subordinating conjunction:

\begin{equation*}
\text{kî be'ôd shêloshet yamîm 'attem 'ôbrîm 'et hayyarden hazzeh hoti eti treis hemerai kai humeis diabainete ton Iordanen touton}
\end{equation*}

\begin{equation*}
\text{Js 1.11}
\end{equation*}

\textsuperscript{55}That this was a traditional formula can be seen from 4.39, where millêbaddô is elided.

\textsuperscript{56}Cf. 4.39.

\textsuperscript{57}Including the second element of [ouk]eti (once).

\textsuperscript{58}G readings in Joshua are from Max L. Margolis, The Book of Joshua in Greek, two volumes (Paris: Librarie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1931).
eti [e] renders ʿōd when Caleb asserted that he was still able to possess his inheritance:

'ādennî hayyôm xazaqa bēyôm shēlo,x
'ōtī mosheh  Js 14.11
eti eimi semeron isxuwn hwsei hote apestilen
me Mwuses

lo' ... ʿōd59 is represented by [ouk]eti:

wēlo'-hayah ʿōd libēnē yisra'el man  Js 5.12
kai ouketi huperxen tois huiois Israel manna

The translator used oudemia to emphasize61 the complete absence of any king courageous enough to stand against Israel, whereas H states simply that the kings (en masse) no longer had the heart to stand before Israel:

wēlo' hayah bam ʿōd rūa,x mippēnē bēnē-yisra'el  Js 5.1
kai ouk en en autois phronesis oudemia apo
proswpou twn huiwn Israel.

The translator of Js was thus relatively free (60%) to use differing representations to emphasize the force and function of ʿōd in different contexts.

---

59 Three times: Js 2.11; 5.1, 12.

60 Note also the use of huparxw to render hayah l in the sense of "have" or "possess", as occurred with yesh lē- (above).

61 Multiple negatives in Greek increase the force of the negation; they do not, as in English, "cancel" each other.
`ôd occurs twelve times in Judges. It is represented by eti (6xx) and by eti [e] and [e] (once each). It is not represented four times.62

The translator of Jg twice used non-verbal clauses that correspond to H. YHWH told Gideon, after the elimination of 22,000 warriors that:

`ôd ha`am rab
eti ho laos polus

Jg 7.4

Micah, lamenting the loss of his idol and priest, complained to the Danite warriors:

ûmah lî `ôd
kai tî emoî eti

etî [e] represents `ôd in a non-verbal clause which is rendered as a genitive absolute governing the second half of the verse:

`âd hayyôm hazzeh `ôdennû b'ophrat 'âbî ha`ezri
hews tes hemeras tautes eti autôs en
Ephratha patros tou Ezri

Jg 6.24

In the explanation of Jether's reluctance to obey his father Gideon by killing Zebah and Zalmunnah the translator used [e] (3sii) to represent `ôd+3ms:

kî `ôdennû na`ar
hoti en newteros

Jg 8.20

62 3xx where G and H are otherwise parallel; 11.14a is a minus in G.

These statistics reflect the A text of Jg; Jg B is far more consistent, using eti (10xx, including all 4xx where `ôd is a minus in Jg A), eti [e] (2xx; 6.24--Jg A also has eti [e], and 8.20--Jg A has only [e]). Jg B thus reflects H much more closely (cf. on yesh, above).
`ôd is not represented in four passages in Jg; in three H and G are otherwise parallel. In Jg 2.11-19, a paradigmatic overview of the book, Israel became as helpless as their enemies had been before them (cf. Js 2.11; 5.1, 12). The translator absolutizes their inability to resist by not reflecting the presence or force of `ôd:

\[\text{welo' yakelû `ôd la`amod liphênê 'ôybêhem}\\ \text{Jg 2.14}\\ \text{kai ouk edunasthesan antistenai kata proswpon twn exthrwn autwn}\]

In Manoah's prayer for further instruction from the man of God `ôd is again a minus in G, probably because the next verse--13.9 (where `ôd is represented by eti)--explicitly mentions his return:

\[\text{yabo'-na' `ôd 'elènû wëyörenû ...}\\ \text{Jg 13.8}\\ \text{elthetw de pros hemas kai photisatw hemas ...}\]

In the account of the Second Battle of Gibeah `ôd is not represented. Here the translator wished to avoid an [apparent] contradiction into his text, since 22000, not 18000 had been killed on the first day of fighting, so did not represent `ôd: 63

\[\text{wayyashxitû bibênê yisra'el `ôd 18000 Jg 20.25}\\ \text{kai diephtheiren ek tou laou 18000}\]

G cannot be aligned satisfactorily with H in Jg

---

63 `ôd modifies the verb, referring to the previous Benjamite victory, not to the number of casualties.
11.14a, where apostrephw seems to represent yasaph. 64

This verse, however, is unusual in describing repetition by yasaph "ôd with a preterite, rather than the usual infinitive construct, and the translator may have been unsure of the best way to render this syntagm:

wayyoseph yiphtax 'ôd wayyishlax mal'akîm 'el-melek bênê 'ammon

kai apestrepsan hoi aggeloi pros Iephthae kai apestilein Iephthae aggelous pros ton basilea huiwn Ammwn

The translator of Jg used eti to represent only one-half of the occurrences of "ôd (7xx of 12 if eti [e] is counted here), and chose not to represent it in one-third of its occurrences, usually for editorial reasons.

In 1 Samuel (17xx) "ôd is represented by eti (9xx) and eti [e] (2xx). It is not represented in six passages. 65

In one non-verbal clause eti renders "ôd, but the verb with which "ôd occurs is not represented, when Jesse tells Samuel that he had yet another son:

wayyo'mer "ôd sha'ar haqqaTan

kai eipen Eti ho mikros

eti [e] represents "ôd twice in S1. S1 13.7 ([e] 3sii), reports that most of the Hebrews had fled beyond

64 If true, this would be the only place where yasaph > apostrephw.

65 In five of these G parallels H; 18.8b is a minus in G.
the Jordan to the territory of Gad and Gilead, but Saul and his entourage were still at Gilgal:

\[ \text{wəsha'ūl 'ōdennū bagilgal wəkol-ha'am xarədū 'axrərayw} \]
\[ \text{kai Saoul eti en en Galgalois, kai pas ho laos eceste opisw autou} \]

\text{eti + genitive absolute of [e] represents}

Jonathan's request in a difficult verse, where \( \text{wəlo'} \) was probably read as \( \text{wəlu'} \), the resulting condition being represented by the adverbial participle:

\[ \text{wəlo'} 'im-'ōdennī xay ...} \]
\[ \text{kai men eti mou zwntos ...} \]

\( \text{`ōd} \) is not represented in six passages; in five \( \text{G} \) parallels \( \text{H} \). In 3.6 the translator may have felt that \( \text{prostithemi} \) alone indicated repetition, and so did not represent \( \text{`ōd}:67 \)

\[ \text{wayyoseph YHWH qəro' `ōd shəmū'el} \]
\[ \text{kai proşetheto kurios kai ekalesen Samouel Samouel}68 \]

In Saul's promise to refrain from further plotting against David \( \text{`ōd} \) is not represented, probably because the future entails the idea of "any longer" or "again:"69

\[ \text{66 S1 18.8b is a minus in G.} \]

\[ \text{67 He did, however, use this combination in the other occurrences of this syntagm (7.13; 23.4; 27.4).} \]

\[ \text{68 The repeated Samouel is probably due to parablepsis which caused the intervening wayyagam (or its rendering) to be overlooked.} \]

\[ \text{69 But cf. 1.18, where this function of 'ōd is represented by ou ... eti.} \]
This is also the probable explanation for the minus in 27.1:

\[ \text{wēnō'ash murmennî sha'ûl lēbaqshenî 'ôd b'ēkol-gēbûl yisra'el} \]
\[ \text{kai ane Saoul tou zetein me eis pan horion} \]
\[ \text{Israel} \]

When Saul was named but could not be found at Mizpah, the assembly inquired further:

\[ \text{wayyish'ālû-'ôd b'ēYHWH hāba' 'ôd hālom 'îsh} \]
\[ \text{kai eperwtesen Samouel eti en kuriw Ei erxetai ho aner entautha?} \]

The rendering sets Samuel apart as the principal figure (in 10.22a, where 'ôd > eti), but appears to have read the second occurrence of 'ôd as the preposition 'ad, which is entailed in entautha.

'ôd is not represented to avoid a contradiction, since David had neither sworn nor answered Jonathan previously:

\[ \text{wayyisshaba' 'ôd david wayyo'mer ...} \]
\[ \text{kai apekrithe Dauid tw Iwnathan kai eipen ...} \]

S1 shows minimal regularity in rendering 'ôd (eti = 52.9%), choosing not to represent its presence (5xx = 29.4%) by entailing its function within verbal forms (especially the future) and depending on the context for the concept of repetition. The translator therefore saw it as an essentially pleonastic component of H which could, with relative impunity, be left unrepresented.
`ôd occurs thirty-five times in 2 Samuel. It is represented by eti (26xx = 74.3%), eti [e] (3xx), and by ouketi (once). It is not represented in five passages. It is thus represented by eti in 86.7% of its occurrences.

David answers his servants' perplexity about his changed attitude and appearance:

wayyo'mer bê`ôd hayyeled xay tsamtî S2 12.22
kai eipen David En tw to paidarion eti zen enesteusa ...

Here G captures precisely the force of H with an idiomatic articular infinitive.70

Although the genitive absolute is temporally adverbial `ôd is represented by eti. The adjective is rendered by the genitive participle, in a rendering similar to that of 12.22.

`ôdennû xay bêleb ha'elah S2 18.14
eti autou zwntos en te kardia tes druos

When Absalom complained about his "internal exile" to Joab, he claimed that he would be better if he had remained in Geshur:

Tôb lî `ôd 'ānî-sham S2 14.32
agathon moi en ([e] 3sii) tou eti einai me ekei

The first occurrence of [e] (3sii) represents the predication of the clause. The second (the [articular]

---

70 Note the contrast with the usual rendering of bê`ôd (genitive absolute).
present infinitive), along with the encompassed eti, represents 'ôd, in a fashion similar to that of 12.22.

'ôd is rendered twice as eti in a conversation between David and Siba when Siba, in answer to David's question about Saulide survivors, reveals Mephibosheth's existence. Its first occurrence is represented by eti, the second by eti [e]. The difference is probably to be explained by the repetition of hupoleipw from 9.1—the presence of the verb made [e] unnecessary:

wayyo'mer hammelek ha'ephes 'ôd 'îsh lêbêt sha'ûl 'e'eseh 'immî xesed 'êlohim wayyo'mer tsîba' 'el-hammelek 'ôd ben lîhônatan nêke[he] raglayim S2 9.3 (2xx) kai eipen ho basileus Ei hupoleleiptai ek tou oikou Saoul eti aner kai poiesw met' autou eleos theou? kai eipen Siba pros ton basilea Eti estin huios tw Iwnathan peplegws tous podas

bê'ôd appears as eti [e] in a genitive absolute, which represents well its force with adverbial hayyôm:

wayyabo' kol-ha'âm lêhabrôt 'et-dawid lexem bê'ôd hayyôm S2 3.35 kai elthen pas ho laos perideipnesai ton dawid artois eti ouses hemeras, ...

The translator uses ouketi to represent 'ôd in order to emphasize YHWH's promise that the nation will no longer be disturbed by the wicked:

wêlo' yirgaz 'ôd S2 7.10 kai ou merimnesei ouketi

'ôd is not represented in five passages in S2. In S2 2.28 (where it occurs twice) its second occurrence
appears in G as eti, but its first--repetition by means of a verb + ʿōd--is not represented:

\[wēlo'-yirdēphū ʿōd 'axārē yisra'el wēlo'-yasēphū ʿōd lēhillaxem\]  
\[kai ou katediwcān opisw tou Israel kai ou proseθentō eti tou polemein\]  

The first half of the verse makes it clear that the people stopped (wya`amādū kol-ha`am ...), which makes ʿōd superfluous, as does its second occurrence in this verse.

When Absalom sent for Joab the second time, ʿōd is not represented in G. It is patently pleonastic, being entailed in an adverbial phrase, as also in G:

\[wayyishlax ʿōd shenīt\]  
\[kai apesteilen ek deuterou pros auton, ...\]  

ʿōd occurs five times in as many verses in S2 21, four times in the construction wattēhī ʿōd [ham]milxamah ... In three of these verses it is represented by eti, once it is not--21.19, where the battle was in Gob not in Gath, as in the other verses. The translator, wishing to avoid an apparent contradiction, merely left out the reference to repeated warfare in Gob.

Saul, dying, commands the Amalekite to kill him

\[kī-kol-ʿōd naphshī bī\]  
\[hoti pasa he psuxe mou en emoi\]  

The translator, uncertain of the force of ʿōd in this
hypallage, \(^{71}\) did not reflect its presence in his translation—perhaps also because he felt that it was superfluous.

The translator also seems not to have known how to represent ʿod in 7.19, when David asks YHWH:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wattiqTan} & \text{ ʿod zoʾt } h^\text{e}ʾ\text{̄neyka } \text{ʿ} \text{donay YHWH} \\
\text{wat}^\text{e}\text{́daber gam} & \text{... S2 7.19} \\
\text{kai katesmikrunthe mikron enwpion sou, kurie} & \text{mou kurie, kai elalesas ...}
\end{align*}
\]

The force of ʿod here, indeed, is not obvious. It may be equivalent to that of gam [−zoʾt]: "And this too is a small thing in your sight, O Lord YHWH, ..."

The difference in proportion of renderings between S2 and S1 is striking, S2 being far more regular than S1 (86.7% to 52.9%). The translator of S2 also showed sensitivity for the nuances of Gin his rendering of ʿod + adjective and ʰêʾʿod.

1 Kings contains twelve occurrences of ʿod. It is represented by eti (7xx), eti [e] (2xx), and hews (once: 12.5). It is not represented in 10.5 and 22.7.

It is rendered by eti in three parallel verses describing Nathan and Bathsheba's plot to ensure Solomon's succession. Here ʿod+sfx + participle > eti

\(^{71}\)Hypallage is "inversion of normal syntactical order" (Williams, Hebrew Syntax, #30). It is not surprising that Saul, wounded and dying, with his dead sons near him, was not concerned with the niceties of syntax or grammar!
witha a genitive absolute in all three cases, the suffix supplying the pronominal "subject" of the genitival participle:72

hinneh `ôdak mëdabberet sham `im-hammelek
wa`ănî 'abô' 'axärayik K1 1.14
kai idou eti lalouses sou ekei meta tou
basilews kai egw eiseleusomai opisw sou ... 

At the end of Solomon's prayer of dedication `ôd is also represented by eti:73

lêma`an da`at kol-`ammê ha`arets kî YHWH hû'
ha`elhoîm `ên `ôd K1 8.60
hopws gnwsin pantes hoi laoi tes ges hoti
kurios ho theós, autos theós kai ouk estin eti

In a disjunctive clause in K1 12.2 (11.43a in G)
`ôd+sfx is represented by eti [e] (genitive absolute), with a genitive pronoun again representing the pronominal suffix:

wêhû` `ôdennû bemîtsrayîm K1 12.2
kai autou eti ontos en Aiguptw

It is also rendered by eti [e] when the king of Israel admitted to Jehoshaphat of Judah that there was yet another prophet, Micaiah, whom he hated because of his prophecies:

`ôd `îsh-`exad lidêrosh 'et-YHWH me`otô K1 22.8
eti estin aner heis tou eperwtesai ton kurion
dî' autou

72Cf. K1 1.22, 42, which are precisely parallel. Cf. also K1 12.2 (below), where `ôd is represented by eti [e] (genitive absolute).

73[e] is part of the representation of 'ên (often rendered by ouk [e]). See on 'ên, below.
In the previous verse, which contains the question that solicits this grudging response, however, it is not represented in G, perhaps to throw Ahab's reluctance into greater relief:

\[ \text{ha'ên poh nabi' 1έYHWH ̀ód} \quad \text{Kl 22.7} \\
\text{Ouk estin hwde prophetes tou kuriou ...} \]

`̀ód is not represented in Kl 10.5, which describes the effect of the splendor of Solomon's court upon the Queen of Sheba:

\[ \text{welo'- hayah bah ̀ód ruₐx} \quad \text{Kl 10.5} \\
\text{kai ec heautes egeneto} \]

Here the translator's free rendering of the idiom did not require (allow?) that he represent `̀ód.

Although `̀ód is consistently represented by eti (and eti [e]), the translator of Kl also left it unrepresented (10.5; 22.7) and translated it according to its sense (12.5: hews).

`̀ód occurs thirteen times in 2 Kings, in all of which it is represented by eti.

In Isaiah (48xx) `̀ód is represented by eti (29xx = 50%),\(^7\) ouketi (4xx), heteros and me (2xx each), and by eti [e], plen, and allos (once each). In one passage (28.4) it may be represented by prin e.

\(^7\)Including five occurrences in which `̀ód is represented by the second element of [ouk]eti.
It is not represented in seven occurrences, in all of which G parallels H (10.31(32); 26.21; 49.20; 56.8; 60.19, 20; 62.4 (second occurrence). eti is thus contained within the representation of ʿōd in 82.9% of its occurrences, although eti alone accounts for only 58.5%.

The parallelism of Is 2.4c is made more explicit in G by the addition of eti to the first colon:

lo'-yissa' gōy 'el-gōy xereb wēlo'-yilmēdū ʿōd milxamah
kai ou lempsetai eti ethnos ep' ethnos
maxairan, kai ou me mathwsin eti polemein

In the refrain75 "Despite all this, his anger has not turned away, but his hand is still outstretched" ʿōd + participle > eti + adjective, in marked contrast to the genitive absolutes, and verbal and periphrastic constructions seen in other books:

bekōl-zo't lo'-shab 'appō wēʿōd yādō nēTūyah
epi toutois pasin ouk apestraphe ho thumos,
all' eti he xeir hupsele

In its last occurrence in Isaiah, however, ʿōd, which occurs here with an independent pronominal subject(!) and participial predicate is rendered with eti + genitive absolute:

wēnayah Terem-yiqra'ū wa'ānī 'e'ēneh ʿōd hem
mēdabrim wa'ānī 'eshma' ʿēshma' ʿēshma'
kai estai prin e kekracai autous egw
epakousomai autwn, eti lalountwn autwn erw Tī esti?

75 Cf. Is 9.11(12), 16(17), 20(21).
The translator divided Is 45.5 into three clauses rather than four, reading 'w'en ... 'elohîm as one clause rather than two, but nonetheless represented 'ôd by eti: 76

'ânî YHWH wê'ên 'ôd zûlatî 'ên 'elohîm 'â'azzerka wêlo' yêda'tani Is 45.5 hotî egw kurios ho theos kai ouk estin eti plen emou theos kai ouk edeis me 77

eti [e] represents 'ôd in a non-verbal clause:

wê'ôd bah 'âsiriyah ... Is 6.13 kai eti ep' autes esti to epidekaton, ...

In 32.10 it appears that the translator, after reading 'ibri as 'ibdi, struggled to make sense of the rest of the text, 78 yielding the rather different reason for the instruction given at the beginning of the verse. He nonetheless recognized and rendered lo' ... 'ôd by the compound form ouketi: 79

---

76 Cf. Is 45.6, 18; 46.9. In this clause, 'ên > ouk [e] (further, below).

77 The minus of 'â'azzerka in G is puzzling, although it probably reflects the translator's freedom with his text, especially in light of the nearly identical preceding verse (45.4b):

wa'egra' lêka bishêmekha 'âxannêka wêlo' yêda'tani Is 45.4b egw kalesw se tw onomati mou kai prosdecomai se, su de ouk egnws me

78 'ibrî could be read as 'ibdi, and a redivision of consonants could have read kayôr bat as kî ūrab, but tarshîsh as a hypocatastasis for 'ôniyyôt tarshîsh (cf. 23.14) is unlikely.

79 As he does in 10.20; 23.10; 29.17; 52.1; 62.4 (first occurrence).
`ibrî 'artsek kay'or bat-tarshîsh 'ên mezax `ôd

Is 32.10

ergazou ten gen sou kai gar wkî ploia rab
ouketi erxetai ek Karxedonos

Only two verses later (32.12) he represented `ôd itself by ouketi, separately representing lo' by me:80

lo'-tôsîphî `ôd la`alôz

Is 32.12

Ouketi me prosthete tou hubrizein

The translator used several forms only once to represent `ôd--several in essentially the same syntagm. In 45.14 and 21 the statement found in Is 45.5 is expanded, leading the translator to different renderings of `ôd:

'ak bak 'el we'ên `ôd 'ephes 'êlohim Is 45.14

hoti en soi ho theos esti kai erousin Ouk esti theos plen sou

hâlô' 'ânî YHWH we'ên-`ôd 'êlohim mibbal`aday Is 45.21

Egw ho theos, kai ouk estin allos plen emou

In a parody of this saying, YHWH puts these words in the mouth of Jerusalem as an expression of her self-sufficiency, where `ôd is represented by heteros:81

'ânî we'aphsi `ôd

egw eimi kai ouk estin hetera

In an exegetical translation that heightens the imagery of H by stressing the immediacy of the action, be`ôd+sfx is rendered by prin e "before":

80 He also does this in 30.20; 32.5; 38.11; 65.19.

81 This is repeated two verses later (47.10), in both H and G.
"'asher yir'eh haro'eh 'ótah b°ódah b°kappô yibla`ennah
ho idwn auto prin e eis ten xeira autou labein thelesei auto katapiein

Is 28.4

"ôd is not represented seven times in Isaiah. In 60.18-20, where "ôd occurs in the opening (negative) clause of three consecutive verses, the first occurrence of "ôd is rendered by eti, but it is not represented in the other two, most probably due to ellipsis. This explanation appears to apply to Is 62.4 also, where lo'
"ôd is represented by ouketî in the first line, but is elided in the second, which depends on the preceding line for its connotation of continuance.

10.32 was seen by G as the introduction to the words of encouragement (10.33ff), not the conclusion to the picture of the ravages of the Assyrian, and so became a call to exhortation to stand against him:

"ôd hayyôm be¹nob la'¹mod y¹nopheph yadô har bat-tsiôn gib¹°at y¹rûshâlaim
Is 10.32
parakaleite semeron en hodw tou meinai, te xeiri parakaleite, to oros ten thugatera Siwn, kai hoi bounoi hoi en Ierousalem"^2

It is not represented, perhaps due to the use of the negated future tense (which itself implies "no longer"), or because the translator thought that the context sufficed to imply that the land was already

^2Cf. H: "Yet today they will halt at Nob; they will shake their fist at the mountain of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem"; G: "Today exhort [them] to remain in the way; exhort with [your] hand the mountain, the daughter of Zion, even you, O Hills of Jerusalem."
concealing the victims of violence, and that the non-continuance need not therefore be expressed:

\[\text{welo'-tekasseh 'ôd 'al-hârûqeyha} \quad \text{Is 26.21}\]
\[\text{kai ou katakalupsei tous anerêmenous}\]

This may also apply to 56.8, where 'ôd is not represented in a positive expression, although there the translator may not have been certain about the function of 'ôd ("again" or "yet"):

\[\text{'ôd 'aqqabbets 'alay leniqbatsayw} \quad \text{Is 56.8}\]
\[\text{sunacw ep' auton sunagwgen}\]

Perhaps again due to the translator's uncertainty about the function of 'ôd it is not represented in 49.20 (it is parallel to gar, but this is a highly unlikely rendering of 'ôd):

\[\text{'ôd yo'mèrù bê'oznayik bênê shikkulayik} \quad \text{Is 49.20}\]
\[\text{erousi gar eis ta wta sou hoi huioi sou hous apolwlekas}\]

It may be represented twice by the negative me. It is more likely in Isaiah, where lo' ... 'ôd is represented by ou me ... eti only twice, than in other books where this is a not uncommon rendering.

\[\text{lo' tizkèrî-'ôd} \quad \text{Is 54.4}\]
\[\text{ou me mnesthese}\]

The translator of Is was thus quite free in rendering 'ôd into Greek, using eti alone in only 58.5% of its occurrences, leaving it out--especially in

---

83 54.4 and 65.20.
84 Cf. on Jr (below).
passages in which its function was unclear, rendering it with unique forms, and combining its rendering with other forms as he felt appropriate.

Jeremiah contains fifty-four occurrences of `ôd, in which it is represented by eti (41xx = 75.9%), ouketi (3xx), and eti [e] (33.1). `ôd is a G minus in five passages in which G and H are parallel, and in three that are G minuses. In 40.5 its equivalent cannot be discerned—if, indeed, it is even represented. eti therefore renders `ôd in 89.1% of the passages in which it is represented in G.

In Jr 15.9 be`ôd + adverb is rendered by eti with a genitive absolute, as elsewhere in G when rendering be`ôd ...:

\[
\text{ba' shimshah be`ôd yômam} \quad \text{Jr 15.9}
\]

\[\text{epedu ho helios aute eti mesouses tes hemeras}\]

In Jr 33.1 `ôd+sfx with a participle is rendered by eti [e] (3sii) in a periphrastic participial clause in which the passive participle in H is rendered by a

---

85 The same number as Gn; only Ek has more occurrences (58xx). Both Gn and Ek have a much higher incidence of occurrence, however, due to their lower word-count.

86 E.g., S2 3.35 (be`ôd + noun); Gn 25.6; Dt 31.27 (both = be`ôd+sfx + adj). In most texts in which `ôd is represented by eti with a genitive absolute, however, `ôd has a pronominal suffix.

87 "Analytic tense" (see under yesh, above).
passive participle in G. [e] is necessary for the periphrastic participle:

\[ \text{wehû} \ 'ödennû 'atsûr baxâtsar haTTaTTarah ... \]
\[ \text{Jr 33.1(40.1)} \]
\[ \text{kai autos en eti dedemenos en te aule tes phulakes, ...} \]

It is tempting to understand the use of ouketi as emphatic in Jr 22.11, where YHWH prophecies Shallum's death in exile, but 'ôd is rendered by eti in verses 10 and 12 in a repeated statement that he will never return nor again see his homeland:

\[ \text{kî lo' yashûb 'ôd wëra'ah 'et-erets môleadtô} \]
\[ \text{Jr 22.10} \]
\[ \text{hoti ouk epistrepsei eti kai ou me ide ten gen patridos autou} \]
... lo'-yashûb sham 'ôd \[ \text{Jr 22.11} \]
... Ou anastrepsei ekei ouketi

... wë'et-ha'arets hazzo't lo'-yir'eh 'ôd \[ \text{Jr 22.12} \]
... kai ten gen tauten ouk opsetai eti.

Both other passages in which 'ôd is represented by ouketi use a repeated negative (ou me ... ouketi). The first is a promise from YHWH that the Jews who are about to flee Judah for Egypt will never see their land again:

\[ \text{we'lo'-tirë'ã 'ôd 'et-hammaqôm hazzeh} \]
\[ \text{Jr 42.18(49.18)} \]
\[ \text{kai ou me idete ouketi ton topon touton, ...} \]

The second falls within the oracle against Babylon (Jr 50.1-51.58):

\[ \text{we'lo'-tesheb 'ôd lanetsax} \]
\[ \text{Jr 50.39(27.39)} \]
\[ \text{ou me katoikethe ouketi eis ton aiwna} \]
Although it is likewise tempting to see the translator writing from the vantage point of his own knowledge of the history of the exiles and of Babylon, this does not seem likely given his relatively consistent use of ou ... eti for lo' ... 'ôd throughout Jeremiah, even in consecutive passages (as shown above on 22.10-12).

'ôd is not represented in five passages—all Jr 31(!)—in which H and G are otherwise parallel. Two verses in which 'ôd is not represented contain the common88 syntagm lo' ... 'ôd, which occurs four times in Jr 31 (38). In 31.29 and in 31.34 (first occurrence) 'ôd is not represented:89

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bayyamîm hahem lo'-yo'mêrû 'ôd 'abôt 'akêlû} \\
\text{boser wêshinnê banîm tîqheynah} & \quad \text{Jr 31.29} \\
\text{en tais hemerais ekeinais ou me eipwsin Hoi} \\
\text{pateres ephagon omphaka, kai hoi odontes twn} \\
\text{tekwn hemwdiasan} \\
\text{wêlo' yêlammdû 'ôd 'îsh 'et-re`ehû ... ki} \\
\text{'eslax la`awonam úlêxTa'Ta'tam lo' 'ezkor-'ôd} & \quad \text{Jr 31.34} \\
\text{kai ou me didacwsin hekastos ton politen autou} \\
\text{... hoti hilews esomai tais adikiais autwn kai} \\
\text{twn hamartiwn autwn ou me mnesthw eti.}
\end{align*}
\]

It is possible that in both verses one element of ou me represents lo' ... 'ôd, but this is unlikely, since in

\begin{itemize}
\item[88] This formula occurs 27xx (50% of the occurrences of 'ôd in Jeremiah), where it is rendered by ou ... eti (18xx), ou me ... eti (5xx), ou me ... ouketi (2xx), and ou ... ouketi (once).
\item[89] This despite its rendering as ou ... eti in 31.12 (which is, incidentally, the only occurrence in Jr of the "standard" formula of repetition: yasaph ... 'ôd with an infinitive.
\end{itemize}
five passages in Jr (including 31.34, only five verses later) lo' ... `ôd is represented by ou me ... eti. 90

His freedom in rendering lo' ... `ôd does not seem to be based on semantic, contextual, or syntagmatic considerations, but rather on his apparent belief that ou me ... is equivalent to ou ... eti, that ou me ... ouketi is an emphatic form of the same, and that all three represent lo' ... `ôd well. 91

In 31.20 (38.20), a representation of `ôd may be lacking because of the combined effect of the adverbial infinitive absolute and the repetition implicit in remembering:

ki-middê dabbêrî bô zakor 'ezkêrêmû `ôd
Jr 31.20(38.20)
hoti anth' hwn hoi logoi mou en autw, mneia mnesthesomai autou;

In 31.40 (38.40) `ôd was probably read as `ad, especially since `ad `ôlam is far more common than [`ôd] l`ôlam, 92 although it is also possible that the translator saw `ôd as redundant, entailed with l`ôlam (heus tou aiwnos):

90 Cf., in addition to 31.34b: 11.19; 20.9; 22.30; 51.44.

91 Cf. his regularity in rendering 'ên `ôd, which is only translated as ouk [e] eti (4xx: 10.20 (with participle); 38.9; 48.2; 49.7).

92 ouketi occurs in the previous clause, but this is more likely for emphasis than due to transposition from the following clause.
lo'-yinnatesh welo'-yehares 'ôd le'-ôlam
Jr 31.40(38.40)
kai ouketi ou me eklipe kai ou me kathairethe
hews tou aiwnos

In 31.39 H implies that the measuring line had
already gone out in this location (thus 'ôd), but G does
not represent this at all:

wêyatsa' 'ôd qêweh hammiddah negdô 'al gibê'at
gareb
Jr 31.39(38.39)
kai eceleusetai he diametresis autes apenanti
autwn hews bounwn Gareb

The translator may have read 'ôd as 'ad and seen it as
superfluous (cf. yatsa' 'ad), but this seems unlikely.
I have no explanation for this minus.

The equivalent of 'ôd is unclear in 40.5, which is
itself a rather unusual use of 'ôd+sfx with a finite
verb, rather than the usual participle:93 the translator
apparently interpreted 'ôd+sfx ... lo' on the basis of
the context, which is Nebuchadrezzar's offer of a choice
to Jeremiah:

wê'ôdennû lo'-yashub wêshubah 'el-gêdalyah
Jr 40.5
ei de me, apotrexe kai anastrepson pros
Godolian

Although this reflects the variety with which 'ôd+sfx is
generally rendered,94 I have no clear explanation for
his choice here.

93 This only occurs elsewhere in La 4.17.

94 See discussion of "Renderings of 'ôd with
Prefixes and Suffixes", below.
The translator of Jr thus rendered `ôd consistently (eti = 89.1%), but was rather free in rendering lo' ... `ôd, its most frequent use in Jeremiah. 95

In Ezekiel `ôd occurs fifty-eight times. 96 It is rendered by eti (34xx = 66.7%), ouketi (15xx), hews (2xx). Seven occurrences are G minuses; four of these are otherwise parallel. 98

In 8.6 eti represents not just `ôd, but apparently `ôd shûb, the translator interpreting this combination as the equivalent of simple `ôd with a verb: 99

\[ w_\text{e}`ôd tashûb tir'eh tô`ebôt gêdolôt \]
\[ kai eti opsei anomias meizonas \]

Ek 8.6

In 15.5 `ôd is rendered by eti, but in the first half of the verse eti represents the temporal force of a preposition: 100

95 Of 27xx (50% of the occurrences of `ôd in Jeremiah), it is rendered by ou ... eti (18xx = 67%), ou me ... eti (5xx), ou me ... ouketi (2xx), and ou ... ouketi (once). See "Renderings of `ôd with Negatives" (below).

96 `ôd occurs more times in Ek than in any other book (Gn and Jr are next with 54xx), although never with be- or suffix.

97 This includes 4xx in which the second element of ouketi represents `ôd.

98 Three passages (Ek 7.13b; 36.15c; 39.28b) are lacking in G.

99 Cf. 8.13 and 15 for the same rendering of this clause.

100 This is often rendered with henika (above).
The combination lo' ... 'ōd, relatively common in the Latter Prophets, occurs forty-three times in Ek (74.2% of total occurrences), where it is rendered in seven ways.\textsuperscript{102}

In 8.23-28 this combination occurs four times and is rendered in four different ways, showing that, for this translator at least, these are variant renderings without special significance; THEY may even have been used simply to avoid monotony:

\begin{quote}
\text{welo' yimshēlū 'ōd bēyisra'el} \quad \text{Ek 8.23}
\text{kai ouketi me eipwsin ten parabolēn tauten oikos tou Israel}
\text{kī lo' yiḥyeh 'ōd kol-xāzōn shaw'} \quad \text{Ek 8.24}
\text{hoti ouk estai eti pasa horasis pseudes}
\text{lo' timmashek 'ōd} \quad \text{Ek 8.25}
\text{ou me mekunw eti}
\text{lo'-timmashek 'ōd kol-ōbaray} \quad \text{Ek 8.28}
\text{Ou me mekunwsin ouketi pantes hoi logoi mou}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{101}eti [e] (genitive absolute) represents bihēyōt (infinitive construct), eti representing bē-

\textsuperscript{102}By ou/me ... eti (12xx); ou/me ... ouketi (10xx); ou me ... eti (9xx); ou me ... ouketi (5xx); [ouk]eti (4xx). 'ōd is not represented in me ... --- (2xx) or ou me ... --- (36.15b). As normally in Greek, eti follows rather than precedes the predicate.

In 18.3 the translator missed the negative function of 'im in oath formulae, rendering it by ean (rather than using a negative rendering, which might have shed some light on his reasons for choosing one or the other renderings of the negative formula).
It is possible that the translator saw the last two clauses as climactic repetition, or that he used ouketi in vv. 23 and 28 as a sort of "envelope", but there seems to be no compelling reason for this range of renderings in such a short compass.

It was rendered by hews twice, apparently because it was interpreted as 'ad in the phrase 'ōd zo't: 103

'ābôtêkem
Ek 20.27

hews toutou parwrgisan me hoi pateres humwn

'ēsû lî
Ek 23.38

hews kai tauta epoiesan moi

'ōd is not represented in G seven times in Ek. 104

In 19.9 this is probably due to parablepsis, either of 'ōd/'ad or of juxtaposed eti epi 105 which could easily be confused or "corrected" as dittography (cf. eti epi in uncial). 106

In both passages a catalog of offences follows this preface (cf., however, 36.37, where 'ōd zo't is represented by eti touto.

103 By parablepsis (homoioarcton) in 7.13 (lo' yashûb w-... lo' yashûb w-...) and 36.15 (third occurrence: lo' tisse'i- 'ōd ... lo'-takshilî 'ōd ...).

Ek 39.28b is also not represented in G, but the reason for this minus is unclear.

105 epi for 'el in the sense of 'al, as often in H.

106 Cf. Ek 36.30, where this explanation may also apply. In at least two passages, however (??..??; ??..??), this same combination is both rendered and preserved.
In its second (of three) occurrences in 36.15 'ôd was probably not rendered by either ou or me (given the variety of renderings of lo' ... 'ôd in Ek (above)), but should instead be understood as entailed within the prefixed preposition on the compound verb anapherw:

\[ \text{wexerpat 'ammîm lo' tis'î-'ôd Ek 36.15} \]
\[ \text{kai oneidísmaus lawn ou me anenegkete} \]

'ôd occurs three times in 37.22. The third occurrence is not represented--this is, in fact, a difficult use, apparently repeating the preceding occurrence. Although emphasis can hardly be determined in a language without any native speakers, this occurrence of 'ôd appears to be emphatic. The translator, not recognizing this function, and thus not knowing how to represent it, omitted it from his text: ¹⁰⁷

\[ \text{wel' yexatsû 'ôd lishte mamlakot 'ôd Ek 37.22} \]
\[ \text{oude me diairethwsin ouketi eis duo basileias} \]

'ôd is not represented in 36.30. The translator may have wanted either to avoid the implication that this had ever happened, or would never happen again: ¹⁰⁸

\[ \text{lema' an 'asher lo' tiqèxû 'ôd xerpat ra'ab} \]
\[ \text{baggôyim Ek 36.30} \]
\[ \text{hopws me labete oneidísmon limou en tois ethnesin} \]

¹⁰⁷ It is barely possible that oude me represents lo' ... 'ôd, and ouketi then represents the final 'ôd. I do not think this likely, however, given the translator's usual renderings (see on lo' ... 'ôd, above).

¹⁰⁸ We have no way of determining this, of course.
Although the translator of Ek showed considerable regularity in rendering ‘ôd (66.7%),\textsuperscript{109} he also showed considerable variety, especially in rendering lo’... ‘ôd, its most frequent syntagm in Ek.\textsuperscript{110}

In the Minor Prophets,\textsuperscript{111} ‘ôd is rendered by eti (59%), ouketi (16xx), and by nun (Ho 12.1), pro (Am 4.7), eti huparxw (Am 6.10), and hews (Mi 1.15). It is not represented in Mi 6.10 and Zc 1.17a.

\textsuperscript{109}This does not count those passages in which it is not represented, but does include those in which it is represented by the second element of [ouk]eti.

\textsuperscript{110}43xx = 74.2%.

\textsuperscript{111}With the exception of Ob, one of three books in which ‘ôd does not occur.
In Hosea (10xx) `ôd is represented by eti (7xx) and ouketi (2xx); in 12.1 it appears to parallel nun.

The renderings of lo' ... `ôd in Hosea are particularly interesting because the syntagm is rendered in four different ways, demonstrating much the same variety as Jeremiah, although, of course, due to the

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>eti</th>
<th>ouketi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>eti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MP (%) 59% 33% 8%
All (%) 76% 2%

112 This includes eti huparxw (Am 6.10) and [ouk]eti (Zc 13.2), below.

113 The "other" renderings in Ho (once) and Am (2xx) are unique; that in Mi (once) is hews (1% of G).
much higher total number of occurrences in Jeremiah, this variety is more significant in Hosea: 114

\[
\text{welo'-tigre'i-lî 'ôd ba'lı} \quad \text{Ho 2.18(16)}
\]
\[
kai ou kalesei me eti Baalim
\]
\[
kî lo' 'ösi̇ph 'ôd 'araxem 'et-bêt yisra'el \quad \text{Ho 1.6b}
\]
\[
dioti ou me prosthsw eti eōlesai ton oikon Israel
\]

In both other occurrences of this combination in Ho `ôd is rendered by ouketi—perhaps because the translator wanted to relate these statements concerning the rejection of idolatry:

\[
\text{welo'-no'mar 'ôd 'elohēnû lêma'aseh yadēnû} \quad \text{Ho 14.4}
\]
\[
ouketi me eipwmen Theoi hemwn, tois ergois twn xeiρwn hemwn;
\]
\[
\text{welo'-yizzakērû 'ôd bishēmam} \quad \text{Ho 2.19(17)}
\]
\[
kai ou me mnesthwsin ouketi ta onomata autwn
\]

In Ho 12.1 the translator obviously struggled with much the same difficult H text that we have, 115 apparently reading yda'ēm for rad `im, `am for `im, and ne'ēmar for ne'ēman. He rendered `ôd by nun:

\[
\text{`ôd rad `im-`el wē`im qēdōshîm ne'ēman} \quad \text{Ho 12.1}
\]
\[
nun egnw autous ho theos, kai laos hagios keklesetai theou
\]

114 ou ... eti (2.18); ou me ... eti (1.6b); ou me ... ouketi (2.19); ouketi me (14.4).

`ôd occurs three times in Joel. In two verbal clauses it is represented by ouketi:

\[ \text{welo}^\prime-'etten 'etkem `ôd xerpa baggôyim} \]
Jl 2.19
kai ou dowsw humas ouketi eis oneidison en tois ethnesi

\[ \text{wezarîm lo}^\prime-ya`abërû-bah `ôd} \]
Jl 4.17
kai allogeneis ou dieleusontai di' autes ouketi

In a non-verbal declaration of YHWH's uniqueness it is rendered by eti, with an emphatic plus (plen emou):\[116\]

\[ \text{wa'ânî YHWH `elohekem we`ên `ôd} \]
Jl 2.27
kai egw kurios ho theos humwn, kai ouk estin eti plen emou

If MP is the work of one translator, we might expect some consistency of rendering--especially when renderings other than the usual are used, but this is not the case between Hosea and Joel.

In Amos (7xx) `ôd is rendered by ouketi (4xx), eti (8.14), eti huparxw (6.10), and the preposition pro (4.7).

\[ \text{lo'}...`ôd occurs five times in Am. ouketi represents `ôd in four of these texts:} \]

\[ \text{lo'}-'ôsîph `ôd `ábôr lô} \]
Am 7.8 (= 8.2)
ouketi me prosthw tou parelthein auton

\[116\] ouketi is a plus in 2.27c, which has been translated most emphatically:

\[ \text{welo}^\prime-yebêsâshû `ammî 1ê-ôlam} \]
Jl 2.27
kai ou me kataisxunthwsin ouketi pas ho laos mou eis ton aiwna
The common element between these texts is the complete repetition formula (lo' yasaph 'ôd with an infinitive), but this is not true of its fourth appearance as ouketi:

\[ wëlo' yinnatëshû 'ôd me'al 'admatam 'àsher natatti lahem \]
\[ Am 9.15 \]
\[ kai ou me ekspasthwsin ouketi apo tes ges autwn, hes edwka autois \]

The reasons for the translator's choice of eti (alone) are also unclear in its sole appearance in Am, especially given his preference for ouketi, and its use in the same construction one chapter later (above):

\[ wenaphélû wëlo'-yaqûmû 'ôd \]
\[ Am 8.14 \]
\[ kai pesountai kai ou me anastwsin eti \]

He apparently felt relatively free, within certain parameters, to represent negative repetition or continuance in several different ways.

The two unique renderings in Am appear in the two non-verbal clauses in which 'ôd occurs. In a fluent translation he represents 'ôd in an unusual manner, but captures well the nuance of H:

\[ wëgam 'anokî mana'tî mikkem 'et-haggeshem bë'ôd shëloshah xodashim laqqatsîr \]
\[ Am 4.7 \]
\[ kai egw anesxon ec humwn ton hueton pro triwn menwn tou grugetou \]

In the other passage the translator used huparxw (rather than the far more common [e]), which reflects the relative infrequency of eti[e] in G:
Given that the semantic ranges of \([e]\) and \textit{huparxw} overlap considerably\(^{117}\) it is difficult to know what, if any, significance to attach to this rendering—especially given the context which does not have any hint of possession as might be expected from the use of \textit{huparxw}.\(^{118}\)

Thus in Am the usual rendering of \textit{`od} in G is replaced by \textit{ouketi}. The translator also was free to use other renderings where he, for fluency or whatever reason, felt them appropriate.

\textit{`od} occurs once in Jonah (3.4), where it is represented by \textit{eti}.

\textit{`od} occurs four times in Micah. It is rendered by \textit{ouketi} (2xx) and \textit{hews} (1.15). In 6.10 it is not represented. Mi thus contains no occurrences of the usual rendering.

In two occurrences of \textit{lo'} \ldots \textit{`od} it is represented by prepositioned \textit{ouketi} suggesting that this is

\(^{117}\)Despite the nuances mentioned under \textit{yesh}, above.

\(^{118}\)Unless this force ("hint") comes from \textit{`immak} (suggested by Stephen Geller).
equivalent, in the translator's mind, to *ou me ... eti*: 119  

\[w^{\text{\`a}lo'-yilm}^{\text{\`a}d \text{milxamah}}\]  
\[\text{kai ouketi me mathwsi polemein}^{120}\]  

Mi 4.3

In the parallel to this verse (Is 2.4) *ou me ... eti* represents the same text, possibly showing either that the translator of the later of these books121 were aware of the other's work, or that the later felt no compulsion to reflect his predecessor's decisions. 122

\[w^{\text{\`a}lo'-tieshtax^{\text{\`a}d \text{lema`a}seh yadeyka}}\]  
\[\text{kai ouketi me proskuneses tois ergois twn xeirwn sou}\]  

Mi 5.12

In Mi 1.15, the translator read [defective] `\text{\`a}d` as `\text{\`ad}`, probably because of the parallel `\text{\`ad}` in 1.15b:

\[\text{\`a}d \text{hayyoresh `ab\text{\`i} lak y\text{\`o}shebet mareshah}\]  

Mi 1.15

hews tous kleronomous agagw soi, katoikousa [Laxis] kleronomia

119 The word order of this rendering (*ouketi me ...*) also occurs in Ho 14.4; Am 7.8, 13; 8.2. This is not the usual rendering using *ouketi* (*ou [me] ... ouketi*), found throughout MP, even in the context of the rendering above (Ho 2.19; Jl 2.19; 4.17; Am 9.15; Na 2.14; Zp 3.11, 15; Zc 9.8; 11.6; 14.21).

120 Note the addition of *ouketi* in the previous line, probably to balance the parallelism:

\[lo'-yis^{\text{\`a}l-g\text{\`o}y xereb}\]  
\[\text{kai ouketi me antare ethnos ep` ethos hromphaian}\]  

Mi 4.3

121 "Later" to be translated into G.

122 The study of the translation technique of parallel passages could yield valuable results concerning inter-dependency of translation technique, help secure a partial chronology of translation and thus an evolution of translation technique, or both.
In Mi 6.9-10--a difficult text which has as many rearrangements as commentators123 and which obviously puzzled the translator--no form in G parallels `ôd, although it is just possible that he read `ôd as `îr, yielding the direct object for kosmew:

qôl YHWH la`îr yiqra' wêtûshiyyah yir'eh shêmeka shime'û matTeh umi yê'adah `ôd ha'îsh bêt rasha' 'otsê'rôt resha' wê'èphat razôn zê'ûmah Mi 6.9-10 phwne kuriou te polei epiklethesetai kai swsei124 phboournenous to onoma autou. akoue, phule, kai tis kosmesel polin? me pur kai oikos anomou [thesaurizwn],thesaurus anomous kai metron hubreus adikia?125

123 E.g., Delbert R. Hillers, MICAH in HERMENEIA (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), who emends H following Wellhausen, and rearranges the text: 9, 12, 10, 11, 13 (80£).


124 In Pr 2.7 tûshiyyah is rendered by swteria.

125 H: "The voice of YHWH calls to the city (and the one who is wise fears Your Name): "Hear the rod and the One who appointed it [or Hear, O tribe: Who has appointed it?]. Are there still in the house of the wicked treasures of wickedness and cursed scant measures?

G: "The voice of the Lord calls to the city (and he will save those who fear his name): "Hear, O tribe, and who shall set the city in order? Is there not fire: the house of the wicked piling up wicked treasures and the unrighteous measure of the proud?

G apparently struggled with a text close to MT, reading tûshiyyah as from yasha' and yir'ehe as from ra'ah. He also made the pronounal reference (shêmeka) 3ms rather than 2ms, and shime'û 2s rather than 2mp (for grammatical concord with matTeh/phule). In v. 10 he read `ôd as `îr and 'îsh as 'esh (I suggest yesh, above).
Mi thus stands apart from the rest of MP in never using the usual rendering of 'ōd.

'ōd occurs only in the combination lo' ... 'ōd in Nahum, where it is represented by eti (3xx) and ouketi (2.14).

In 1.12 and 14 lo' ... 'ōd is represented by ou ...
eti:

we`innitik lo' 'ā`annek 'ōd
kai he akoe sou ouk enakousthesetai eti

In 2.1 the double negative was used, but still with eti for 'ōd:

kî lo' yôsîph 'ōd la`abar-bak bêliyya`al
dioti ou me prosthwsin eti tou dieithein eis palaiwsin

In 2.14, however, the translator used both the double negative and ouketi:

wê`lo'`yiss'hama` `ōd qôl mal`akekeh
kai ou me akouste ouketi ta erga sou

Could this progression be conscious: ou ... eti (1.12, 14), ou me ... eti (2.1), ou me ... ouketi (2.14)?

'ōd occurs only in Habakkuk 2.3, and is rendered by eti.

---

126 Even though he otherwise misread the text. Cf. H: "Although I have afflicted you I will afflict you no longer" vs. G: "Your report will no longer be heard". akoe usually represents a form or derivative of shama` in G (37/41xx); enakouw occurs only here in G.
In Zephaniah, where `ôd occurs three times, it is rendered by ouketi (Zp 2.15). In combination with 'ephes it is rendered with eti:

ha'omêrah bilebabah 'ânî wê'aphsi `ôd Zp 2.15
he legousa en kardía autes Egw eimi, kai ouk esti met' eme eti

lo' ... `ôd is rendered consistently (twice) with me or ou ... ouketi, again with the syntax noted above:129

wêlo'-tôsiphî lêgabêhah `ôd behar qodshî Zp 3.11
kai ouketi me prosthes tou megalauxesai epi to oros to hagion mou
lo' tîrê'i ra` `ôd Zp 3.15
ouk opse kaka ouketi

Both occurrences of `ôd in Haggai are rendered by eti (2.6, 19). In 2.6 it means "in yet ...":

`ôd 'axat me`âT hî' wa'ânî mar`îsh 'et-hashshamayim ... Hg 2.6
Eti hapac egw seisw ton ouranon ...

In 2.19b the translator read `ad as `od (written defectively), probably because of the parallelism,

127 Further under 'ên, below.

128 Here, as when `ôd occurs in combination with 'ên, [e] is to be reckoned as part of the rendering of 'ephes (here as ouk [e]). See further on 'ephes under "Renderings of Synonyms of 'ên" (below).

129 See on Mi 4.3, above.
although some commentators accept this as a correct
interpretation:¹³⁰

ha`ôd hazzera` bammêgûrah we`ad-haggephen
w`hattê`enah we`harimmôn ...

Hg 2.19

ei eti epignwthesetai epi tes halw kai ei eti
he ampelos kai he suke kai he hroa ...

`ôd occurs fifteen times in Zechariah where it is
rendered by eti (10xx), ouketi (3xx), and [ouk]eti
(once). `ôd `âsher, an unusual syntagm, is rendered by
eti:

`ôd `âsher yabo`û `ammîm ... Zc 8.20
eti hecousi laoi polloi ...

As with Hosea (above) the renderings of lo` ... `ôd
are particularly varied--four renderings are used in
five occurrences. `ôd appears in a negated hayah clause
once as eti

wêyashbû bah wêxerem lo` yihyeh-`ôd Zc 14.11
katoikesousin en aute, kai anathema ouk estai
eti

It is represented by [ouk]eti once, where the verb in H
was rendered by [el] + pronoun (gen) + noun, with the
person of the pronoun taken from the subject of the
verb:

`akrît `et-shêmôt ha`atsabbîm min-ha`arets
wêlo` yizzakêrû `ôd Zc 13.2
ecoletreusw ta onomata twn eidwlon apo tes
ges, kai ouketi estai autwn mneia

¹³⁰E.g., Ralph L. Smith, MICAH-MALACHI. WBC, edited
by David A. Hubbard, et al., 32 (Waco, TX: Word,
1984):159.
`ód is represented by ouketi in two verbal clauses and one clause with hayah:

ki lo' examol `ód `al-yoshèbè ha'aretz nè'um-YHWH Zc 11.6
dia touto ou pheisomai ouketi epi tous
katoikountas ten gen, legei kuriou

wèlo'-yihye kèna`ani `ód bèbèt-YHWH tèba'òt
bayyôm hahû' Zc 14.21
kai ouk estai Xananaios ouketi en tw oikw
kuriou pantokratoros en te hemera ekeine

In 9.8 lo' `ód is rendered by ou me ... ouketi:

wèlo'-ya`abor `alèhem `ód noges Zc 9.8
kai ou me epelthe ep' autous ouketi ecelaunwn

I interpret these renderings as mere variants of one another, chosen by the translator perhaps for that very reason, or for some reasons apparently independent of syntactical or contextual considerations.\textsuperscript{131}

In its first occurrence (1.17) `ód is either represented by the preposition on the compound verb anakrazw, or was left out intentionally due to ellipsis or unintentionally (parablepsis). Its other three occurrences in that verse are rendered by eti:

`ód qèra' le'mor koh 'amar YHWH tèbèa'òt `ód
tèphùtseynah `aray mitòb wènixam YHWH `ód `et-
tsiyòn òbaxar `ód bērûshalaim Zc 1.17
Anakrage legwn Tade legei kuriou pantokratwr
Eti diaxuthesontai poleis en agathois, kai
eleebei kuriou eti ten Siwn kai hairietiei eti
ten Ierousalem

Zc is thus rather regular in rendering `ód by eti (and quite at variance with the rest of MP!) although,

\textsuperscript{131}See "Renderings of `ód with Negatives", below.
as in several other books, ouketi was preferred in the negative formula.

`ôd is represented by eti in Malachi 2.13, a difficult verse:132

cassôt dim`ah 'et-mizbax YHWH bêkî wê`anagah me`ên `ôd pênôt 'el-hamminxah wê`laqaxat ratsôn miyyedkem Ma 2.13 ekaluptete dakrusi to thusiasterion kuriou kai klauthmw kai stenagmw ek kopwn. eti acion epiblepsai eis thusian e labein dekton ek twn xeirwn humwn

In the Minor Prophets `ôd is thus rendered most often by eti (59%) but, due in part to the large number of negated constructions in which it occurs (25xx = 49%), ouketi is also frequent (33%). `ôd is always represented by eti in Hg (2xx) and Jn, Hb, and Ma (once each); it is never rendered by eti in Mi (4xx). There is thus considerable variation within both MP as a whole, and individual books (Ho, Zc).

In Psalms `ôd (21xx) is represented by eti (10xx), eti [e] (2xx), and hews huparxw (2xx--parallel texts). In 39.2 it is rendered by a prepositional articular infinitive, and in 84.5 by eis tous aiwnious twn aiwniwn. It is not represented in five passages (three are parallel).

132 See further under 'ên, below.
`ôd in a non-verbal (locative prepositional) clause was rendered by eti [e] (genitive absolute):

`ôd 'aklam bᵉphîhem Ps 78.30(77.30)
eti tes bwses autwn ouses en tw stomati autwn

This may reflect the rendering in the parallel passage (Nu 11.33, above), where `ôd+3ms is represented by eti + 3sii of [e].

In another clause of the same type `ôd+lcs was rendered by eti [e] (lcspp), rather than the more frequent construction with a genitive absolute:

hᵉqîtsotî wᵉ`ôdî `immak Ps 139.18(138.18)
eecegerthen kai eti eimi meta sou

This is a rather wooden translation, not as fluent as is seen in other passages in G. The translator certainly understood the text, but seems not to have known how to capture the force of the subordinated clause.

`ôd with both a suffix (lcs) and preposition (bᵉ) occurs in identical clauses in 104.33 (103.33) and 146.2 (145.2). In both it is rendered idiomatically by hews huparxw (lcsppap):

`azammᵉrah le'lohay bᵉ`ôdî Ps 104.33 (103.33)
psalw tw thew mou, hews huparxw

The interesting parallel of bᵉ`od ; en tw sustenai (39.2 [38.2]) is more probably due to an interpretative rendering than to parablepsis,¹³³ since the translator

¹³³I.e., reading `amad for `od (pace BHS).
felt it necessary specify what the wicked were doing in the psalmist's presence:

'eshmērah liphī maxsom bēʾōd rashaʿ lenegdī
ethemen tw stomati mou phulaken en tw sustenai
ton hamartwlon enantion mou

Ps 39.2 (38.2)

In 84.5 a lengthy phrase stands parallel to ʾōd, which is used as a simple "yet" or "again":

'asherē yōshēḇē bêtēka ʾōd yēḥallūka
makarioi hoi katoikountes en tw oikw sou eis
tous aiwnas tw aiwnwn ainesousin se

The translator read ʾōd as ʾad, which he then expanded. 134

In the thrice-repeated "refrain" of Pss 42-43 135 ʾōd is not represented, possibly because the translator was uncertain of its force, or because he felt that its sense was entailed in the future tense of ecomologew:

kī-ʾōd ʾōdennū
hoti ecomologesomai autw

Ps 42.6

The same approach—depending on the future of the verb to convey the sense of ʾōd—seems also to be reflected in 49.10, where it is not represented: 136

wixī-ʾōd lanetsax loʾ yirʾeh hashshaxat
kai zesetai eis telos oti ouk opsetai
ekataphthoran

Ps 49.10

134 I am indebted to Stephen A. Geller for this suggestion.

135 hōxīlī leʾlohīm kī-ʾōd ʾōdennū (42.6, 12; 43.5).

136 Note, however, Ps 92.15; 103.16, where eti is used with the future of the verb.
'ôd is also not represented in 104.35, where it occurs in conjunction with 'ên (below), adding the sense of continued non-existence to 'ên. Its presence is not reflected in G, which identifies the "sinners" of 35a with the "wicked" of 35b and makes the second half of the verse the result of the first, rather than a parallel occurrence:

_initializer_\begin{align} \text{עֵרֶשַׁהְיִם} & \ 'ôd \ 'ênam \\
\text{kai} & \ \text{anomoi,} \ \text{hwste me} \ \text{huparxein autous} \\
\text{Ps 104.35(103.35)} & \\
\text{UILDER} & \end{align}_

The characterization of Psalms as a relatively free translation seems accurate in this instance as well, since the usual rendering accounts for only 47.6% of the occurrences of 'ôd, and other [unique] renderings, each of which reflect the presence of 'ôd in the translator's Vorlage, are used in passages in which it occurs with suffixes or prefixes.

'ôd occurs eighteen times in Job where it is rendered by eti (6xx), eti [e] (3xx; 2xx [e], once eneimi), and once each by mexri (2.9) and palin (6.29). Once it was incorrectly read as 'îr and rendered by polis (6.10). Four passages in which it occurs were lacking in G (20.9; 32.15, 16; 34.23), and one passage cannot be aligned (24.20).

'ôd occurs in conjunction with lo' twice in 7.10, where it is rendered by eti, but with compound negatives in both cases:
The compound negatives reflect the translator's desire to emphasize death's finality and the impossibility of return (cf. the same emphasis is also seen in 7.9, where simple lo' is rendered by means of ouketi me).

In S2 1.9 'ôd was not represented, probably because the translator did not understand the syntactical inversion. Jb 27.3 is structurally parallel to that parallel, but the translator understood the construction and rendered it by eti eneimi (genitive absolute), a simple variant of eti [e] that uses a compound form of the verb rather than a separate prepositional phrase: 138

\[ \text{'ôd with a suffix (3xx in Job) in 8.12 is rendered by eti [e], which captures the essence of H, although a genitive absolute might be more exact, since in this rendering there is no indication of the pronominal } \]

137 The second half of this verse could be a proverb. Cf. Ps 103.16, where lo' ... 'ôd is rendered by ou ... eti.

138 Cf. a similar construction in Jb 36.2, where, in addition to the theological interpretation [read: correction, so Dhorame, JOB (538)], 'ôd is rendered by eti [e], and the [dative] 1e- by en + dative:

\[ \text{eti gar en emoi estin lecis} \]

The translator avoided implying that anyone need [could?] speak "for" God by shifting the reference back to Elihu.
suffix, although its referent is clearly **boutomon** (v. 11):

`odennû be'ibbô lo' yiqqateph
eti on epi hrizes kai ou me theristhe

**bê`ôd** is rendered by **hote [e]** in 29.5 which reflects the translation of **ka'asher hayîti** (29.4), either because the translator felt the two expressions were functionally equivalent in H, or because he wished to maintain the strict parallelism of H:

**bê`ôd** shadday `immadî sêbibôtay ne`aray
hote emen hulwdes lian, kuklw de mou hoi paides

He derived the person and number of [e] from the context (**`immadî**), rendering the rest of 5a exegetically.

In 6.29 the translator read the first **shubû** as **yashab** rather than **shûb** and rendered the second with **sunerxomai**, probably because of **`ôd**, which he rendered with **palin**:

shubû-na' `al-têhî `awêlah wêshubû `ôd tsidqî-baH
kathisate de kai me eie adikon kai palin tw dikaiw sunerxeste

**Mexri tinos karterew** is probably an exegetical rendering of **`odka maxazîq btummateka** in 2.9.141

---

139H: "When Shaddai was still with me my children surrounded me." G: "When I had many fields [my] children were round about me."
The translator read **shadday** as **saday** and possibly **`immadî** as **mê`ôd**.

140Cf. Dhorme, JOB (19), especially on the lengthy G plus in this verse, and its transmission history.
watto'mer lô 'ishtô 'odka maxâzîq bêtummateka
barek 'elohîm wamut

... eipen autw he gune autou Mexri tinos
kartereseis legwn [9a-e] alla eipon ti hrema
eis kurion kai teleuta

`ôd was rendered by polis when the translator
misread it as 'îr, and then struggled to reinterpret the
rest of the verse in light of this initial mistake:

ûthî `ôd nexamatî ... Jb 6.10
eie de mou polis taphos ...

`ôd is not represented in four passages (20.9;
32.15,16; 34.23) because they "did not exist in G".¹⁴²
It is also not possible to align G and H in 24.20a with
any certainty; G has numerous pluses, some of which
appear to be taken from the preceding verse (e.g., autou
he hamartia, based on a different pointing of the last
word in 24.19):

yishkaxehû rexem mëtagô rimmah `ôd lo'-
yizzaker wattishshaber ka`ets `awelah Jb 24.20
eit' anemnesthe autou he hamartia hwsper de
homixle drosou aphanes egeneto apodotheie de
autw ha epracen suntribeie de pas adikos isa
culw aniatw

There does not seem, at any rate, to be a form or
syntagm which reflects `ôd.

¹⁴¹Cf. the straightforward rendering of `ôd in
essentially the same clause in 2.3 (although the
commendation has been reversed by using a privative
adjective):

we`ôdennû maxâzîq bêtummatô Jb 2.3
eti de exetai akakias

¹⁴²Dhorme, JOB (293, 481, 520). They are marked
with asterisk in Jerome, Syro-hex, and Codex 248, and
lacking in the Sahidic.
`ôd is rendered by the usual rendering in only one-third of its occurrences in Jb (although renderings which entail eti in some way account for one-half of its occurrences). It was rendered exegetically, and without apparent regard for formal correspondence, although four passages in which it occurs were lacking in G and one passage cannot be aligned.

In Proverbs (6xx) `ôd is represented once each by eti (31.7) and ek (31.15), but its presence is usually implied or entailed in another form.

In 31.7 the use of me ... eti for lo' ... `ôd is due simply to the translator's telic rendering of this clause:

\[ \text{yishteh weyishkax rishô wa`amalô lo' yizkar-} \]
\[ \text{ôd Pr 31.7} \]
\[ \text{hina epilathwntai tes penias kai twon ponwn me} \]
\[ \text{mnesthwston eti.} \]

No form corresponds to `ôd in 9.9, but its function is represented by the comparative form of the adjective:

\[ \text{ten lexakam weyexkam-`ôd} \]
\[ \text{Pr 9.9} \]
\[ \text{didou sophw aphormen,}^{143} \text{kai sophwteros estai} \]

This explanation also applies to 11.24, where pleiwn represents `ôd (and poiew interpets yasaph):

---

^{143}aphorme in the sense of "pretext" or "starting point" arises out of the translator's exegesis--he is apparently unwilling to leave the verse somewhat ambiguous.
In 19.19, an obscure verse with which the translator seems to have struggled, the elliptical construction\textsuperscript{145} \textit{yasaph} \textit{`od} is telescoped into \textit{prostithemi}:

\textit{gēdal-xemah} nose' \textit{`onesh} kī \textit{`im-tatsīl} wē`ōd tōsiph \textit{Pr 19.19}
\textit{kakophrwn} aner polla zemiwthesetai; ean de loimeuetai, kai ten psuxen autou prosthesei

In a temporal clause, \textit{be`ūd} is represented by the preposition \textit{ek}, although this is more interpretive and pictorial (poetic) than literal:

\textit{wattaqam} bē`ūd laylah wattiṣen Tereph lēbētaḥ \textit{Pr 31.15}
\textit{kai anistatai} ek nuktwn kai edwken brwmata tw oikw

In the highly interpretable translation of Pr 23.35 \textit{`od} does not appear to be represented, although its presence may be reflected in the adverbial participle, which emphasizes the idea of continued seeking:

\textit{matay} `aqīts `ūṣiph `āpaqshēnnū `ōd \textit{Pr 23.35}
pote orthros estai, hina elthwn zetesw meth' hwn suneleusomai?

\textsuperscript{144}See on \textit{yesh}, above.

\textsuperscript{145}Will his poorly-controlled temper increase, or will the rescuer find himself in that role repeatedly or continually (since a short temper is only one outworking of the foolish heart in Pr)? In G's rendering he will continue his troublesome behavior and be forced to add his life--the ultimate fine--to those he has already paid.
The translator of Pr, therefore, used a highly idiosyncratic method to render 'ôd, apparently choosing renderings on a case-by-case basis, depending on the grammar, context, and content of the verse.

In both Ruth (2xx) and Ecclesiastes (6xx) 'ôd is rendered consistently by eti.

In its only occurrence in Lamentations (4.17) 'ôd+1cp was rendered by eti [e] in a genitive absolute, trying to make sense of a difficult passage ("Our eyes still failed [as they looked] in vain for our help:

```
ôdeynah tikleynah ënënu ël-ëzratenë habel
```
La 4.17
Eti ontwn hemwn ecelipon hoi ophthalmoi hemwn eis ten boetheian hemwn mataia

'ôd occurs three times in Esther, where it is rendered by eti (6.14; 9.12) and [ouk]eti (2.14). In 6.14 'ôd+3mp with a participle is rendered by eti and a genitive absolute, in which the pronominal subject of the genitive absolute was determined by the pronominal suffix, as often in G:

---

146 Reading 'ôdênaH with K.

147 This is the usual rendering of 'ôd+sfx with an adjective or participle (cf., e.g., Gn 25.6; 29.9; 44.14; Dt 31.27; Jg 6.24; S1 20.14; S2 18.14; K1 1.14, 22, 42; 12.2 (11.43); K2 6.33a).

There are exceptions: e.g., Ex 4.18; 9.2, 17 (where a finite verb represents the adjective or participle);
In Daniel (6xx) `ōd is rendered without exception by eti alone, including nominal clauses, where no verbal forms ([e] or otherwise) occur in G. This suggests that the translator felt no need to use verbals with eti:

\[ kî-`ōd\gets \text{lamm}^\ast \text{ed} \quad \text{Dn 11.27} \]
\[ \text{hoti eti peras eis kairon} \]

`ōd occurs exceptionally with independent pronominal subjects in a participial clause:\(^ {148}\)

\[ \text{we}^\ast `\text{ōd} \ '\text{anî mēdabber \ldots} \quad \text{Dn 9.20} \]
\[ \text{kai eti emou lalountos \ldots} \]

The translation technique used in Dn, therefore, is entirely regular in its representation of `ōd.

`ōd occurs once in Nehemiah (2.17), where it is represented by eti.

All eleven occurrences of `ōd in 1 Chronicles are rendered by eti. In 14.13b eti appears to have been added for the sake of parallelism with 13a:

\[ \text{Nu 11.33 and Sl 13.7 (`ōd+3ms > eti [e] (3sii)); Js 14.11 (`ōd+3ms > eti [e] (1cpi)); Jg 8.20 (`ōd+3ms > [e] (1cpi)); Kl 20.32 (21.32).} \]

\(^ {148}\) The same clause is repeated and parallel to 9.21 (cf. GKC #116u).
The translator's technique was so regulated by the normal rendering that in one text he rendered 'ôd by eti in one case where the parallel in S2 used oukëtì: 150

The translator of C1 was absolutely consistent in representing 'ôd.

In 2 Chronicles (14xx) 'ôd is rendered by eti (10xx) and hews (10.5). In three passages its equivalent, if any, cannot be identified.

In a non-verbal clause 'ôd+3ms was rendered by eti (alone), when Josiah is described as "still a boy":

This shows clearly that the translator of C2 felt no need to represent 'ôd verbally (with [el] or any other form). This is further reflected in 14.7, where the usual rendering was used even though 'ôd was rendered by eti [el] in K1 22.8 (the parallel text):

149 The plusses in G reflect the parallel passage (S2 5.22).

150 This is the only case where C1 and S2 are parallel where 'ôd is rendered differently.
In 18.6 'ôd is represented by eti, even though it was not rendered in the parallel passage (= K1 22.7):

ha'ên poh nabi' lêYHWH 'ôd ouk estin hwde prophetes tou kurion eti

In two texts 'ôd is apparently rendered by en with a pronoun, which, although parallel and therefore a representation of the presence and function of 'ôd, were probably used as means of representing one aspect of the clause as a unit. The rendering of 14.6 reflects the sense of the passage (albeit heavily interpreted):

'ôdennû ha'arets liphenennû en hw tes ges kurieusomen

The translator may have wanted to avoid an apparent contradiction when he chose en toutw to render 'ôd in 28.17, since a prior Edomite invasion is not mentioned:

we'ôd 'adômîm ba'û wayyakkû bîhûdah kai en toutw, hoti Idoumaioi epethento kai epatacan en Iouda

151 NB: 'ên is represented by ouk [e]. See further under 'ên (below).

152 The use of the 3ms suffix with reference to [usually] feminine 'erets merely reflects the noun's dual status.

153 The contradiction is only apparent because 'ôd could mean "also" (in addition to Syria, Israel (5-14), and the Philistines (18ff)), or "again" in the sense of a repeated affliction, albeit by a different foe.
C2 9.4 describes the Queen of Sheba's response to the magnificence of Solomon's wealth. Its rendering here is the same interpretative rendering found in the parallel passage (K1 12.5):

\[
\text{welo'-hayah } \ddot{\text{o}} \text{d bah r}\text{\textbar} \text{ax} \\
ak\text{ai ec heautes egeneto}
\]

C1 and C2 thus differ in their renderings of \`\ddot{\text{o}}\text{d}.\textsuperscript{154} Of the four passages in C2 in which \`\ddot{\text{o}}\text{d} is not represented by \textit{eti}, two (9.4; 10.5) use the renderings found in the parallel passages in K1. In two other passages (C2 14.6; 28.17; both explanatory clauses) the translator used the preposition \textit{en} with a pronoun.\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{154} Cf. on S1 and S2 (above).

\textsuperscript{155} Did he see this as a separate function of \`\ddot{\text{o}}\text{d}, or was he exegeting [and "protecting" the accuracy of] his text (cf. C2 28.17)?
RENDERINGS OF `ÔD WITH AFFIXES

These constructions account for slightly less than one-tenth of all occurrences of `Ôd (54xx = 9.2%). The use of eti to render these forms is significantly lower than its use to represent `Ôd as a whole (26xx = 50% vs. 76.1%), although it is still most common. There are three times as many unique renderings for these forms than for `Ôd as a whole (10xx = 19.1% vs. 6.2%), suggesting that the translators were unsure of either the significance or the best way to rendering them.

Four combinations occur: b^e+`Ôd (15xx), b+`Ôd+sfx (4xx), min+`Ôd+sfx (2xx), `Ôd+sfx (33xx). These combinations are rendered as follows:
`ôd thus follows the pattern of 'ayye or yesh: the greatest variation in rendering occurs when representing `ôd with pronominal suffixes (although eti is the preferred rendering of `ôd+sfx, it is much less frequent than that of `ôd as a whole: 26% = 50% vs. 76.1%).

156 be`ôd is rendered by eti (Gn 40.19; Dt 31.27 (suffixed); Js 1.11; S2 12.22; Is 7.8, 21.16; Jr 15.9; 28.3), eti [e] (S2 3.35), [e] (Jb 29.5), and eti kai (Gn 40.13). It also corresponds to pro (Am 4.7), en tw sunistemi (Ps 39.2), and ek (Pr 31.15). With suffixes (in addition to Dt 31.27, above) it is rendered by prin e (Is 28.4) and hews huparxw (Ps 104.33 = 146.2).

157 These figures include two occurrences of `ôd in combination with both the interrogative prefix and a pronominal suffix (Ex 4.18; K1 20.32). Since there is no irregularity in rendering (both are represented by eti), I have not made this combination a separate category.

These figures also include Jr 40.5 under the heading "unique", although I am unable to determine the exact correspondence between H and G in this verse.

158 Percentages are calculated against a base of 54, since be`ôd is not represented in two passages (Gn 48.7; Jr 28.11).
RENDERINGS OF ‘ÔD WITH NEGATIVES

‘Ôd occurs with negatives meaning "never again", "no longer", or "there is no other" in more than one quarter of all of its biblical occurrences (155xx; 26.3%). Because of the frequency of this construction and the need to discuss many of these texts in the preceding pages, it seems appropriate to summarize the representation of ‘Ôd with negatives.

The overall rate of representation for this construction is higher than that of ‘Ôd as a whole (146 = 94.2% vs. 86.5%). The frequency of the usual rendering, however, is significantly lower (94xx = 64.3%), although eti is still preferred. This is because 80% of the occurrences of ‘Ôd with a negative are in the Latter Prophets, which have the lowest incidence of the usual rendering of ‘Ôd, both generally and with negatives.161

159 This sense of "no longer" is not absolute. It signals instead that the particular occurrence of the action or incident just described came to an end, and implies nothing regarding its recurrence. Cf., e.g., the discussion on Si 7.13 (above).

160 80% of the occurrences of ‘Ôd with a negative are in the Latter Prophets: Is (45.8%), MP (52.9%), Jr (59.3%) and Ek (72.4%).

‘Ôd occurs in four books of MP only in this construction: Na (4/4), Jl and Zp (each 3/3), and Ma (1/1). ‘Ôd with a negative does not occur in Jn or Hb (each 0/1), or Hg (0/2).

161 The frequency of eti for ‘Ôd (all) in the sections of the Bible: Pentateuch (80.3%), Former Prophets (83.1%), Latter Prophets (70.4%), and Writings
I have tried to distinguish two uses of ouketi in contexts of lo' ... `6d; those in which `6d is represented by the -eti element of the compound form,\(^{162}\) and those in which ouketi--the entire form--corresponds to `6d. The use of the latter is particularly striking in the Latter Prophets, and significantly affects the frequency of eti as the usual rendering in those books:\(^{163}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sect.</th>
<th>Neg.</th>
<th>eti</th>
<th>o[e]</th>
<th>o/e</th>
<th>Unque</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>eti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penta</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Pro</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Pro</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrtgs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCNT</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rate of unique renderings for `6d in these constructions is slightly lower than that of `6d as a whole (6xx = 4.1% vs. 6.2%), suggesting that although (75.7%).

\(^{162}\)These are counted under eti since ouketi = ou + eti.

\(^{163}\)A negative occurs only once with `6d+sfx (Jr 40.5); I cannot explain this rendering (above).

\(^{164}\)o[e] = `6d is represented by the -eti element of ouketi; o/e = `6d is represented by ouketi (the entire word).
the translators felt somewhat freer when rendering `ôd with negatives, they had no trouble understanding it.

Since G uses multiple negatives for emphatic negation, it is worth considering whether theological, grammatical, syntactical, or other considerations may underly the various renderings of lo' ... `ôd. To this end I examined the content of each statement to see if there was any common element that might provide a basis for a particular rendering. The range of renderings of this construction is quite broad:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings of `ôd with Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occurrences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk `ôd Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 48 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr 54 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek 58 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 51 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbrev.</th>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>Abbrev.</th>
<th>Represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o+e</td>
<td>ou . eti</td>
<td>o+o/e</td>
<td>ou . ouketi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m+e</td>
<td>me . eti</td>
<td>m+o/e</td>
<td>me . ouketi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o+m+e</td>
<td>ou me . eti</td>
<td>o+m+o/e</td>
<td>ou me . ouketi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/e</td>
<td>[ouk]eti</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>ou me .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No pattern appears to underlie the distribution of these renderings. They are scattered throughout the
units\textsuperscript{165} in which they occur. No rendering is limited to one or another part of a unit, nor does any rendering reflect a specific type of promise or content (favorable promises, e.g., are not more emphatic than unfavorable).

In fact, the opposite phenomenon is true. The renderings often vary in the space of a few verses, even when referring to the same general topic. This variety of renderings of 'ôd with a negative suggests that the translators did not seek consistency, but were willing to vary their representations, perhaps because absolute regularity was not an issue in this area, for the sake of variety, or for some other reason not yet known.

Although there is significant variation in the representation of 'ôd with negatives, this was not true of its occurrences with 'ên (20xx). In these passages 'ên was consistently represented by ou [e] (95\%), and 'ôd by eti (92\%).\textsuperscript{166} This consistency is especially striking in Is, which did not render 'ôd consistently.\textsuperscript{167}

---

\textsuperscript{165}"Unit" is not intended either to impugn the identity of either the individual books or to impute unity of translation to MP.

\textsuperscript{166}In this combination 'ôd is represented once by plen (Is 45.14). Twice it is a minus in G (K1 22.7; Ps 104.35).

\textsuperscript{167}On the other hand, five of six texts in Is are identical: 'ên 'ôd > ou [e] eti (Is 45.5, 6, 18, 22; 46.9). The exception has plen for 'ôd (Is 45.14).
SUMMARY

'ôd was rendered fairly consistently by eti throughout G (322xx = 76.1%), except for Amos (14.3%), Job (46.2%), and MP as a whole (59.2%). Its generally regular translation suggests that the translators chose eti for its ability to represent both functions of 'ôd--repetition and continuance--depending on the context in which it occurred.

The frequency of the usual rendering, however, is quite broad, ranging from those books which are absolutely consistent (100%: Dt (15xx), K2 (13xx), Cl (11xx), Qo and Da (6xx each), Es (3xx), Hg and Ru (2xx each), and in Jn, Hb, Ma, and Ne (once each)), to those in which the usual rendering represents 'ôd in fewer than 70% of its occurrences: Is (68.3%), Ek (66.7%); Nu and Ps (62.5% each), Js (60%), MP (59.2%), and Jb (46.2%).

In MP 'ôd is rendered most often by eti (59.2%) but, due in part to the large number of negated constructions in which it occurs (25xx = 49%), ouketi is also frequent (33%).168 Ho and Zc, the two books of MP in which 'ôd occurs the most, render 'ôd fairly consistently: Zc (11/14xx = 78.6%) and Ho (7/10xx =

168 Cases in which the entire form (ouketi) represents 'ôd, not just -eti (which are included under eti).
70%), but `öd is always represented by eti in Hg (2xx) and Jn, Hb, and Ma (once each); it is never rendered by eti in Mi (4xx). There is thus considerable variation within MP as a whole, and even a wide range of renderings in individual books (Ho, Zc). 169

It is possible to group some books. The rate of the usual rendering in the Pentateuch hovers near the average for G as a whole, with the exception of Nu (62.5%) and Dt (100%). The Former Prophets range from Js (60%) to S2 (86.7%); K2, however, stands out from this group by virtue of its consistency (100%). Jr (91.1%) is far more consistent than either Is (68.3%) or Ek (66.7%). In the Writings `öd was generally rendered consistently (100%), apart from Ps (62.5%), Pr (50%), Jb (46.2%), La (once; 0%), and C2 (76.9%).

`öd is also represented by ouketi (40xx = 9.5%) and by eti [e] (21xx = 5%), making the total number of occurrences in which eti figures in its representation 383 (90.1%).

169 See the excursus "Is MP a Translation Unit?" in the Conclusion (below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>'ød</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>20613</td>
<td>54 0.262%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>16713</td>
<td>13 0.078%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>11950</td>
<td>4 0.033%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>16408</td>
<td>9 0.055%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>14294</td>
<td>15 0.105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>10151</td>
<td>5 0.049%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>9886</td>
<td>12 0.121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>13264</td>
<td>17 0.128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>11040</td>
<td>35 0.317%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>13140</td>
<td>12 0.091%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>12284</td>
<td>13 0.106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>16943</td>
<td>48 0.283%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>21836</td>
<td>54 0.247%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>18730</td>
<td>58 0.310%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>10 0.420%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3 0.313%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>7 0.343%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1 0.145%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>4 0.287%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4 0.717%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1 0.149%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>3 0.391%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2 0.333%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>15 0.480%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1 0.114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>14363</td>
<td>51 0.355%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>19587</td>
<td>21 0.107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>8351</td>
<td>18 0.216%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>6915</td>
<td>6 0.087%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>2 0.154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>6 0.201%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>1 0.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>3 0.099%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>6 0.101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>5312</td>
<td>1 0.017%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>10746</td>
<td>11 0.102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13315</td>
<td>14 0.105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>305634</td>
<td>489 0.160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>ød</td>
<td>Rep'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS | 489 | 423 | 322 | 40 | 21 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 26 | 53 | 13 |
| PERCENT | 86.5% | 76.1% | 1.5% | 5.0% | 1.0% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 6.2% | 12.5 | 3.1% | 76.12% |
Chart 3.2.1

`od: Summary of Renderings

eti (68%)
ouketi (8%) eti [e] (4%)
Unique (5%)
— (11%)
palin (1%)
[e] (1%)
news (1%)
Chapter Four: 'ên/'ayin

'ên,² the predicator of non-existence,³ occurs seven hundred and eighty-nine times in H.⁴

The form 'ayin is either clause-terminal or syntactically separate from the following phrase or clause, and answers a question or offers an alternative to something previously mentioned, normally by ellipsis. 'ayin monophthongizes to 'ên when it is clause-

¹For the sake of simplicity I will refer to it as 'ên, which is by far more common (747xx vs. 42xx).

²'ên (<PS *'ayin) is related morphologically and semantically to forms in several other Semitic languages (the relation between these forms reflects the standard monophthongization (ayi > ê)). Cf., e.g., Akkadian yanu/ya'nu (<ayyanum "where?") Ugaritic 'n, Moabite 'n, Phoenician 'e/i, Ethiopic 'en. Even the pronominal suffixation characteristic of 'ên is seen in Akkadian. Wolfgang von Soden, GRUNDRISS DER AKKADISCHEN GRAMMATIK (Rome, 1952):#111b.

For the reasonable theory that 'ên has developed by semantic shift from the interrogative ('ayin), see Bauer-Leander, HEBRÄISCHE GRAMMATIK (§80.2), and Jenni-Westermann, THAT (I:127f). Cf. 'ayyeh "Where is ...?" which can imply "X is nowhere/does not exist" (above).

³It tends to function as the negative complement to yesh. Cf. Brockelmann, GRUNDRISS: "Es verneint zunächst als Gegensatz su ies die Existenz einer Sache ..." (II:114). We shall see, however, that at least one of its major functions is completely distinct from those of yesh.

⁴'ên appears in every biblical book except Jn.
initial or medial,\(^5\) or has a suffixed pronominal subject.\(^6\)

FUNCTION IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

'ën, usually described as the antonym or negative complement of yesh,\(^7\) is normally translated "There is/are no[t] ...\(^8\) It is the second most common negative in H,\(^9\) occurring almost exclusively in nominal clauses (whereas lo' usually occurs in verbal contexts).\(^10\)

It has two main functions: to negate the [primarily participial] clause within which it occurs, and to deny

\(^5\)I.e., whenever it precedes its subject, whether immediately or at a distance.

\(^6\)'ën occurs 103xx with suffixes: 3ms (48xx), 3mp (16xx), 1cs and 2ms (12xx each), 2mp (6xx), 3fs (5xx), 2fs (2xx), 1p (1). This accounts for 12.9% of its occurrences.

\(^7\)Although 'ën can be described vis à vis yesh, 'ën affects the overt meaning of its sentence in a way foreign to yesh, since it negates the predication that would have been positive without it. 'ën thus has much more lexical "fullness" than yesh, even though their syntagmatic functions appear similar.

\(^8\)See on yesh, above.

\(^9\)Less frequent than lo' (c. 5050 times), but slightly more common than 'al (c. 730 times).

\(^10\)Muraoka, EMPHATIC WORDS, lists twenty-five different syntagms (102-108). Although I do not agree with all of his analyses, it at least shows the possibilities.
the existence (or, conversely, predicate the absence) of its subject.

It normally fronts its clause,\(^{11}\) preceding the word it negates, but there are many exceptions:\(^{12}\)

\[w^n\text{ish} \ 'en \ ba'arets \ labö' \ 'alënû \ldots \] \text{Gn 19.31}
Since there is no man in the land [area] to have sexual relations with us ...

\['im-t^n\text{anneh} \ 'et-b^n\text{enotay} \ w^n\text{im-tiqqax} \ nashîm \ 'al-b^n\text{enotay} \ 'ên 'îsh 'immanû \ re'eh 'îlohim \ 'ed bënî ūbënëka \] \text{Gn 31.50}
If you harm my daughters or if you take other wives in place of my daughters, although no one is with us, note that God is a witness between you and me.

\('ên\) negates a clause in a manner functionally equivalent to \(\text{lo}'\).\(^{13}\) The two are even found in exactly parallel texts:\(^{14}\)

\[ūmin \ habb\text{ehemah} \ 'a\text{sher} \ lo' \ t\text{ehorah hî'} \] \text{Gn 7.2}
and from the animals that are not clean

\[ūmin \ habb\text{ehemah} \ 'a\text{sher} \ ênennah \ t\text{ehorah} \] \text{Gn 7.8}
and from the animals that are not clean

\(^{11}\)For a description of fronting, see under \(\text{ayyeh}\) (above).

\(^{12}\)These examples are also cited by Jean Carmignac, "L'emploi de la négation \(\text{ên}\) dans la Bible et a Qumran" REVUE DE QUMRAN 8 (1974):407f.
The difference between these clauses appears to be related to discourse, not syntax. In Gn 19.31 it sets out the reason for the proposition to follow; in Gn 31.50 it grants a concession in the covenental [threat].

\(^{13}\)We shall see below that they were usually translated into G as though this were the understanding of the translators as well.

\(^{14}\)Joüon, GRAMMAIRE, distinguishes sharply between these verses (#160b).
This occurs frequently when 'èn is followed by a participial predicate:

'èn sar bêt-hasso har ro'eh 'et-kol-mē'ūmah bēyadō
The official over the prison did not observe (know) anything that he [Joseph] did

'èn YHWH ro'eh 'otanû
YHWH does not see us

'èn 'ester maggedet mōladtaH wē'et-'ammaH
Esther did not make known either her ancestry or her people.15

'èn predicates absence in degrees ranging from absolute non-existence to present or particular non-existence. Absolute non-existence states that the subject of 'èn does not exist.16 In, e.g., Nu 27.4 there is no possibility that the man in question will ever have a son, since he is dead:

'èn lō ben
he does not have a son17

If there is no one to whom restitution can be made, restitution must be made to YHWH through the priest:

wē'im 'èn la'īsh go'el
if the man does not have a go'el

15 Cf. Ex 33.15; Lv 14.21; Ek 9.9; Ec 9.1; Es 3.5; 7.4; Ez 3.13. With one exception (Ec 9.1) the order in these clauses is 'èn-subject-predicate (vs. lō-predicate-subject).

16 Jouon, GRAMMAIRE: "'ayin exprime d'abord la non-existence dans le lieu, à savoir l'absence, puis, par extension, la non'existence tout court" (#154k).

17 Cf. Nu 27.8-11 for other examples of the same predication.
Monotheistic passages in the Latter Prophets, especially Isaiah, assert the uniqueness of YHWH and the absence of any true rival:\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{quote}
'anokî 'anokî YHWH w'en mibbal'aday mōshiā'.
\end{quote} 

\textbf{Is 43.11}

I, I am YHWH; there is no other Savior.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{'en} also indicates the spatial or temporal absence of persons or things, usually at the time of speaking:

\begin{quote}
wēhaya kī'ērotō kī-'ēn hanna'ar wamēt Gn 44.31
\end{quote}

When he sees that the lad is not there, he will die.

\begin{quote}
wēhinneh 'ēn yonatan wēnose' kelayw 1S 14.17
\end{quote}

Neither Jonathan nor his armor bearer was there.

\begin{quote}
ra'ītī ... wē'el-hashshamayim wē'ēn 'ōram Jr 4.23
\end{quote}

I looked ... to the heavens, but their light was gone.

\begin{quote}
ra'ītī wēhinneh 'ēn ha'adam Jr 4.25
\end{quote}

I looked--but no one was there.

With locatives \textit{'en} predicates situation-specific physical and temporal non-existence or absence:

\begin{quote}
raq 'ēn-yir'at 'ēlohim bammaqōm hazzeh Gn 20.11
\end{quote}

Surely there is no fear of God in this place.

\begin{quote}
kī 'ēn YHWH bēqirbē'kem Nu 14.42
\end{quote}

... for YHWH is not in your midst\textsuperscript{20}

---


\textsuperscript{19}Cf. Is 44.6; 45.5 (twice, once with \textit{'ōd}), 6, 14.

\textsuperscript{20}Cf. kī 'ēn YHWH bēyisra'ēl "for YHWH is not in Israel (C2 25.7)."
but Manoah her husband was not with her
[circumstantial clause]

for there is no memory of you [objective genitive] in Zion

when the [my] word is not in them

for [my] husband is not at home

'ên functions privatively when, in effect, it forms a compound adjective with the word it negates:

My people have forgotten me for numberless days (days without number)

As the heavens for height and the earth for breadth, so the heart of kings is unsearchable

---

21 Reading haddabar for haddibber.

22 Cf. Gn 37.29; Ex 22.13; Dt 31.17; Jg 16.15; Jr 8.19a; 8.19b; 15.1; 22.17; 38.9; Ps 36.2; Jb 6.13; 41.25.

23 Also called "item adverb" (Waltke & O'Connor, BIBLICAL HEBREW SYNTAX (#39.3.3)).

24 For the same idiom, cf. Cl 22.4.

25 Cf. the same function, but in a different syntagm:

Why is there a price in the hand of a fool to acquire wisdom when there is no heart [he is senseless]?
'en with le- + infinitive indicates negative result or inability: 26

\[\text{we'adam 'ayin la'abod 'et-ha'adamah} \quad \text{Gn 2.5}\]

nor was there anyone to till the ground 27

\[\text{we'en mayim lishtôt ha'am} \quad \text{Ex 17.1}\]

but there was no water for the people to drink

\[\text{ûteshûra 'en-lehabî' la'îsh ha'ëlohîm} \quad \text{Sl 9.7}\]

but there is [we have] no gift to bring to the man of God

\[\text{'ad 'asher 'en-bahem kôx libkôt} \quad \text{Sl 30.4}\]

until there was no more strength in them to weep

\[\text{ûlebanon 'en dê ba'er} \quad \text{Is 40.16a}\]

Lebanon is not sufficient for burning

\[\text{'ên 'eshkol le'ëkol} \quad \text{Mi 7.1}\]

There is no bunch of grapes to eat

\[\text{we'en shenî lahâqîmô} \quad \text{Qo 4.10}\]

but there would be no one else to lift him up

Even without an explicit subject this syntagm implies general inability or lack of permission: 28

\[\text{kî 'ên labo' 'el-sha'ar hammelek bilëbûsh sag} \quad \text{Es 4.2}\]

for no one may enter the king's gate dressed in sackcloth

26 Cf., among others, Nu 22.26; K2 19.3 (= Is 37.3); Is 47.14; Jr 19.11; Mi 7.1; Dn 11.15. Carmignac, "L'emploi de la Négation", sees this as a development of later H: "... on ne peut douter que l'association de 'YN et d'un infinitif pourvu de lamed est une création récente en hébreu ..."). Although this is an observable tendency, he limits his citations to Pr, Ru, Qo, Cl-2, as does Joüon, GRAMMAIRE (#160j).

27 Had there been human beings, they could have tilled the ground (they would at least have been available). The action is impossible because the subject is lacking.

28 xx; only Es, Ez, Cl-2.
ki ketab 'asher niktab ... 'en leheshib Es 8.8
for that which is written ... no one may
revoke
we'e'en 'immeka lehityatstseb C2 20.6
No one can stand against you ... 29

Limited inability is also signalled by le with a nominal
or pronominal:

w'e'gam lal'ewiyim 'en lase't 'et hammishkan C1 23.26
and the Levites would have no more carrying of
the Tabernacle (= ... would not have to carry
the Tabernacle [any longer])

The nature of the inability is sometimes explicit:

w'e'en lebêt 'axazyahu la'tsor ko'aX le'mamlakah C2 22.9
but the house of Ahaziah had no one able to
hold the kingship

'ên occurs without an explicit subject in
elliptical clauses that offer an alternative or answer a
question: 30

hayesh baH 'ets 'im-'ayin Nu 13.20
whether or not there are any trees in it

'im-'ayin 'atta shema' lî Jb 33.33
but if not [if there are no words], listen to
me.

we'amart 'ayin Jg 4.20
then you shall say,"No [no one is here.]"

29 The other examples are Ez 9.15; 2C 5.11; 35.15.

30 Although his discussion is limited to lo', cf.
the same point by Ziony Zevit, "Expressing Denial in
Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, and in Amos" VT 29

In the passages cited here 'ên stands opposite
yesh.
'ên WITH AFFIXES

'ên occurs with both prefixes and suffixes. It is used with all four prefixed prepositions: min [me] (27xx), be- and le- (10xx each), and ke- (7xx).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'ên with Prefixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

me'ên "without" occurs primarily in passages that foretell covenantal disaster through decimation of the population, especially with yosheb (13xx) and 'adam (5xx):

---

31 It shares this characteristic with 'êd (above; contrast 'ayyeh and yesh). It also occurs with the conjunction we- and interrogative ha-, but these do not affect its function.

Its distribution is interesting because each combination tends to occur in one book: min primarily in Jr (19/27xx = 70%); b^e- in Pr (8/10xx = 80%); l^e- in C2 (5/10xx = 50%); ke- in Is (4/7xx = 58%).

'ên does not occur with any prefix other than the conjunction or interrogative in the Torah or Former Prophets.
Cities without inhabitants, and houses without people.

Your cities shall fall into ruin without inhabitants

be'ên appears to have the same function:

He will die without discipline

Plans are frustrated without counsel

In ke'ayin the negative functions as a substantive

"nothing":

Those who strive against you will become like nothing—they will perish

kê'ên (only Is 59.10) seems to be periphrastic for

ka'anashîm 'asher 'ên lahem:

And we grope like [those who have] no eyes

'ên occurs with suffixes that identify its pronominal subject (103xx).

In one-fifth of these passages 'ên

32 Cf. Pr 8.24; 11.14; 14.4; 26.20; 29.18; Is 57.1; Ek 38.11 (all occurrences).

33 6/7xx with ke-: Is 40.17; 41.11, 12; Hg 2.3; Ps 39.6; 73.2.

34 It appears with more than eight forms due to morphological variation, but in only eight of the ten positions in the identificatory matrix of H.

Four suffixes are added to the monophthongized stem: 2ms ('ênka), 2fs ('ênêk), 2mp ('ênkem), and 3mp ('ênam).

41 of these occurrences with pronominal suffixes
occurs with only a pronominal suffix (21xx), generally "to be/exist no longer":

wayyithallek hēnōk 'et-ha'ēlohim wē'ēnennū kī-
laqax 'ōtō 'ēlohim
Gn 5.24
And Enoch walked with God, then he was no
longer, because God took him.

yībash niddaph wē'ēnenū
Is 19.7
[They] will dry up, be driven away, and be no
more.

banay yētsa'ūnī37 wē'ēnam
Jr 10.20a
My children have left me--they are not (= no
longer) here.

wēhitbonnanta 'al-mēqomō wē'ēnennū
Ps 37.10b
And you will consider his place, but it will not
be there.38

fall in Gn (16xx), Jr (13xx), Qo (12xx).
The other suffixes--all vocalic--are added with a
prosthetic syllable: lcs ('ēnennī), 3ms ('ēnennū), 3fs
('ēnennā), lcp ('ēnennū; only in Jr 44.16 (haddabar
ashar-dibbarta 'elenū bešem YHWH 'ēnennū shomē-sīm
'eleka "As for the message which you have given to us in
the name of the LORD, we will not listen to you"), where
syntax and grammar require that the form be plural).

35 On the more frequent syntagm with a suffix ('ēn
with a suffix and participle), see above.

36 In addition to the examples cited, cf. Jr 31.15
(14); 49.10; 50.20; Ek 26.21; Ps 37.36; 39.14; 59.14;
103.16; Jb 3.21; 7.8, 21; 24.24; 27.19; Pr 12.7; 23.5;
La 5.7 ( all occurrences).

37 G and VSS apparently read tsō'nī here, but yatsa'
with an accusative of source is not unknown (cf. Gn
44.4; Ex 9.29; Jb 31.34).

38 At least one case seems not to have this temporal
significance:

hen qedem 'ohēlok wē'ēnennū
Jb 23.8
If I go ahead, he is not there
(cf. 23.8b: wē'axōr wē'lo' 'abin lō "... or back, I do
not perceive him").
'ên occurs infrequently with independent pronouns:

**zeh/zo’t** (7xx)\(^{39}\) and personal pronouns (2xx):

\[\text{zeh/zo’t} \text{ kî-’im bêt ’elohîm} \quad \text{Gn 28.17}\]
This is nothing but the house of God [= Is this not the house of God?]

\[\text{Umádûa } \text{ yastîr ’abî mimennî ’et-haddabar hazzeh} \quad \text{Is 20.2}\]
Or why would my father hide this thing from me?
This [what you are suggesting] is not so!

\[\text{’ên zo’t biltî-’im xereb gid’e’on} \quad \text{Jr 7.14}\]
This is nothing but the sword of Gideon [= Is this not ... ?]

\[\text{ha’aph } \text{’ên zo’t ben-e-yisra’el} \quad \text{Am 2.11}\]
Is this not so, O children of Israel?

\[\text{’ên zeh kî-’im ra` leb} \quad \text{Ne 2.2b}\]
This is nothing but sadness of heart [= Is this not ... ?]

In Ne 4.17 **’ên** is followed by an independent personal pronoun:\(^{40}\)

\[\text{we’e’en } \text{’anî we’e’axay ûna’ara’ray we’e’anshê hammishmar} \quad \text{Ne 4.17 (twice)}\]
\[\text{’asher } \text{’ax’ara’yan } \text{’ên } \text{’anaxnû posh’e’Tîm be’gadênû}\]
So neither I, my brothers, my servants, nor the men of the guard who followed me--none of us stripped off our clothes.\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{39}\)These tend to be followed by ’im, which sets off the contrast: "This is nothing but ..."

\(^{40}\)It is preceded by a proleptic independent pronoun in Ne 2.2a.

\(^{41}\)The first occurrence here is proleptic, anticipating the second before the participle, in precisely the same function that we have seen with the pronominal suffix and participle (above).
SUMMARY

'ên has two primary functions in H: to negate the clause which it heads (especially with a participial predicate), and to predicate the local, temporal, or absolute non-existence or lack of its subject.

It differs from 'ayyeh and yesh (especially) and from ʿōd (as a predicator of existence) in that its function with participial predicates is very nearly that of ʾol with a finite verb.
TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

USUAL RENDERING

The usual rendering of 'én is ou/me\textsuperscript{42} [e]\textsuperscript{43} (515xx = 67\%). 'én is also rendered by ou (106xx = 14.8\%),\textsuperscript{44} ou huparxw (27xx = 3.8\%), oudeis (22xx = 3.1\%), and alpha privative (16xx = 2.3\%). Other renderings include oudeis [e] (5xx), ou heuriskw (4xx), and thirty-six passages in which a rendering is common to only two books\textsuperscript{45} or is unique.\textsuperscript{46}

'én is not represented in G in 40 passages (5.6\%).

Taking into the account the use of ou alone to negate a

\textsuperscript{42}Alternation between me and ou is grammatically motivated; they are therefore considered a single rendering.

\textsuperscript{43}As above, [e] refers to "any form of the verb eimi".

\textsuperscript{44}Primarily when 'én occurs with a participle and the participle is rendered by a finite verb in G (below).

\textsuperscript{45}There are five of these "shared" renderings: alpha privative with [e] (Jb 22.5; Pr 30.27), aneu (Ex 21.11; Am 3.5), ou me huparxw (Ps 59.14; Pr 29.18), ouketi (Ex 5.10; Is 23.10), and ouketi [e] (Ek 27.36; Jb 7.21; 23.8).

\textsuperscript{46}Nineteen renderings occur only once. The preposition apo occurs five times but only in Jr; I therefore classify it as unique.
participle rendered as a finite verb, ou is the primary component used to render 'ên in G (87.3%).

The use of ou [e] to represent 'ên in the great majority of its occurrences shows that the interpretation suggested above was that of the translators as well—they viewed 'ên as a predicator, not merely as an adverb.

**RENDERINGS OF 'ên IN G**

'ên occurs 37xx in Genesis where it is represented by ou [e] (26xx), ou/me (7xx), ou huparxw (2xx), and ou exw and ou heuriskw (once each). It is striking that the translator rendered 'ên four different ways in its first five occurrences.47 The usual rendering occurs frequently, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{we'adom 'ayin la'abod 'et-ha'adamah} & \quad \text{Gn 2.5} \\
\text{wayyo'mer 'abraham ki 'amartī raq 'ên yir'at} & \quad \text{Gn 20.11} \\
\text{eipen de Abraam Eipa gar Ara ouk estin} & \quad \text{theosebeia en tw topw toutw} \\
\text{wa'omar 'el-haxarTummim we'ên maggīd lī} & \quad \text{Gn 41.24} \\
\text{eipa oun tois ecegetais, kai ouk en ho} & \quad \text{apaggellwn moi} \\
\text{wayyo'mer 'alehem ya'aqob ... yoseph 'ênennū} & \quad \text{Gn 42.36 (2xx)} \\
\text{we'shim'ön 'ênennū ...} & \quad \text{eipen de autois Iakwb ... Iwseph ouk estin,} \\
\text{Sumewn ouk estin ...} & \quad \text{Iwseph ouk estin,} \\
\end{align*}
\]

47 ou [e] (2.5), ou heuriskw (5.24), me (7.8), ou (11.30), oudeis [e] (19.31).
In 41.39 ouk estin anthrwpos might be considered a unique rendering, but here anthrwpos reflects the substantive nature of the adjectives in H, not an aspect of 'én: 49

'én-nabôn we'xakam kamôka ouk estin anthrwpos phronimwteros kai sunetwteros sou

Less frequent renderings which Gn has in common with at least two other books of G are ou/me (6xx), ou huparxw (2xx), and ou exw and ou heuriskw (once each).

In another apparently unique rendering the translator seems to have used ou outheis 50 to represent 'én in order to emphasize Joseph's authority in Potiphar's house: 51

'enennu gadôl babbayit hazzeh memmennî Gn 39.9 kai ouk huperexei en te oikia taute outhen emou

48. The translator used an adverbial participle (here a concessive genitive absolute) to subordinate the disjunctive clause (cf. Gn 44.31, 34, and often, passim, below).

49. Further evidence for this understanding of this passage is the translator's propensity for oudeis/outheis (even in the relatively near context: Gn 19.31; 31.50; 39.9). Further on oudeis [e], below.

50. Combining a negative adverb with a negative [neuter] subject plus a genitive of comparison.

51. Thus avoiding the possible misinterpretation that he was greater than one particular person.
Here, however, ouk, representing 'ên, negates huperexw (representing gadôl). outhen, the subject of huperexw, represents the pronominal suffix used with 'ên and specifies that Joseph is superior to everyone else.

In another occurrence of ou/me without [e] (5xx, including the preceding)\(^{52}\) the translator interpreted walad verbally and rendered it as an historic present:

\[
\text{wattēhî saray 'agarah 'ên laH walad } \text{Gn 11.30 kai en Sara steira kai ouk eteknopoiēi}
\]

Included in the list of the animals that entered into the ark with Noah and his family are those that are unclean:

\[
\text{ūmin-habbēhemah 'asher 'ěnennaH Tēbgorah } \text{Gn 7.8 kai apo twn ktenwn twn me katharwn}\(^{53}\)
\]

The translator elegantly turned the relative clause into an attributive adjectival phrase,\(^{54}\) which makes [e] not only unnecessary, but grammatically unacceptable.\(^{55}\)

\(^{52}\)Four of five uses of ou alone represent 'ên with a suffix (see "Renderings of 'ên with Affixes", Below).

\(^{53}\)Note that the translator did not use akatharos, an alpha-privative form of the adjective found in Lv and G generally, but not in Gn or Ex.

\(^{54}\)This translation is also used six verses earlier to represent the same construction with lo':

\[
\text{ūmin-habbhemah 'asher lo' Thorah hî' shnayim } \text{Gn 7.2 apo de twn ktenwn twn me katharwn duo duo, ...}
\]

\(^{55}\)All relative clauses are of course adjectival, but the point here is that the translator used a different grammatical realization to represent H.
In Gn 37.29 ou corresponds to 'én, which here follows ṣhinneh:

wayyashab rĕ'ūben 'el-habbôr ṣhinneh 'én
yôseph babbôr

Gn 37.29
anestrepsen de Rouben epi ton lakkon, kai oux
hora ton Iwseph en tw lakkw

hinneh was rendered as a transitive verb, and 'én as ouk
which negates it.56

When 'én with a pronominal suffix occurs with a
verbal participle in Gn,57 'én is rendered by the simple
negative in G, and the participle by a verb which is
assigned person and number on the basis of the
pronominal suffix:58

we'îm 'ênka meshîb da' kî-môt tamût 'attah
we'kol-'āsher-lak
Gn 20.7
ei de me apodidws, gnwthi hoti apothane su kai
panta ta sa

we'îm 'ênka me'shalleâx lo' nered
Gn 43.5
ei de me apostelleis ton adelphon hemwn meth'
hemwn, ou poreusometha

In Gn 30.1 me shows that there is a conditional
ellipsis in H. Again [e] would be grammatically
unacceptable, since it is not the elided verb:59

56See further under hinneh, below.

57Twice, both are conditions.

58This is analogous to the representation of 'ôd in
similar syntagms (above).

59This distinction is not maintained in H where we
would expect lo', since the reconstructed ellipsis would
read we'îm 'ênka [noten(?) lî banîm] (yahab, which
Rachel uses in the preceding clause, was not used in H
other than as an imperative).
'ên 'îsh is translated outheis ... [e] three times in Gn. Here ou- of outheis together with [e] represents the force of 'ên: 60

\[
\text{we'îm-tiqqax nashîm 'al-bênotay 'ên 'îsh 'immannû} \ldots \quad \text{Gn 31.50}
\]
\[
ei lepse gunaikas epi tas thugaterasin mou hora outheis meth' hemwn estin
\]
\[
\text{we'îsh 'ên ba'arets labô 'alênû} \ldots \quad \text{Gn 19.31}
\]
\[
kai oudeis estin epi tes ges, hos eiseleusetai pros hemas, \ldots \quad \text{61}
\]
\[
\text{we'ên 'îsh me'anshê habbayit sham babbayit} \quad \text{Gn 39.11}
\]
\[
kai outheis en twn en te oikia esw
\]

Less common renderings in Gn which are nonetheless common to at least two other books of G are ou huparxw (Gn 42.13, 32), ou exw (Gn 37.24), and ou heuriskw (Gn 5.24).

Twice ou huparxw represents 'ên with a pronominal suffix when the brothers explain (to Joseph!) that Joseph their eleventh brother was dead:

\[
\text{we'ah'exad 'ênennnû} \quad \text{Gn 42.13}
\]
\[
\text{ho de heteros oux huparxei}
\]
\[
\text{ha'exad 'ênennû} \quad \text{Gn 42.32}
\]
\[
\text{ho heis oux huparxei}
\]

60 This rendering is analogous to the use of ouketi [e] for lo' ... 'ôd, in which the ou[k]- represents lo' and eti 'ôd (above). These occurrences are therefore counted with the usual rendering.

61 The translator used the same rendering despite the unusual word order (the subject does not usually precede 'ên).
huparxw can mean "live" (properly "exist"), but it occurs elsewhere in Gn only as "property" or "belongings".62

ou heuriskw is an exegetical representation of 'ên in Gn 5.24. Enoch was no more (= could not be found) because God had taken him away:63

\[
\text{wayyithallek hänök 'et-ha'ëlohim w'ennennû kî-laqax 'otô 'ëlohim} \quad \text{Gn 5.24}
\]
\[
kai euerestesen hEnwx tw thew kai ouk heurisketo, hoti metetheken auton ho theos. \quad 64
\]

ou exw, another exegetical rendering of 'ên, nicely captures the idiom of H, although the syntax of the clause is "inverted", mayîm becoming the object rather than the subject:

\[
\text{wehabbor req 'ên bô mayîm} \quad \text{Gn 37.24}
\]
\[
\text{ho de lakkos kenos, hudwr ouk exein}
\]

The translator of Gn was relatively consistent—he used ou [e] to represent 'ên in 70% of its occurrences. Variation from this was normally to use ou alone (19%) either because of the presence of a participle in H which he rendered with a finite verb, or because he

---

62 Cf., e.g., rekûsh (Gn 12.5; 13.6; 14.16; 36.7), migneh (Gn 36.7; 46.6; 47.18). Other occurrences represent various combinations expressing ownership, e.g., 'asher î (25.5; 45.11).

63 On ou heuriskw for 'ên, cf. on Pr 14.6, below.

64 The New Testament author of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes G, as is his custom, when referring to Enoch: ouk heurisketo dioti metetheken auton ho theos (Hb 11.5, probably quoted from memory; cf. dioti vs. hoti).
interpreted an adjective or noun verbally and rendered it so in G, yielding a context in which [e] would not have been grammatically proper.

In Exodus (22xx) 'ên is rendered by ou [e] (9xx), ou (8xx), me huparxw (2xx), and by oudeis, ouketi, and aneu (once each). 65

ou [e] is in two comparisons, where the translator supplied allos to heighten the incomparability of YHWH:

le'ma`an teda` kî-'ên kêYHWH `êlohe`nu Ex 8.6
hina eides hoti ouk estin allos plen kuriou;

ba`abûr teda` kî 'ên kamonî bêkol-ha'arets Ex 9.14
hin' eides hoti ouk estin hws egw allos en pase te ge

Other occurrences of the usual rendering parallel those in Gn (above). 66

ou alone represents 'ên when 'ên occurs with a verbal participle, whether or not 'ên has a suffix:

wayyar' wêhinneh hassêneh bo`er ba`e'sh
wêhassêneh 'ênnenû 'ukkal Ex 3.2
kai hora hoti ho batos kaïetai puri, ho de batos ou katekaieto

kî 'im-'ênka mêshalle`ax 'et-`ammî ... Ex 8.17
ean de me boule ecaposteilai ton laon mou ...
In two absolute occurrences of 'ayin, both presenting alternatives, elision of the clause in H is reflected in G: 68

hâyesh YHWH bêgirbenû 'im-'ayin  Ex 17.7
Ei estin kurios en hemin e ou?

wa`attah 'im-tissa' xaTTa'tam wê'im-'ayin mëxenî na' missiphreka ...  Ex 32.32
kai nun ei men apheis autois ten hamartian, apheis; ei de me, ecaleipson me ek tes biblou sou, ...

In 2.12 Moses killed the Egyptian:

wayyiphen koh wakoh wayyar' kî 'ên 'îsh  Ex 2.12
periblepsamenos de hwde kai hwde oux hora oudena

'ên is represented by oux; oudena renders 'îsh, which is now the direct object of the verb (negated by oux). 69 The first clause of the verse was subordinated to the second, so that the indirect observation [discourse] introduced by kî is the main clause in G.

ou huparxw represents 'ên twice in Ex. In Ex 14.11, when the people grumble to Moses for bringing

67 Ex 5.16; 33.15, the other two occurrences of this construction, have the same rendering as 5.11.

68 In neither case would [e] be appropriate, since it is not the verb elided.

69 The use of [ou] oudeis ([e]) to represent 'ên 'îsh is not uncommon: cf. Gn 19.31; 31.50; 39.11 (all oudeis [e]); Sl 21.2; Is 41.28a; 57.1a (all oudeis). These are all the biblical examples of this rendering.
them into the wilderness, the translator's motives in choosing \textit{me huparxw} are unclear: \footnote{\emph{huparxw} occurs in Ex three times (cf. 32.24, where the idiomatic \emph{lemi} zahab ... is rendered as \emph{Ei tini huparxei xrusia ...}).}

\begin{verbatim}
wayyo'merû 'el-mosheh hamibbêlî 'ên-qêbarîm bêmitsrayim ... \textit{Ex 14:11}
kai eipan pros Mwusen Para to me huparxein mnemata en ge Aigua\textit{w} ... \\
\end{verbatim}

\textit{'ên le} (22.2) refers to the lack of possessions that prevents a thief from making restitution, so \textit{huparxw} was chosen for its connotations:

\begin{verbatim}
'im-'ên lô wênimkar bignebatô \textit{Ex 22.2}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
ean de me huparxei autw, prathetw anti tou klemmatos
\end{verbatim}

In Ex 5.10 \textit{ouketi} represents \textit{'ên} because of the larger context. Pharaoh announced that he would no longer supply straw for the bricks, signalling the end of his former policy. The translator used \textit{ouketi} because of his sensitivity to the context and, probably, to stress the point of Pharaoh's changed attitude toward the Hebrews:

\begin{verbatim}
koh 'amar par'oh 'ênennî noten lakem teben \textit{Ex 5.10}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Tade legei Pharaw Ouketi didwmi humin axura \textit{oudeis} renders \textit{'ên} once (22.9) when the translator
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{\emph{huparxw} could well imply "Do [they] have no graves ..."; if not, I have no explanation for this rendering other than as a lexical choice which, to the translator, reflected the function of \textit{'ên} as well as \textit{ou} [e].}
rendered 'ên with medeis\textsuperscript{72} because he interpreted the participle as a finite verb;\textsuperscript{73} medeis thus negates the verb (corresponding to 'ên) by functioning as its subject (reflecting the substantive nature of the participle in H):

\begin{quote}
\(\text{Umêt 'ô-nishbar 'ô-nisbah 'ên ro'eh Ex 22.9}
\text{\textit{kai suntribe e teleutese e aixmalwton genetai}}
\text{\textit{kai medeis gnw}}\)
\end{quote}

\textit{aneu} (2\textsuperscript{xx} in G) represents 'ên in Ex 21.11, where 'ên means "without". This infrequency of this literal rendering in G is surprising:\textsuperscript{74}

\begin{quote}
\(\text{\textit{wê'im-shêlash-'elleh lo' ya'ăseh laH wêyats'ah}}
\text{\textit{xinnam 'ên kaseph Ex 21.11}}
\text{\textit{eann de ta tria tauta me poiese aute,}}
\text{\textit{eceleusetai dwrean aneu argiriu}}\)
\end{quote}

The translator was far less consistent than Gn: \textit{ou} [e] (41\%) represents 'ên in non-verbal contexts, but \textit{ou} alone (32\%) represents 'ên (with or without a suffix) followed by a participle, which he usually rendered verbally.

\textsuperscript{72}The me- form is used because this further clause of the protasis is governed by ean (at the beginning of the verse).

\textsuperscript{73}It is also entirely possible that he simply thought this the best way to capture the flavor of H.

\textsuperscript{74}\textit{aneu} occurs 29\textsuperscript{xx} in G (three times in Jb under *). It represents lo'/bêlo' (6\textsuperscript{xx}), bil'ad/mibbil'ad (5\textsuperscript{xx}), bêlî/mibbêlî (5\textsuperscript{xx}), 'ên and \textit{al} (2\textsuperscript{xx} each), interrogative hî (once).

It also occurs in two identical clauses in the Aramaic portion of Dn, where it corresponds to di-la'. In S1 6.7 \textit{aneu} occurs within a G plus; Es 3.13f is part of the Additions to Esther.
In Leviticus 'èn occurs twenty-one times, primarily in three contexts: laws concerning skin disease (10xx), dietary law (5xx), and covenantal blessings and curses (4xx). It is rendered by ou [e] (11xx), ou (6xx), and outheis (3xx). It is not represented in 11.26a.

In Lv 11.4, its first occurrence of five in this chapter, 'èn followed by a participle is rendered by ou with a finite verb:75

\[ \text{Upharsah 'ènennû maphrîs} \]
\[ \text{hoplen de ou dixelei} \]

Lv 11.4

The other four verses in which 'èn is rendered by ou fall in the laws concerning skin diseases.76 The renderings in this chapter, however, are not easily explained, especially the variation between ou [e] and ou. Its first five occurrences are rendered as ou [e],77 which then alternates with ou:

\[ \text{wehinneh 'èn-mar'ehû `amoq min-ha`ôr wèse`ar} \]
\[ \text{shaxor 'èn bô} \]
\[ \text{Lv 13.31 (2xx)} \]
\[ \text{kai idou oux he opsis egkoilotera tou} \]
\[ \text{dermatos, kai thric canthizousa ouk estin en aute} \]

\[ \text{Úmar'eh hanneteq 'èn `amoq min-ha`ôr Lv 13.32} \]
\[ \text{kai he opsis tou thrausmatos ouk estin koile} \]
\[ \text{apo tou dermatos} \]

75 Cf. the same rendering in 11.26b, below.

76 'èn occurs nine times in Lv 13; it is represented by ou [e] (6xx) and ou (3xx).

77 Lv 13.4, 21 (2xx), 26 (2xx).

78 Despite the slightly different syntax of H (Úmar'ehû 'ènennû ...) the translator rendered 13.34 in exactly the same form.
I have no explanation for this variation, since egkoilotera is simply a comparative of egkoilos (the comparative functioning as apo with the genitive). Could the translator have seen a grammatical difference between koilos and egkoilos, so that when he rendered 'ên ... min by ouk ... koilos apo he needed [e], but when he used egkoilotera he did not?

The last three occurrences of 'ên in Lv, which are translated by oudeis/outheis, fall within the list of covenantal curses (26.14-39). The translator represented each subordinate 'ên-clause with a genitive absolute, using the genitive of outhenos to negate the participle as its subject:

\[\text{wêna} \text{'ên rodeph etkem} \quad \text{Lv 26.17} \\
\text{kai pheucesthe outhenos diwkontos humas} \]

\[\text{wênaphalû} \text{'ên rodeph} \quad \text{Lv 26.36} \\
\text{kai pesountai outhenos diwkontos} \]

---

79 These occurrences fall within both a topical unit and relatively close context, and since the statements are all quite similar. Stylistic variation does not seem reasonable, especially in light of the distribution of the renderings.

80 egkoilos occurs only twice in G: Lv 13.30, 31.

81 The 'ên-clause is disjunctive, and thus subordinate.

82 Cf. on Ex 22.9, above.
Lv 26.6 is an exception to this pattern, even though 'ên occurs with a participle and in the same context:

\[ \text{ûshèkabtem } \text{wè'ên } \text{maxàrid}^{84} \]

The translator apparently interpreted the syntax of w'èn rodeph differently from that of w'èn maxàrid, and wanted to distinguish what he saw as the essentially substantive character of the latter vs. the verbal nature of the former.

In Lv 11.26, where 'ên occurs twice, the translator's mis-interpretation of his Vorlage led him to view its first occurrence as superfluous:

---

83 The lexical variance here (diwkontos, katatrexontos) is probably textural, i.e., to avoid repetition.

84 This is the first canonical occurrence of maxàrid (12xx), which always occurs in descriptions of the blessings of YHWH upon Israel, and always following 'ên. In every case 'ên is represented with ou [e], showing that maxàrid was understood substantively by the translators. maxàrid is mainly represented by a participle of ekphobew (7xx, including here). In its other five occurrences it is represented by: diwikw (Is 17.2), aposobew (Jr 7.33), parenoxlew (Jr 46.27), and polemew (Jb 11.19). Jr 30.10 is lacking in G. All three occurrences in MP are translated with ekphobew (Mi 4.4; Na 2.12; Zp 3.13).
The second occurrence of 'én is represented as ou to negate the verb with which he rendered ma`alah.

The translator of Lv was not regular in rendering 'én, although more so than the translator of Ex. He used ou [e] (55%), but also used ou alone to represent the same construction in H.

'én occurs 19xx in Numbers, where it is rendered by ou [e] (13xx), ou (3xx), oudeis (2xx, once with and once without [e]), and ou exw (once).

'én is represented by ou thrice. 13.20 contains an either-or alternative using yesh and 'ayin, which is used elliptically in H and rendered that way in G:

h^a^y^e^s^h^b^a^H 'e^t^s 'i^m-'a^y^i^n Nu 13.20
ei estin en aute dendra e ou

In Nu 21.5 'én occurs twice in parallel and contiguous clauses. The translator did not use [e] to represent its second occurrence because he assumed its distribution across the conjunction:

kî 'én lexem w^e^né^n mayim Nu 21.5 (2xx)
hoti ouk estin artos oude hudwr

ou negates katadedetai in Nu 19.15, which apparently represents patîl, in a difficult rendering:
It is not unlikely that the translator read *patūl*. 86

In 11.6 ‘ên kol is probably a separate clause:
"There is nothing at all--only manna [for] our eyes!"
which the translator understood as the object of an implied verb "Our eyes [look] at nothing--only at manna!" He then represented ‘ên kol by ouden, which both serves as the subject (of an implied verb) and negates the clause:87

\[\text{wê-attah naphshenu yêbeshah 'ên kol biltî 'el-hamman 'ênênû} \]
\[\text{Nu 11.6} \]
\[\text{nuni de he psuxe hemwn kataceros, ouden plen eis to manna hoi ophthalmoi hemwn} \]

The translator rendered ‘ên consistently with oudeis insofar as in 20.19, where ‘ên appears as oudeis [e], it is as the negative subject of [e]:

\[\text{raq 'ên-dabar bêraglay 'e'eborah} \]
\[\text{Nu 20.19} \]
\[\text{alla to pragma ouden estin para to oros pareleusometha} \]

Once in Nu the translator represented ‘ên with ou exw:

\[\text{parah ... 'âsher 'ên baH mûm ...} \]
\[\text{Nu 19.2} \]
\[\text{damalin ... hetis ouk exei en aute mwmon ...} \]

85 In its other occurrence (Nu 15.38) *patil* (11xx in H) is represented accurately by *klwsma* "thread".

86 Cf. BHS, note 15a.

87 It is also possible, given the similarity of *bet* and *kaph*, that *kol* is a minus due to haplography.
ou [e] would seem as good a rendering, if not better, but this preserves the word order of H--he had no real choice in G if he was to do so, given the use of 'asher with the resumptive pronoun.

The translator of Nu was thus fairly regular in rendering 'en (68%).

In Dueteronomy (30xx) 'en is rendered by ou [e] (24xx) and ou (6xx).

In the five occurrences in which 'en is represented by simple ou, 'en plus pronominal suffix is followed by a participle. In each of these passages the participle is rendered as a finite verb (which is given its person and number on the basis of the pronominal suffix): 89

88[e] is not even a variant in this verse.

89The exception to this pattern occurs in 21.18, where the participle in H is rendered as a participle in G, which is surprising in light of the usual rendering of this syntagm in the parallel expression (two verses later):

\[\text{ki-yihyeh le'ish ben sorer umoreh 'enennu shome' beqol 'abiw ubeqol immo} \]
\[\text{ean de tini e huios apeithes kai erethistes} \]
\[\text{oux hupakouwn phwnen patros kai phwnen metros} \]

Contrast:

\[\text{... 'enennu shome' beqolenu} \]
\[\text{... oux hupakouei tes phwnes hemwv} \]

In 21.18 the translator rendered the participles adjectivally, treating 'enennu shome' as grammatically parallel to sorer and mereh, but in 21.20 he interpreted them verbally, with 'enennu shome' again parallel, but as a finite verb. This may contrast an abstract description of a rebellious son (21.18) with that rebellious son's actual deeds (21.20).
übaddabar hazzeh 'ênkem ma'âmînim bêYHWH 'êlohekem Dt 1.32
kai en tw logw toutw ouk enepisteusate kuriw tw thew humwn

ûtemûnâh 'ênkem ro'im zûlatî qôl Dt 4.12
kai homoiwma ouk eîdete, all' e phwnen

kî anokî met ba'arets hazzo't 'ênennî 'ober 'et-hayyarden Dt 4.22
egw gar apotheneskw en te ge taute kai ou diabainw ton Iordanen touton

The idiom yesh/'ên l'el yad- (28.32) is rendered exegetically with ou isxuw, which captures the sense of this construction:90

we'ên le'el yadeyka Dt 28.32
kai ouk isxueis he xeir sou

The translator of Dt used ou [e] as his standard rendering (80%), varying from it only to use ou when 'ên occurred with a participle and in an idiom.

'ên occurs five times in Joshua, where it is rendered by ou [e] (3xx), and by oude and outheis (once each).

Both secondary renderings (outheis, oude) represent 'ên in Js (6.1). In 6.1a two participial clauses were rendered as main clauses.91 'ên was represented as the negatives governing the verbs—as the subject (outheis)

---

90 On this idiom, cf. Frank Moore Cross, TDOT, 1:261. His explanation does not, however, explain the idiom in its positive form (with yesh).

91 The first is made more explicit by the insertion of the prepositional phrase.
of the first and a negative conjunction (oude) governing the second: 92

\[ \text{'ên yotse' wê'ên ba'} \]
\[ \text{kJ 6.1} \]
\[ \text{kai outheis ecependeueto ec autes oude ecependeueto} \]

The translator of Js was fairly consistent in his use of ou [e] for 'ên (60%).

In Judges (27xx) 'ên is rendered by ou [e] (22xx), ou (4xx), and oudeis [e] (once).

In Jg 19.28 the participle following 'ên was rendered as a finite verb; 'ên as ou negates it:

\[ \text{wayyo'mer 'eleyha qûmî wê'ên 'oneh} \]
\[ \text{Jg 19.28} \]
\[ \text{kai eipen pros auten Anastethi kai apektômen; kai ouk apektômen autô, alla tethnekei} 93 \]

In Jotham's fable of the trees and their search for a king and in its interpretation, 'ayin presents the elided alternative of the prospective king's ultimatum: if they are not anointing him in good faith they will be destroyed. Here w'im-'ayin should be understood, with the translator, as an independent clause:

92 This rendering conforms to the general pattern of G (passim) in representing 'ên with a participle by ou with a finite verb.

93 apokrinomai requires a dative object of the one answered; the translator either (unintentionally) spoiled the suspense of H by adding the last clause, or thought that she died as he spoke to her.
we'im-'ayin tetse' 'esh min-ha'aTad we'to'kal 'et-'arzê hallebanôn Jg 9.15
kai ei me, ecelthoi pur ek tes hramnou kai kataphagoi tas kedrous tou Libanou
we'im-'ayin tetse' 'esh me'abîmêlek we'to'kal 'et-ba'alê shêxem ... Jg 9.20
kai ei me, ecelthoi pur ec Abimelex kai kataphagoi tous andras Sikimwn ...

In Jg 14.3 Samson's parents remonstrate with him concerning his desire for a Philistine wife; the translator used me to represent the interrogative prefix, and ouk estin for 'ên:

ha'ên bibênôt 'axeyka ûbêkol-'amâî 'ishshah Jg 14.3
Me ouk estin apo twn thugaterwn twn adelphwn sou kai en panti tw law mou gune,

Three verses later (14.6) me'ûmah 'ên was rendered by ouden [e]. It is difficult to determine the correspondence between the two phrases, but the negative predication was derived from 'ên--ouden represents the substantive me'ûmah:

ûmê'ûmah 'ên bêyadô Jg 14.6
kai ouden en en xeiri autou

'ên le was represented as ou exw in its second occurrence in Jg 18.7; ou corresponds 'ên. The translator interpreted the last clause in this verse as implying that the people of Laish had no communication
(treaty?) with anyone. ou exw well represents this idiom:

\[
\text{we} \text{"en-maklim dabar ba'arets yöresh \text{"etser}} \\
\text{ûre-xoqim hemmah mitstsidonîm we\text{"dabar \"en lahem}} \\
\text{\"im-'adam} \\
\text{Jg 18.7}
\]
kai me dunamenous lalesai hrema, hoti makran eisin apo Sidwnos, kai logos ouk exousin pros anthrwpon

The translator of Judges was consistent in representing \text{\"en} with \text{ou [e]} (81%).

\text{\"en} in 1 Samuel (33xx) is represented mainly by \text{ou [e]} (28xx) and \text{ou} (2xx), as well as by \text{outheis} and \text{ou heuriskw} (once each). S1 17.50f is lacking in G.

In 18.25 \text{\"en} was rendered as \text{ou} because the...

---

94 Reading \text{\'adam}, with H (and contra, e.g., Boling, JUDGES, AB 6A, who says that this should be read as \text{\'aram "Aram" on the basis that \text{\'adam "leaves MT unintelligible" (263))}. There is no reason for emendation—the versions seem to have tried to conflate this idiom with the context (but cf. 18.28, where the same phrase is rendered meta anthrwpon):

\[
\text{we} \text{\text{"en matsil kî rexogah-hî} mitstsidonîn we\text{\"dabar \"en-lahem \"im-\'adam}} \\
\text{Jg 18.28b}
kai ouk estin ecairoumenos, hoti makran estin apo Sidwniwn, kai logos ouk estin autois meta anthrwpon
\]

95 This clause, difficult in H, was not understood by the translator and so omitted. It may, however, be a minus in G due to haplography ('rts ... tsr). lalesai was supplied to make sense of dabar following maklim.

96 It is striking that all five exceptions to the usual rendering of \text{\"en} occur in one section of S1 (14.17-21.2), although four occurrences within these parameters are represented by \text{ou [e]} (14.26, 39; 20.2, 21). Before 14.17 (13xx) and after 21.2 (11xx) \text{\"en} is only represented by \text{ou [e]}. 

translator interpreted xephets as xaphats, so rendering it with a finite verb:

'en-xephets lammelek b'emohar ki b'eme'ah 'arlôt p'elishtìm S1 18.25
ou bouletai ho basileus en domati all' e en hekaton akrobustiais allophulwn

In Michal's warning to David (19.11) the translator used a finite verb to represent the participle following 'ên (with pronominal suffix): 97

'im-'ênka m'emalleT 'et-naphshka hallaylah maxar 'attah mümat S1 19.11
Ean me su swses ten psuxen saytou ten nukta tauten, aurion thanatwthese. 98

When Ahimelech went out to meet David as he fled from Saul he asked why David was alone:

maddu' 'attah l'baddeka w'ish 'ên 'ittak S1 21.2
Ti hoti su monos, kai outheis meta sou?

G represents H well, using outheis for 'îsh 'ên, 99 but the translator left the phrase predicate, rather than make it explicitly verbal.

The translator used ou heuriskw as an exegetical

---

97 The independent pronoun for the pronominal suffix contrasts with the pattern of much of G, where the pronominal suffix is entailed within the form of the verb that represents the participle.

98 See "Renderings of 'ên with Affixes", below.

99 As in the first four occurrences of oudeis in G (Gn 19.31; 31.50; 39.11; Ex 2.12), above.
rendering of 'én in S1 14.17 to specify that Jonathan and his armor-bearer were not with the army: 100

wayyiphqdu wéhinneh 'én yónatan wénose' kelayw
S1 14.17
kai epeskepsanto, kai idou ouch heurisketo
Iwnathan kai ho airwn ta skeue autou

The translator of S1 was fairly consistent in using ou [e] to represent 'én (85%).

In 2 Samuel (15xx) 'én is rendered by ou [e] (12xx), me (2xx), and oudeis (once).

In S2 17.6 Absalom asks Hushai the Archite if he should act according to Ahitophel's counsel:

'im-'ayin 'attah dabber
ei de me, su laleson

Here, as often, 'én in an alternative is represented by simple me. 101

Joab rebuked David for not thanking his troops (19.8) and warned him that they would desert him if he persisted in mourning Absalom:

ki-'énka yótse' 'im yalín 'ísh 'ittëka
hallaylah
S2 19.8
ei me ekporeuse semeron, ei aulistesetai aner
meta sou ten nukta tauten

100 As opposed to an assertion that they were no longer; cf. Gn 42.13, 32, 36. This rendering is in fact not unlike that of ou horaw (Gn 37.29), and probably arises from a similar motivation (on ou heuriskw, cf. on Pr 14.6, below).

101 It is not only the equivalence of 'én with me that is regular, but the phrase 'im-'ayin (usually with maggeph) is normally rendered as ei de me (passim).
This is again the frequent use of a finite verb for a participle negated by 'ên, making the use of [e] superfluous and grammatically unacceptable in G.

In S2 'ên kol appears again as ouden,¹⁰² but this time without a verbal predicate:

\[
\text{wêlarash 'ên-kol kî 'im-kibsa 'axat qêTannah}
\]
\[
\text{ki}
\]
\[
\text{qêTannah}
\]
\[
\text{S2 12.3}
\]
\[
\text{kai tw peneti ouden all' e amnas mia mikra}
\]

The lack of a verbal predicate here is surprising in light of the parallel¹⁰³ and of the translator's strong tendency to use ou [e] for 'ên (12/15xx). He may have felt that the force of the preceding verse would carry over into this text, or that his rendering made the statement more dramatic—highly desirable in a parable.

The translator of S2 was consistent in his representation of 'ên (80%).

In 1 Kings (25xx) 'ên is represented by ou [e] (21xx) and corresponds to eis Ainakim (once). Its second and third occurrences in Kl 18.29 are minuses in G,¹⁰⁴ as is Kl 6.18.

¹⁰² Cf. on Nu 11.6, above.

¹⁰³ The preceding verse contains a parallel construction:

\[
\text{lê'ashîr hayah tso'n ûbaqar harbeh mê'od}
\]
\[
\text{S2 12.2}
\]
\[
\text{kai tw plousiw en pimnia kai boukolia polla}
\]
\[
\text{sphodra}
\]

¹⁰⁴ These clauses are lacking in G.
The usual rendering occurs in K1 3.18, but with a "twist", in that *outheis* here represents *zar*, resulting in a double negative (adverb and subject) that emphasizes their isolation more than would a "literal" rendering of *zar*:

\[ \text{wa'annaxnū yaxdaw 'ēn-zar 'ittanū babbayit} \\
\text{zūlatī sheṭayim 'annaxnū babbayit} \]

K1 3.18

kai hemeis kata to auto, kai ouk estin outheis meth' hemwn parec amphoterwn hemwn en tw oikiv

The only other rendering used in K1 is *eis Ainakim* (15.22), where the translator apparently did not understand the H idiom of this admittedly awkwardly placed clause:105

\[ \text{w'hemmelek 'asa' hishmā 'et-kol-yēhūdah 'ēn} \\
\text{noqī wayyiśē'ū 'et-'abnē haramah wē'et-} \\
\text{'etseyha 'āsher banah ba'sha' wayyiben ...} \]

K1 15.22

kai ho basileus Asa pareggeilen panti Iouda
\[ eis Ainakim,} \]
106 kai airousin tous lithous tes Rama kai ta cula autes ha wkodomesen Baasa, kai wkodomesen ...

The translator of K1 was thus absolutely consistent (95%) except where he misunderstood his *Vorlage* (once).

The translator of 2 Kings (20xx) represented *'ēn* by means of *ou [e]* (15xx) and *ou* (3xx). It is not represented in 17.34 (twice).

---

105 "So King Asa proclaimed to all Judah (no one was excluded) ..."

106 Did he read *'ēn* as *'ad?"
K2 4.2 resembles K1 3.18 (above) in that ouk [e] represents 'ên, but its subject (kol) is rendered by outhen, again emphasizing the widow's complete lack of anything with which to sustain herself and her son, without adding the burden of caring for Elijah:

\[
\text{watto'mer 'ên lëshiphxatka kol babbayit kî 'im-'asûk shamen} \quad \text{K2 4.2}
\]
\[
\text{he de eipen ouk estin te doule outhen en tw oikw hoti all' e ho aleipsomai elaion}
\]

In two places 'ên with a pronominal suffix followed by a participle is rendered by ou with a finite verb. Joash interrogated Jehoiada and the priests about the lack of work done on the Temple:

\[
\text{maddû\textsuperscript{a} 'ènkem mëxazzqîm 'et-bedeq babbayit} \quad \text{K2 12.8}
\]
\[
\text{Ti hoti ouk ekrataioute to bedek tou oikou?}
\]

The report to the king of Assyria concerning the devastation by lions of the persons displaced to Samaria by Assyria placed the responsibility on the shoulders of the deportees, saying that these things had come to pass because they did not know YHWH. Two constructions (lo' yad'û, 'ênam yod'îm) are rendered with the same

---

107 The translator did not know how to render bedeq so he transliterated it in every occurrence in K2 (7xx in K2 12; also K2 22.5). Ez 27.9, 27 are its only other occurrences.
syntagm, but different lexical choices, apparently to avoid repetition.

lo' yade'û 'et-mishpaT 'Elohe ha'arets wayshallax-bam 'et-ha'arahayôt wehinnam memitîm 'otam ka'asher 'enam yode'îm 'et-mishpaT 'Elohe ha'arets ouk egnwsan ta krima tou theou tes ges, kai apestilein eis autous tous leontas, kai idou eisin thanatountes autous, kathoti ouk oidasin to krima tou theou tes ges.

In K2 2.10 'ayin represents the negative of two alternatives, when Elijah responded to Elisha's request for a double portion of Elijah's spirit after his departure, by saying that if he saw him when he was taken away he would receive his request,

we'im 'ayin lo' yihyeh kai ean me, ou me genetai

This absolute [elliptical] use of 'ên is rendered elliptically; [e] is not used because it is not the verb which has been elided.

In K2 17.34 suffixed 'ên occurs twice before participles. It is not represented either time:

108 This may show, especially given this close proximity, that for the translator of K2, at least, there was no functional difference between lo' with a finite verb and 'ên with a verbal participle.

109 The aorist of gignwskw is grammatically equivalent to the perfect of oida.

110 But cf. the putative difference between gignwskw as "find out" or "learn" and oida as more simply and generally "know [someone or something]".
The translator was probably avoiding the apparent contradiction between statements that they did fear YHWH (17.32, 33, 41) and this verse.

The translator of K2 was thus fairly consistent in his representation of 'ên (75%), but in at least one place did not distinguish in his translation its use with a participle from that of lo' with a finite verb.

Isaiah has more occurrences of 'ên than any other book (91xx). It is rendered by ou [e] (57xx), ou (10xx), oudeis (7xx), ou exw (4xx), and once each by oudeis [e] (40.17), hoti exw (47.14), ou huparxw (59.10), ouketi (23.10), and alpha privative (44.12). Seven of its occurrences are not represented.

me'ên, is represented by para to me and para to me [e] (6.11). Its first occurrence lacks [e]

111Although its relatively frequency is not particularly high due to the size of Is.

112It is a minus because the clause or verse in which it appears is a minus (3xx), or because the translation of the text made it superfluous or impossible to align the two texts (4xx).

11320xx in H.

114More exactly, para to corresponds to me- and me [e] to 'ên.
because the participle which follows 'ên is rendered with an infinitive; the second occurrence requires the infinitive of [e] because 'ên negates a noun.\textsuperscript{115}

\begin{verbatim}
'ad 'asher 'im-sha'û 'arîm me'ên yôsheb ûbattîm me'ên 'adam wê'ha'êdamah tishsha'êh shêmamah
\end{verbatim}

Is 6.11 (2xx)

hews an eremthwsi poleis para to me katoikeisthai kai oikoi para to me einai anthrwpous kai he ge kataleipthesetai eremos

The translator used an unusual construction (para to with infinitive), since he used ou [e] (5.9) and me [e] (50.2d) in the other two occurrences of me'ên in Is.\textsuperscript{116}

ou without [e] represents 'ên nine times in Is--with participles, in ellipses, and in an idiomatic phrase. When 'ên occurs with a "verbal" participle, as throughout G, the participle is rendered with a finite verb, and 'ên with ou:

\begin{verbatim}
gam kî-tarbû têphillah 'ênennî shomea' Is 1.15 kai ean plethunete ten deesin, ouk eisakousomai humwn
\end{verbatim}

Is 5.27 (2xx)

ou peinasousin oude kopiasousin

\begin{verbatim}
'ên-'âyeph wê'ên-kôshel bô
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
yâ'an qara'tî wê'ên 'ôneh dibbartî wlo'
\end{verbatim}

shame'û

Is 66.4

hoti ekalesa autous kai ouk huperkousan mou, elalesa kai ouk ekousan\textsuperscript{117}

\begin{verbatim}
\footnote{This rendering is shared only with Jr (33.10c, 12).}
\footnote{This rendering, which may reflect the influence of mibbêli (see below under "Synonyms of 'ên"), is especially puzzling since he had just used kai ouk esontai hoi enoikountes for the same clause (5.9).}
\footnote{The pronouns are plusses in G, and both ou with a participle and lo' with a verb were rendered with ou and a finite verb. This implies either that the}
When 'ên occurs in consecutive clauses, its second occurrence is represented by oude with an ellipsis of the predicate:

lo'-'ehye xobesh ûbêbêtî 'ên lexem wê'ên simlah Is 3.7 (2xx)
Ouk esomai sou arxegos ou gar estin en oikw mou artos oude himation

'aph 'ên-maggîd 'aph 'ên-mashmiâ 'aph 'ên-shomeîm 'imrêkem Is 41.26 (3xx)
ocuk estin ho prolegwn oude ho akouwn tous logous humwn

In 40.16, where 'ên occurs twice with dê, the translator used ou hikanos without [e] as is not uncommon in G: 119

ûlêbanôn 'ên dê ba'er wêxayyato 'ên dê 'ôlah Is 40.16 (2xx)
ho de Libanos oux hikanos eis kausin kai panta
ta tetrapoda oux hikan eis holokarpwsin 120

translator saw no difference between the two syntagms in H, or that he wanted to maintain [strengthen] the parallelism between the two by making it grammatical as well as semantic.

118 That these participles were understood as substantives is clear from the first clause and their representation with articular (and substantive) participles in G:

'ên-maggîd Is 41.26 (first occurrence only)
ocuk estin ho prolegwn
The second clause in which 'ên occurs is a minus in G due to homoioarcton.

119 "The copula is often omitted" (BGD, 374). His examples, however, are largely from G (e.g., Gn 30.15; Ek 34.18; Lk 22.38). hikanos (31xx in G) occurs both with and without [e] (cf., e.g., Ex 4.10; 12.4; 36.7; Kl 16.31).

120 In 40.17 'ên (2xx) is rendered as oudeis both times (below).
In 40.29 ἐν, in combination with the following noun, is rendered by a substantive participle negated by me (between the article and participle):

\[ \text{noten layya‘eph ko}^\alpha\text{x úl}^\omega\text{‘ên }\text{‘onîm ‘atsmah yarbeh} \]

\[ \text{didous tois peinwsin isxun kai tois me hodunwmenois lupen} \]

The translator correctly treated the clause as a functional substantive: "to [the one(s)] without strength".

In 50.2 (4xx) ἐν is rendered by ou [e] thrice and once by ou when its clause was represented idiomatically by a verb:

\[ \text{maddû‘ ba’ti we’en ’}\text{ish qara’ti we’en }\text{’oneh hâqatsôr qats}^\varepsilon\text{raah yadî mipp}^\varepsilon\text{dût we’im-’ên-bî ko}^\alpha\text{x l’hatstsîl ... tib’ash d}^\varepsilon\text{gatam me’ên mayim w}^\varepsilon\text{tamot batstsama’} \]

\[ \text{ti hoti elthon kai ouk en anthrwpos? ekalesa kai ouk en ho hupakouwn? me ouk isxuei he xeir mou tou hrasasthai? e ouk isxuw tou ecelesthai? ... kai ceranthesontai hoi ixthues autwn apo tou me einai hudwr kai apothanountai en dipsei} \]

ἐν is also represented by oudeis/outheis in Is (8xx).\(^{121}\) In two of these passages ἀ'ayin is substantive:

\[ \text{kol-haggoyim ke’ayin negdô me’ephes w}^\varepsilon\text{tohû nexsh}^\varepsilon\text{bû-lô} \]

\[ \text{kai panta ta ethne hws ouden eisi kai eis outhen elogisthesan} \]

\(^{121}\) This is the only book in the Latter Prophets to represent ἐν with oudeis.

\(^{122}\) Here ἀ’ayin is rendered by oudeis [e].
hannōten ḫōznēṁīm lē'ayin shophTē 'erets kattohū 'asah
ho didous arxontas eis ouden arxein, ten de
gen hws ouden epoiesen 123

Is 40.23 contains an exegetical translation based on the context. YHWH derides the lack of wisdom or counsel to be found in Jerusalem. Twice in Is, w'ēn 'îsh is represented by outheis: 124

wē'ere' wē'ēn 'îsh ûme'elleh wē'ēn yō`ets
Is 41.28a
apo gar twn ethnwn idou outheis kai apo twn
eidwlwn autwn ouk en ho anaggelwn 125

In Is 57.1 (2xx) 'ēn is again rendered by oudeis. The first occurrence follows the pattern of w'ēn 'îsh (above), but the second—a subordinate clause (b'ēn mebīn)—was translated to parallel the first:

hatstsaddīq 'abad wē'ēn 'îsh sam 'al-leb
we'anshe-xesed ne'saphīm bē'ēn mebīn Is 57.1a
idete hws ho dikaios apwleto, kai oudeis
ekdexetai te kardia kai andres dikaioi
airontai, kai oudeis katanei

For 'ēn with a participle the translator used oudeis and a finite verb in 59.4a, 126 but oude [e] with a noun in 59.4b:

123 The translator interpreted shophTē not as construct with 'erets, but as the predicate governing lē'ayin, although G reflects the sense of H.

124 Cf. above, on Gn 19.31, et passim.

125 The translator demonstrates his sensitivity to the grammar and syntax of the context by rendering 'ēn as ouk [e] in its second occurrence in this verse; both renderings are appropriate in their place.

126 Cf. on Is 63.5b, below.
The variation may well be artistic.

Another unusual use of *oudeis* occurs in 63.5a, where *w'en* plus noun is rendered non-verbally by *kai oudeis*, even though in the next clause *w'en* plus a participle is represented by *outheis* with a verb:

Is 63.5a

The translator used *ou exw* (5xx in Is) fairly consistently to represent *'en le*, whether the idiom indicates possession or existence:

Is 1.30

The translator rendered *'en le* by *me* and a participle of *exw*, with which he subordinated the relative clause, obviating the need for a relative pronoun, since that relation is now shown by the participle.

In Is 37.3 the combination of *'en* with an infinitive, which shows inability, is also rendered with *ou exw*:

Is 37.3

The translator has personalized the abstract statement that "there is no strength to bear" by applying the
saying to he tiktousa, which is thus the subject of exw (here supplied due to the requirements of G).

The translator also represents 'ên lê with ou exw in the question of the clay to the potter:

mah ta'aqseh ûpa'alka 'ên-yadayim lô Is 45.9
Ti poieis, hoti ouk ergaze oude exexs xeiras

This rendering represents the thrust of H well. He has, however, made exw second person in order to agree with the preceding clause, and used the second question (in H) explanatory to the first question rather than parallel.

The same approach to 'ên lê and the person of the verb was also used in 55.1:

wa'asher 'ên-lô käseph Is 55.1
kai hosoi me exete argurion

In Is 47.14 the translator misinterpreted H by reading it as a threat of fire being "heaped upon their heads"; 129

---

127 Cf. aneu for bêlô' in 55.1b.

128 H should be translated "This [the fire mentioned in 14a] will not be [merely] a coal to warm themselves by, or a fire to sit before", which would better fit the context of the rest of the verse. [I later discovered that this interpretation was also that of RSV.]

129 Cf. Is 47.15 where the objective genitive [suffix] was rendered by a dative of possession:

'sên mōšî'ek Is 47.15
soi de ouk estai swteria

G is certainly comparable to H (in result!), but not at all formally similar, which shows ou [exw] may well have been formally, not idiomatically, motivated.
'ên-gaxelet lax'emam 'ûr lashebet negdô
hoti exeis anthrakas puors kathisai ep' autous

Is 47.14

In 59.10 ou huparxw represents 'ên:
negashshah ka'iwrîm qîr âk'e'ên 'ênayim
pselaphesousin hws tuphloi toixon kai hws oux
hupaxontwn ophthalmw̱n psepalhousi

'ên 'ênayim has been rendered by means of a genitive absolute with ou huparxw, even though the translator used ou [e] in Is 59 all but once.131

In Is 23.10, an extremely difficult verse, the translator apparently misread 'ibri as 'ibdi, and then paraphrased heavily in order to make sense of the rest of the verse:133

'ibri 'artsek kay'or bat-tarshîsh 'ên mezax
'ôd
ergazou ten gen sou, kai gar ploia ouketi
erxetai ek Karvedonos

130 Note the third person in G where H has first. H switches from third to first at 59.9, but G maintains third until 59.11b.

131 59.4 (once, the first occurrence is rendered by oudeis), 8, 11, 15, 16 (twice).


133 But cf. 4QIsa, which also reads 'ibdi (in the immediate context 'abar is rendered by diaperaw (which occurs in G only Is 23.2 and Dt 30.13, both for 'abar), and aperxomai (23.6, 12)).

134 Did G read ye'or as 'Onî or 'Oniyvah (in Is ploion usually represents one of these: cf. especially 23.1, 14; but also 2.16; 33.21; 43.14; 60.9)?
In the midst of an extended argument against idolatry, the craftsman becomes tired when he does not eat. The translator may have used the alpha-privative form of the verb for consonance:

\[
gam-ra'eb \text{ w}\varepsilon^\text{e} \text{ 'ên ko\textsuperscript{a}x } \\
kai \text{ peinasei kai asthenesei } \\
\text{Is 44.12}
\]

'ên is not represented seven times in Is. This was sometimes due to parablepsis, and sometimes because the translator misunderstood or reinterpreted his text.

In 1.6 the clause in which 'ên occurs is not represented, perhaps due to homoioarcton:

\[
mikkaph-regel \text{ w}\varepsilon^\text{e} \text{ 'ad-ro'sh 'ên-bô m\textsuperscript{e}tom } \\
\text{Is 1.6}
\]

apo podwn hews kephales

In Is 22.22b G grammatically parallels the first use of 'ên in H, but it appears that the translator misunderstood sagar as sûg [mis]translated the rest of the clause accordingly. The last clause is probably a minus due to parablepsis caused by the similarity of the material in the two clauses:

\[
\text{wenatatti maphteax bêt-dawid 'al-shikmô }
\\
\text{úphatax w}\varepsilon\text{ 'ên soger w}\varepsilon\text{ sagar w}\varepsilon\text{ 'ên pote\textsuperscript{a}x } \\
\text{Is 22.22 (2xx)}
\]

\[
kai \text{ dwsw ten docen Dauïd autw, kai arcei, kai ouk estai ho antilegw} \\
\text{136}
\]

135 In G the succeeding phrases in the verse begin with ou-. If the translator had a shorter Vorlage there is no record of its existence other than in G.

136 In Is 50.5 antilegw represents the nipthal of sûg; in Is 65.2 it may correspond to the qal participle of sarar.
In 41.26 the second of three consecutive clauses beginning with 'aph 'ên- is a minus in G, probably due to both homoioarcton and homoioteleuton:

'aph 'ên-maggid 'aph 'ên mashmîa' 'aph 'ên-shomea' 'imrêkem Is 41.26b ouk estin ho prolegwn oude ho akouwn tous logous humwn

In Is 19.7 the disjunctive clause w'ênennû was not represented because the translator used anemophthoros, which he felt implied the destruction of that which had been sown.137 The adverbial function of the disjunctive clause is reflected in the adverbial use of the adjective in G:

wêkol mizra' ye'ôr yîbash niddaph wê'ênennû Is 19.7
kai pan to speiromenon dia tou potamou ceranthesetai anemophthoron

The translator either did not understand the function of the clause in which 'ên occurs in 47.1, or wanted a stronger poetic parallelism between 1a and 1b, and so omitted 'ên-kisse':

sheôbî-la'arets 'ên-kisse' bat-kasdîm Is 47.1 eiselthe eis to skotos, thugater Xaldaiwn138

The translator interpreted 45.5a-b as two clauses

137He may also have either incorrectly etymologized the an- beginning of the adjective as an alpha-privative, or correctly etymologized the second element of the adjective to imply destruction (anemophthoros < anemos "wind" + phthora "pass out of existence").

138He may have used skotos because he interpreted 'erets as "land of the dead".
rather than three, and thus omitted any representation for the second occurrence of 'ên as superfluous:

\[ ^{\text{'ânî YHWH w^e'ên 'ôd zûlatî 'ên 'êlohîm} \]

hoti egw kurios bo theos, kai ouk estin eti plen emou theos\(^{139}\)

In 34.10 the translator replaced H ('ên 'ober baH) with the form that he used at the end of the preceding clause: \(^{140}\)

middôr ladôr texe'rab lênetsax netsaxîm 'ên 'ober baH Is 34.10
eis geneas eremwthesetai kai eis xronon polun eremwthesetai

The translator of Is was somewhat consistent in representing 'ên by ou [e] (67%), although it was by far his preferred rendering, the next highest being ou (12%).

'ên in Jeremiah (88xx) is rendered by ou [e] (51xx), ou (14xx), apo (5xx), \(^{141}\) ou huparxw (4xx), and once each by

\(^{139}\text{Cf. Is 45.21:} \)
\[ ^{\text{'el tsaddiq ûmôshi‘å 'ayin zûlatî} \]
dikaios kai swter ouk esti parec emou

\(^{140}\text{Two verses later (34.12) he used ou [e] for 'ên, although he redivided the verse, simplifying its rather unusual syntax:} \)
\[ ^{\text{xoreyha w^e'ên-sham m^elûkah yiqra’û w^ekol- sareyha yiyyû 'aphes} \]

hoi arxontes autes ouk esontai; hoi gar basileis autes kai hoi arxontes autes kai hoi megistanes autes esontai eis apweian.

\(^{141}\text{In four of these passages apo technically represents privative min (of me'ên) rather than 'ên (below).} \)
alpha privative (5.21) and pou [ε] (6.14). Once (48.9) me'ēn was read as me'ayin and rendered by pothen. 'ēn is not represented in eleven passages in G due to parablepsis or elision, or because the verse in which it occurs is a minus in G (5xx).142

In Jr 49.1 me [ε] renders 'ēn twice; me represents the interrogative prefix:143

hâbanîm 'ēn lyisra'el 'im-yôresh 'ēn lô
me huioi ouk eisin en Israel, e paralempsomenos ouk estin autois

Jr 49.1

In a rendering common in G, the suffix on 'ēn supplies the subject of the transitive verb which represents the participle negated by 'ēn, and the clause elegantly reordered, with ou or me alone corresponding to 'ēn:144

... wê'al-tiphga' bî ki-'ēnennî shomeâ' 'otak
... kai me proselthes moi peri autwn, hoti ouk eisakousomai.

Jr 7.16

142 Lacking in G are Jr 8.11; 10.6, 7; 39.10; 46.27.

143 Cf. Jg 14.3, above.

144 In addition to those cited, cf. Jr 7.17; 11.14; 38.4; 44.16. The exception to this pattern ('ēn+suffix) is 38.5 (45.5), where the syntactical function of 'ēn appears to approach that of lo', although the accents militate against this:

ki-'ēn hammelek [disjunctive] yûkal 'etkem dabar
hoti ouk edunato ho basileus pros autous.
kî yatsumû 'ēnennî shome'â' 'el-rinnatam wêkî ta'ālû 'olah ûmînaxh 'ēnennî rotsîm
Jr 14.12 (2xx)
hoti ean nesteuswsin, ouk eisakousomai tes
deesews autwn, kai ean prosenegkwsin
holokautwmnama kai thusias, ouk eudokesw en
autois
wê'ënam shome'îm laqaxat mûsar
Jr 32.33 (39.33)
kai ouk ekousan epilabein paideian

In 37.14, which follows the same pattern, the
pronominal suffix on 'ēn is represented by means of an
independent pronoun in G, probably to reflect the
independent pronoun at the end of the previous verse.145

'ēnennî nophel 'al-hakkasdim
Jr 37.14
ouk eis tous Xaldaious egw pheugw

The same phenomenon occurs with the common phrase
me'ēn yosheb:146

'arayik titseynah me'ēn yosheb
Jr 4.7
kai poleis kathairethesontai para to me
katoikeisthai autas.

kol-ha'îr 'âzûbah w'ēn-yôsheb bahen 'îsh
Jr 4.29
pasa polis egkateliepithe, ou katoikei en
autais anthrwpos147

145 In 37.13b the same representation of a
participle by a finite verb occurs; the pronoun in G
reflects that of H:

'attah nophel
su pheugeis
Jr 37.13

146 9xx in Jr, once as wê'ēn yosheb; cf. mibbêlî
yosheb (2xx) and lo' yihyeh yosheb (50.3 (27.3)).

Four occurrences of me'ēn are not represented in G
(33.10b, d, e; 44.22).

147 Cf. also:
me'ēn yosheb
kai me katoikeisthai auten
Jr 51.29
The wide variation in the rendering of this phrase seems to indicate that the translator thought of various representations as equivalents, since their contexts are generally similar.\(^\text{148}\)

In 7.32 and 46.19 (26.19) the translator correctly represented the causative aspect of me'ên with dia to me plus an infinitive; me represents the force of 'ên:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wēqabarū bētophet me'ên magôm} & \quad \text{Jr 7.32} \\
\text{kai thapsousin en tw Tapheth dia to me huparxein topon} & \\
\text{kī-noph lēshammah tihyeh wēnitstsētah me'ên yōsheb} & \quad \text{Jr 46.19} \\
\text{hoti Memphis eis anaphismon estai kai klethesetai ouai dia to me huparxein katoikountas en aute} &
\end{align*}
\]

The translator also used para to me [e] to represent me'ên (2xx):\(^\text{149}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{me'ên yosheb} & \quad \text{Jr 51.37} \\
\text{kai ou katoiketheisetai} &
\end{align*}
\]

\(^\text{148}\) The rendering of these phrases may be analyzed as follows (although it is impossible to determine whether or not the translator actually thought in these terms):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{para} & < \text{min} \\
\text{me/ou} & < 'ên \\
\text{to ... [infinitive]} & < \text{participle}
\end{align*}
\]

See also under "Renderings of Synonyms of 'ên" (below).

\(^\text{149}\) Jr 4.7; Cf. also dia to me [e] for me'ên, above.
xareb hû' me'ên 'adam ûme'ên bêhemah bê'arê yêhûdah ûbê'xutsôt yêrûshalaîm hanshammôt me'ên 'adam ûme'ên yôsheb ûme'ên bêhemah

Jr 33.10 (5xx; 40.10)

Eremos estin apo anthrwpon kai ktenwn, en poleisin Iouda kai ecwthên Ierousalem tais eremw megâis para to me einai anthrwpon kai ktenes 150

'îd yihyeh bammagôm hazzeb hexareb me'ên-'adam w'ad-bêhemah ûbê'kol-'arayw Jr 33.12 (40.12) evi estai en tw topw toutw tw eremw para to me einai anthrwpon kai ktenos kai en pasais tais poleisin autou

He may have been influenced to choose this by his early use of para to me [infinitive] to render mibbelî yosheb, which is the first syntagm with a negative followed by yosheb in Jr (2.15; 9.10). 151

In rendering other occurrences of me'ên the translator used the preposition apo (5xx; only in Jr). Four times it represents the privative min of me'ên, describing the destroyed land or city as "without" inhabitant, human or animal. Because apo alone may have this privative force, 'ên is not represented as superfluous:

150ûme'ên yôsheb was probably omitted due to homoioarcton.

151See further on bêlî under "Synonyms of 'ên" (below). Cf.:

'arayw nitstsêtû mibbelî yosheb Jr 2.15 kai hai poleis autou kateskaphesan para to me katoikeisthai

we'et-'arê yêhûdah 'etten shêmamah mibbelî yosheb Jr 9.10 kai tas poleis Iouda eis anaphismon thesomai para to me katoikeisthai
weha'ir hazzo't texerab me'en yôsheb  
Jr 26.9 (33.9)

kai he polis haute eremwthesetai apo  
katoikountwn

shemamah hî' me'en 'adam ûbêhemah  
Jr 32.43 (39.43)

Abatos estin apo anthrwpon kai ktenous

xareb hû' me'en 'adam ûme'en bêhemah  
Jr 33.10 (44.10; twice)152

Eremos estin apo anthrwpon kai ktenwn153

we'et 'are ùhûdah 'etten shemamah me'en  
yosheb  
Jr 34.22 (41.22)

dws autous eremous apo katoikountwn

In the fifth occurrence of apo the translator used the  
same clause in G despite the different H syntagm:

wehinnam xarbah hayyôm hazzeh we'ên bahem  
yôsheb  
Jr 44.2 (51.2)

kai idou eisin eremoi apo katoikountwn154

me'ên was thus rendered in six different ways in  
Jr, reflecting the translator's sensivity to his  
context, and his consequent freedom in representing H.

ou huparxw represents 'ên four times in Jr. In all  
four passages it appears to be merely a lexical choice  
(huparxw vs. [el]), since nothing in the context either  
requires or suggests its use:

---

152 me'ên occurs five times in Jr 33.10 (below).

153 The second occurrence of 'ên is elided; apo is  
to be inferred from the preceding clause.

154 hayyôm hazzeh was probably omitted by  
homoioioteleuton.
wehannebi'im yihyu leruax wenaddibber 'ên bahem koh ye`aseh lahem

In 50.20 (27.20), where we might expect a form of heuriskw due to the preceding baqash,\textsuperscript{156} heuriskw was instead reserved to represent matsa' in the following clause; huparxw represents 'ên:

Three renderings each occur once in Jr. An alpha privative form of the adjective represents w'ên leb (5.21), probably because of the preceding adjective, although 'ên is patently adjectival here:

In 6.14 the translator may have read we'ayyeh shalôm for we'ên, or he may have felt that the rhetorical question represented the force of the negative assertion:

\textsuperscript{155}The translator's use of [e] for the niphal of 'asah may have influence him to choose another vocabulary word here.

\textsuperscript{156}Cf. Gn 5.24; Sl 14.17; Ps 37.10b; Pr 14.6 (all passages in which heuriskw represents 'ên in G); the context of each of these implies or states that a search is made but that the object of the search (e.g., Enoch, the wicked) is not found.
shalôm shalôm we'ên shalôm
Eirene eirene; kai pou estin eirene? 157

In 48.9 (31.9) the translator also rendered a
negative assertion with a rhetorical question, again
with a locative interrogative adverb, probably because
he read me'ayin "Whence" for me'ên: 158

we'areyha leshammah tihyenah me'ên yōsheb
bahan
Jr 48.9 (31.9)
kai pasai hai poleis autes eis abaton esontai;
pothen enoikos aute?

Eleven occurrences of 'ên in Jr are not represented
in G. This is due to parablepsis (once), 159 elision
(2xx), 160 or because the verse in which it occurs is a
minus in G (5xx). 161 In 44.22 (51.22) the clause in
which it occurs is a minus in G. 162

The translator of Jr was fairly consistent in his
representation of 'ên (66%), although he was

157 If he read we'ayin "Where" then this is, of
course, not a representation of 'ên, but if he used pou
to represent 'ên, this is a unique rendering in G (see
further on synonyms of 'ayyeh, above).

158 On pothen see under "Synonyms of 'ayyeh",
Chapter 1, above.

159 33.10d, above.

160 33.10b, e, above.

161 Jr 8.11; 10.6, 7; 19.11b; 30.10; 39.10; 46.27
are lacking in G.

162 The translator may have overlooked me'ên yōsheb
because he expected to see it after lexarbah or
leshamah, where it commonly occurs (above), but it is
here displaced from its usual context.
considerably freer when rendering [me]'ên yosheb, the most frequent syntagm in which 'ên occurs in Jr.

In Ezekiel 'ên (24xx) is rendered by ou [e] (12xx), ou (6xx), ou huparxw (2xx), and by ou me, ouketi [e], ou eti huparxw, and ou exw (once each).

When 'ên occurs with a participle the participle is rendered by means of a finite verb, and 'ên by simple ou:

ûbêt yisra'el lo' yo'bû lishmoa' 'eleyka kî- 'ênam 'obîm lishmoa' 'elay
ho de oikos Israel ou me theleswsin eisakousai sou, dioti ou boulontai eisakouein mou 163

kî 'omrîm 'ên YHWH ro'eh 'otanû 164
dioti eipan Oux hora kurios, ...

kî 'amërû 'azab YHWH 'et-ha'arets wê'ên YHWH ro'eh
hoti eipan Egkataleloipe kurios ten gen, ouk ephora ho kurios. 165

'im-'ënkem shomeîm 'îm 'elay
ei me humeis eisakouete mou

163 This verse is an excellent example of the difference between the functions of lo' with a finite verb and 'ên with a participle: "The house of Israel will not be willing to listen to you because they are not willing to listen to me", which is reflected in the translator's choice of tenses.

164 G lacks the pronominal direct object, but comparison with Ek 9.9 (per BHS) is not helpful here, since two different objects are in view: here, the elders; in 9.9, all the activities of the land.

165 This is the only occurrence of ephoraw in Ek (A has this for [horaw] in 8.12).
Once, however, in YHWH's warning that Ezekiel's message would go unheeded, the translator emphasized the certainty of their obstinacy by using the double negative ou me (only here in G):166

---

166 ou me huparxw occurs twice (Ps 59.14; Pr 29.18, on which cf. below).
In two verses where 'ên occurs twice its second occurrences is rendered by oude, with the verbal function elided from its first occurrence (both times with [e]):

we'omar lakem 'ên haqqîr we'ên ha'Taxîm 'otô
Ek 13.15 (2xx)
kai eipa pros humas Ouk estin ho toixos oude
hoi aleiphontes auton

we'al kol-pînê ha'aretz naphotsû tso'nî we'ên
dôresh we'ên mîbaqqesh
Ek 34.6 (2xx)
kai epi proswpou pases tes ges diespare, kai
ouk en ho ekzetwn oude ho apostrophwn

ou huparxw occurs three times in Ek, once with eti.
In 26.21 it represents an absolute use of 'ên with a
suffix:

ballahôt 'ette'nêk we'ének ûte'bugshî we'lo'-
timmatsêî 'î'ôd lê-'olam nê'um YHWH 'elohîm
Ek 26.21
apwleian se dws, kai oux huparceis eti eis
ton aiwna, legei kurios.167

In its first occurrence in 38.11 [bê]'ên is

167 Note the minus in G which results in oux
huparceis eti eis ton aiwna, a syntagm which may have
affected his use of ou ... eti for 'ên in two other
laments over Tyre (see on 27.36; 28.19, below).
represented by ou huparxw,168 but 'ên by the usual rendering at the end of the verse:169

\[\text{b}^{\text{e}}'\text{ên xömah ûb}^{\text{e}}\text{ri}^{\text{a}}\text{x ûd}^{\text{e}}\text{latayim} '\text{ên lahem} \]

Ek 38.11 (2xx)

en he oux huparxei teixos oude moxloi, kai thurai ouk eisin autois

The translator of Ek used both ouketi [e] and ou huparxw eti in two verses that are parallel in syntax and content:

soxārim ba`ammīm sharēqū `alayik ballahōt hayīt wē`ēnek `ad-`ōlam \[\text{Ek 27.36} \]

emporoi apo ethnwn esurisan se; apwleia egenou kai ouketi ese eis ton aiwna

kol-yōd`eyka ba`ammīm shamēmū `aleyka ballahōt hayīta wē`ēnka `ad-`ōlam \[\text{Ek 28.19} \]

kai pantes hoi epistamenoi se en tois ethnesi stugnasousin epi se; apwleia egenou kai oux huparceis eti eis ton aiwna

The translator used eti by analogy with his rendering of 26.21 (above).170 These passages show that his choice of ou [e] or ou huparxw was probably stylistic.

168 The preposition was rendered as a locative by the preposition en (and a relative pronoun), showing that he may not have known quite how to interpret this syntagm (which occurs only here in Ek).

It might seem that the preposition motivated him to use ou huparxw, but he also used huparxw in two other passages without the preposition.

169 The translator differed from the scribes by joining bēriāx to xômah rather than to ûdlatayim.

170 There (26.21) eti for `ōd immediately follows huparxw because of the minus. This combination could have influenced his use of eti in these verses which also contain the relatively rare ballahōt (3xx in Ek of 10xx in H).
'ên 1ᵉ is represented by ou [exw] once in Ek.

Chambers obviously do not "possess" pillars, although they can be characterized by their presence or absence:171

kî mᵉ'shullashōt hennah we'ên lahen 'ammūdīm
ekē'ammūdē haxᵃ'tserōt
Ek 42.6
dioti triplai esan kai stulos ouk eixon kathws
hoi stuloi twn ecwterwn

The translator of Ek was thus fairly free in representing 'ên, using ou [e] in 50% of its occurrences.172

'ên occurs fifty-eight times in Minor Prophets,173 where it is represented by ou [e] (32xx; 56%), ou/me (10xx), ou huparxw (6xx), ou exw (4xx), alpha-private (2xx), and aneu174 and ou epistrephw175 (once each).

'ên is always represented by ou [e] in Na (7xx) and Ob (once; v. 7). It is never represented by ou [e] in Hg (5xx).

171 This is a good example of the combination 'ên 1ᵉ- being used for existence relative to the subject of 'ên, rather than for possession (cf. on yesh, above).

172 When, however, we consider passages in which 'ên with a participle became ou/me with a finite verb, or in which [e] was elided because of an immediately preceding occurrence, he was relatively consistent (79%).

173 'ên does not occur in Jn.

174 Am 3.5; a rendering shared only with Ex 21.11.

175 Hg 2.17; a unique rendering.
'ён in MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MP (%): 57
All (%): 73

KEY

1 ou [e] 7 ou heuriskw
2 ou huparxw 8 a- privative
3 ou 9 Shared (2 bks)
4 oudeis [e] 10 Unique
5 oudeis 11 < G
6 ou exw 12 --- ('ён not rep'd)

In Hosea 'ён (15xx) is represented by ou [e] (10xx), oude and ou exw (2xx each), and by alpha-privative (once).

'ён occurs three times in Ho 4.1, where it is rendered first by ou [e], then by oude (for w'ён):

176 Renderings which were not used are listed in the key for the sake of completeness and comparison.
riḥ 1ᵉYHWH 'im-yōshbê ha'arets kî 'ēn-ēmet
we'ēn-xesed we'ēn da'at 'ēlohim ba'arets
Ho 4.1
diōtî krisis tw kuriw pros tous katoikountas
ten gen, diiōtî ouk estîn aletheia oude eleos
oude epignwsis theou epi tes ges.

[e] is not required in the second and third instances,
since it is understood (distributed) via the
conjunction.

To represent 'ēn as "without" the translator used
ou exw, although in the previous clause (word!) he used
an adjective with alpha-privative: 177

wayhî 'ephrayîm kêyônah phŏτah 'ēn leb Ho 7.11
kai en Ephraim hws peristera anous ouk exousa
kardian

In Ho 8.7 the translator made the second half of
the line a purpose/result clause dependent upon the
first, and rendered 'ēn lē as ou with a participle of
exw:

qamah 'ēn lô tsemax bēlî ya`ăseh gemax Ho 8.7
dragma ouk exon isxun 178 tou poiesai aleuron

The translator used alpha-privative in Ho 8.8,
which enabled him to avoid an extremely circumlocutory
construction in G:

177 The adjective which we might expect (akardios)
occurs only three times in the canonical books of G: for
'ēn leb (Jr 5.21), leb 'ayîn (Pr 17.16), and xāsar leb
(Pr 10.13). [It also occurs in Sirach 6.20.]

178 This is the only time that isxus renders tsemax.
In Ho 7.9, as often, it represents ko`ăx. tsemax, which
occurs only twelve times, has five other renderings.
Each of the three occurrences in Joel is rendered differently: ou [e] (2.27), ou huparxw (1.18), and alpha privative (1.6). The usual rendering occurs in a statement familiar from the discussion of 'ôd (above):

wa'anî YHWH 'elahêxem wê 'ên 'ôd Jl 2.27
kai egw kurios ho theos humwn, kai ouk estin eti plen emou

In Jl 1.18 the translator used ou huparxw to represent 'ên, probably for stylistic variation; the sense is that of simple existence:179

nabokû 'edrê baqar kî 'ên mir'eh lahem Jl 1.18
eklausan boukolia bown, hoti oux huperxe nome autois

The combination w'ên mispar was represented by the alpha-privative form of an adjective (anarithmetos) (Jl 1.6), probably for the sake of parallelism—two adjectives rather than an adjective and a verbal clause:

179 ou huparxw represents 'ên six times in MP. This accounts for one quarter of the total occurrence of ou huparxw in G (24xx) as a rendering of 'ên. Its relative frequency in MP (10.7%) is more than three times that of G as a whole (3.2%), although it is never the most frequent rendering of 'ên in any one book of MP, nor does it occur in every book of MP, nor even in a majority of them (Mi (2/6); Jl and Hb (1/3); Zc (1/4); Hg (1/5)).

It appears to be a stylistic variant of the usual rendering in MP; there is no element of grammar, syntax, content, or context common to its occurrences in MP.
ki-goy ʿalah `al-ʿartsî `atsûm wēʾēn mispar
hoti ethnos anebe epi ten gen mou isxurôn kai anarithmeton

ʾēn occurs four times in Amos. It is rendered by ou [e] (3xx) and by ou exw and aneu (once each).

ʾēn 1ᵉ, indicating non-possession or lack, is represented by ou exw:

hayish'ag ʿaryeh bayyaʿar wēTereph ʾēn lô
Am 3.4
ei eurecetai lewn ek tou drumou autou theran
oux exwn

The translator subordinated the second clause by means of a concessive participle which derives its gender and number from the suffix on 1ᵉ.

In Am 3.5 ʾēn is rendered by aneu, a rendering of ʾēn that this passage shares only with Ex 21.11. 180 Here, however, it is probably influenced by its use in the second half of the verse to represent lo'. 181

---

180 See the note on aneu under the discussion of Ex 21.11, above.
181 Or vice versa since we have no way of knowing whether or not, or to what extent, the original translator may have edited his (rough?) draft.
In Obadiah (once; v. 7) 'ên is represented by ou [e].
It does not occur in Jonah.

'ên is rendered by ou [e] (4xx) and ou huparxw (2xx) in Micah (6xx total). The renderings are consecutive: ou [e] in the first four occurrences of 'ên; ou huparxw in the last two.

In Mi 7.1 and 2 'ên is rendered by ou huparxw. The first occurrence, in a passage filled with relatively rare vocabulary, falls in a clause which the translator has subordinated by means of a genitive absolute:

\[
\text{ki hayiti ke'aspê-qayits ke'ollot batsir 'ên- 'eshkôl le'êxôl bikkûrah 'iwwêtah naphshî} \\
\text{hoti egenomen hws sunagwn kalamen en ametw kai hws epiphullida en trugêtw oux huparxontos botruos tou phagein ta prwtogona. oimmoi, psuxe (voc.).}
\]

182 Cf. the second half of this verse, where aneu occurs again, this time corresponding to lo':
\[
h^a^ya^'âle^h-pax \text{ min-}ha'â^damah \text{ wê}^lâkôd \text{ lo'} \text{ yîlkôd} \\
ei sxasthesetai pagis epi tes ges aneu tou sullabein ti?
\]

183 Only four of the fourteen words in this verse occur more than ten times in H (l^e+suffix, hayah, 'ên, nephesh).
The translator misunderstood bikkurah "early fig" as bekôr "first-born". In Mi 7.2, however, this connotation is neither required nor indicated:

'abad xasîd min-ha'arets w'éyashar ba'adam 'ayin Mi 7.2
hoti apolwlen eulabes apo tes ges, kai katorthwn en anthrwpois ous xuparxei

In Nahum (7xx) 'èn is always represented by ou [e].

'èn occurs three times in Habakkuk, where it is rendered by ou [e] (2xx), and by ou huparxw (once). 'èn occurs twice in Hb 3.17, where it is represented by both ou [e] and ou huparxw:

Hb 3.17 (2xx)

ki-tê'enah lo'-tiphrax wê'é'n yêbûl baggephanîm kixesh ma'ëseh-zayit ûshê'demôt lo'-'asah 'okel gazar mimmiklah tso'n wê'é'n baqar barê'phatîm

dioti suke ou karpophoresei, kai ousk estai genentà en tais ampeloi, pheusetai ergon elaias, kai ta padia ou poiesei brwsin; eceilipon apo brwses probata, kai ous xuparxousi boes epi phatnais

This variation is probably stylistic, not substantive, using huparxw as a variant of [e].

In Zephaniah (3xx) 'èn is represented by ou [e] (3.13; = Mi 4.4) and medê (3.6). It is not represented in Zp 2.5.

184 To connote possession he then used ou huparxw, although, given the comment above on Jl 1.18, it may just as likely be a variant of ou [e].
In 3.6 the substantive participle following me'ên was rendered by an infinitive, probably to parallel that in the preceding clause:

\[
\text{nits̱dû 'arâhem mibḇelî-īsh me'ên yôsheb}
\]

\[
\text{ecelipon hai poleis autwn para to medena huparxeîn mede katoikein.}
\]

In 2.5 'ên is not represented because ek sufficiently represents the force of me'ên with a privative min:

\[
\text{w̱hâ'abdîk me'ên yôsheb}
\]

\[
\text{kai apolw humas ek katoikias}
\]

The usual rendering does not occur in Haggai, where 'ên appears five times.\(^{185}\) It is rendered by ou (4xx) and ou huparxw (once; Hg 2.3).

In Hg 1.6 the prophet confronts the people with their apparent wealth, but real poverty:

\[
\text{zēra'tem harbeh w̱habe' me̱aT 'akōl w̱e'ên-}
\]

\[
\text{iēsab'ah shatō w̱e'ên-iēshakrah labôsh w̱e'ên-}
\]

\[
\text{iēxom lō}
\]

\[
\text{Hg 1.6 (3xx)
\]

\[
\text{espeirate polla kai eisenegkate oliga,
}\]

\[
\text{ephagete kai ouk eis plesmonen, epiete kai ouk}
\]

\[
\text{eis methen, periebalesthe kai ouk}
\]

\[
\text{ethermanthete en autois}
\]

The translator recognized that the first and second occurrences of 'ên in Hg 1.6 are elliptical ("You have eaten, but [you have not eaten] to satiety ...") and rendered them in the same way. Its third occurrence

\(^{185}\text{Hg is thus the only book in G in which 'ên is found but the usual rendering does not occur.}\)
precedes an infinitive construct, which he rendered by means of a finite verb.

The translator used ou huparxw in Hg 2.3, perhaps to represent the substantive function of 'ayin ("nothing").\(^{186}\)

\[
\text{hâlo' kamohû k}^e\text{'ayin b}^e\text{'ênèkem} \\
\text{kathws oux huparxonta enwpion humwn}
\]

In Hg 2.17 it appears that the translator either had an entirely different Vorlage before him, or tried to make sense out of H.\(^{187}\)

\[
\text{hikkêtî 'etkem bashshiddaphôn übayyeraqôn} \\
\text{ubabbarad 'et kol-ma}^\text{â}\text{seh y}^\text{ê}\text{dèkem w'ên-'etkem} \\
\text{'elay n}^\text{ê}\text{um-YHWH}
\]

ou here corresponds to 'ên, but epestrepsate came out of his exegesis.

In Zechariah (4xx) 'ên is represented by ou [e] (2xx) and by ou huparxw and ou exw (once each).

---

\(^{186}\) The preceding clause is a minus in G, presumably due to parablepsis.

\(^{187}\) His rendering does make sense, but whether or not it makes sense of H is debatable. It may be more reasonable to read 'etkem as 'ittkem, and interpret the clause as "it is not with you to me" (i.e., "you have no regard for me", or "we have nothing in common"). It is difficult to think that shûb is a minus in H--it is intransitive, which would not explain 'etkem.
'ên occurs twice in Zc 8.10, where it is rendered by both ou huparxw and by ou [e]:

\[ \text{ûsêkar habbêhemah 'ênennah wêlayyôtse' wêlabba' 'ên-shalôm min-hatstsar} \]

Zc 8.10 (2xx)

kai ho misthos twn ktenwn oux huparxei, kai tw ekporeuomenw kai tw eisporeuomenw ouk estai eirene apo tes thlipsews

In Zc 9.11 'ên is represented by ou exw. As elsewhere the clause with 'ên has been subordinated to the preceding clause by means of a participle. Here, in 'ên mayim bô, 'ên means "without"; ou exw yields an idiomatic rendering:

\[ \text{gam-'at bêdam-bèritek shillaxtî 'âsîrayik mibbôr 'ên mayim bô} \]

Zc 9.11

kai su en haimati diathekes ecapesteilas desmious sou ek lakkou ouk exontos hudwr

In Malachi (6xx) 'ên is represented by ou [e] once (1.10) and by ou alone (4xx). It is lacking in (2.13).

In two structurally and semantically parallel rhetorical questions in 1.8 it is apparently verbless for the sake of vividness:

\[ \text{wêkî-taggishûn 'iwwer lizboâx 'ên ra' wêkî-taggîshû pisseâx wêxoleh 'ên ra'} \]

Ma 1.8 (2xx)

dioti ean prosagagete tuphlon eis thusian, ou kakon? kai ean prosagagete xwlon e arrwston, ou kakon?

---

188 See note on Jl 1.18, above.

189 Cf., i.a., Am 3.4, above.
In 2.2 and 2.9 'en plus a pronominal suffix followed by a participle is represented by ou. The participle, rendered as a finite verb, takes its person and number from the suffix, which is also represented by the independent pronoun(!):\textsuperscript{190}

\[
\text{w}^\text{e}'\text{arôtî 'et-birkôtêkem w}^\text{e}\text{gam 'arôtîha ki 'ênkem samîm 'al-leb Ma 2.2 kai katařasomai auten kai diaskedasw ten eulogian humwn hoti humeis ou tithesthe eis ten kardian humwn}
\]

\[
k^\text{e}\text{phî 'ašer 'ênkem shom}^\text{e}\text{rîm 'et-darkay Ma 2.9 anh' hwn humeis ouk ephulacasthe tas hodous mou}
\]

In 2.13 'ên is not represented since the translator made the line a separate question rather than the result of the preceding statement as it is in H).\textsuperscript{191} acion is thus supplied to represent what is implicit in H:

\[
cassôt dim`ah 'et-mizbax YHWH bêxî wa`änagah me'ên `ôd pênôt 'el-hamminxah wêlagaxat ratsôn miyyedkem Ma 2.13 ekalupte dakrusi to thusiasterion kuriou kai klauthmw kai stenagmw ek kopwn. eti acion epiblepsai thusian e labein dektwn ek twn xeirwn humwn?
\]

The individual books of MP vary greatly in their representation of 'ên, ranging from Na (7xx) and Ob (once), which use only ou [e], to Hg (5xx), where ou [e] does not occur. MP is fairly free in representing 'ên,

\textsuperscript{190}Cf. Jr 37.14. Note the redistribution of the first two clauses.

\textsuperscript{191}H: "so that [He] no longer regards the gift or accepts [it] favorably from your hand"; G: "Is it still worthy (proper, fitting) to consider [your] offering or to receive gifts from your hands?"
using ou [e] less regularly than G as a whole (57% vs. 67%), but differing from the rest of G by its slight inclination to use huparxw. Another interesting aspect of the representation of 'ën in MP is the use of personal pronouns in G to represent pronominals suffixed to 'ën, although this is too infrequent to be called a tendency.

The translator of Psalms (67xx) represented 'ën by ou [e] (51xx), ou huparxw (5xx), and ou/oude (4xx), and once each by outheis, ou exw, ou heuriskw, ou me huparxw, ouketi me huparxw, oligos, and alpha privative. ou alone represents 'ën three times in verses in which a preceding occurrence of 'ën was rendered by ou [e]:

'en 'omer we'één de'barîm bêlî nishma' gōlam Ps 19.4 (2xx)
ouk eisin lalaioi oude logoi, hwn ouxi akouontaî hai phvnai autwn

'allûphênû îm 'ên-perets we'één yôtse't we'één tsêwaxah birxobotênû Ps 144.14 (3xx)
hoi boes autwn paxeis, ouk estin kataptwma phragmou oude diecodos oude krauge en tais plateiais autwn

192 cf. note on Jl 1.18, above (the relative frequency of ou huparxw for 'ën is 10.5% for MP; cf. 3.2% for all G, and 2.6% for G apart from MP).

193 'ën occurs three times with pronominal suffixes in MP (Zc 8.10; Ma 2.2, 9). In the latter two occurrences the pronominal suffixes are represented by personal pronouns in G.
In Ps 33.16, the other passage in which ou alone represents 'ên, 'ên with a participle is rendered by ou with a finite verb:

'ên hammelek nôsha' bêrab-xayil Ps 33.16
ou swzetai basileus dia pollen dunamin 194

ou huparxw (5xx in Ps) seems to be at least partially motivated by content (context). When 'ên refers to non-existence as a result of destruction the translator preferred huparxw (37.10; 39.14; 59.14; 103.16; 104.35): 195

Here it appears that the translator has also been influenced by the similar content of Ps 37.36. 197 Cf.: 194 This is parallel to lo' with a verb, which is rendered in the same way, suggesting that this translator saw these constructions as functionally equivalent:

gibbor lo'-yinnatsel bêrab-koâx Ps 33.16b
kai gigas ou swthesetai en plethei isxuos autou

195 The exceptions: Ps 37.36 (which parallels 37.10 but huparxw was not used; artistry probably controlled the translator's choice of rendering, below) and Ps 72.12, where huparxw occurs, but not in a context of destruction.

196 Cf. on Pr 14.6, below.

197 The apparently random renderings in these two verses are actually carefully arranged in G (the G plusses ho topos autou (36) and heures (10)):

kai zeteseis ton topon autou kai oux heurethe ho topos Ps 37.10
kai ezetesa auton, kai oux heurethe ho topos
This connotation of destruction appears in the other occurrences of *huparxw*:

- hasha' immennï w'e'abligah b'ëTerem 'elek w'e'ënennï Ps 39.14
- kalleh b'ëxemah kalleh w'e'ënemô Ps 59.14
- xerpah shab'era'rah libbî wa'anûsah shâ'agawweh lanûd wâ'ayin Ps 69.21
- ki rûâx 'æbrah-bô w'e'ënennô wëlo'-yakkïrennû ô'd m'egômô Ps 103.16

Note the alternation between the person and his "place": In 37.10 his place is sought but [it--or, better, he is] not found, in 37.36 the wicked is sought, but his place not found.

I have no explanation for ou huparxw (10a) vs. ou [e] (36a) beyond, again, artistic variation.

---

198 ouketi may be a plus either because his Vorlage read w'e'ëneninn ô'd or he wanted to emphasize the finality of death.

199 The G minus of kalleh is an apparent haplography; word order suggests that the first, rather then second, was overlooked.

200 On the non-representation of ô'd in G, see above.
Ps 72.12 is the exception to this pattern:

\[
\begin{align*}
kî-yatstsil & \ 'ebôn mëshawwe\textsuperscript{a} \ w'ânî w'ën-'ôzer \ 10 \\
& \text{hoti errusato ptwxon ek xeiros ðunastou kai peneta, hw oux huperxen boethos} \ 201
\end{align*}
\]

Substantive 'ayin is rendered once in Ps by outheis (Ps 39.6). The translator probably understood natan as elided from the second clause, voiding the need of a verbal predicate:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{hinneh Tëphaxöt natattah yamay wëxeldî ke'ayin negdeka} \ 39.6 \\
& \text{idou palaistas ethou tas hemeras mou, kai he hupostasis mou hwsei outhen enwpion sou}
\end{align*}
\]

'ën is also rendered by ou exw (Ps 38.15), where the translator used ou with a participle of exw, making 15b a relative clause. He based this rendering on the assumption that k'îsh is elided from the second line:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{we'êhî ke'îsh 'âsher lo'-shome\textsuperscript{a} \ we'ën bephiw tókaxôt} \ 38.15 \\
& \text{kai egenomen hwsei anthrwpos ouk akouwn kai ouk exwn en tw stomati autou elegmous.}
\end{align*}
\]

Although 'ën does not occur here with lë, it obviously connotes non-possession, well-indicated by ou exw.

oligos corresponds to 'ayin in Ps 73.2 (only here in G):

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{wa'ânî kimë'at naTawû raglay ke'ayin shuppe\textsuperscript{u} 'âshuray} \ 73.2 \\
& \text{emou de para mikron esaleuthesan hoi podes, par' oligon ecexute ta diabemata mou.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[201\] The connotations of "having" may have influenced the translator here.

\[202\] Without the ellipsis: ûkë'îsh [a'asher] 'ën bëphiw tòkaxôt.
The translator struggled with his text but settled upon a rendering that makes sense, although it does not represent H. 203

'ên with a noun is rendered by the alpha-privative form of an adjective once in Ps, where he was probably unsure of the best way to represent 'eyal (hapax legomenon):

\[
\text{nexshabti 'im-yórëdê bôr hayîtî këgeber 'ên-}
\text{'eyal} \quad \text{Ps 88.5}
\text{proselogisthen meta twn katabainontwn eis lakkon, egenethen bws anthrwpos aboethetos en nekrois eleutheros} 204
\]

The translator of Ps was fairly consistent in using ou [e] to represent 'ên (76%), but seems to have used ou huparxw in a sense all his own.

In Job 'ên (37xx) is represented by ou [e] (17xx), ou and alpha privative (3xx each),205 and ouketi [e] (2xx), and once each by oudeis (2.13), ou oudeis [e] (41.25), me erxomai (3.9), ou tugxanw (3.21), and oudamou (19.7). It is not represented in seven passages which are either minuses in G, or which cannot be aligned with H. 206

\footnote{H: "... were poured [so that they became] like nothing"(?).} 

\footnote{204 The extreme periphrasis of G also reflects the unusual vocabulary.}

\footnote{205 Including once perhaps by alpha privative with [e] (22.5).}

\footnote{206 Jb 7.8; 10.7; 12.3; 21.33; 24.7, 24; 33.33.}
The correspondence of ou alone with 'ên (3xx) is due the translator's predilection to interpret his text by paraphrase:

ha'îm 'ên 'ezratî bî wêtushiyah niddêxah mimmenî Jb 6.13 e ouk ep' autw epepoithei' bîotheia de ap' emou apêstîn

lo' nîn lô wêlo'-neked bê'ammô wê'ên sarîd bîmêgûrayw Jb 18.19 ouk estai epignwstos en law autou oude seswsmenos en te hup' ouranon ho oikos autou all' en tois autou zesontai heteroi

'im-'er'eh 'ôbed mîbbêlî lêbûsh wê'ên kêsût la'ébyôn Jb 31.19 eî de kai hupereidôn gumnon apollumenon kai ouk emphiasa

Alpha privative represents 'ên in three passages, but only two texts (two are identical):

"oseh gedolôt wê'ên xeqer niphla'ôt 'ad-'ên mispar Jb 5.9 (2xx; = 9.10) ton poiounta megala kai anecixniasta, endoca te kai ecaisia, hwn ouk estin arithmos

The translator may have used the alpha privative form of the adjective in the first half of the verse because of the parallelism between the 'ên-clause and the adjective gedolôt (megalâ).208

In 22.5, however, the translator used anarithmos, but for wê'ên gets rather than 'ên mispar. His

207 ampiazw and amphiâsis occur 7xx in G, 6xx in Jb, representing labash/labûsh (29.14; 38.9; 40.10), kêsût (31.19; 24.7), and beged (22.6).

208 Its second occurrence, however, is absolute and explicit predication (rather than, e.g., hwn anarithmos).
rendering of the clause makes it difficult to tell whether or not \[e\] should be considered part of the representation of \(\text{w}^\text{e}"\text{en}\):\(^{209}\)

\[
\text{ha}^\text{lo'} \text{ ra}'\text{atka rabbah w}^\text{e}"\text{en-gets la}^\text{awonoteyka}
\]

\(\text{Jb 22.5}\)

poteron oux he kakia sou estin polle, anarithmetoi de sou eisin he hamartiai?

In Jb 2.13 \(\text{w}^\text{e}"\text{en}\) with a participle is rendered by oudeis with a finite verb:\(^{210}\)

\[
\text{wayyeshb}^\text{u} \text{'}itt}^\text{o la}'\text{arets shib}^\text{a}t yam}^\text{im}
\text{w}^\text{e} \text{shib}^\text{a}t \text{l}^\text{el}^\text{ot} \text{w}^\text{e}"\text{en-dober 'elayw dabar}
\]

\(\text{Jb 2.13}\)

parekathisan autw hepta hemeras kai hepta nuktas kai oudeis autwn elalesen

ouk \[e\] ouden in Jb 41.25 emphasizes the incomparability of Leviathan (40.25) to any other created being:\(^{211}\)

\[
\text{'en-'}^\text{al-}^\text{'}\text{aphar mashl}^\text{o}
\]

\(\text{Jb 41.25}\)

ouk estin ouden epi tes ges homoion autw

Jb shares the rendering ouketi \[e\] with Ek (27.36) but, whereas in Ek \text{'}\text{enek} was followed by \text{'}\text{ad }^\text{'}\text{olam, 'en}

occurs only with a suffix in both passages in Jb:

\[
\text{k}^\text{i-'}\text{attah le'}\text{aphar 'eshkab w}^\text{e} \text{shix}^\text{a} \text{rtani} \text{w}^\text{e}"\text{enenni}
\]

\(\text{Jb 7.21}\)

nuni de eis gen apeleusomai, orthrizwn de ouketi eimi.

---

\(^{209}\text{If it is considered part of the rendering, this passage and Pr 30.27 are the only occurrences of 'en rendered by an alpha privative form with [e].}\)

\(^{210}\text{The ablative autwn specifies that Job's visitors refrained from speaking.}\)

\(^{211}\text{This is the only passage in which ou oudeis [e] corresponds to 'en.}\)
Three renderings of 'ên are unique to Jb. Each is a result of the translator's tendency to explain the text by making explicit in G what is implicit in H:

yexshôkû kôkbê nishpô yêqaw-lô'ôr wa'ayin
skotwtheie ta astra tes nuktos ekeines,
hupomeinai kai eis phwtismon me elthoi
hamxakîm lammawet we'ênennû wayyaxpêruhû
mimmaTmônîm
hoi homeirontai tou thanatou kai ou
tugxanousin anorussontes hwsper thesauros
hen 'ets'aq xamas we'lo' 'ê'aneh 'âshawwa'
we'ên mishpaT
idou gelw
oneidei kai ouk lalesw;
kekracomai, kai oudamou krima.

The use of oudamou\textsuperscript{214} is striking here because, although it fits the context, we might well expect a form of [e] in the clause.

Seven occurrences of 'ên are not represented in Jb. Four are verses or clauses lacking in G; three are due to exegetical or paraphrastic translations of the text:

In 10.7 the translator renderd the clause with a positive rhetorical question rather than repeat the negative assertion of H:

\textsuperscript{212} The difference in person may be orthographic (yod vs. waw), contextual (Job is here talking of himself, not of YHWH), or under the influence of 7.21.

\textsuperscript{213} Apparently reading 'etsxaq for 'ets'aq.

\textsuperscript{214} Only elsewhere in Pr 23.5 (with phainw).
G corresponds exactly to H in 24.7a. The second half of the verse in G fits the context, but may be due to the translator's desire for poetic symmetry in these verses, especially 24.6-11, climaxing in v. 12:

\[
\text{'arôm yalinû mibbêlî lêbûsh wê'ên kêsût baqqarah} \quad \text{Jb 24.7}
\]

The difficulty of 24.24 is apparent in his non-representation of 'ên; G and H cannot be aligned:

\[
rômû m^e\text{'aT wê'ênennû} \quad \text{Jb 24.24}
pollous gar ekakwsen to hupswma autou
\]

Three verses are lacking in G (7.8; 21.33; 33.33), and in 12.3 homoioarcton probably accounts for the lacking clause:217

\[
\begin{align*}
gam-lî libab kêmôkem lo'-nophel 'anokî mikkem \\
wê'et-mî-'ên kêmô-'elleh \\
kamoi men kardia kath' humas estin.
\end{align*} \quad \text{Jb 12.3}
\]

The translator of Job was not very consistent in his representation of 'ên (53%), although his tendency to explain the text by paraphrase allowed [caused?] him to use a wide variety of renderings.

---

215 In 5.4 the translator used kai ouk estai ho ecairoumenos to represent 'ên matstsil.

216 psuxe is probably a variant in transmission from a poorly written pxuke (Dhorme, JOB, 359).

217 kêmôkem ... kêmô-'elleh.
In Proverbs (28xx) 'ên is rendered by alpha privative (8xx), \(^{218}\) ou (7xx), ou [ε] (6xx), oudeis (4xx), me huparxw and pro tou with an infinitive (2xx each), and once each by ou me huparxw (29.18), ou pareimi (7.19), ou heuriskw (14.6), ou dunamai (17.16), me exw (22.27), oudamos phainw (23.5), and epiphainos (25.14). \(^{219}\) It is not represented in 13.4 or 20.4.

The usual rendering occurs infrequently in Pr:

\begin{quote}
'ên xokmah wε'ên tebûnah wε'ên etsah 1εneged YHWH Pr 21.30 (3xx)
ouk estin sophia, ouk estin andreia, ouk estin boule pros ton asebe\(^{220}\)
\end{quote}

29.1 has been translated as a comparison between two types of men, rather than portraying a certain type of behavior and its result:

\begin{quote}
'îsh tòkaxòt maqsheh-'oreph peta' yishshaber wε'ên marpe'
Pr 29.1 kreira sn aner elegxwn andros sklerotraxelou;
ecapines gar phlegomenou autou ouk estin iasis
\end{quote}

The compound b'ên is represented by a temporal

\(^{218}\) Including alpha privative with [ε] (39.27). These account for nearly half of the occurrences of this rendering in G.

\(^{219}\) The last five of these are unique to Pr, as is an occurrence of alpha privative with [ε] (Pr 39.27).

\(^{220}\) The incongruity of asebes for YHWH is probably due to the context (21.27-31), which emphasizes the folly of wickedness. The translator may have thought that this verse is continued in the following, i.e., that there are four things which the wicked try to use to their own ends, but the victory ultimately belongs to YHWH (21.31).
clause (14.4), using the genitive, and by a locative clause (26.20), using a relative locative adverb: 221

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{be'én 'alaphīm 'ebūs bar} & \quad \text{Pr 14.4} \\
\text{hou me eisin boes, phatnai katharai} & \quad \text{222}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{be'ephēs 'etsim tikbeh 'esh ūbe'én nirgan yishtōq madōn} & \quad \text{Pr 26.20} \\
en pollois cuilois thallei pur, bogou de ouk estin dithumos, hesuxazei maxe. \quad \text{223}
\end{align*}
\]

'ēn is also represented by ou in Pr (7xx). 'ēn is rendered with ou in four passages to negate the verb that represents the participle or noun following 'ēn:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{naTītī yādī we'ēn maqshīb} & \quad \text{Pr 1.24} \\
zetēsousin me kakoi kai oux heuresousin
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bidēbarīm lo'-yiwwaser 'ābed kī-yābīn we'ēn ma'āneh} & \quad \text{Pr 29.19} \\
logois ou paideuthesetai oiketes sklerōs; ean gar kai noese, all' oux hupakουsetai. \quad \text{224}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nōten larash 'ēn maxsōr ...} & \quad \text{Pr 28.27} \\
hōs didwsi πtwwōs, ouk endeethesetai; ...
\end{align*}
\]

221 Cf. on Jg 14.3; Jr 47.1, above.

222 The same construction is used in 14.4b for a different syntagm, the translator assuming that the lines are parallel, with the temporal force of the preposition be extending "across" the conjunction:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{we'rāb-tēbū'ōt bēkoāx shōr} & \quad \text{Jb 14.4} \\
hōu de polla genemata, phanera boos isxus.
\end{align*}
\]

223 This verse has also been transformed from emblematic to antithetical parallelism (not that the translator thought in or would have recognized those terms) by making the first half positive rather than negative ('ēphēs vs. polloi).

224 Although G explains the slave's rebelliousness (sklerōs), and changes the verb with 'ēn ('ānah > hupakouw), it represents the general sense of H.
Three other times the translator H with the result that he used ou alone:

hapher maxashabôt bê'en sôd Pr 15.22
hupertithentai logismous hoi me timwntes sunedria 226

'îr pêrûtsah 'ên xômah 'âsher 'ên ma'tsar lêrûxô Pr 25.28 (2xx)
hwsper polis ta teixe katabeblemene kai ateixistos, houtws aner hos ou meta boules ti prassei.

gôzel 'abîw wê'immô wê'omer 'ên-pasha' Pr 28.24
hos apoballetai patera e metera kai dokei me hamartanein

Pr uses an alpha privative nine times—more than any other book of G. It is prefixed to both adjectives (7xx) 227 and a verb (10.25; 12.7, both aphanizw):

hû' yamût bê'en músar Pr 5.23
houtos teleuta meta apaideutwn

'al-ken pit'om yabô' 'êdô peta' yishshabër wê'ên marpe' Pr 6.15
dia touto ecapines erxetai he apwleia autou, diakope kai suntribe aniatos

lammah-zeh mûxir bêyad-kêsîl liqnôt xokmah wêleb-'ayin Pr 17.16
hina ti hupercent xremata aphroni? ktesasthai gar sophian akardios ou dunesetai.

225 G has redivided the verse, and subordinated the first verb of the second clause to the second verb, making the clause—disjunctive and subordinated—ine independent.

226 The translator personalized abstract H.

227 See Pr 25.28, above.
shanayim larum wa'arets la'omeq we'leb m-elakim 'en xeger
ouranos hupselos, ge de batheia, kardia de
basilews anecelegkto

geber rash we'osheq dallim maTar soxeph we'ên
andreios en asebeiais sukophantei pwtxous.
hwsper hyetos labros kai anwphes,

melek 'en la'arbeh wayyetse' xotests kullô
abasileuton estin he akriv kai ekstrateuei
aph' henos keleusmatos eutaktwn

ka'abôr sôphah we'ên rasha' wetsaddiq yësôd
'olam paraporeuomenes kataigidos aphanizetai asebes,
dikaios de ekklinas swzetai eis ton aiwna

haphôk re'sha'im we'ênam ùbêt tsaddiqim yâ'âmôd
hwsper huetos labros kai anwphes,
oihois me huparxei kubernesis, piptousin
phulla, swteria de huparxei en polle boule

ou huparxw also occurs in Pr (3xx). Pr 6.7 and
11.14 parallel the content of Pr 30.27 (above), but here
the translator used ou huparxw:

'asher 'en-laH qatsîn shoTer ûmoshel
ekteinw gar gewrgiou me huparxontos mede ton
anagkazonta exwn mede hupo despoten wn

bê'ên taxbulôt yippol-'am ûteshû'ah bê'rob
hois me huparxei kubernesis, piptousin hwsper
phulla, swteria de huparxei en polle boule

228 aphanizw "perish" represents the [verbal] sense
of 'ên. Note also the adverbial participle to
subordinate the first clause to aphanizw. In 10.25b the
translator read yasôd as yasûr, and so inserted swzw.

229 The translator again used aphanizw, and again
reversed the syntactical hierarchy by subordinating the
opening clause to the 'ên-clause.

230 Note that the translator also used huparxw to
supply explicit predication in 11.14b.
huparxw occurs once with a double negative;\textsuperscript{231} me may represent the preposition $b^e$:

\begin{align*}
b'\text{'en} & xaz\text{o}n \ nippara` `am \quad \text{Pr 29.18} \\
ou \ me & huparce \ ecegetes \ ethnei \ paranomw \\
\end{align*}

In a highly interpretive yet idiomatic rendering, $b'\text{'en}$ is rendered by pro tou with an infinitive (8.24), as are $b\text{Terem}$ and liphnē in the following verse:

\begin{align*}
b^{e'}\text{'en} & \ t\text{homin}\dot{\text{t}} \ x\text{o}\lambda\text{lalti} \ b^{e'}\text{'en} \ ma`\text{yan\dot{o}}t \ nikbad\text{\-} \ mayim \ b^{e}\text{Terem} \ harim \ t\text{a}Ta`\text{'u} \ liph\text{\-nē} \ g\text{e}ba`\dot{\text{o}}t \ x\text{o}\lambda\text{lalti} \quad \text{Pr 8.24} \\
pro \ tou & \ ten \ gen \ poiesai \ kai \ pro \ tou \ tas \ abussous \ poiesai \ pro \ tou \ ore \ hedrasthenai \ pro \ de \ pantwn \ bouwn \ genna \ me \\
ou \ pareimi & \ corresponds \ to \ '\text{ēn} \ once \ in \ G: \\
kî \ '\text{ēn} & \ ha`\text{ish} \ b\text{ebētō} \quad \text{Pr 7.19} \\
ou \ gar \ & \ parestin \ ho \ aner \ mou \ en \ oikw \\
pareimi \ "to \ be \ present" & \ nicely \ captures \ the \ flavor \ of \ H, \ since \ [e] \ would \ have \ implied \ that \ her \ husband \ had \ died. \\
'\text{ēn} & \ is \ rendered \ by \ heuriskw \ four \ times \ in \ G, \ each \ time \ in \ a \ context \ of \ searching \ for \ someone \ who \ had \ disappeared;\textsuperscript{232} \\
biqqesh-\text{lets} & \ xokmah \ wa`\text{ayin} \quad \text{Pr 14.6} \\
zeteseis & \ sophian \ para \ kakois \ kai \ oun \ heureseis \\
\end{align*}

The translator probably used heuriskw here under the influence of zetew at the beginning of the verse--it rounds off the verse nicely.

\textsuperscript{231}A rendering used only here and Ps 59.14 (above).

\textsuperscript{232}Gn 5.24 (Enoch); S1 14.17 (Jonathan and his armor bearer); Ps 37.10 (the wicked who had passed away--his non-existence expressed by ou huparxw, above).
Another unique rendering that occurs in Pr is oudamou phainw, a negative locative adverb "nowhere", which again shows the translator's highly interpretive approach to H:

\[
\text{hata`iph `eneyska bò wè`ènennû} \quad \text{Pr 23.5}
\]
\[
ean \text{epistese} \text{s to son omma pros auton, oudamou phane} \text{itai}
\]

Not unrelated to this is his use of epiphainos in Pr 25.14, although here the opposite point is being made, i.e., a boastful liar is as visible as these meteorological phenomena:

\[
\text{nësi'îm wèrûx wègeshem 'ayin 'îsh mithallel bèmattat-shaquer} \quad \text{Pr 25.14}
\]
\[
hwsper anemoi kai nephe kai huetoi epiphanestatoi, houtws hoi kauxwmenoi epi dosei pseudei
\]

This of course sounds the opposite of H, but G is still an accurate, if highly paraphrastic, rendition.\(^{233}\)

In two passages the translator of Pr did not represent 'ën, both times because of his interpretation of the verse. His rendering of 13.4 is so heavily paraphrased that wa'ayin cannot be represented:

\[
\text{mit`awwah wa'ayin naphshô `atsel} \quad \text{Pr 13.4}
\]
\[
en \text{epithumiais estin pas aergos}^{234}
\]

\(^{233}\)Cf. H: "Clouds and wind and rain [but] nothing is there, [this is] one who boasts falsely of a gift"; G: "As winds and clouds and rain are highly visible, so those who boast about false gifts."

\(^{234}\)There is the slim possibility that the alpha privative on aergos is intended to represent 'ayin, but this is unlikely (the syntax of 'ayin in this verse is admittedly awkward: "The heart of the sluggard desires, but there is nothing").
The translator made 20.4 into a comparison of two types of men, rather than interpreting it as a description of the sloth's [lack of] work and its results:

\[
\text{mexoreph \ 'atsel lo'-yax\textsuperscript{a}rosh y\textsuperscript{e}sha'al}\n\text{baqqatsir wa'ayin } \text{Pr 20.4}\n\text{oneidizomenos okneros ouk aixunetai, hwsautws}\n\text{kai ho danizomenos siton en ametw}\n\]

There is no place for 'ayin in his interpretation of these verses.

The translator made the second half of Pr 5.17 more explicit, by making the "strangers" the subject rather than the indirect object of the second half:

\[
yi\text{hyû } 1\text{èka } 1\text{èbadka we'èn } 1\text{èzarîm } '\text{ittak}\n\text{Pr 5.17}\n\text{estw soi monw huparxonta kai medeis allotriuos}\n\text{metasxetw soi}\n\]

5.17b is translated to parallel 5.17a, using medeis to modify the subject of the [supplied] verb, which is imperative with the dative personal pronoun to complete the parallelism.

\text{oudeis} is the subject of a non-verbal clause in Pr 8.8 (\text{oude} for the conjunction before the second adjective merely specifies the distribution of the negative):

\[
b\text{etsedeq kol-'imrê-pî 'ên bahem niphtal}\n\text{we'iqqesh } \text{Pr 8.8}\n\text{meta dikaiosunes panta ta hremata tou stomatos}\n\text{mou oudên en autois skolion oude straggalwdes}\n\]

The substantive function of 'ên kol in a disjunctive phrase is idiomatically rendered in Pr 13.7
by meden as the object of a concessive participle supplied for specificity:

\[
yesh \textit{mit'ashsher w\textsuperscript{e}én kol mitr\check{o}shesh w\textsuperscript{e}hôn rab} \quad \text{Pr 13.7}
\]
\[
eisin \textit{hoi ploutizontes heautous meden exontes kai eisin hoi tapeinountes heautous en pollw ploutw}\textsuperscript{235}
\]

In another disjunctive concessive clause w\textsuperscript{e}én with participle is again represented by medeis as the subject of the concessive genitive absolute:

\[
nasû \textit{w\textsuperscript{e}én-rodeph rasha\textsuperscript{c} w\textsuperscript{e}tsaddîqîm kik\textsuperscript{e}phîr yibTax} \quad \text{Pr 28.1}
\]
\[
\textit{pheugei asebes medenos diwkontos dikaios de hwsper lewn pepoithen}
\]

\textit{ou exw} represents 'ên once in Pr (22.27). In the second half of a warning against pledging surety for another's debt, 'ên-l\textsuperscript{k}a l\textsuperscript{esh}allem connotes inability to repay [a debt]. The rendering of the clause, using \textit{pothen} "if you have not whence (= wherewithall [with which]) to repay":

\[
\textit{'im-'ên-l\textsuperscript{k}a l\textsuperscript{esh}allem lammah yiqqax mishkabka mittaxteyka} \quad \text{Pr 22.27}
\]
\[
ean \textit{gar me exes pothen apoteises, lempsontai to strwma hupo tas pleuras sou}
\]

The second half of the verse is a question in H, but an assertion in G, due to the lack of a parallel for lammah.\textsuperscript{236}

\textsuperscript{235}\textsuperscript{[e]} is added to the second half of the verse for the sake of the parallelism, although the participle is not repeated.

\textsuperscript{236} Probably a G minus due to haplography (it is difficult to imagine what would have induced a scribe to introduce lammah into H).
The translator of Pr was exceedingly free in rendering 'ên. The usual rendering is the third most commonly used (17%); the rendering most frequent in Pr—alpha privative (22%)—occurs only eighteen times in G, nearly half of which are in Pr.

In Ruth (once; 4.4) 'ên is represented by ouk [e].

In Song of Songs 'ên (5xx) is rendered by ou [e] (4xx) and once by ou exw (8.8) where, as elsewhere in G, it signals non-possession:

'axôt lanû qêTannah wêshadayim 'ên laH SS 8.8
delophe hemin mikra kai mastous ouk exei

In Qohelet 'ên (44xx) is rendered by ou [e] (41xx), ou (2xx), and once by oudeis (3.19).

In Qo 9.2 me for 'ên is required by the translator's extreme literalness, which he attains by representing H formally as well as semantically. Since the participle is rendered substantivally, this is the grammatically correct rendering:

welazzobeâx welâ'asher 'ennennû zobeâx Qo 9.2
kai tw thusiazonti kai tw me thusiazonti

The other occurrence of ou alone also represents 'ên with a participle. This participle, however, is verbal, and is rendered by a finite verb. Its person and number are determined by the suffix on 'ên:

\[ ki \ 'ênka \ yôde^3 \ 'è \ zeh \ yikshar \ h^a\text{a}zeh \ 'ô-zeh \ Qo \ 11.6 \]
hoti ou ginwskeis poion stoixesei e touto e touto

In Qo 3.19, where 'ayin is absolute,\(^{238}\) ouden is also absolute; G captures well the flavor of the rhetorical question and its elliptical answer:

\[ \text{úmôtar} \ ha'adam \ min-habb^e\text{hemah} \ 'ayin \ ki \ hakkol \ habel \ Qo \ 3.19 \]
\[ kai \ ti \ eperisseusen \ ho \ anthrwpos \ para \ to \ ktenos? \ ouden, \ hoti \ ta \ panta \ mataiotes \]

Qo consistently represents 'ên as ou [e] (93%).

In Lamentations (11xx) 'ên is rendered by ou [e] (8xx) and ou huparxw (3xx).

\[ 'ên-laH \ m^e\text{naxem} \ mikkol-'oh^a\text{beyha} \ kol-re'eyha \ bag^o\text{dû} \ baH \ hayû \ laH \ l'oy^e\text{bîm} \ La \ 1.2 \]
\[ kai \ oux \ huparxei \ ho \ parakalwn \ auten \ apo \ pantwn \ agapwntwn \ auten \ pantes \ hoi \ philontes \ auten \ ethetesan \ en \ aute, \ egenonto \ aute \ eis \ exthrous\(^{239}\) \]

\(^{238}\)Technically, in an elliptical answer to the question.

\(^{239}\)Cf. 1.17 and 21 where clauses parallel to that in 1.2 is rendered with ou [e]:

persah tsiyyôn b^e\text{yadeyha} \ 'ên \ m^e\text{naxem} \ laH \ ... \ haytah \ y^e\text{rushalaim} \ l^e\text{niddah} \ bènêhem \ La \ 1.17 \ Diepetasen \ Siwn \ xeiras \ autes, \ ouk \ estin \ ho \ parakalwn \ auten; \ ... \ egenethe \ Ierousalem \ eis \ apokathemenen \ ana \ meson \ autwn

shâm^e\text{`û} \ ki \ ne'ênaxah \ 'anî \ 'ên \ m^e\text{naxem} \ lî
ou huparxw in La 5.3, 7 have in common their reference to fathers, but it is difficult to imagine that this had any effect on the translator:

\[
\begin{align*}
y\收取\text{tômîm hayînû} & \\text{we\'}ê\text{\textacute{e}n} \ 'ab & \text{La 5.3} \\
o\收取\text{ orphanoi egenethtemen,} & \text{oux huparxei pater} \\
'收取\text{abotênû xat\textacute{e}\textsuperscript{e}\textacute{u} w\textsuperscript{e}\textacute{e}nam} & \text{La 5.7} \\
o\收取\text{ hoi pateres hemwn hemarton,} & \text{oux huparxousin}
\end{align*}
\]

\'ên is fairly regularly represented by ou [e] in La (64%); it is likely that huparxw is used as a stylistic variation for [e].

In Esther (10xx) \'ên is represented by ou [e] (2xx), ou (5xx), and ou ginomai (once). It is not represented in its first occurrence in 3.8; G cannot be aligned with H in 2.7.240

\'ên with a participle (5xx in Es) is rendered by ou with a finite verb four times:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'ên 'ester maggedet m\textsuperscript{o}ladtaH w\textsuperscript{e}'et-'am\textsuperscript{a}H} & \text{Es 2.20} \\
he de Esther oux hupedeicen ten patrida autes \\
\text{wayyar'} haman kî-'ên mord\textsuperscript{o}kay kore\textsuperscript{a}} & \text{Es 3.5} \\
kai epignous Aman hoti ou proskunei autw Mardoxaios
\end{align*}
\]

La 1.21

\begin{align*}
\text{Akousate de hoti stevazw ego, ouk estin ho parakalwn me}
\end{align*}

240 Although there is a long plus in G, the clause in which \'ên occurs in H is not represented.
Its fifth occurrences in this syntagm, however, is non-verbal, possibly to convey the emotional trauma of Esther's appeal:

ki 'ën hâtstsr showeh bênezeq hammelek Es 7.4 ou gar acios ho diabolos tes aules tou basilews

In 1.8, the first occurrence of 'ën in Es, it is rendered by ou ginomai, the only use of this rendering in G:

wëhashshëtiyyah kaddat 'ën 'ones Es 1.8 ho de potos houtos ou kata prokeimenon nomon egeneto

It was used possibly to convey the sense "the drinking was not [to be at any point during the feast] according to ordinance".

The translator of Es used ou [e] infrequently (20%), but this was largely due to the syntax of the clauses in which 'ën occurred (5xx with participles which he represented as ou with a finite verb).

241 Its first occurrence in this verse is not represented because of the translator's choice of parakouw "disregard" to render 'ênam `osîm.

242 All three occurrences in H of the qal participle of shawah occur in Es with 'ên, and are rendered in three different ways: ou sumpherei (3.8), ou areskw (5.13), and ou acios (7.4).
In Daniel (9xx) 'ên is rendered in four ways in G:243 ou [e] (5xx), oudeis [e] (2xx), and ou and alpha privative (once each).

'ên with a participle is represented by oudeis [e] with a substantive participle which functions as the predicate nominative of the negative subject:

\[ \text{wa'eshtomem 'al-hammar'eh we'ên mebin Dn 8.27} \]
\[ \text{kai eceluomen epi tw horamati, kai oudeis en ho dianooumenos} \]
\[ \text{we'ên 'exad mitxazzeq 'immî 'al-'elleh} \]
\[ \text{kai outheis en ho boethwn met' emou huper toutwn} \]

In Dn 8.5 'ên with a participle is, contrary to the above, rendered with ou with a finite verb:

\[ \text{we'ên noge'a' ba'arets Dn 8.5} \]
\[ \text{kai ouk hepteto tes ges} \]

alpha-privative with an adjective is used once (Dn 1.4), where it represents the entire relative clause of which 'ên is the predicate:

\[ \text{yeladîm 'asher 'ên-bahem kol-mûm ... Dn 1.4} \]
\[ \text{neaniskous amwmous ...} \]

The translator of the G Dn was thus relatively free in representing 'ên (56%).245

---

243 Theodotion renders 'ên consistently as ou [e] in Dn (9xx; 100%).

244 The translator obviously understood the point of the verse as "he was not touching the ground" rather than "none [of his feet] was touching the ground".

245 Contrast the absolute regularity of Th (100%).
'ên is always represented by ou [e] in Ezra (4xx).

'ên in Nehemiah (11xx) is represented by ou [e] (9xx) and ou exw (once; 8.10). Its first occurrence in 4.17 is not represented in G.

The repeated le in Ne 8.10 apparently gives rise to the use of me with a participle of exw. The first preposition (l'ên) defines the indirect object, the recipients of the gifts. The second (lô) indicates non-possession; the resumptive suffix defines who is being described:

\[
\text{we'shilkû manôt l'é'en nakôn lô}
\]
\[
\text{Ne 8.10}
\]
\[
\text{kai aposteilate metidas tois me exousin}
\]
\[
\text{246}
\]

The preposed 'ên in Ne 4.17 was apparently overlooked by haplography or, more likely because the translator simply did not know what to make of it:

\[
\text{we'é'en 'ânî we'axay úne'aray we'é'anshê}
\]
\[
\text{hammishmar 'âsher 'axaray 'ên-ânaxnû poshtîm}
\]
\[
\text{bégadênû}
\]
\[
\text{Ne 4.17}
\]
\[
\text{kai emen egw kai hoi andres tes prophulakes}
\]
\[
\text{opisw mou ec hymwn ekdiduskomenos aner ta}
\]
\[
\text{himatia autou}
\]

The translation of the rest of the verse, however, does reflect H, albeit with minuses and one plus.

Ne regularly represents 'ên by ou [e] (90%).

In 1 Chronicles 'ên is represented only by ou [e] (9xx).

246 This is the only text in which le'ên (10xx, represented 9xx) is represented by ou exw.
2 Chronicles contains twenty-five occurrences of 'ên. It is rendered by ou [e] (22xx) and once by ou. It is not represented in 14.10b or 20.25.

In C2 14.10 'ên appears twice. The first time it is rendered as ouk, negating the supplied verb adunamai; the second time, however, the translator apparently rendered the idiom 1e'ên koαx by en oligois, apparently under the influence of S1 14.6:247

\[
\text{YHWH 'ên `immēka la`zōr bèn rab 1e'ên koαx} \\
\text{Kurie ouk adunatei para soi swzein en pollois kai en oligois}
\]

In C2 20.25 'ên is not represented, apparently because of a misinterpreted Vorlage:

---

247 S1 14.6 is not parallel in H, but the renderings make it most likely that the translator of C2 knew, or was influenced by, Jonathan's statement. It is possible that he rendered it in this way in order to call S1 14.6 to the mind of the reader.

\[
\text{kī 'ên lēYHWH ma`tsōr lēhōshiā` bērab 'ō bimē`aT} \\
\text{hoti ouk estin tw kuriw sunexomenon swzein en pollois e en oligois}
\]
C2 is thus quite regular in using ou [e] to represent 'ên (88%), although the translator was not above interpretation (14.10a), the influence of other passages (14.10b), and even misinterpretation of his Vorlage (20.25).
RENDERINGS of 'ên WITH AFFIXES

'ên occurs with prefixed prepositions (54xx) and with pronominal (103xx). These combinations severely affected the translators' renderings of 'ên.

With prefixes (54xx, represented 44xx) it is represented by ou [e] (17xx = 39%), ou huparxw (8xx = 18%), ou (7xx = 15%), and other renderings (none more than 2xx).\(^{249}\) In the case of Jr and Pr, at least, the relatively high frequency of prefixed occurrences of 'ên effectively lowered the rate at which those translators used ou [e] to represent it.

This wide variation in rendering 'ên with prefixes is due mainly to the translators' attempts to represent the H constructions idiomatically, which they often did very well indeed.\(^{250}\)

---

249 Unique renderings (8xx) account for 18%.

250 See on various passages (above).
Renderings of 'ên with Prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Px</th>
<th>Oc</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>b+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>m+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>b+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>k+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>m+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>k+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>b+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>l+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>l+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>l+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>l+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pfx</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY TO RENDERINGS**

1 ou [e] 7 ou heuriskw
2 ou huparxw 8 a- privative
3 ou 9 Shared (2 bks)
4 oudeis [e] 10 Unique
5 oudeis 11 < G
6 ou exw 12 --- ('ên not rep'd)

'ên occurs 103xx with a pronominal suffix identifying its subject. In these clauses it is
represented by ou [e] (40xx = 42%), ou (35xx = 37%), ou huparxw (8xx = 8%), and other renderings (none more than 2xx). 251

'en with a suffix is rendered less frequently by ou [e] than 'en as a whole, due mainly to its frequent use to negate a participle, since this construction is normally rendered in G as a finite verbal clause (in which 'en is represented by ou/me). In the table on the following page the column on the right shows that this pattern is true of nearly every book of G. 252

This tendency is not unlike that of 'ayyeh, yesh, and '6d, where suffixed forms were less likely to be represented with the usual rendering (above). Both of these patterns show that the translators were much more likely to use ou [e] when the form was not affixed by either prefixed prepositions or suffixed pronominals.

251 Unique renderings (5xx) account for 5%.

252 The exceptions are Jg, K1, Ne. The most striking difference between the two is in K2 (0 vs. 75%), La (0 vs. 73%), Ek and Zc (both 0 vs. 50%), and Dt (29% vs. 80%). A glance at rendering #3 (ou), however, reveals that this is partially due to a high occurrence of 'en with suffix plus a participle.
### Renderings of 'ên with Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk Occ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn 16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sf 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kl 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### KEY TO RENDERINGS

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ou [e]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ou heuriskw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ou huparxw</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>a- privative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shared (2 bks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>oudeis [e]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>oudeis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ou exw</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--- ('ên not rep'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYNONYMS OF 'ën IN G

How did the translators of G render 'ephes (42xx)\(^{253}\) and bēlî (58xx),\(^{254}\) alleged synonyms of 'ën?\(^ {255}\) Did they view them as synonyms (and use ou [e] to represent them), or did they assess them differently and so use other rendering(s)?\(^ {256}\)

'ephes

'ephes\(^ {257}\) has three main functions in H:\(^ {258}\) as a substantive (20xx),\(^ {259}\) as a negative predicator of existence (14xx),\(^ {260}\) and as a strong adversative "but" (6xx).\(^ {261}\)

\(^{253}\) Primarily in Is (14/42xx = 33%).

\(^{254}\) Mainly in Jb (21/58xx = 36%).

\(^{255}\) Cf. Waltke & O'Connor, BIBLICAL HEBREW SYNTAX, #39.3.3a; Jouon, GRAMMAIRE, #160n; Hamp, in TDOT, I:362.

\(^{256}\) See the background to this question under 'ayyeh (above).

\(^{257}\) Hamp tentatively suggests an etymology from Akk. apsu. TDOT I:361.

\(^{258}\) One passage does not fit these uses. In Dn 8.25 be'ephes signals "without":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ūbē'ephes yad yishshaber} \\
\text{without a hand he will be destroyed}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{259}\) It can be translated "nothing" (7xx) and "end" (13xx). The latter occurs only in the phrase 'aphsē 'arets "the ends of the earth".

\(^{260}\) These occurrences are used to align it with 'ën.

\(^{261}\) Especially when followed by kî (5xx).
'ên does not function as an adversative, so it is not surprising that 'éphes in this use is not translated at all like 'ên, but by plen hoti (3xx), and by plen, hoti, and all' e hoti (once each).262

Nor does its use or translation in the phrase 'aphse 'arets parallel 'ên.263 In its other substantive uses (7xx) 'éphes is rendered five different ways, only once by ou [e] (two are not represented).

In those passages in which it seems to be analogous to 'ên (14xx) 'éphes is represented most frequently by ou [e] (4xx),264 but this is not a majority of the passages in which it occurs (30%). It is also represented by plen and ekleipw (2xx each), and by five other renderings, each used once to represent 'éphes.265

Its use in some occurrences may parallel that of

262 It is interesting that the last translation listed is probably the most accurate representation of the strong adversative function of 'éphes kî.

263 'aphsê (in 'aphsê 'arets) is represented by akros (5xx), perata (6xx, all Ps), and by exatou and diekbole (once each).

264 Is (3xx) and Zp (once). Three are identical in H, though not in G: 'ânî YHWH w'ephshì 'ôd Is 47.8, 10
  Egw eimi, kai ouk esti hetera
  Egw eimi, kai ouk esti met' eme eti Zp 2.15

265 In Is 41.29 H and G cannot be aligned.
'en, but 'ephes is at best a partial synonym—this was also recognized by the translators.

belî

belî (58xx) occurs more frequently with prefixes than without266 and, unlike 'ên, negates both perfect and imperfect verbs. It has no usual rendering in G, being represented by a variety of prepositions with an articular infinitive (usually negated by me),267 by ou and alpha privative (6xx each), aneu (5xx), and six other renderings, each of which represents belî only once.268

belî should probably be considered only a partial synonym of 'ên; it appears from G that the translators did not view it as parallel in function either.

266 34xx: with mibelî (25xx), bibelî (8xx), and libelî (once).

267 The following prepositions precede the infinitives with belî: para to me (9xx), para to ('ên > me) (3xx), dia to me (2xx with [e], 2xx with an infinitive of another verb), tou me (3xx). Once tou without a negation precedes an infinitive (Ma 3.10).

268 It is not represented in G (11xx), either because the verse is a minus in G (8xx), or because the translators paraphrased or interpreted the text in such that it is not possible to discern an equivalent (3xx).
SUMMARY

'ên occurs 789xx in H, ranging from Is (91xx) to Ob and Ru (once each). It does not occur in Jn. Its frequency varies from Qo (1.5%) to Js (.05%).

It is rendered by ou [e] (515x = 72.5%), ou/me (105xx = 14.8%), ou huparxw (27xx), oudeis (22xx), alpha privative (17xx), ou exw (15xx), oudeis [e] (5xx), and ou heuriskw (4xx). Five other renderings are limited to two books ("shared" renderings). Twenty-five renderings are unique, each occurring only once (3.5%).

When [e] occurs in a rendering of 'ên it is usually

---

269 It does not occur in Jn.

270 Cf. on yesh (above), which is also most frequent in Qo.

271 Alpha private [e] (Jb 22.5; Pr 30.27), aneu (Ex 21.11; Am 3.5), ou me huparxw (Ps 59.14; Pr 29.18), ouketi (Ex 5.10; Is 23.10), and ouketi [e] (Ek 27.36; Jb 7.21; 23.8).
present tense. 272

Five books use only ou [e] to represent 'ên: Cl (9xx), Na (7xx), Ez (4xx), and Ob and Ru (once each). Only one never uses ou [e]: Hg (5xx).

The frequency of ou [e], the usual rendering, ranges widely: from 100% in Cl (9xx), Na (7xx), and Ez (4xx) 273 to Ma (20%), Pr (16.2%), and Hg (0/5xx). 274

The following forms and tenses of eimi represent 'ên, with various forms (ou, me, oudeis, etc.; 528xx):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of eimi Used to Render 'ên</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mood, Person, &amp; Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3spi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ppi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1spi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2spi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These forms do not exist in Greek

The present was the preferred tense used to represent 'ên, which suggests that the translators recognized in the function of 'ên the same present aspect seen in 'ayyeh and yesh (above).

In addition, Ob and Ru, where 'ên occurs only once, use ou [e].
Some books can be grouped regarding their consistency: Jg - K2 are all well above the average (80% - 95.5%), as are Ez - C2 (90% - 100%). Gn, Lv, Nu, Is, Jr, on the other hand, all hover near the average. Qo, in which 'ên is most frequent, is quite consistent (93.2%), using only ou [e] and, in three participial clauses, ou. The variation within MP is again striking, ranging from 100% in Na (7xx) to 0% in Hg (5xx).

That the translators understood 'ên to convey not merely negation, but negative predication, can be seen in their use of ou [e] to represent it, rather than simple ou (or me).

274 Other books with the usual rendering in fewer than half of its occurrences are Ex (9/22xx = 40.9%) and Es (2/8xx = 25%). ou [e] represents only 33% of the occurrences of 'ên in Jl (1/3xx).

275 The range within the Pentateuch is noticeable: Dt (80%) vs. Ex (40.9%).

276 ou [e] in MP = 57.1%, below the average for G as a whole.

277 See the excursus "Is MP a Translation Unit?" in the Conclusion (below).

278 Which I suggested as a more proper understanding of its function (above).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>'ên</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>20613</td>
<td>37  0.179%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>16713</td>
<td>22  0.132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>11950</td>
<td>21  0.176%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>16408</td>
<td>19  0.116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>14294</td>
<td>30  0.210%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>10151</td>
<td>5   0.049%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>9886</td>
<td>27  0.273%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>13264</td>
<td>33  0.249%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>11040</td>
<td>15  0.136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>13140</td>
<td>25  0.190%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>12284</td>
<td>20  0.163%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>16943</td>
<td>95  0.561%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>21836</td>
<td>90  0.412%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>18730</td>
<td>24  0.128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>15  0.630%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3   0.313%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>5   0.245%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1   0.334%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>6   0.430%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>7   1.254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>3   0.447%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>3   0.391%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>5   0.833%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>4   0.128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>6   0.685%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>14363</td>
<td>58  0.404%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>19587</td>
<td>71  0.362%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>8351</td>
<td>38  0.455%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>6915</td>
<td>39  0.564%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1   0.077%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>5   0.400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>44  1.473%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>11  0.713%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>10  0.328%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>9   0.152%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>4   0.107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>5312</td>
<td>11  0.207%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>10746</td>
<td>9   0.084%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13315</td>
<td>25  0.188%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 305634 798 0.261%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>'ên Rep'd</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>37 37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>22 22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>21 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>19 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>30 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>27 27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>33 32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>15 15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kl</td>
<td>25 22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>20 18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>91 84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>88 77</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>24 24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>15 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>58 56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>67 67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>37 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>38 37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>44 44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>11 11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>10 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>25 23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>786 710</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent: 90.3% 72.5% 14.8% 0.7% 3.1% 2.1% 0.6% 2.3% 1.5% 3.5% 3.2% 2.4% 32.5%
Chart 4.2.1.
'ēn: Summary of Renderings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY TO RENDERINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ou [e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ou huparxw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 oudeis [e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 oudeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ou exw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ou huparxw (67%)  
ou deis (14%)  
ou exw (3%)  
ou deis (1%)  
< G (3%)  
Unique (1%)  
Shared (2%)  
a- (1%)  
on deis (2%)
Chart 4.2.2
'en: ou eimi & Other Renderings

Chart 4.2.3
'en: Usual Rendering by Book
hinneh is both the most frequent of the words studied in this dissertation and the most frequently studied.\(^1\)

\(^1\) On the etymology of hinneh, C. J. Labuschagne says that "hinneh is nothing but an extended form of hen, which seems to have won greater popularity than the original form". He adds that "they are etymologically related with other original deictic forms in Hebrew, such as the definite article, the interrogative particle, and with the conjunction 'im, and with Ugaritic hn and hm, Phoenician hn and 'm, Canaanite annu, and Arabic 'inna and 'in" ("The Particles hen and hinneh" OTS 18 (1973):1-14):3).

Muraoka, EMPHATIC WORDS AND STRUCTURES, also says that "no legitimate doubt can be raised as to the etymological relationship between [hen and hinneh] and the corresponding Arabic 'inna, ..." (137).

Brockelmann adds he' to the cognates of hinneh (SYNTAX, §4). For further on the etymology of hen and hinneh cf. the lexica, ad loc.

Schenkel argues on the basis of a syntagmatic analysis of the clauses in which some [Egyptian] particles occur that they developed from full verbs to semi-verb/imperatives to particles, or from full nouns to semi-nouns to particles ("Semiverb", 32-34). This is not unlike the Hebrew lexica which tend to posit development of hinneh (and other forms, e.g. yesh, 'ên, 'ôd) from substantive to particle. This reasoning, however, assumes the historical and functional priority of verbs and nouns ("full words"--see the Introduction, above), and obscures or ignores the importance (and indispensability) of particles in discourse.

\(^2\) 1063xx--the lexica and concordances disagree. Only 46 words of the biblical vocabulary (approximately 10,000) occur more frequently.
In light of this concentration of effort it is surprising that there is not more agreement on its function in H.\(^4\)

**FUNCTION IN BIBLICAL HEBREW**

There are two main views of the function of hinneh: that it is syntagmatic (i.e., as a syntactically significant element of the clause), and that it is supra-syntagmatic.


\(^4\)Hinneh is indeed an example of a "Pesky Little Particle", a problem "widespread in linguistic analysis":

Most languages have particles whose use seems to be related to gluing the parts of discourses together but which are never easy to pin down.

(i.e., it is outside that syntax, and does not affect or relate to it).

hinneh as Supra-syntagmatic

The view that hinneh is primarily supra-syntagmatic embraces three more specific explanations. hinneh has traditionally\(^5\) been interpreted as a deictic or demonstrative interjection of surprise,\(^6\) excitement, or exclamation\(^7\) translated "Behold!", "See!", or the like:

... the primary function of [hen and hinneh] lies in indicating that the speaker or the writer wants to draw the special attention of the hearer or reader respectively to a fact or object which can be said to be important, new, unexpected, etc.\(^8\)

There is still general agreement that its main function

\(^5\) That this tradition is being discarded may be seen by comparing nearly any new grammar with those of even the past generation, or any modern translation of H with older versions. [Comparison of modern translations also reveals little or no agreement on how to represent hinneh either in general or in particular passages.]

\(^6\) Cf. Andersen: "As a kind of exclamation, hinneh ... is clause-initial and, when it is not primarily the predicator in a declarative clause, is grammatically attached to the following text in only a loose way" (SENTENCE (115)).

\(^7\) "... on emploie pour renforcer l'affirmation l'adverbe démonstratif hinneh (hen) voici ..." (Jouion, GRAMMAIRE (502; §164a)).

\(^8\) Muraoka, EMPHATIC WORDS AND STRUCTURES (138).
is deictic, although few if any would say today that this is its only function.\(^9\)

This function is conceded in passing by others, who go on to argue for less common functions of hinneh, e.g., Labuschagne, who says:

[hen and hinneh] are first and foremost demonstrative particles. This does not mean, however, that these particles have always retained their original and primary function as deictic interjections ...\(^10\)

Long, analyzing the reports of prophetic visions or oracles, labels \(\textit{wehinneh}\) the "transition" from the "Announcement of the Vision" to the "Vision Sequence".\(^11\) This is closely related to its demonstrative or deictic function, since:

\(^9\) Cf., i.al., Brockelmann, SYNTAX: "Diese Interjektionen dienen dann weiter nur dazu, die Aufmerksamkeit auf eine Person oder Sache zu lenken ..." (§4); Blau, GRAMMAR, calls hinneh [one of several words which may be used] a "presentative" (§103), a term used also by Waltke & O'Connor, INTRODUCTION (§40.2a).

\(^10\) Labuschagne, "hen and hinneh" (1). He goes on to argue that hinneh became the equivalent of a conjunction, with temporal, conditional, and concessive functions (cf., e.g., Lambdin's approach, below).

McCarthy concedes this "ordinary deictic use and the use with verbs of perception", denies emphatically that \(\textit{wehinneh}\) ever "declines to the level of a mere connective", then goes on to list six other functions, which are the actual focus of his article ("Uses of \(\textit{wehinneh}\)", 330f).


Long, "Reports" (355). Andersen foreshadows this: "the abundant use of \(\textit{wehinneh}\) clauses is thus a feature of dream reports in classical Hebrew" (SENTENCE, 95), but does not further study this use.
Often, hinneh denotes a shift in scenes in the midst of a longer vision-sequence, . . . the particle probably conveys the sense of immediacy in the perception.\textsuperscript{12}

This "transitional" use is in turn not far removed from Adele Berlin's description of its discourse function\textsuperscript{13} as "one of the clearest indicators of point of view".\textsuperscript{14} Wehinneh puts the reader in the eyes of the narrator, and so indicates the shift in the narrative.\textsuperscript{15} Andersen refers to this as "suprise", although it more frequently entails a shift of attention rather than emotional surprise:

... that something comes into the view of one of the participants, is prominent in the commonest idiom in which a wehinneh clause is used—wayyar' wehinneh..., and he looked, and behold ... It is this feature of the unexpected that we

\textsuperscript{12}Long, "Reports" (356).

\textsuperscript{13}Wolfgang Schneider calls hinneh one of several "macrosyntactic signs" in H—discourse devices that "bind together the sentences constituting a larger span of text". [we]hinneh can be either an "introductory or transitional signal[s] in dialogue" (GRAMMATIK DES BIBLISCHES HEBRÄISCH (Munich: Claudius, 1974):261); cited in Waltke and O'Connor, BIBLICAL HEBREW SYNTAX (634; §381e).

\textsuperscript{14}Adele Berlin, POETICS AND INTERPRETATION OF BIBLICAL NARRATIVE; BIBLE AND LITERATURE SERIES, 9 (Sheffield, Almond, 1983; reprinted 1987):91-95 (cf. 62f).

\textsuperscript{15}Although I would not say that hinneh and wehinneh function as different "words", there is a general uniformity to the contexts of wehinneh that is somewhat distinct from those of hinneh.
describe as "surprise" in such clauses.\textsuperscript{16}

The third supra-syntagmatic explanation of hinneh limits its function to introducing content-clauses as a synonym of $\text{re'eh}$\textsuperscript{17} and $kî$ (when $kî$ introduces the content of direct or indirect discourse):\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{quote}
 wayyar' ya'aqîb 'et-pênê laban wêhinneh 'ênnenû lamô kitêmôl shilshom Gn 31.2 
 Jacob noticed Laban's attitude--that he was no longer [pleased with] him as previously.

 wayyo'mer lahen ro'eh 'anokî 'et-pênê 'abîken kî 'ênnenû 'elay kitêmôl shilshom Gn 31.5 
 He said to them, "I have noticed your father's attitude--that he is no longer [pleased with] me as previously."
\end{quote}

Although these, especially that posited by Berlin, appear to be genuine functions of hinneh, it is difficult to justify limiting it to the rôle of inter-clausal connector, or to say, as does Kogut, that "hinneh is not to be regarded as part of [the sentence

\textsuperscript{16} And:

\textsuperscript{17} Kogut, "Meaning and Function": "... the meaning of the imperative of the verb ra'ah was absorbed by hinneh when it introduces direct speech" (152). Cf. the discussion of $\text{re'eh}$ as a synonym of hinneh (below).

\textsuperscript{18} She posits the development of this function from hinneh's use in increasingly shortened formulae, beginning with wayyar' 'et 'ênayw wayyere' wêhinneh ... and ending with simply wêhinneh.

In comparing L\textsuperscript{v} 13.32 and 51 Kogut further notes that "wêhinneh is paralleled by $kî$". Since "one of the functions of $kî$ is to introduce content clauses" she concludes that "... this is also the [sic] function of hinneh" (Kogut, "Meaning and Function" (147f)).
or clause], since to say that hinneh has discourse function does not necessarily entail denying it a syntagmatic rôle.

**hinneh as Syntagmatic**

The other primary characterization is that of hinneh as syntagmatic. This approach explains many of its occurrences as logical or connective. That is, hinneh "introduces a fact upon which a following statement or command is based"; [wē]hinneh may function as a bridge between a verb [or context] of perception and the following clause of the content of that perception. They may both also function as logical connectors.

This does not mean, however, that hinneh has one or two specific logical or connective meanings, since it does not specify the nature of the inter-clausal

---

19 Kogut's identification of hinneh as a suprasyntagmatic element probably does not reflect Wolfgang Schneider's description of hinneh as a "macrosyntactic sign" (above). Since Kogut rejects any function for hinneh other than to introduce content clauses (as a mere synonym of rē'eh or kî), she appears to deny it any larger (macrosyntactic or discourse) rôle.

20 Lambdin, INTRODUCTION (169; §135).

21 Cf. Waltke & O'Connor, INTRODUCTION (§40.2a).

22 The attempts to specify further the usage of hinneh yields diminishing returns, since the uses "discovered"—though real—are almost inevitably confined to a small number of occurrences.
relationship, but it at least directs the reader to search out the connection to which it refers.

Labuschagne argues for this function of hinneh, although he overstates the case for development of hinneh into a full conjunction:

Like the particles ki and 'im ... these particles were subjected to syntactic influences causing them to develop in the direction of full-grown conjunctions ... both hen and hinneh came to be used to connect clauses and sentences in such a way that they served as conjunctions.

Another (nearly adverbial) aspect of this syntagmatic use, especially when hinneh occurs in participial clauses, is suggested by Joüon:

Le futur exprimé par le participe est ordinairement un futur prochain.

23"... the deictic particle hinneh may conceal the logically subordinate relationship of the clauses which [it introduces]" (Waltke & O'Connor, INTRODUCTION (§38.1h)). Cf. Lambdin, INTRODUCTION (168; §135).

24Joshua Blau argues that [wî]hinneh separates the adverbial--the "psychological subject"--from the rest of the sentence (Blau, AN ADVERBIAL CONSTRUCTION (5-11; §1.4)), but it is difficult to understand in what sense the adverbials that he lists should be identified as the subjects of their clauses. Even if this is a proper explanation of this use of [wî]hinneh, it is limited to only a few occurrences.

25Labuschagne, "hen and hinneh" (1). McCarthy, "Uses of wôhinneh", denies emphatically that wôhinneh ever "declines to the level of a mere connective" (330f), but his suggested functions often resemble those listed by Lambdin, INTRODUCTION (§135).
This function seems especially prominent in announcements of divine intent to or through the prophets.  

The final aspect of its function is that hinneh, like the other words in this study, is a predicator of existence. Andersen implies that this is hinneh's major function:

hinneh predicates present and local existence. . . . hinneni means I'm here! rather than Look at me!.  

This is stated even more forcefully by Lambdin:  

26Joüon, GRAMMAIRE (332; §119n). Cf. Lambdin, who says that "hinneh may also be used to add this same nuance [of immediacy] to sentences with adverbial, adjectival, or participial predicates" (Lambdin, INTRODUCTION (169; §135)).  

27Cf. Long, "Reports" (above).  

28Andersen, SENTENCE (94).  

29This role, however, is explicitly and absolutely rejected by Kogut (even in one-member sentences) since, according to her interpretation of hinneh it is extra-clausal (above):  

One-member sentences often convey the existence of something, ... and always inherent in such statements of existence is a designation of place. These semantic components--existence and place--are present in one-member sentences whether hinneh precedes them or not. . . . Thus, it is not the word hinneh, which precedes these sentences, that expresses the fact of existence and place. On the contrary, it is the semantic components of existence and place inherent in one-member
The clearest and most basic use of hinneh is as a predicator of existence. It differs from yesh in that it emphasizes the immediacy, the here-and-now-ness, of the situation. Thus these two functions—supra-syntagmatic and syntagmatic co-exist within the same form. Without evidence more certain than we have we cannot know in which direction, if either, the function of hinneh developed.

30 Lambdin, INTRODUCTION (§135). As noted above, however, yesh often connotes the same "here-and-now-ness" (cf. Jouon on hinneh in participial clauses (above)).
hinneh WITH PRONOMINALS

hinneh occurs with both suffixed and independent pronominal subjects. Independent pronouns precede or follow hinneh, and even occur when hinneh also has a suffix. Although Lambdin says that in its function as a predicator of existence "inflected forms are

31 "The explanation of these suffixes as verbal suffixes, ... is questionable" (GKC, §1000). This does not disagree in essence with Bauer-Leander, HISTORISCHE GRAMMATIK:

"hinnêni = arab. 'innâni, in Proto-Semitic n was inserted in order to avoid the hiatus between the particle, *hinna or *'inna and the suffix, i.e., the particle took the object suffix -nî" (§83.2), since morphology (the "object suffix") does not determine function.

32 I have found at least 68 passages in which hinneh is followed immediately by an independent pronoun, pace Waltke & O'Connor, INTRODUCTION, who say that hinneh precedes a personal pronoun only when it also has a pronominal suffix (§16.3.5b).

"Sometimes, ... the pronoun referring to the subject is wanting, and the simple hinneh takes the place of the subject and copula (as Gn 18.9 hinneh ba'ôhel "behold she is in the tent"), or there is no indication whatever of the predicate, so that the sentence is limited to hinneh with the suffix, as in the frequent use of hinnêni, hinnennî "here am I", in answer to an address" (GKC, §147b).

"Le sujet est souvent omis après l'adverbe démonstratif hinneh, qui montre suffisamment le sujet" (Jouon, GRAMMAIRE (§146h).

The syntags with personal pronouns include:

we+[pronoun] hinneh+suffix [participle] (Gn 6.17; 9.9; Ex 14.17; Jr 26.14); w[e]+[pronoun] hinneh (Jr 40.10); hinneh+suffix [pronoun] (Ek 34.11, 20); hinneh+suffix [participle] [pronoun] (C1 11.25).

33 "The subject of hinneh as predicator can be a free-form pronoun or noun, and in either case a concordant subject pronoun suffix is optional, not obligatory ..." (Andersen, SENTENCE, 94).
the inflected forms are most common when
hinneh is used in participial clauses—the suffix
indicates the person, gender, and number of the subject
of the participle.

The occurrence of independent pronouns with hinneh
also sets it off from the other predicators of existence
(above).

34 Lambdin, INTRODUCTION (168; §135).

35 "Le pronom sujet est parfois omis dans une
proposition participiale, notamment après hinneh ..."
(Jouon, GRAMMAIRE (466; §154c)).

P. Humbert ("La formule hébraïque en hinnenî suivi
d'un participe", OPUSCULES D'UN HÉBRÂISANT
(Neuchâtel, 1958):54-59) notes that this combination (125xx)
usually precedes a hiphil or [transitive] qal
participle, that "dans 85 passages sur 125 la formule
introduit nettement une menace" (56; emphasis original),
and that it "sert essentiellement à introduire des actes
dont Dieu est l'auteur, ..., actes dont la particule
hinneh souligne en général l'imminence." He adds that
"la formule est employée essentiellement dans des
oracles rendus par la divinité qui annonce ainsi son
intervention soudaine, imminente et active" (57).

Cf. id., "Die Herausforderungsformel hinnenî eleka"
ZAW (1933):101-8; reprinted in id. (44-53). for a
discussion of the special uses of this formula.

36 It is difficult to reconcile this with the
statement that ". . . attached to a verb, 'et, or hinneh,
[pronominal suffixes] are in the accusative function"
(Waltke & O'Connor, INTRODUCTION (§16.4c)).

Cf. Gesenius: "The demonstrative particle hen,
hinneh en, ecce may be used either absolutely (as a kind
of interjection, ...) before complete noun- or verbal-
clauses, ... or may take the pronoun, which would be the
natural subject of a noun-clause, in the form of a
suffix" (GRAMMAR (469; §147b, cf. §100o)).

37 Cf. Humbert, "La formule", who says that hinînî
'ânî or 'anokî followed by a participle is "une simple
variante de la tournure en hinînî, variante destinée
sans doute à faire ressortir au moyen du pronom isolé
'anokî ou 'ânî la personne même du sujet" (59).
SUMMARY

Unfortunately, we cannot determine the diachronic development of hinneh's function in H, although we can say with certainty that hinneh functions in all three of these ways throughout the biblical books, and even that its function as a predicator of existence may be anterior to the others.

Without further evidence, however, its development from a predicator of existence to a connective to a presentative (or vice versa) cannot be proved and must remain the subject of further study.

38"Other [interjections], however, originally expressed independent ideas, and become interjections only by rapid pronunciation and by usage, e.g. ... hinneh behold! (prop. here) ..." (Gesenius, GRAMMAR (307; §105b)).

39The approach suggested by Grimes that we note the syntactical and discourse cotext of hinneh may prove the most useful in the long run (THREAD OF DISCOURSE (93)).
TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

USUAL RENDERING

hinneh is usually represented by idou (797xx = 84%).

No other rendering represents even 2% of its occurrences. Seventeen passages contain renderings common to only two books; there are twenty-nine unique renderings. hinneh is not represented in G in 90 passages (9%).

40 idou is 2s second aorist imperative of horaw.

41 Each of the following renderings occurs in at least three books: ei/ean (18xx = 1.8%), idou [e] (16xx = 1.6%), [e] (12xx = 1.2%), hoti (11xx = 1.1%), hode (10xx = 9.9%), houtos/ekenos [e] (7xx = .7%), nun, idou de, and ti [e] (each 5xx = .5%), idou houtos (3xx = .3%), and ginomai (4xx = .4%).

42 alla (Is 5.7b; Jb 3.7), de (Is 5.7a; Jb 5.17; 32.19), exw (Gn 8.11; Is 62.11c), horaw (Gn 24.63; 26.8; 37.29; 40.6; Ex 2.13), hode (Jg 19.9b; Sl 20.21b; 20.22), pareimi (Is 52.6; Ps 139.8).

43 Twenty-four renderings occur only once. Five renderings represent fourteen occurrences of hinneh--these are limited to Gn; I therefore classify them as unique: epeide (Gn 18.31; 19.19), euthus (Gn 15.4; 24.45; 38.29), hode [e] (Gn 25.24; 38.27), hwsper (Gn 37.9b; 41.18, 22), oiomai (Gn 37.7a; 40.16; 41.1; 41.17).

44 In twenty-four texts all or part of the verse (vs. one word) is lacking in G; in sixty-six passages hinneh is not represented.
Taking into account the various demonstrative and emphatic particles used in G to represent hinneh, it is clear that the translators viewed deixis as hinneh's primary function. The source of idou as a rendering of hinneh is unclear, although its meaning is not.

It is, however, clear that once idou was established as the normative rendering of hinneh, it was used fairly consistently throughout G—so consistently, in fact, that in only three books it represents hinneh in fewer than one-half of its occurrences.

 RENDERINGS OF HINNEH IN G

hinneh occurs 119xx in Genesis, where it is represented by idou (66xx), [e] (5xx), horaw and oiomai (4xx each), ti [e], hwsper, and euthus (3xx each), as well as

45 The overall frequency of these renderings is approximately 85%.

46 idou did not occur as a particle before G (which, regardless of its syntactical function, it must be considered in and after G). E.g., Denniston does not mention it in his study of the particles of Classical Greek (J. D. Denniston, THE GREEK PARTICLES (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934; second edition, 1978)).

47 SS (4/9xx = 44%), Hb (1/4xx = 25%), Hg (0/1xx).

48 This does not include four occurrences in which idou appears with other forms: idou [e] (2xx), idou hwsper and idou houtos (once each).

This figure does include one occurrence of ide (Gn 27.6).
by ten other forms which once\(^49\) or twice\(^50\) each. It is lacking in G 14xx.\(^51\)

The deictic function of hinneh, clearly seen in Gn 12.19, where Pharaoh upbraids Abram for his lie concerning Sarai, is reflected in the G plus (enantion sou):\(^52\)

\[
\text{we'attah hinneh 'isht\(\varepsilon\)ka gax walek} \quad \text{Gn 12.19}
\]
\[
kai nun idou he gune sou enantion sou; labwn apotrexe.
\]

Although idou represents hinneh in Gn 42.22 the sentence has been arranged so that idou is fronted, rather than following its proleptic subject:

\[
\text{we'gam-dam\(\varepsilon\) hinneh nidrash} \quad \text{Gn 42.22}
\]
\[
kai idou to haima autou ekzeteitai.
\]

idou again represents hinneh in Gn 42.28, where an

\(^49\)Renderings that occur once in Gn: exw, houtos [e], and the conjunctions nun, ara ge, and men.

\(^50\)Renderings used twice in Gn: hode [e], hode, epeide, and hoti.

\(^51\)11xx due to translation technique (Gn 12.11; 15.3; 18.10; 24.30; 27.36; 28.13; 37.7b, c, 15; 41.3; 41.23); 3xx because either the clause or verse in which it occurs are minuses in G (Gn 31.51a, b; 50.5).

\(^52\)Although enantion sou may represent l\(\varepsilon\)phaneika which became a minus in H due to homoiarchton.

In Gn enantion (76xx) usually represents either liph\(\varepsilon\)nê (33xx) or b\(\varepsilon\)nê (29xx), although it also represents l\(\varepsilon\)nê (4xx), neged (3xx), l\(\varepsilon\)- (2xx), and (once each) 'et-\(\varepsilon\)nê, pênê, and b\(\varepsilon\)oznê. Twice it appears to be a G plus.
original pronoun (hû') may have fallen out by homoioarchton:53

\[\text{we'gam hinneh b'amtaxtî} \quad \text{Gn 42.28}\]
\[\text{kai idou touto en tw marsippw mou.}\]

*ide* occurs as a variant of *idou* in Rebekkah's instructions in Jacob:

\[\text{hinneh shama'tî 'et-'abîka mëdabber 'el-'esaw} \quad \text{Gn 27.6}\]
\[\text{'axîka}\]
\[\text{ide egw ekousa tou patros sou lalountos pros Esau ton adelphon sou}\]

*idou* [e] represents *hinneh* in G 47.1, where Joseph reports to Pharaoh that his family has arrived:

\[\text{'abî we'axay ... ba'û me'erets këna'an} \quad \text{Gn 47.1}\]
\[\text{we'hinnam be'erets goshen}\]
\[\text{ho pater mou kai hoi adelphoi mou ... elthon ek ges Xanaan, kai idou eisin en ge Gesem.}\]

*houtos* [e], connoting the deictic function *hinneh*, represents its second occurrence in G 20.16, and contrasts with *idou* in the first clause:54

\[\text{ûle'sarah 'amar hinneh natattî 'eleph keseiph} \quad \text{Gn 20.16}\]
\[\text{lë'axik hinneh hû'-lak kësût 'ênayim}\]
\[\text{te de Sarra eipen Idou dedwka xilia didraxma} \quad \text{Gn 20.16}\]
\[\text{tw adelphw sou; tauta estai soi eis timen tou proswpou sou}\]

In two parallel passages, G 25.24 and 38.27, *tede*

\[\]

53 Although it is not unreasonable that *idou touto* represents *hinneh* or, conversely, that *tutto* reflects the preceding *gam*.

54 This may reflect, at least in this verse, the respective verbal and non-verbal nature of these clauses.
(ho + de) [e] corresponds to hinneh—a rendering semantically identical to houtos with [e]:

\[
\text{wayyiml}^\text{e} \text{'y ameyha laledet w}^\text{e} \text{hinneh to}^\text{m} \text{im b}^\text{e} \text{biTnaH} \quad \text{Gn 25.24}
\]
kai eplerwthesan hai hemerai tou tekein auten,
kai tede en diduma en te koilia autes.

\[
\text{wayh}^\text{hi b}^\text{e} \text{'et lidtaH w}^\text{e} \text{hinneh t}^\text{e} \text{'om}^\text{m} \text{im b}^\text{e} \text{biTnaH} \quad \text{Gn 38.27}
\]
egeno\text{te de henika etikten}, kai tede en diduma
en te gastri autes.

\text{hode also represents hinneh in its final occurrence in Gn (50.18), where Joseph's brothers, fearing for their lives now that their father is dead, tell Joseph:}

\[
\text{wayyele}^\text{k} \text{u gam-'exayw wayyipp}^\text{e} \text{l} \text{u l} \text{e} \text{phanayw}
\text{wayyo'\text{m}r}^\text{u hinennn}^\text{u l} \text{k} \text{a la}^\text{\'ab} \text{d} \text{i} \text{m} \quad \text{Gn 50.18}
\]
kai elthontes pros auton eipan hoide hemeis
soi oidetai.

[e] represents hinneh 5xx in Gn. Gn 40.9, where w^e\text{hinneh points (somewhat awkwardly) to the main theme of the chief cupbearer's dream, is a sterling example of the predicatory function of hinneh:}

\[
\text{wayyo'\text{mer l} \text{o b}^\text{ax} \text{\'alom} \text{w}^\text{e} \text{hinneh-gephen l} \text{\e} \text{phanay}
\quad \text{Gn 40.9}
\]
kai eipen En tw hupnw mou en ampelos enantion
mou.;}

In Gn 6.12 hinneh is followed by a participle; the

---

55 Cf. tode alone in Gn 43.21 (below).

56 I.e., without an introductory formula.

57 The same function and rendering occurs in Gn 41.7, where Pharaoh awakes to find that what he had seen was [only?] a dream:

\[
\text{wayyiqats par'oh w}^\text{e} \text{hinneh x}^\text{\a} \text{\l} \text{om} \quad \text{Gn 41.7}
\]
egeterhe de Pharaw, kai en enupnion.
combination is represented by \([e]\), corresponding to hinneh, and a (predicate) adjectival participle:

\[
\text{wayyar} \ '\text{êlohim} \ '\text{et-ha'arets} \ w\text{ê}hìnneh
\]
\[
nishkatah \quad \text{Gn 6.12}
\]
\[
kai \ eiden \ kurios \ ho \ theos \ ten \ gen, \ kai \ en \ katephtharmene
\]

The syntax of Gn 42.35 is somewhat unusual, 'îsh being used to represent the distribution of the sacks among Joseph's brothers; again \([e]\) represents hinneh, but here it appears that idou would much better have represented the force and function of hinneh:\(^58\)

\[
\text{wayhî} \ hem \ m\text{ê}rigîm \ sâqqêhem \ w\text{ê}hìnneh-'îsh
\]
\[
ts\text{ê}r-rôr-kaspô \ bôsaggô \quad \text{Gn 42.35}
\]
\[
eggeneto \ de \ en \ tw \ katanenoun \ autous \ tous \ sakkous \ autwn \ kai \ en \ hekastou \ ho \ desmos \ tou \ arguiou \ en \ tw \ sakkw \ autwn;
\]

In Gn 19.8 \([e]\) (with a dative pronoun) corresponds to hinneh (followed by \(\text{î}e\)), a not infrequent rendering of this idiom of possession:

\[
hìnneh-na' \ lî \ shtê \ banôt \ldots \quad \text{Gn 19.8}
\]
\[
eisin \ de \ moi \ duo \ thugateres, \ldots
\]

\(w\text{ê}hìnneh\) is represented by horaw in several passages, the first when Isaac looks up from his walk in the field:

\[
\text{w}hìnneh \ g\text{ê}mallîm \ ba'îm
\]
\[
eiden \ kamelous \ erxomenas \quad \text{Gn 24.63}
\]

\(^{58}\)When the brothers report this incident to their father, using nearly the same words (with slightly different syntax), hinneh is rendered by tode:

\[
w\text{ê}hìnneh \ kesseph-'îsh \ bôphî \ 'amtaxtô \quad \text{Gn 43.21}
\]
\[
kai \ tode \ to \ argurion \ hekastou \ en \ tw \ marsippw \ autou
In Gn 26.8 the first clause is participially subordinated to the *hinneh*-clause; *hinneh*, represented by *eiden*, is treated as the leading verb:

\[
\text{wayyashqeph } '\text{bimelek melek pelishtim be'ad haxallôn wayyar' wêhinneh yitsxaq mêtsa'eq 'et ribqah 'ishtô } \text{Gn 26.8}
\]

parakupsas de Abimelex ho basileus Gerarwn dia tes thuridos eiden ton Isaak paizonta meta hRebekkas tes gunaikos autou.

The translator again used *horaw* for *hinneh* in Gn 40.6, where both the *hinneh*-clause and its participial predicate appear as independent clauses--the participle being rendered by [e] with a [predicate] adjectival participle:

\[
\text{wayyabo' } '\text{lêhem yôseph babboqer wayyar' 'otam wêhinneh zo'âphîm } \text{Gn 40.6}
\]

eiselthen de pros autous Iwseph to prwi, kai eiden autous, kai esan tetaragmenoi.

In a rendering that is similar, although highly paraphrastic, *wêhinneh 'ên* is represented by *oux horaw*:

\[
\text{wayyashab rê'ûben 'el-habbûr wêhinneh 'ên- yôseph babbôr } \text{Gn 37.29}
\]
anestrepsen de Rouben epi ton lakkon kai oux hora ton Iwseph en tw lâkkw

In Gn 8.11 the translator rendered *hinneh* idiomatically with *kai exw*, reflecting the essence of H:

\[
\text{wêhinneh } '\text{âleh Taraph bêphîha } \text{Gn 8.11}
\]
kai eixen phullon elaias karphos en tw stomati autes

In another idiomatic rendering the translator used *hoti* for *hinneh* to introduce indirect (8.13) or direct (48.1) "discourse":
The use of euthus for hinneh in Gn 24.45, where Abraham's servant, recounting his meeting with Rebekah, highlights the

59Although the meaning is the same, G uses to hudwr as the subject, rather than pēnē ha'adamah. H: "He looked and the face of the ground was dried up"; G: "He saw that the water had left the face of the earth."

Ekleipw represents xareb only here (twice) and Is 19.5 (referring to a drought in Egypt that will even dry up the Nile).

60 In the next verse, however, hinneh in the same syntagm appears as idou:

wayyagged lēya'aqob wayyo'mer hinneh binka yōseph ba' 'eleyka Gn 48.2 apeggele de tw Iakwb legontes Idou ho huios sou Iwseph erxetai pros se.

This sequence points to an idiomatic translation style far removed from a concordantial approach based on a philosophy of exact correspondence.

61 egeneto may also reflect the predicative function of hinneh, although its location seems to stress the "movement" of the Word of YHWH from God to Abram, rather than its presence.
immediacy of her entrance before he could finish praying:62

'ānî Terem 'ākalleh lēdabber 'el-libbî
wehinneh ribqah yotse'î ...   Gn 24.45
kai egeneto pro tou suntelesai me lalounta en
teiānoia euthus hRebekka eceperueto ...

nun represents hinneh63 in Gn 18.27 and epeide in
18.31, although the clauses are identical in H. epeide,

hinneh-na' hō'altî lēdabber 'el-'ādonay   Gn 18.27
Nun ercamen lalesai pros ton kurion,
Epeide exw lalesai pros ton kurion,   Gn 18.31

In Gn 22.7 the translator represented Abraham's
response to Isaac with ti estin,65 perhaps to
distinguish Abraham's response to God from that to his

wayyo'mer yitsxaq 'el-'abraham 'abîw wayyo'mer
'abî wayyo'mer hinnennî bēnî wayyo'mer hinneh
ha'esh wēha'etsîm ...   Gn 22.7 (twice)
eipen de Isaak pros Abraam ton patera autou
eipas Pater. ho de eipen Ti estin, teknon;
legwn Idou to pur kai ta cula ...
This explanation cannot apply, however, to Jacob's responses to either the angel (Gn 31.11) or to God (Gn 46.2), which may imply that the translator saw ti [e] as a normal answer to a summons.

wa'omar hinnenî
egw de eipa Ti estin?

Gn 31.11

wayyo'mer hinnenî
ho de eipen Ti estin?

Gn 46.2

In Gn 26.9, when Abimelek confronts Isaac with his discovery that he is married to Rebekkah, the translator represented 'ak hinneh by interrogative ara ge, so that Abimelek's charge ("She is actually your wife!") becomes a [rhetorical] question ("Is she actually your wife?"): 69

wayyo'mer 'ak hinneh 'ishtëka hiw'

Gn 26.9

kai eipen autw ara ge gune sou estin

idou represents hinneh's first occurrence and hwsper the second in Gn 37.9, Joseph's account of his second dream:

66 Note that estin is not inflected to reflect the [person of the] speaker.

67 'ak (159xx) occurs with hinneh only here.

68 It would be arbitrary to assign a particular correspondence between the elements of G and H.

69 'ak in Gn (14xx) is rendered by adverbial monon (4xx), and once each by alla, hws, gar, eti, plen, epeide, hoti, and ara (this text); two occurrences are minuses in G.
Here _hwsper_ must mean "in which..." or "namely (that)...", since its usual sense "[just] as" does not seem to fit this context.

_hwsper_ appears again, but this time following _idou_, in Gn 41.2, the account of the substance of Pharaoh's first dream:

\[\text{wehinneh min-hay'}or \, 'olot \, sheba' \, parôt \, y'éphôt \, mar'eh}...\]

Here too it is difficult to explain the nuance of _hwsper_, since "[just] as" does not seem to fit the context.

_ment_ corresponds to _hinneh_ in Gn 38.23, where Jacob calls off the hunt for Tamar, whom he supposed a prostitute. This is balanced nicely by the use of _de_ for the conjunction in the second clause:

---

70"Just as" being a term of comparison, not of sequence (or overlap).

71_wehinneh_ occurs three times in this narration of Pharaoh's first dream (Gn 41.1-3), where it is rendered by [1] ... _oiomai_ ... [2] _kai idou hwsper_ ... [3] _de_ ...

Its third occurrence is not represented, probably because the translator wanted to avoid repeating it, which he has already done to some extent by his first two renderings.
Wehinneh occurs three times in Gn 37.7 when Joseph recounts his first dream to his brothers. None of these occurrences are represented by idou, the first being rendered by oiomai, and its second and third occurrences by kai and de, respectively: 72

Did the translator consider the dream striking enough to stand without emphasis? He considered at least its first occurrence introductory to the content of the dream, representing it with oiomai "I think, ween", 73 which should probably be understood as an equivalent of horaw (above). 74

72 Wegam (between the second and third occurrences of wehinneh) is also not represented.

73 Cf. Longacre, JOSEPH (210), where this first clause is seen as the setting of the dream to follow.

74 Cf. Gn 37.9, Joseph's second dream, where the first occurrence of hinneh is rendered by idou but the second by hwsper (above).
oiomai appears again when the chief baker recounts his dream to Joseph (40.16): 75

'ap-'ānī baxālōmī wēhinneh ṣēloshah sallē xorî 'al-ro'shî
Gn 40.16
Kagw eidon enupnion, kai wmen tria kana xondritwn airein epi tes kephales mou;

It is difficult to explain the difference between this rendering and the use of [e] in the preceding dream narrative (40.9) apart from some stylistic consideration (i.e., desire for variation) on the part of the translator.

This is probably due to a tendency to introduce dreams with oiomai, even though the translator does not do this consistently, 76 since oiomai appears in both the next occurrence of hinneh (Gn 41.1; when Pharaoh's dreams begin), and again when Pharaoh begins to recount his dreams to Joseph for his interpretation (41.17): 77

75 With rather awkward baxālōmī wēhinneh (cf. Gn 40.9, above).

76 Cf. Jacob's dream at Bethel (Gn 28.13), where hinneh is not represented (below).

77 The inconsistency between the renderings of the occurrences of hinneh in the narration and recitation of Pharaoh's dreams is striking. hinneh occurs 10xx in five parallel passages in Gn 41.1-23; only its first parallel occurrences, however, are rendered identically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dream</th>
<th>Recitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>oiomai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>idou hwsper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pharaw eiden enupnion. weto hestanai epi tou potamou,

baxalômî hinênî ʻomêd 'al sephat hay'or

En tw hupnw mou wmen hestanai para to xeilos tou potamou,

In Gn 12.11 hinneh appears not to be represented, although its force may be reflected in the independent pronoun following the verb:

hinneh-na' yada'tî ki 'ishshah ye-phat-mar'eh 'att
giwskw egw hotî gune euproswpos ei

Again in Gn 15.3 hinneh is not represented, although its prefixed conjunction is part of G:

wehinneh ben-bêtî yôresh 'otî

ho de oikogenes mou kleronomesei me

hinneh is also not represented in Gn 18.10, probably because Sarah (rather than ben) has been made the subject of the sentence by using the future of exw:

wehinneh-ben 1º sarah 'ishteka

kai hecei huion Sarra he gune sou

In Gn 24.30 (we)hinneh is not represented because the two clauses are united using a genitive absolute to

In two other occurrences in Gn 41 hinneh is rendered by [e] (41.7) and idou (41.29).

78 Final [e] represents the independent pronoun rather than hinneh.

79 Here, as frequently, the participle following hinneh is rendered by a finite verb.
render the participle following hinneh. This syntax makes the representation of hinneh superfluous:

\[ \text{wayyabo' 'el-ha'ish wen\text{hinneh} 'omed \text{al-hagg\text{mallim} 'al-ha'ayin} } \]
\[ \text{Gn 24.30 kai elthen pros ton anthrwpon hestekotos autou } \]
\[ \text{epi tw kamelwn epi tes peges,} \]

\[ \text{hinneh is a minus in Esau's description of Jacob's trickery (Gn 27.36), perhaps because its force is entailed in the following } \text{`attah (nun)--what would idou or any other particle add?:} \]

\[ \text{`et-he\text{koratî laqax wen\text{hinneh} `attah laqax birkatî } \]
\[ \text{Gn 27.36 ta te prwtotokia mou eilephen, kai nun } \]
\[ \text{eilephen ten eulogian mou.} \]

In Gn 28.13, Jacob's dream of the ladder, hinneh is also a G minus:

\[ \text{wen\text{hinneh YHWH nitstsab `alayw} \]
\[ \text{Gn 28.13 ho de kurios epesterikto ep autes} \]

By rendering the H participle with a participle in G, the translator made hinneh, the predicator of the participle in H, superfluous:

\[ \text{wayyimtsa'ehû 'îsh wen\text{hinneh to`eh bassadeh} } \]
\[ \text{Gn 37.15 kai heuren auton anthrwpos planwmenon en tw pediw;} \]

The translator, therefore, was fairly free in

---

80 episterizw (only here in Gn) occurs 12xx in G, rendering [forms of] seven different verbal roots. This is the only passage in which it represents any form of natsab. Did the translator perhaps read nitstsab as ya'ats (rendered by episterizw only in Ps 31.8 (32.8))? 81 A participle of "concommitant circumstance".
representing *hinneh*, using *idou* in only 62.9% of its occurrences.

In Exodus (41xx) *hinneh* is rendered by *idou* (25xx), *hode*, *hoti*, and *[e]* (each 2xx), and once each by *horaw*, *horaw oun*, *ti [e]*, *ginomai*, and *palin*. It is a minus in G (4xx; 2.6; 14.10; 16.10; 31.6); one verse in which it occurs is lacking in G (32.9).

The element of perception implicit in *hinneh* is made explicit by *horaw* in 2.13, where the main clause in H is subordinated to the [now] verbal *hinneh*-clause:

```
ecelthwn de te hemera te deutera hora duo
andras Ebraious dialektizomenous Ex 2.13
wayyetse' bayyôm hashshenî wëhinneh shëné-
'ãhashîm `ibrîm nitstsîm
```

It is, however, difficult to discern why *hinneh* is rendered by *horaw* in Moses' declaration of intent to Pharaoh, especially since no perception was [yet] involved:

```
hinneh 'anoki horeg 'et-binka bëkoreka Ex 4.23
hora oun egy apoktenw ton huion sou ton
prwtotokon 82
```

82 The plus oun is easier to understand, this being the ultimate conclusion to which events could come to pass.

A nearly identical statement, the same syntagm, is rendered with *idou*, however, three chapters later:

```
we'im ma'en 'attah lëshalleâx hinneh 'anokî
nogeph 'et-kol-gëbûlka ... Ex 7.27
```

```
ei de me boulei su ecaposteilai, idou egw
tuptw panta ta horia sou tois batraxois.
```

Ex 10.4 (= 16.4) is also identical syntactically, differing only lexically with regard to the participle/verb.
hode\textsuperscript{83} represents hinneh in Ex 8.25, but this does not seem a felicitous use of this rendering, which is demonstrative:

\begin{quote}
wayyo'\textsuperscript{mer} moshe\textsuperscript{h} hinneh 'anokî yôtse\textsuperscript{e} me\textsuperscript{m}im\textsuperscript{ak} eipen de Mwuses hode egw ecleusomai apo sou
\end{quote}

hode also renders hinneh in Ex 17.6, where hinneh is followed by a participle, but its pronominal subject is suffixed, not independent (as in 8.25):

\begin{quote}
hi\textsuperscript{ne}nî 'omed l\textsuperscript{e}phaney\textsuperscript{x}a sham 'al-hatstsûr b\textsuperscript{e}xoreb hode egw hesteka pro tou se ekei epi tes petras en Xwreb
\end{quote}

hoti renders hinneh in Ex 3.2, where the angel of YHWH appeared to Moses in the burning, yet unconsumed, bush. This represents hinneh's function in introducing indirect discourse:

\begin{quote}
wayyar' w\textsuperscript{e}hinneh hass\textsuperscript{e}neh bo'er ba'esh kai hora hoti ho batos kaietai puri
\end{quote}

hoti also occurs in Ex 9.7 when the translator subordinated the entire clause, including the governing verb, to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart:

\begin{quote}
wayyish\textsuperscript{a}x par\textsuperscript{`o}h w\textsuperscript{e}hinneh lo'-met mimmi\textsuperscript{ne}h yisra'el 'ad-'exad wayyikbad leb par\textsuperscript{`o}h id\textsuperscript{w}n de Pharaw hoti ouk eteleutesen apo pantwn ktenwn twn hyiwn Israel ouden, ebarunte he kardia Pharaw\textsuperscript{84}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{83}xx in Gn (above).

\textsuperscript{84}The G plusses appear to be a formalization and dramatization of Israel's freedom from the plague: "... all the herds of the sons of Israel".
ti [e], which also occurs in Gn,\(^85\) appears in Moses' response to YHWH's summons in Ex 3.4:

\[
\text{wayyo'mer mosheh mosheh wayyo'mer hinnenî Ex 3.4}
\]

exalesen auton kurios ek tou batou legwn Mwuse, Mwuse. ho de eipen Ti estin?

[e] in an analytic tense with a perfect participle represents hinneh, perhaps because the element of surprise is not present (for the reader) since the previous verse narrated the change in Moses' appearance:

\[
\text{wayyar' 'aharon wekol-benê yisra'el 'et-mosheh wehinneh qaran 'ôr panayw Ex 34.30}
\]

kai eiden Aarwn kai pantes hoi presbuteroi Israel ton Mwusen kai en dedocasmene he opsis tou xrwmatos tou proswpou autou\(^85\)

In the next (and final) occurrence of hinneh it is also rendered by [e] in an analytic tense with a perfect participle:

\[
\text{wayyar' mosheh 'et-kol-hammêla'kah wehinneh 'ásû 'otaH Ex 39.43 (39.23)}
\]

kai eiden Mwuses panta ta erga, kai esan pepoiekotes auta

hinneh precedes a verb only elsewhere in Ex 7.16, where it is rendered by idou with a verb. Do these passages (Ex 34.30; 39.43) betray the hand of another translator in the latter portion of Ex?

The resultative function of hinneh is represented by the aorist of ginomai in Ex 4.6:

\(^85\)Gn 22.7; 31.11; 46.2. Its use is confined to these two books.

\(^86\)In Ex qaran (3xx) is only rendered by the perfect of docazw.
In the following verse, which parallels 4.6, hinneh is uniquely rendered by palin, Moses, having again plunged his hand into the bosom of his garment,

\[ \text{wayyotsi}aH \, \text{mexeq}6 \, \text{wehinneh-shabah} \, \text{kib}^\text{esar}6 \]

In Ex 2.6 hinneh is a minus in G, perhaps by parablepsis:

\[ \text{wattiphtax} \, \text{wattir}^\text{eh}u \, 'et-hayyeled \, \text{wehinneh-na}^\text{ar} \, \text{bokeh} \]

hinneh is also lacking in Ex 14.10 where, as in Ex 9.7, the "main clause" is subordinated to the following verb:

\[ \text{wayyis}^\text{e}u \, \text{b}^\text{e}n\text{e}-\text{yisra}^\text{el} \, 'et-\text{\-'en}\text{e}hem \, \text{wehinneh} \]

In Ex 16.10 hinneh is a minus in G, but here the participial hinneh-clause has been rendered paratactically, without either being subordinated to the other:

\[ \text{wayyire}^\text{u} \, \text{me}^\text{r}od \]

---

87 Probably due to d/r: 'et-hayyeled ... na`ar.

In Ex paidion represents yeled (9xx) or ben (3xx), never na`ar (4xx in Ex), which is rendered instead by neaniskos (10.9; 24.5) and neos (33.11).
wayyiphnu 'el-hammidbar w'hinneh kēbōd YHWH
nir'ah be'anan
kai epestraphesan eis ten eremon, kai he doca
kuriou wphthe en nephele

hinneh is a G minus in Ex 31.6. An original idou
could have been lost due to homoioarchton (egw... edwka), although it is just as likely that the different
order (the pronoun preceding rather than following hinneh) caused it to be overlooked:

wa'anî hinneh natattî 'ittō 'et 'ohōlî'ab ben-
'āxisamak
kai egw edwka auton kai ton Eliab ton tou
Axisamak_

The translator was fairly consistent in
representing hinneh (69%), although it is striking that
in its first eleven occurrences in Ex hinneh is rendered
in seven different ways: by idou (4xx: Ex 1.9; 3.9, 13;
4.14), horaw (2.13; with oun 4.23), hoti (3.2), ti [e]
(3.4), ginomai (4.6), palin (4.7), and is lacking once
(2.6). Between 4.23 and 34.30 hinneh, where occurs
28xx, only idou (21xx), hode (2xx), and hoti (once)
render it (four of five minuses also occur in this
section).

88 The translator read 'ittō as 'otō.
In Leviticus (26xx)\textsuperscript{89} hinneh is rendered by idou (20xx), hode (2xx), and once each by [e] and ei. Two occurrences are not represented.\textsuperscript{90}

Its first seventeen occurrences in Lv 13 are all rendered by idou, but its first occurrence in Lv and its final eight are not at all consistently rendered.\textsuperscript{91}

In its first occurrence (Lv 10.16) hinneh is rendered by hode, which represents well its force:\textsuperscript{92}

\begin{verbatim}

\textit{we}hinneh soraph
\textit{LV 10.16}
\textit{kai hode enepepuristo;

hode also occurs in Lv 13.55 which is, however, more difficult to explain, since it was consistently rendered by idou twenty times in the same chapter:

\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{89} 20xx in Lv 13; 5xx in Lv 14.

\textsuperscript{90} Lv 13.53; 14.37 (the latter due to haplography, below).

\textsuperscript{91} Note the pattern of its renderings throughout Lv:

\begin{verbatim}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>idou (20xx!)</th>
<th>idou</th>
<th>[e]</th>
<th>idou</th>
<th>idou</th>
<th>idou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>hode</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>idou</td>
<td>--- (homoioarchton)</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5-43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This variety is all the more striking in that the syntagms in which it occurs in chapters 13 and 14 are virtually identical.

\textsuperscript{92} This is its only occurrence in Lv not preceded by a sight-formula.
Its preceding occurrence, Lv 13.53, is not represented in G, possibly in order to avoid an exactly duplicate text (below):

\[ \text{wē'm} \text{ym yir'eh hakkohen wēhinneh lo'-pasah hannega' babbeged} \quad \text{Lv 13.53} \\
\text{ean de ide ho hiereus, kai me diaxeetai he aphe en tw himatiw, ...} \]

In Lv 14.37 hinneh, along with the following hannega' is also a minus due to homoioarchton:

\[ \text{wēra'ah 'et-hannega' wēhinneh hannega' bēqīrot habbayit} \quad \text{Lv 14.37} \\
kai opsetai ten aphen en tois toixois tes oikias, \]

Parallel passages account for half (3) of the passages in Lv in which idou does not represent hinneh.\(^{93}\) Could this represent an attempt by the translator to avoid exactly duplicate passages? This does not seem, however, to fit his use of idou in chapter 13.

The translator of Leviticus was thus relatively consistent in rendering hinneh (83.3%), the other

\(^{93}\)hinneh occurs in four pairs of clauses that are not merely parallel, but identical. In only one of these, however, is it rendered in the same way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>idou</th>
<th>[e]</th>
<th>13.56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
renderings occurring primarily in parallel passages, apparently for the sake of variety.

In Numbers (28xx) hinneh is rendered by idou (18xx), hode (3xx), nun (2xx), and idou hode, ede, and [e] (once each). It is not represented in two passages.94

When Balak describes Israel to Balaam, idou represents hinneh (Nu 22.11, which parallels Nu 22.5):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hinneh} & \quad \text{`am yatsa' mimmitsrayim hinneh kissah} \\
\text{idou} & \quad \text{et-`en ha'arets} \\
\text{Nu 22.5} & \quad \text{idou laos eceleluthen ec Aiguptou, kai idou} \\
\text{katekalupsen ten opsin tes ges}^{95} \\
\text{hinneh} & \quad \text{ha'am hayyotse' mimmitsrayim waykas} \\
\text{idou} & \quad \text{et-`en ha'arets} \\
\text{Nu 22.11} & \quad \text{idou laos eceleluthen ec Aiguptou, kai idou} \\
\text{kekaluphen ten opsin tes ges}
\end{align*}
\]

hinneh occurs once in 22.11, but twice in 22.5. idou, however, occurs twice in 22.11, under the influence of 22.5.

idou with hode renders hinnenu\(^96\) in Nu 14.40, where

---

94 Nu 18.6; 32.23.

95 On the G plus kai, cf. also Nu 22.32.

96 A personal pronoun renders the (3ms) pronominal suffix on hinneh. In Nu 24.14 the pronominal suffix is a minus in G:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{we'attah hinnêni hólek le`ammi} \\
\text{Nu 24.14} & \quad \text{kai nun idou apotrezw eis ton topon mou}
\end{align*}
\]

The use of topos for `am here is problematic, since topos represents magôm (18/20xx in Nu; except here and 19.3, where topos is a G plus, perhaps due to the influence of Nu 19.9).

`am is usually rendered by laos (76/78xx in Nu); four other occurrences of laos do not have clear equivalents.
the people "repent" of their rebellion and determine to invade the land on their own:

le'mor hinnennû wᵉ'alînû 'el-hammaqôm Nu 14.40
legontes idou hoide hemeis anabesometha eis
ton topon,

hode alone renders hinneh, again⁹⁷ as nearly
equivalent to houtos which, however, the translator of
Nu did not use for hinneh:

wayyiphnû 'el-'ohel mô'ed wᵉhinneh kissahû
he'anan Nu 17.7 (16.42)
kai hwrmesan epi ten skenen tou marturiou, kai
tende ekalupsen auten he nephele

wayyashab 'elayw wᵉhinneh nitstsa'b 'al-'olatô
Nu 23.6
kai apestrape pros auton, kai hode
epheistekei epi twî holokautwmatwn autou⁹⁸

The simple predicatory function of hinneh is
represented by [e] in Nu 32.1:

wayyir'û 'et-'erets ya`zer w'et-'erets gîl`ad
wᵉhinneh hammaqôm mᵉqôm migneh Nu 32.1
kai eidon ten xwran Iazer kai ten xwran
Galaad, kai en ho topos topos ktenesin

It thus seems that the translator either had a
different Vorlage, or was being unusually free—perhaps,
in cryptic allusion to Balaam's fate (Nu 31.8; Js
13.22), using "place" as a euphemism for "grave".

⁹⁷ 3xx (Nu 17.7; 23.6 12); cf. on Gn (above).

⁹⁸ 23.17, which is parallel, but has a pronominal
suffix on hinneh, uses the same rendering:
wayyabo' 'elayw wᵉhinno nitstsa'b 'al-'olatô
Nu 23.17
kai apestrape pros auton, kai hode
epheistekei epi tes holokautwsews autou
The sacrifice is plural in G in 23.6, but singular here.
I have no explanation for this, especially in light of
the context which specifies seven altars and sacrifices
in each case.
That the plague halted immediately becomes explicit in Nu 17.12 in G through the use of ede:

\[\text{wayyarats 'el-tōk haqqahal wehinneh hexel hannegeph ba'am Nu 17.12 (16.47) kai edramen eis ten sunagwgen; kai ede enerkto he thrausis en tw law}\]

\text{nun indicates the same thrust (of the immediate present) in Nu 20.16; the personal pronoun following hinneh is rendered by [e]:}

\[\text{wehinneh 'anaxnū beqadesh 'īr getseh gebuleka Nu 20.16 kai nun esmen en Kades, polei ek merous twn horiwn sou}\]

In Nu 24.11, however, nun represents hinneh in a conclusive or adversative sense "however":

\[\text{'amarti kabbed 'akabbedka wehinneh mēna'aka YHWH mikkabōd Nu 24.11 eipa Timesw se, kai nun esteresen se kurios tes doces}\]

\text{hinneh is a minus in G at Nu 18.6, whereas in three other occurrences of the same syntagm in Nu--hinneh preceded or followed by a pronoun with a verb--it is rendered by idou:}

\[\text{wa'anī hinneh laqaxtī 'et-'ażēhem halwiyyim mittōk benē-yisra'el Nu 18.6 kai egw eilepha tous adelphous humwn tous Leuitas ek mesous huiwn Israel}\]

\text{hinneh is also lacking in Nu 32.23, its final occurrence in the book:}

\[99\text{Indeed, the translation of this clause could have been much more explicit through the use of nun de or alla nun (as reads MS 126).}\]

\[100\text{Cf. Nu 3.12; 18.8 (only two vv. later); 22.32.}\]
hinneh here is conclusive ("If you do not do this, then you will have sinned against YHWH"). If the translator did not recognize its function, he may simply have omitted it.

The translator of Numbers was thus somewhat consistent in representing hinneh (69%), although, like the translator of Gn, he used a variety of conjunctions to represent its function, sometimes quite idiomatically, although there were several passages in which it would have been appropriate to render it thus where he simply used idou.

In Deuteronomy (10xx) hinneh is represented by idou (7xx) and once each by idou [e], hoti, and nun.101

idou [e] occurs for hinneh in Dt 1.10 (its first occurrence in Dt), where hinneh is conclusive "so that":

\[ w^\circ \text{hinneh }^* \text{emet nacôn haddabar} \]
\[ \text{kai idou alethes saphws ho logos} \quad \text{Dt 13.15} \]

\[ w^\circ \text{hinneh }^* \text{emet nacôn haddabar} \]
\[ \text{kai idou alethws gegonen to hrema} \quad \text{Dt 17.4} \]
YHWH, Elohim, hirbah 'etkem w^hinn^kem hayyôm k^xôkëbë hashshamayim larob Dt 1.10 kurios ho theos humwn eplethunen humas, kai idou este semeron hwsei ta astra tou ouranou tw plethei

nun represents [we]hinneh in Dt 22.17, perhaps because the accuser's "wanton" words had already been spoken; they were not present, although their effects certainly lingered:

w^hinnë-hû' sam 'alîlot d^bârîm Dt 22.17 autos nun epitithesis aute prophasistikous logous

In Dt 9.16, where w^hinnë introduces what is seen, it is rendered by hotî, which also introduces indirect discourse in G:

wa're' w^hinnë xàTa'tem l^YHWH 'Elohim kai idwn hotî hemartete enanti kuriou tou theou humwn102

The translator of Deuteronomy, although not literal, was somewhat consistent in representing hinneh (70%).

hinneh occurs 15xx in Joshua, where it is rendered by idou (7xx), and once each by houtos [e] and houtos. It is lacking in six passages.103

---

102 In 9.13, however, where w^hinnë also follows ra'ah, it is rendered as kai idou (the nature of the clauses, verbal (9.16) versus non-verbal (9.13) may have affected his choice.

103 Js 2.2; 5.13; 8.20; 9.12; 14.10a; 23.14.
In Js 7.22 Achan’s loot is discovered in his tent.

Here houtos [e] represents hinneh:

\[
\text{we'}\text{hinneh Temûnah be'ohOlô Js 7.22}
\]
\[
kai tauta en egkekrummena eis ten skenen,104
\]

The use of idou auta to describe the same items (7.21) is the climax of the passage; the translator may have used tauta in 7.22 to reflect hinneh in order to leave the stress on Achan’s confession. He may, however, have seen tauta as an adequate rendering of hinneh because of verse 21 and its use of auta.

houtos alone represents hinneh (9.13) when the Gibeonites are presenting their worn-out wine-skins to Joshua and the elders, probably because of the preceding houtoi:

\[
\text{we'elleh no'dôt hayyayin 'asher mille'nû}
\]
\[
xadashîm we'hinneh hitbaqqa'û Js 9.13
\]
\[
kai houtoi hoi askoi tou oinou, ãous eplesamen
\]
\[
kainous, kai houtoi errwgasin,105
\]

104 In Js 7.21 Achan’s confession, more verbose than this narrative description of the discovery, but nonetheless parallel, hinneh is rendered by idou:

\[
\text{we'hinnam Temûnim ba'arets be'tôk ha'ohOlî Js 7.21}
\]
\[
wêhakkeseph taxteyha
\]
\[
kai idou auta egkekruptai en te ge en te skene mou, kai to argurion kekruptai hupokatw autwn.
\]

105 In a parallel occurrence in the preceding verse (9.12), hinneh is not represented:

\[
\text{zeh laxmenû xam hitsTayyadnû 'otô mibbatênû}
\]
\[
be'yôm tse'tenû laleket 'alêkem wê'attah hinneh yabesh we'hayah niggûdim Js 9.12
\]
\[
houtoi hoi ârtoi, thermous ephwdiasthemen autous en te hemera, he ecelthomen parageneshthai pros humas, nun de eceranthesan kai gegonasin bebrwmenoi
\]

This is not because he wanted to avoid a construction such as kai nun idou (for wê'attah hinneh), since he
In Js 5.13 Joshua met the commander of YHWH's army. Here the use of an adverbial participle with *eiden* renders any representation of *hinneh* superfluous, although it may have been the translator's view that the presence of a verb of seeing rendered *idou* superfluous: 106

\[
\text{wayyissa' 'ênayw wayyar' wêhinneh-'îsh 'ômed lênegdô kai anablepsas tois ophthalmois eiden anthrwpon hestekota enantion autou,}^{107}
\]

Again in Js 8.20 hinneh is not represented due to the preceding verb:

\[
\text{wayyiphnu 'anshe ha 'ay 'axărêhem wayyir'û wêhinneh 'alah 'âshan ha 'îr hashshamaymah kai periblepsantes hoi katoikoi Gai eis ta opisw autwn kai ethewroun kapnon anabainonta ek tes polews eis ton ouranon;}^{107}
\]

In Js 2.2, however, the reason for the minus of hinneh is unclear:

\[
\text{wayye'amar lêmelek yerixo le'mor hinneh 'ânashîm ba 'û hennah hallaylah mibbê'nê yisra'el kai apeggele tw basilei Ierixw legontes Eispeporeuntai hwde andres twn huiwn Israel}
\]

hinneh occurs twice in Js 14.10, but only its second occurrence is represented in G, perhaps due to uses this twice (9.25; 10.14b).

106 It is unlikely, due to the evidence of other passages (below), that *wehinneh* is lacking due to homoioarchton.

107 Note the relatively infrequent use of a G participle to render a participle with *hinneh* (but cf. Js 8.20).
the verbal and non-verbal nature of the respective clauses:

\[ w^\text{e} \text{attah hinneh hex}^\text{eyah YHWH 'otî ka'\text{Asher} dibber ...} \]
\[ w^\text{e} \text{attah hinneh 'anokî hayyôm ben-xamesh ûsh}^\text{emônîm shanah} \quad \text{Js 14.10 (2xx)} \]
\[ \text{kai nun diethrepsen me kurios, hon tropon, ... kai nun idou egw seameron ogdœkonta kai pente etwn;} \]

Joshua predicates the need for Israel to renew the covenant with YHWH on his impending death (Js 23.14).

Here, too, hinneh is not represented in G, although the conjunction prefixed to it appears as de:

\[ w^\text{e} \text{hinneh 'anokî hîlekh hayyôm b}^\text{ederek kol-}
\]
\[ \text{ha'arets} \quad \text{Js 23.14} \]
\[ \text{egw de apotrexxw ten hodon katha kai pantes hoi epi tes ges} \]

The translator of Joshua used idou with relative consistency when he represented hinneh (77%). He tended nearly as strongly, however, to leave it unrepresented (40%) due to contextual considerations (or other considerations no longer clear).

When representing hinneh the A and B texts of Judges (44xx) are nearly identical: idou (40xx)\(^{108}\) and, once each, idou [e], hode,\(^{109}\) and hwde (19.9b). hinneh is not represented once.\(^{110}\)

\(^{108}\)B once has ide (19.24).

\(^{109}\)B has idou (9.31b).

\(^{110}\)B has idou de (21.19).
When Samson investigates the carcass of the lion in Jg 14.8 idou ... [e] appears to represent hinneh,\textsuperscript{111} despite the separation between them, with [e] representing the predication posited by hinneh:

\[ \text{wehineh} \text{'a}d\text{at d'bôrîm big'wiyyat ha'aryeh} \]
\[ \text{Ud}ebash \quad \text{Jg 14.8} \]
\[ \text{kai idou sustrophe melisswn en tw stomati tou leontos kai meli en.} \]

hode represents the second occurrence of hinneh in Jg 9.31:\textsuperscript{112}

\[ \text{hinneh ga'\text{al ben-'ebed w'exayw ba'îm sh'kemah} \]
\[ \text{wehinnam tsarîm 'et-ha'îr 'aleyka} \quad \text{Jg 9.31 (2xx)} \]
\[ \text{idou Gaal huios Abed kai hoi adelphoi autou paragegonasin eis Sikima, kai hoi de poliorkousin ten polin epi se} \]

The clause containing the second occurrence of hinneh in Jg 19.9 is a minus in G due to homoioarchton:

\[ \text{wayyo'mer lô xot'enô 'abî hanna'arah hinneh na'} \]
\[ \text{raphah hayyôm la'arob lînu'-na' hinneh x'ûnôt} \]
\[ \text{hayyôm lîn poh wyîTab l'îbabeka} \quad \text{Jg 19.9 (2xx)} \]
\[ \text{kai eipen autw hō gambros autou hō pater tes neanidös Idou de eis hesperan kekkilen he hemera; kataluson hwde eti semeron kai agathunthetw he kardia sou.} \]

The penultimate occurrence of hinneh in Jg (21.19) is a minus in G.\textsuperscript{113} Its function here is clearly that of predication "There is a feast ..."

\textsuperscript{111}idou (without [e]) in Judges B.
\textsuperscript{112}Jg B has idou.
\textsuperscript{113}Jg B: idou de.
The translator of Judges A was thus quite consistent in rendering hinneh (93%).

In 1 Samuel (82xx) hinneh is rendered by idou (68xx), hwde (2xx), and once each by idou [e] (20.12) and hoti (24.2). It is a minus in G 7xx.

In S1 14.26 hinneh is represented by idou, although G has melliswn for ya`ar. It occurs again, this time as a G plus, in the following clause (kai idou ouk en for we`ên):

---

The renderings in which the two texts differ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Jg A</th>
<th>Jg B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>idou</td>
<td>ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.31b</td>
<td>hode</td>
<td>idou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>idou de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jg B is thus statistically just consistent in rendering hinneh as Jg A (93%), although both share two of the other renderings: idou [e] (14.8) and hwde (19.9b). Jg B, in fact, uses only one rendering not found in A (ide; 19.24, above).

This does not include three passages in which is appears to be rendered by idou de [with eta, not epsilon] (2xx) and idou houtos (once).

Due apparently to scribal error or choice (5xx) or because the verse in which it occurs is lacking in G (2xx).

Cf. idou ouk [e] for 'ên also in S1 21.10 (below).
The conjunction is not represented in S1 16.11, Jesse's description of David:

```
`6d sha'ar haqqaTan wēhinneh ro`eh batstso'n S1 16.11
eti ho mikros idou poimainei en tw poimniw.
```

**idou** [e] represents **hinneh** when Jonathan declares to David his intent to discover what, if any, plans Saul has against him:

```
wēhinneh-Tōb 'el-dawid S1 20.12
kai idou agathon e peri Dauid
```

The subjunctive of [e] indicates that Jonathan's statement is conditional.

**hoti** renders **hinneh** in S1 24.2, where it introduces a direct quotation:

```
wayyaggidō lō le'mor hinneh dawid bēmidbar `ēn gedī S1 24.2
kai apeggele autw legontwn hoti Dauid en te eremw Eggaddi.
```

The translator probably used **hwde** to represent **hinneh** in S1 20.21 and 22 because, influenced by the context, he read it as **hennah**.

---

118 Its first occurrence in this verse (wēhinneh) is rendered as **kai idou** (these are the only occurrences of hwde in S1).
'im-'amor 'omar lanna'ar hinneh haxitstsim mimm\(^{\text{e}}\)ka wahennah \(\text{S1 20.21}\) ean eipw legwn tw paidariw hwde he sxiza apo sou kai hwde

\(\text{we}^{\text{e}}\) 'im-koh 'omar la\`elem hinneh haxitstsim mimm\(^{\text{e}}\)ka wahal\(^{\text{e}}\)ah \(\text{S1 20.22}\) ean tade eipw tw neaniskw hode he sxiza apo sou kai epekeina

\text{hinneh} is not represented in \(\text{S1 13.10}\), the participial \text{hinneh}-clause being treated paratactically:\(^{119}\)

\begin{align*}
\text{wayhī k\text{\text{e}}\text{kallotō l\text{\text{e}}\text{ha´alōt ha´olah we\text{\text{e}}\text{hinneh sh\text{\text{e}}mū\text{\text{e}}\text{el ba}}}} & \text{S1 13.10} \\
\text{kai egeneto hws sunetelesen anapherwn ten holokautwsin, kai Samouel paraginetai}
\end{align*}

\text{hinneh} is also a \text{G} minus in \(\text{S1 14.33}\), perhaps due to homoioarchton with the following word:

\begin{align*}
\text{wayyaggidú l\text{\text{e}}\text{sha´ul le'mor hinneh ha´am xoT\text{\text{i}}\text{ym l\text{\text{e}}\text{YHWH}} & \text{S1 14.33} \\
\text{kai apeggele tw Saoul legontes hemarteken ho laos tw kuriw}
\end{align*}

It is also lacking in \(\text{S1 26.21}\), again probably due to homoioarchton, but this time with the preceding word:

\begin{align*}
\text{... taxat `\text{\text{a}}\text{sher yaq\text{\text{e}}\text{rah naphshī b\text{\text{e}}\text{\text{e}}\text{\text{e}}\text{neyka hayyôm hazzeh hinneh hiskaltī ... S1 26.21}} \\
\text{... anth' hwn entimos psuxe mou en ophthalmois sou en te semeron; memataiwmai} \ldots
\end{align*}

I have no explanation, however, for its omission in \(\text{S1 15.12}\):

\(^{119}\)The usual rendering of a participle following hinneh is a finite verb in \text{G}, so that in itself is not surprising here. What is surprising, however, is the omission of hinneh, especially since it is difficult to see what would have led to its insertion in \text{H} if it had not already been present.
The first occurrence of idou in S1 21.10 represents hinneh, but fronted to the discussion of Goliath's sword:

wayyo'mer hakkohen xereb golyat happelishtî 'àsher-hikkîta bê`emeg ha'elah hinneh-hî' lûTah bassimlah 'axandrê ha'ephôd ... wayyo'mer dawid 'ên kamôha tê'nennah lî S1 21.10 kai eipen ho hiereus Idou he hromphaia Goliath tou allophulou, hon epatacas en te koilâdi Ela, kai aute eneilemene en himatiw; ... kai eipen Daui~ Idou ouk estin hwsper aute, dos moi auten.\footnote{\label{i20}120 This second occurrence of idou appears to reflect 'ên, as in S1 14.26 (above).}

In S1 24.5 hinneh 'anoki is a minus in G, probably because the following participle (noten) is rendered as an infinitive in indirect discourse.\footnote{\label{i21}121 Although it could have dropped out of either H or G due to homoiarchton, its omission is probably due to syntactical requirements of G (i.e., having decided to represent the participle as an infinitive, it would be far better G to leave hinneh 'anoki unrepresented).}

hinneh hayyôm 'àsher-'amar YHWH 'eleyka hinneh 'anoki noten 'et-'oyibka bêyadeka S1 24.5 idou he hemera haute, hen eipen kurios pros se paradounai ton exthron sou eis tas xeiras sou

Three of the last five occurrences of hinneh in S1 are problematic. In S1 28.9 and 21 idou de\footnote{\label{i122}122 With eta, not epsilon.}, which usually reflects hinneh-na', corresponds to hinneh.
In both passages the noun or pronoun is the subject of the verb. \textit{hinneh} occurs in this syntagm only five other times in \textit{S1}; in each of those passages it is rendered by \textit{idou}.\textsuperscript{123}

Also, in \textit{S1} 30.16 \textit{idou houtos} appears to represent \textit{hinneh}:

\begin{align*}
\text{wayyoridehú wēhinneh nēTushîm ‘al-pēnē kol-ha’ārets} & \quad \text{S1 30.16} \\
\text{kai kategagen auton ekei, kai idou houtoi diakexumenoi epi proswpon pases tes ges} &
\end{align*}

\textit{ekei} as a G plus, however, may indicate a tendency to specificity which could account for \textit{houtoi}.

The translator of 1 Samuel rendered \textit{hinneh} rather consistently (90%); the evidence is not beyond suggesting that it was translated by more than one

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{S1} 8.5; 10.2; 12.13b; 18.22; 24.11.
hand.124

In 2 Samuel (47xx)125 hinneh is rendered by idou (46xx) and hoti (once).

The rendering of hinneh is unclear in S2 17.9: gar ... nun may reflect 'attah, or idou gar may represent hinneh? If the latter, gar may be a plus added to make the inference explicit:

hinneh 'attah hû'-nexba' bê'axat happèxatîm
idou gar autos nun kekruptai en henì twn bounwn

On the other hand, gar may reflect [wê]hinneh, rather than H as it now stands.

The pattern shows a definite breakdown in consistency in the latter third of the book (20.12 - 30.26), which entails 37.8% of its occurrences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Samuel</th>
<th>Rendering</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.31-20.5</td>
<td>idou</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v &lt; G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12-30.26</td>
<td>idou</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hwde</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>idou de[eta]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>idou [e]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>idou houtos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I made 20.5 the "breaking point" because of the use in rapid succession of idou [e], hwde, and hoti (the eleven occurrences beginning with 20.12 are rendered by idou (7xx), other renderings (4xx)).

Including S2 4.6, where I restore hinneh for hennah.
The occurrence of *idou* as a rendering of *hâlo'* (15.35) is probably due to the parallel in the following verse:126

```
waḥâlô' ʾimmê'ka sham tsadôq weʾebyatar
hakkohānîm . . . [36] hinneh-sham ʾimmam shênê
bê'nêhem ʾaxîmaʾats l'e-tsadôq wîhônatan
l'eʾebyatar
kai idou meta sou ekei Sadwk kai Abiathar hoi
hiereis . . . [36] idou ekei met' autwn duo
huioi autwn, Aximaas huios tw Sadwk kai
Iwnathan huois tw Abiathar
```

In S2 4.10 *hoti* signals that David's quotation of the Amalekite is probably indirect rather than direct, a regular function of *hinneh* (above), although infrequent in S2:

```
kî hammagîd lî leʾmor hinneh-met shaʾûl
hoti ho apaggeilas moi hoti tethneken Saoul
```

In S2 15.26, David sent the priests, Levites, and the ark back to Jerusalem, implying that if YHWH wanted to restore him, he could do so without the presence of the ark, and that:

```
wêʾim koh yoʾmar loʾ xaphatstî bak hînënhî
yaasʾeh lî kaʾâsher TÔb bêʾênayw
kai ean eipe houtws Ouk etheleka en soi, idou
egw eimi, poieitw moi kata to agathon en
ophthalmois autou
```

This rendering of *hinënhî* may intentionally strengthen

---

126See under "Was *idou* Added for Emphasis?" (below).
David's statement for added force at the climax of this incident. 127

The translator of 2 Samuel was thus quite consistent in representing hinneh by idou (98%), deviating from it only once, in a usage uncommon in S2. 128

127 It is difficult to determine whether [e] represents the pronominal suffix or hinneh. Cf. the Amalekite's response to Saul, where the same construction is rendered by idou egw (S2 1.7). In its other occurrence in S2 (12.11) hinneni precedes a participle; it is rendered by idou egw with a verb. In S2 24.17 hinneh 'anokî xaTa'tî is rendered as idou egw eimi kakopoiesa; the following clause shows clearly that egw eimi represents the pronoun:

wayyo'mer hinneh 'anokî xaTa'tî wê'anokî he'ëwëtî wê'elleh hatstso'n meh 'asû S2 24.17 idou egw eimi edikesa, kai egw eimi ho poimen ekakopoiesa, kai houtoi ta probata ti epoiesan?

The second clause also shows the extreme literalism of this rendering--it follows H to the point of ill-formedness in Greek (the plus of ho poimen probably anticipates the figure of the nation as tso'n/probata). There are two other occurrences of hinneh with a pronominal suffix in S2 (5.1; 16.8). Both are in non-verbal syntagms, and both are rendered non-verbally:

hinênû 'atsmêxa ûbêsarka 'ânaxnû S2 5.1 Idou osta sou kai sarkes sou hemeis

wêhinneêxa bêra'ateka kî 'îsh damîm 'attah S2 16.8 kai idou su en te kakia sou, hoti aner haimatwn su

128 The difference in translation style between S1 and S2 is more real than apparent (the percentages of the usual rendering are fairly close--91% vs. 97%, respectively). The variety of renderings, however, makes the difference more striking, S1 using idou, hoti, hwde, and idou with de, houtos, and [e], but S2 only idou and hoti (once).
In 1 Kings (55xx) hinneh is rendered by idou (45xx) and, once each, by idou houtos (21.18), ekeinos [e] (3.21a), ei (8.27), and erxomai (18.7). Four verses in which it occurs are lacking in G (14.2, 5, 10, 19); it is a G minus twice (1.51b; 20.31).

idou renders hinneh in K 20.39 (21.39), but the participle which follows it is not represented in G, perhaps to simplify the story, since both sar and the conjunction on the following verb are minuses:

'abdēka yatsa' bēqereb-hammilmaham wēhinneh-'īsh sar wayyabe' 'elay 'īsh K 20.39 (21.39) ho doulos sou ecelthen epi ten stratian tou polemou, kai idou aner eisegagen pros me andra

In another unusual rendering, idou represents hinneh but, whereas noun clauses in H are usually rendered as such in G, this is represented verbally, perhaps because the translator read dibbērū for dibrē:

hinneh-na' dibrē hannēbi'im peh-'exad Tōb 'el-hammelek K 22.13
idou de lalousin pantes hoi prophetai en stomati heni kala peri tou baselews

In K 1.25 idou [e] appears to represent hinneh, but eisin represents the pronominal suffix used with hinneh, not, technically, hinneh (or an aspect thereof):

\[129\text{K}1\ 14.1-20\ \text{is lacking in G (below).}

\[130\text{eisin forms an analytic tense with the following participle.}\]
An excellent example of the predicate function of hinneh (Kl 21.18) is rendered by idou houtos, when YHWH tells Elijah where to find Ahab "He is in the vineyard of Naboth, ...":

\[
\text{hinneh be}\text{kerem nab}öt \ '\text{asher-yarad sham}
\text{lërishtō} \quad \text{Kl 21.18 (20.18)}
\text{idou houtos en ampelwni Nabouthai, hoti}
\text{katabebeken ekei kleronomesai auton.}
\]

In Solomon's prayer of dedication hinneh occurs in a sentence which the translator interpreted as a simple condition, and so used \text{ei} for hinneh:\footnote{131}

\[
\text{hinneh hashshamayim ū\text{shemē hashshamayim lo'}}
\text{yëkalxëlūka ...} \quad \text{Kl 8.27}
\text{ei ho ouranos kai ho ouranos tou ouranou ouk}
\text{arkesousin soi, ...}
\]

\text{erxomai} for hinneh is probably due to the following infinitive (Kl 18.7), where Elijah meets Obadiah, Ahab's servant:

\[
\text{wayhi 'obadyahû badderek wëhinneh 'eliyyahû}
\text{ligra'tō} \quad \text{Kl 18.7}
\text{kai en Abdiou en tw hodw monos, kai elthen}
\text{Eliou eis sunantesin autou monos} \footnote{132}
\]

hinneh occurs twice in Kl 1.51. Its second

\footnote{131}{On "simple" condition, cf. on 'ayyeh (above).}
\footnote{132}{Note the repeated insistence on their solitude (monos), laying the ground for Obadiah's protest that he will be killed when the king comes to "find" Elijah gone.}
occurrence is a G minus, probably to tie the two clauses more closely together, or because the translator felt the second superfluous given the presence of the first:

\[\text{wayyuggad lish\ellomoh le'mor hinneh 'adoniyyah\u201c yare' 'et-hammelek sh\ellomoh w\ehinne'haxax b\egarn\ot hammizbe\axx}\]

\[\text{kai aneggele tw Salwmwn legontes Idou Adwnias ephobethe ton basilea Salwmwn kai katexei twn keratwn tou thusiasteriou}\]

In K1 3.21, where hinneh also occurs twice, its first occurrence is represented in G by ekeinos [e], probably to distinguish the other woman's son from the woman testifying:

\[\text{wa'aqum babboqer leheniq 'et-ben\i w\ehinne'h-met wa'etb\onen 'elayw babboqer w\ehinne' lo'hayah ben\i 'asher yalad\i}\]

\[\text{kai anesten to prwi thelasai ton huion mou, kai ekeinos en tethnekws; kai idou katenoesa auton pryi, kai idou ouk en ho huios mou, hon etekon}\]

G differs from H in K1 20.31 (21.31), where the speech is made by the king of Aram rather than by his servants, and several words in addition to hinneh-na' are lacking in G:

---

133 Its first occurrence is represented by idou.

134 The second is rendered by idou.

135 Although the second occurrence of idou (a G plus) may appear a simple case of haplography in H, note that the conjunction on the verb in H appears in G as well, suggesting instead a deliberate interpolation.
Four occurrences of hinneh in K1 14.1-20 are minuses in G (this passage is lacking in G). 136

The translator of 1 Kings was thus fairly consistent in rendering hinneh by idou (92%), using no other rendering more than once, although he did not as consistently reproduce the syntagms in which it occurs.

In 2 Kings (54xx) hinneh is represented by idou (42xx), idou [e] (7xx), idou de 137 (2xx), and nun (once; 7.6). It is a G minus twice (6.30; 7.13b).

hinneh is apparently rendered by idou de 138 in K2 4.25, where Elijah tells Gehazi that the Shunamitess is coming:

136 K1 14.2, 5, 10, 19. Although the substance of a similar story and oracle in G (K1 12.24g-n) is parallel, there is no reflection of these hinneh-clauses (idou occurs in K1 12.24g-n, but not in passages that parallel these occurrences of hinneh):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Relation to G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>content reflected in 12.24h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>no parallel in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>content reflected in 12.24m, but not the hinneh-clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>no parallel in G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137 eta, not epsilon.
138 eta, not epsilon.
idou de usually represents hinneh-na',\textsuperscript{139} which normally precedes verbal forms;\textsuperscript{140} there is no indication of such here.

This same rendering appears in K2 5.11. Naaman was angered at Elisha's refusal to see him:

\begin{quote}
wayyo'omer hinneh 'amartî 'elay yetse' yatsô'
\textit{wē'amad ...}
\textit{kai eipen Idou de elegon hoti eceleusetai pros me kai stesetai ...}
\end{quote}

This translator apparently equated hinneh and hinneh-na', as well as idou and idou de.

In K2 6.20 idou [e] represents hinneh:

\begin{quote}
wayyiphqax YHWH 'et-'ēnêhem wēhinneh bētôk shomrôn
\textit{kai dienoicen kurios tous ophthalmous autwn, kai eidon, kai idou esan en mesw Samareias.}
\end{quote}

There is no clear reason for this rendering, especially since hinneh followed by a prepositional phrase is rendered by idou with a prepositional phrase without further predication only a few verses earlier.\textsuperscript{141}

In a repeated statement idou [e] represents hinneh

\textsuperscript{139}Cf. K2 2.16; 4.9 (= 5.15).

\textsuperscript{140}In K2 2.18 it precedes yesh (here not represented in G; see on yesh, above); in K2 6.1 its clause is non-verbal: hinneh-na' hammagôm 'asher ....

\textsuperscript{141}Cf. K2 6.13:

\begin{quote}
wayyuggad-îô le'mor hinneh bēdotan
\textit{kai aneggeilan autw legontes Idou en Dwthaim}
\end{quote}
with pronominal suffix, although [e] is again part of an analytic tense:

\[ \text{w\textsuperscript{e}yether dibr\textsuperscript{e} z\textsuperscript{e}karyah hinnam k\textsuperscript{e}tub\textsuperscript{e}m 'al-sepher dibr\textsuperscript{e} hayyam\textsuperscript{i}m l\textsuperscript{e}malk\textsuperscript{e} yisra'el} \]

\[ \text{K2 15.11}\]

\[ \text{kai ta loipa twn logwn Zaxariou idou estin gegrammena epi bibliw logwn twn hemerwn tois basileusin Israel.} \]

\[ \text{idou represents hinneh in K2 10.9, a verbal clause rendered with a periphrastic participle (analytic tense); egw eimi reflects the pronoun-verb combination, not hinneh:} \]

\[ \text{hinneh 'an\textsuperscript{i} qasharti 'al-'\textsuperscript{a}doni wa'ehe\textsuperscript{e}geh\textsuperscript{u}} \]

\[ \text{K2 10.9} \]

\[ \text{idou egw eimi sunestraphen epi ton kurion mou kai apekteina auton;} \]

\[ \text{nun renders hinneh in K2 7.6, perhaps better to convey the urgency of the Arameans' response:} \]

\[ \text{hinneh sakar-'al\textsuperscript{e}n\textsuperscript{u} melek yisra'el 'et-malk\textsuperscript{e} haxitt\textsuperscript{i}m ...} \]

\[ \text{K2 7.6} \]

\[ \text{nun emisthsato eph' hemas basileus Israel tous basileas twn Xettaiwn ...} \]

\[ \text{hinneh is lacking in K2 6.30, again for no apparent reason, although the syntax of G now represents ton sakkon as the object of eiden, rather than the subject of the [in?]direct discourse:}^{143} \]

\[ ^{142} \text{This = 15.15, 26, 31. Note also the interesting variation in this formula between hinnam k\textsuperscript{e}tub\textsuperscript{e}m and h\textsuperscript{a}l\textsuperscript{\text{o}}'-hem k\textsuperscript{e}tub\textsuperscript{e}m (e.g., K2 15.21). For further on this see ??}. \]

\[ ^{143} \text{It is difficult to explain its addition in H, however; it was more likely omitted from G.} \]
The translator of 2 Kings was thus fairly consistent in rendering hinneh by idou (81%), although he tended to represent hinneh with a pronominal suffix and participle as idou [e] rather than the usual idou with a finite verb.

In Isaiah (75xx) hinneh is rendered by idou (53xx)\(^{145}\) and idou [e] (2xx), as well as once each by alla (5.7b), de (5.7a), hoti (48.7), pareimi (52.6), heuriskw (37.36), ginomai (59.9), exw (62.11c), [e] (17.14), and

---


\(^{145}\)This does not include idou de[eta] (22.17) or idou pareimi (58.9).
autos (22.13). Eleven occurrences are not represented. 146

In Is 10.33 idou gar appears to correspond to hinneh, but gar is more likely a plus to specify the subordination of this verse to the preceding: 147

\[
\text{hinneh ha'adon YHWH ts'ba'ot me'sa'eph pu'rah bema'aratsah} \quad \text{Is 10.33}
\]

idou gar ho despotes kurios sabawth suntarassei tous endocous meta isxuos

In Is 20.6 hinneh-koh corresponds to idou; hemeis [e] represents the subjective genitive pronoun (mabbaTenû), since the translator interpreted mabbaTenû as a participle and rendered the phrase with an analytic tense of the verb:

\[
w'e'am yosheb ha'i havzeh bayyôm hahû' \quad \text{Is 20.6}
\]

kai erousin hoi katoikountes en te nesw taute idou hemeis emen pepoithotes tou phugein eis autous eis boetheian,

idou again renders hinneh in Is 36.6, the verb in H here being rendered by an analytic tense, a virtual reversal of the usual syntagmatic pattern: 148

---

146 Two clauses or verses are lacking in G (38.17; 49.12b); in nine passages hinneh is a G minus (29.8 3xx); 37.11; 38.8; 41.27 (2xx); 65.1b, 17).
147 Cf. Is 13.9; 62.11 (first occurrence; further on this verse below).
148 The usual rendering of hinneh with participle being idou with a finite verb.
hinneh baTaxta 'al-mish'enet haqqaneh
haratsûts hazzeh 'al-mitsrayim  Is 36.6
idou pepoithws ei epi ten hrabdon ten
kalaninen ten tethlasmenen tauten, ep'
Aigupton

In Is 47.14 hinneh is represented by idou, but
hayah following hinneh by pantes. This "heightening" or
intensification is reflected in the multiple negatives
of the following line:

hinneh hayû keqash 'esh sëraphatam lo'
yatsstîlû 'et-naphsham miyyad lehabah Is 41.14
idou pantes hws phrugana epi puri
katakăesontai kai ou me ecelwntai ten psuxen
autwn ek phlogos

idou [e] represents hinneh with pronominal suffix
in Is 6.8, Isaiah's dramatic statement of his
willingness to follow the call of YHWH:

wa'omar hinënî shëlaxenî  Is 6.8
kai eipa Idou eimi egw; aposteilon me.

hinneh occurs twice in a row in Is 65.1. The first
occurrence is rendered by hinneh [e], the second is a G
minus due to homoioarchton:149

'amatî hinnenî hinnenî 'el-gûy lo'-gora'
bishëmî  Is 65.1 (2xx)
eipa Idou eimi, tw ethnei hoi ouk ekalesen to
onoma mou

The use of idou de150 in Is 22.17 resembles that
seen in K2 (above):

149 Or to the translator's interpretation of this as a
dittography in his Vorlage.

150 eta, not epsilon.
hinneh YHWH m^eTalTelka TalTelah gaber Is 22.17
idou de kurios sabawth ekbalei kai ektripsei andra

In Is 17.14 [e] represents hinneh, probably to parallel [e] (ouk estai for 'ênennû) in the following clause:

1^et 'ereb w^ehinneh ballahah b^Terem boger 'ênennû Is 17.1
pros hesperan estai penthos, prin e prwi kai ouk estai.

pareimi\(^{151}\) represents hinneni in Is 52.6, and idou pareimi in Is 58.9, perhaps as an emphatic statement of YHWH's presence:

laken yeda' 'ammî sh^əmî laken bayyôm hahû' kî- 'ânî-hû' ham^ədabber hinnenî Is 52.6
dia touto gnwsetai ho laos mou to onoma mou en te hemera ekeine, hoti egw eimi autos ho lalwn; pareimi 'az tigra' w^eYHWH ya'âneh t^əshawwa' w^eyo'mar hinneni Is 58.9
tote boese, kai ho theos eisakousetai sou; eti lalountos sou erei Idou pareimi.

ginomai corresponds to hinneh in Is 59.9, mainly through the translator's paraphrase of the text:

n^eqawweh la'ôr w^ehinneh xoshek lin^əghôt ba'âphelôt n^əhallek Is 59.9
hupomeinantwn autwn phws egeneto autois skotos, meinantes augen en awria periepatesan\(^{152}\)

\(^{151}\) Also in Ps 139.8.

\(^{152}\) H: "We hoped for light, but there is only darkness, for brightness, [but] we walk in gloom"; vs. G: "As they waited, light turned to darkness for them, while waiting for dawn, they walked in sleep [confusion]".
exw corresponds to the third occurrence of hinneh in Is 62.11. The clause has been subordinated to the preceding by means of an adverbial participle (attendant circumstance). Each of the previous occurrences of hinneh in this verse, both rendered by idou,\textsuperscript{153} begins an independent clause, versus the subordinated translation of this occurrence.

\textit{hinneh YHWH hishmīa' 'el-qētseh ha'arets 'imrū lēbat-tsiyyôn hinneh yish'ek ba' hinneh sēkarō 'ittō úphē'ullatō lēghanōy} Is 62.11 (3xx)

\textit{idou gar kurios epoiesen akouston hews esxatou tes ges Eipate te thugatri Siwn Idou soi ho swter paraqinetai exwn ton heautou misthon kai to ergon pro proswpou autou}

In Is 37.36\textsuperscript{154} hinneh is rendered by \textit{heuriskw}, a contextually appropriate rendering:

\textit{wayyashkimû babboger wehinneh kullam pēgarîm metîm} Is 37.36
\textit{kai ecanastantes to prwi heuron panta ta swmata nekra.}

A misread text (\textit{'asû} for \textit{sasōn}) in Is 22.13 led to its rendering as the subject (\textit{autoî}):\textsuperscript{155}

\textit{wehinneh sasōn wesimxah harog baqar wešaxoT tso'ın} Is 22.13
\textit{autoî de epoiesanto euphrosunen kai agallimâ sphazontes mosxous kai thuontes probata}

\textsuperscript{153} On the first, see on Is 10.33 (above).

\textsuperscript{154} Parallel to K2 19.35.

\textsuperscript{155} The translator may have read \textit{wehemmah 'asû} for \textit{wehinneh sasōn}. 
hinneh occurs twice in Is 5.7; its first occurrence is a minus in G,\(^{156}\) the second represented by alla:

\[
\text{waygaw le mishpaT we hinneh mispax lits' daqah we hinneh ts' aqah} \quad \text{Is 5.7 (2xx)}
\]

emeina tou poiesai krisin, epoiese de anomian kai ou dikaiosunen alla kraugen

The rendering of hinneh in Is 48.7 is unclear--hoti, nai, or both:

\[
\text{attah nibr' u welo' me'az welipnē-yōm wēlo' shema' tem pen-to'mar hinneh yē'da'tin} \quad \text{Is 48.7}
\]

nun ginetai kai ou palai, kai ou proterais hemerais ekousas auta; me eipes hoti Nai, ginwskw auta.

The translator of G captured the flavor of H in Is 29.8 (hinneh 3xx). Although it is difficult to align the texts, hinneh does not seem to be represented in this verse:\(^{157}\)

\[
wēhayah ka'asher yaxālom hari'eb wēhinneh 'ōkel wēneqīts wēreqah naphshō wēka'asher yaxālom hatstsame' wēhinneh shoteh wēneqīts wēhinneh 'ayeeph wēnaphshō shōqeqah \quad \text{Is 29.8 (3xx)}
\]

kai esontai hws hoi en hupnw peinwtes kai esthiontes, kai ecanastantwn mataion autwn to enupnion kai hon tropon enupniazetai ho dipswn hws pinwn kai ecanastas eti dipsa he de psuxe autou eis xenon elpisen

In Is 37.11 hinneh is not represented because the translator cast the statement as a [negative] rhetorical question:

\[^{156}\text{de represents the conjunction, which itself makes the clause adversative.}\]

\[^{157}\text{Its first two occurrences are parallel to, and probably represented by kai and hws, respectively; the third has no parallel--the clause in which it occurs is a G minus, probably by homoioarchton.}\]
hinneh 'attah shama'ta 'asher 'asu malkê 'ashshûr 1êkol-ha'âratsôt 1êhaxârimam Is 37.11 e ouk ekousas ha epoiesan basileis Assuriwn pasan ten gen hws apwlesan?

In Is 38.8 hinneh is not represented, the sentence being continued directly from the previous verse:

ya`a seh YHWH 'et-haddabar hazheh 'asher dibber [8] hinênî meshîb 'et-tsel hammal`aîôt 'asher yarêdah ... Is 38.8 hoti ho theos poiesei to hrema touto; ten skian twn anabathmwn, hous katebe ho helios ...

A unique double occurrence of hinneh, the second with a pronominal suffix, is a minus in G, perhaps because it is unique:

ri'shon lêtsiyôn hinneh hinnam wêlîrushalaim mëbasser 'etten Is 41.27 arxen Siwn dwsw kai Ierousalem parakalesw eis hodon

In Is 49.12 the second occurrence of hinneh is not represented, probably under the influence of the following clause which, although parallel, lacks the introductory wêhinneh:

hinneh-'elleh meraxoq yabo'û wêhinneh-'elleh mitstsaphôn ūmiyyam wê'elleh me'erets sînîm Is 49.12 (2xx) idou houtoi porrwthen erxontai, houtoi apo borra kai houtoi apo thalasses, alloi de ek ges Perswn.

hinneh is not represented in Is 65.17 due to the paraphrase of this clause (which contrasts with the consistent rendering of the rest of the verse): 158

158 This is especially perplexing in light of the next occurrence of hinneh (Is 65.18), where hinneh in the same syntagm (albeit with a different object) is
ki-hinenî bôre' shamayim xâdashîm wa'arets xâdashah wêlo' tizzakarnah hari'shonôt wêlo' ta'âleynah ʿal-leb  
Is 65.17  
estai gar ho ouranos kainos kai he ge kaine, 
kai ou me mnësthswi tw proterwn, oud' ou me  
epelthe autwn epi ten kardian

The translator of Isaiah was fairly consistent in representing hinneh (82%), although he also used verbs,159 a pronoun,160 and various conjunctions.161

hinneh in Jeremiah (135xx) is rendered by idou (113xx) and hoti (2xx), as well as once each by idou hekw (4.16), [e] (4.24), and ei (7.8). It is twice rendered by a strengthening cognate form (32.28 = 34.2); it is a minus in G fifteen times.162

hinneh is represented by idou in Jr 3.22, but the translator felt that 'atanû implied to come in a particular way (i.e., as slaves):163

rendered with idou:
ki hînêni bôre' 'et-yêrûshâlam gîlah Iâ 65.18
hoti idou egw poiw Ierousalem agallîama

159 Once each: pareimi (52.6), heuriskw (37.36), ginomai (59.9), exw (62.11c), and [e] (17.14).

160 Once: autos (22.13).

161 hoti/nai (48.7), de (5.7a), and alla (5.7b).

162 The verse or clause in which it occurs is lacking five times (27.16; 29.17; 30.10; 33.14; 48.40); ten occurrences are not represented, although G and H are otherwise parallel (8.8; 24.1; 25.29; 32.17, 24b, 27; 49.12, 15, 35; 50.12).

163 Did he read 'atanû as a verb meaning "to be (or become) [a] slave"? If so, this is the only such correspondence in G. Or did the translator think 'atan
The difficulty of interpreting the absolute use of "hinneh" in Jr 4.22 was felt by the translator, who translated "hinneh" with "idou hekasim," probably on the basis of the parallelism with "erxontai" (rendering "ba'im") in the following line:

> hazkîrû laggôyim hinneh hashmî'û 'al-yîrûshalaim nôtsîrimon ba'im me'erets hammerxaq

anamnesate ethne idou hekasim; anaggeilate en Ierousalem Sustrophai erxontai ek ges makrothen

"hinneh" occurs four times in four consecutive and parallel verses (4.23-26). Three of these are translated by "idou," but the second is represented by "[e]," probably in order to reflect its participial predicate, rendered in G by an analytic tense:

> ra'îtî 'et-ha'arets wehinneh-tohû wabohû ... ra'îtî heharîm wehinneh ro'âshîm ...
> ra'îtî wehinneh 'en ha'adam ...
> ra'îtî wehinneh hakkarmel hammidbar ...

Jr 4.23-6 (4xx)

epeblepsa epi ten gen, kai idou outhen, ... eidon ta ore, kai en tremonta, ... epeblepsa, kai idou ouk en anthrwpos, ...164 eidon, kai idou ho Karmelos eremos, ...

related to "'aton "she-ass" and render it euphemistically (i.e., "We come as slaves [= beasts of burden]")?"?

164 The variation between epeblepsa and eidon is merely stylistic; note the A-B-A-B pattern. Note also the careful use of foreshortening in the introductory formula, from the rather complete syntax using the object marker (23), to an object (definite!)
The pronominal suffix was rendered with [e] (Jr 44.2), hinneh with idou:

\[ \text{wehinnam xarbah hayyôm hazzeh we'ën bahem yôsheb} \]
\[ \text{Jr 44.2 (51.2)} \]
\[ \text{kai idou eisin eremoi apo enoikwn} \]

The statement in which hinneh occurs is rendered as a condition, so that the translator used ei (de) for hinneh:

\[ \text{hinneh 'attem bôTe'-xîm lakem 'al-dibrê hashshagîr lêbîlî hô'il} \]
\[ \text{Jr 7.8} \]
\[ \text{ei de humeis pepoithate epi logois pseudesin, hothen ouk wphelethesesthe} \]

hinneh (with preceding 'aken) is a G minus in Jr 8.8, probably because the translator was not sure how to render the combination:

\[ \text{'êkah to'mérû xàkamîm 'ànaxnu wêtôrat YHWH 'ittanû 'aken hinneh lashsheqer 'asah 'eT sheqer sophèrîm} \]
\[ \text{Jr 8.8} \]
\[ \text{pws ereite hoti Sophoi esmen hemeis, kai nomos kuriou estin meth' hemwn? eis maten egenethe sxoinos pseudes grammateusin.} \]

hinneh as a conjunction is represented by hoti in Jr 30.32 (37.23), although it is rendered by idou in the same clause some seven chapters earlier (23.19)

without the marker, to no object (25f).

165 On privative apo for 'ên, see on 'ên (above).

166 'aken (5xx in Jr) is otherwise rendered by plen (3.20, 23b), ara ge (4.10), and, apparently, by a participle of [e] (3.23a).
hinneh sa`arat YHWH xemah yatsu'ah sa`ar
mitgörer
Jr 30.23 (37.23; = 23.19)
hoti orge kuriou ecelthen theumwdes, ecelthen
orge strephoumene,
idou seismos para kuriou kai orge ekporeuetai
eis susseismon
(Jr 23.19)

In both Jr 32.28 (39.28) and 34.2 (41.2) hinneh
with a pronominal suffix precedes noten. Both
occurrences of hinneh are rendered by cognates of
[para]didwmi, the first by a passive participle, the
second by a noun. Both passages are translated so to
emphasize the prophetic announcement:167

laken koh 'amar YHWH hinênî noten 'et-ha`îr
hazzo't bêyad hakkasdîm ûbêyad
nêbûkadre'ttsar melek-babel ûlêkadaH
Jr 32.28 (39.28)
dia touto houtws eipen kurios ho theos Israel
Dotheisa paradothesetai he polis haute eis
xeiras basilews Babulwnos, kai lempsetai auten

koh 'amar YHWH hinênî noten 'et-ha`îr hazzo't
bêyad melek-babel ûsêraphaH ba'esh
Jr 34.2 (41.2)
houtws eipen kurios Paradosei paradothesetai
he polis haute eis xeiras basilews Babulwnos,
kaî sullempsetai auten kai kausei auten en
puri.

In Jr 24.1 wêhinneh is not represented because the
translator rendered the subject introduced by wêhinneh
as the direct object of the verb:

hir'anî YHWH wêhinneh shênê dûda'ê te'enîm
mû`adîm liphnê hêkal YHWH
Jr 24.1
edecen moi kurios duo kalathous sukwn
keimenous kata proswpon naou kuriou

167 These renderings may reflect hinneh noten or
hinnaton tinnaten, as suggested by, e.g., BHS.
hinneh is also lacking in Jr 25.29 (32.16), where the need for its demonstrative force is obviated by the relative clause:

\[
\text{kî hinneh ba`îr `āsher niqra`-shêmî `aleyha `anokî mexel iêhara`} \quad \text{Jr 25.29 (32.16)}
\]

\[
\text{hoti en polei, en he wnomašthe to onoma mou ep` auten, egw arxomai kakwsai}
\]

In Jr 32.17 YHWH hinneh may be a G minus due to parablepsis ('âhaH `âdonay ... 'attah):

\[
\text{`âhaH `âdonay YHWH hinneh `attah `asîta `et-hashshamayîm wê`et-ha`arets} \quad \text{Jr 32.17 (39.17)}
\]

\[
\text{W kurie, su epoiesen ton ouranon kai ten gen}
\]

This may also explain why its second occurrence in Jr 32.24 (39.24) is lacking:

\[
\text{wa`asher dibbarta hayah wêhinnêka to`eh [25] wê`attah `amarta `el... Jr 32.24 (39.24)}
\]

\[
\text{hws elalesas, houtws egeneto. [25] kai su legeis pros me ...}
\]

In Jr 32.27 (39.27) hinneh is again a G minus:

\[
\text{[26] wayhi dêbar-YHWH `el-yirmêyahû le`mor} \quad \text{[27] hinneh `ânî YHWH `êlohe kol-basar} \quad \text{Jr 32.26f (39.26f)}
\]

\[
\text{[26] kai egeneto logos kuriou pros me legwn} \quad \text{[27] Egw kurios ho theos pases sarkos}
\]

hinneh is lacking in G of Jr 49.12; the combination hinneh `âsher `ên being rendered hois ouk en:

\[
\text{kî-koh `amar YHWH hinneh `âsher `ên mishpaTam lishtôt hakkôs sható yishtû} \quad \text{Jr 49.12 (30.6)}
\]

\[
\text{hoti tade eipen kurios Hois ouk en nomos piein to poterion, epion}
\]

In Jr 49.15 (30.9), a verse nearly identical to Ob
2, hinneh and the preceding conjunction kî are not represented in G:168

ki-hinneh qaTon re'tattîka baggôyim
Jr 49.15 (30.9)
mikron edwka se en ethnesin

Neither hinneh nor its pronominal suffix are explicitly represented in Jr 49.35 (25.15), although the G verb takes its person and number from the suffix:

koh 'amar YHWH ts'qebot hinënî shober 'et-geshet 'êlâm
Jr 49.35 (25.15)
take lege kurios Suntribew to tocon Aîlam

The second half of Jr 50.12 is barely reflected in G; hinneh is lacking:

bôshah 'immêkem mê'od xaphrah yöladêkem
hinneh 'axârit göyim midbar tsiyyah wa'ârabah
Jr 50.12 (27.12)
esxunthe he meter humwn sphodra, meter ep'
agatha esxate ethnwn eremos169

The translator of Jeremiah was quite consistent in rendering hinneh by means of idou (94%), using only five other renderings--none more than twice.

In Ezekiel (113xx) hinneh is represented by idou (88xx), ean or ei (4xx), and houtos [e] (2xx), as well as nine

168 In Ob 2, its only occurrence in that book, hinneh is rendered by idou (below).

169 Only one form in G eremos represents three synonyms in H (midbar, tsiyyah, wa'ârabah).
other renderings (once each).\textsuperscript{170} It is lacking in G eleven times.\textsuperscript{171}

\textbf{hinneh} is rendered by \textit{idou [e]} in Ek 8.4, possibly under the influence of the adverb:

\begin{verbatim}
whinneh-sham kepôd 'elohe yisra'el kammar'eh
'asher ra'îtî babbiq'ah Ek 8.4
kai idou ekei en doca kuriou theou Israel kata
ten horasin, hen eidon en tw pediw
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{hinneh} \textit{le}- is treated like the idiomatic \textbf{hayah} \textit{le}-
"to become" in an excellent example of \textbf{hinneh}'s predicate function:

\begin{verbatim}
whinneh'ka lahem keshīr 'agabîm yepheh qôl
UmeTib naggen Ek 33.32
kai gine autois hws phwne psalteriou
heduphwnou euarmostou
\end{verbatim}

Ezekiel's statements in Ek 4.14 and 16.27 are translated as explicit conditions by rendering \textbf{hinneh} with either \textit{ei} or \textit{eàn}:\textsuperscript{172}

\begin{verbatim}
170 idou [e] (8.4), ginomai (33.32), oude (15.5), plen
(16.49), hotan (17.12); hoti (23.39), hama (23.40), and
me (28.3).

171 The verse or part of thereof in which it occurs is lacking five times (7.5, 6, 10b; 8.7; 43.12); hinneh is not represented six times (13.10; 15.4; 18.18; 25.7; 37.2b, 11).

172 Cf. also:
whinneh hōlîd ben wayyar' 'et-kol-xaTTTo't
'abîw 'asher 'asah Ek 18.14
ean de gennese huion, kai ide pasas tas
hamartias tou patros autou, has epoiese,

whinneh hikkêtî kappî 'el-bits'ek 'asher
'asît Ek 22.13
ean de epacw xeira mou pros xeira mou eph'
oois suntetelesai
\end{verbatim}
wa'omar 'āhaH 'ādonay YHWH hinneh naphshî lo'
mêTumma'ah \Ek 4.14
kai eipa Medamws, kurie thee tou Israel; ei he
psuxe mou ou memiantai en akatharsia

wēhinneh naTîtî yadî 'alayik \Ek 16.27
ean de ekteinw ten xeira mou epi se

The translator also used *hotan* to make a statement
explicitly, though indefinitely, conditional:

'emor hinneh ba' melek-babel yērushalaim \Ek 17.12
eipon hotan elthe basileus Babulwnos epi
Ierousalem

oude represents *hinneh* in Ek 15.5, to show that
YHWH expects a positive answer to his rhetorical
question:

hinneh bihyôtô tamîm lo' ye'aseh limêla'kah
'aph kî-'esh 'ākalathû wayyexar wēna'āsah 'êd
limêla'kah \Ek 15.5
oude eti autou ontos holoklerou ouk estai eis
ergasion me hoti ean kai auto analwse eis
telos, ei estai eti eis ergasion pur

In Ek 28.3 *me* shows that he expects a negative
answer:

hinneh xakam 'attah middani'el \Ek 28.3
me sophwteros ei su tou Daniel?

In Ek 13.10 *autos*, as the subject of the following
verb, renders the pronominal suffix on *hinneh*, which
itself is not represented:

wēhû' boneh xayits wēhinnam Taxîm 'ôtô taphel \Ek 13.10
kai houtos oikodomei toixon, kai autoi
aleiphousin auton, peseitai173

173The translator read tippol for *taphel*. 
Another pronoun, the demonstrative houtos, with [e] represents hinneh in Ek 16.44, probably because the clauses are divided so that kol/panta is a predicate nominative rather than an adjective, and the participle is a finite verb. houtos thus becomes the subject of esti:

hinneh kol-hammoshel `alayik yimshol le'mor k'immah bittaH
Ek 16.44
tauta esti panta, hosa eipan kata sou en parabole legontes Kathws he meter, [45] kai he thugater.

houtos [e] again represents hinneh in order to distinguish the various parts of the temple as they are being described:

weninneh `al-penē hahēkal me'ah ammah Ek 42.8 kai hautai eisin antiproswpoi tautais; to pan pexwn hekaton

hoti represents hinneh in Ek 23.39 when this clause is presented as the head of YHWH's list of the sins of Oholiab and Oholibah:

weninneh koh `asū bētōk bētī Ek 23.39 kai hoti houtws epoioun en mesw tou oikou mou

plen represents hinneh in Ek 16.49, an interesting rendering which focusses the passage on the charge: 174

hinneh-zeh hayah `awōn sēdom 'āxōtek Ek 16.49 plen touto to anomema Sodomwn tes adelphes sou

hama for hinneh in Ek 23.40 and the G plus (euthus) emphasize the immediacy of her feverish preparations for the arrival of the men sent for:

174It is interesting that hayah here is a G minus.
καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς οἱ κατοικοῦντες τις παρὰ τοὺς λατρεύοντας τὸν θεὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν πολεμιστῶν τοὺς ἐπετελομένους, καὶ τὰν ἐκείνην εἰς τὸν τελός; ἀποθανοῦντες εἰς τὸν ἐπίστασθαι τοὺς πρὸς πάντα ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν. 

In Ex 15.4 the function of hinneh seems to be subsumed by the compound preposition that represents "εἰς":

τὸν ἐκκυκλίσαν μὴ εἰς τὸν παράκτην, οἱ αγγέλοις ἐκπέμπεσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἀληθῶς καὶ πρὸς τὸν δύναμιν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ πάντα εἰς τὸν τελός; ἀποθανοῦντες εἰς τὸν ἐπίστασθαι τοὺς πρὸς πάντα ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν; 

hinneh is also lacking in G in Ex 18.18--its clause is presented as the simple outcome of the aforementioned choices:

καὶ ἀποθανοῦντες εἰς τὸν τελός; ἐργάζομαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν; 

In Ex 25.7 hinêni is lacking; the greater surprise is that the pronominal suffix is not reflected in G--this is so contrary to the general tendency that we might reasonably conclude that hinêni was lacking in the translator's Vorlage:

τὸν καὶ ἀποθανοῦντες εἰς τὸν τελός; ἐργάζομαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν; 

hinneh occurs twice in Ex 37.2. The first time it is represented by idou, the second is a G minus, perhaps
because the translator felt that its distribution was sufficiently implied:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wēhinneh} & \text{ tabbōt} \text{ mē'od} \ '\text{al-pēnē habbiq'ah} \\
\text{wēhinneh} & \text{ yēbeshōt} \text{ mē'od} \quad \text{Ek 37.2 (2xx)} \\
kai idou & \text{ polla sphodra epi proszpou tou} \\
& \text{ pediou, cera sphodra.}
\end{align*}
\]

Further along in this vision of the valley of dry bones hinneh is not directly represented, although its force is felt in the subject pronoun (a G plus): 175

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hā'atsamōt} & \text{ ha'el'leh kol-bēt yisra'el hemmah} \\
\text{hinneh} & \text{ 'omrim yabēshū 'atšmōtēnū} \quad \text{Ek 37.11} \\
ta osta & \text{ tauta pas oikos Israel esti, kai autoi} \\
& \text{ legousi Cera gegone ta osta hemw, ...}
\end{align*}
\]

The translator of Ezekiel was fairly consistent in his rendering of hinneh (86%), but used ten other renderings, most of which were particles, based on his sensitivity to the context.

In the Minor Prophets 176 hinneh (62xx) is represented by idou (55xx), houtos [e] (2xx), 177 and once each by ean (Hb 2.4), [e] (Hb 2.19), ginomai (Hg 1.9), and dia touto (Zc 9.4). 178

175 It may be lacking by parablepsis due to the sequence hemmah hinneh.

176 hinneh does not occur in Jn.

177 Hb 2.13; Ma 1.13.

178 Its first occurrence (of two) in Zc 3.9 is not represented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % (MP) | 90% | 2%  | 2%  | 2%  | 4%  | 2%  | 2% |
| % (G)   | 84% | 2%  | 1%  | <1% | <1% | 2%  | 2% |

**KEY TO RENDERINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>idou</th>
<th>7 nun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>idou [e]</td>
<td>8 idou houtos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ei/ean</td>
<td>9 ginomai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>hode</td>
<td>10 houtos/ekteinos [e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>11 idou de[eta]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>hoti</td>
<td>12 ti [e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shared (2 bks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; G (clause, verse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>--- (hinneh not rep'd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**hinneh is always represented by idou in Hosea and Joel (3xx each), Amos (15xx), Obadiah (once), Micah (2xx), and Nahum (4xx). The first half of MP are thus consistent (100%);**

**it is with Hb that the other renderings begin.**

179 Renderings not used in MP are listed here for the sake of comparison.

180 Except for Jn, in which hinneh does not occur.
Although hinneh is always rendered by idou in Amos (15xx), in one passage a conjunction is prefixed, probably to specify the nature of the relationship between this verse and the preceding:

\[
\text{hinneh 'anokî me'îq taxtêkem Am 2.13} \\
\text{dia touto idou egw kuliw hupokatw humwn}
\]

In four occurrences in Habakkuk hinneh is rendered in four ways: by idou (1.6), ean (2.4), houtos [e] (2.13), and [e] (2.19). This is in part due to difficult or ambiguous texts (2.4, 13):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hinneh 'uppelah lo'-yasherah naphshô bô Hb 2.4} \\
\text{ean huposteiletai,}^{181} \text{ ouk eudokei he psuxe mou en autw}^{182}
\end{align*}
\]

The translator may have seen this as parallel to the latter portion of the preceding verse, which is also conditional, or may simply have tried to make sense of his admittedly difficult\textsuperscript{183} text.

In Hb 2.13 the translator again paraphrased his text, and used tauta [e] to represent the predicate function of hinneh:

\[
181\text{hupostellw (5xx) represents four different forms or syntagms in H one time each. In Ex 23.21 the parallel is uncertain.}
\]

\[
182\text{H: Since he is puffed up his soul will not delight in him"; G: "If he draws back [out of fear], my soul will not delight in him."}
\]

\[
183\text{Variously divided and emended by commentators. Cf., e.g., Ralph L. Smith, MICAH-MALACHI in WBC, 32 (Waco, TX: Word, 1984):105.}
\]
halo' hinneh me'et YHWH ts'ba'ôt Hb 2.13
ou tauta esti para kuriou pantokratoros?

In Hb 2.19 G again has touto [e], but here touto
represents the pronoun ḫû' following hinneh; hinneh
itself is represented, if at all, by [e]:

hinneh-ḫû' taphus zahab wakeseph Hb 2.19
touto de estin elasma xrusiou kai arguriou

The difference between Hb and the preceding books
of MP is striking (25% vs. 100%).

In Zephaniah (once; 3.19) it is rendered by idou.

In Haggai (once; 1.9) hinneh is rendered by ginomai,
perhaps because the translator misread it as hayah: 184

panoh 'el-harbeh wêhinneh limê'aT Hg 1.9
epeblepsate eis polla, kai egeneto oliga

In Zechariah (22xx) hinneh is represented by idou (20xx)
and dia touto (once; 9.4). Its first occurrence (of
two) in Zc 3.9 is lacking in G.

In Zc 9.4 dia touto represents hinneh in order to
specify the relation between the two verses:

hinneh 'ađonay yôrishennaH Zc 9.4
dia touto kurios kleronomesei auten

184 ginomai parallels hinneh in three other passages
(Ex 4.6; Ts 59.9; Ek 33.32).

185 If the translator understood wêhinneh l- as an
idiom equivalent to hayah l- ("become"), he would most
likely have rendered it by ginomai, which carries the
same force.
The first occurrence of **hinneh** in Zc 3.9 is not represented, probably because the two clauses are combined in G:

\[
\text{ki hinneh ha'eben 'asher natatti liphènè } \\
\text{yèhòshuà 'al-'eben 'axat hinènì mèphatteàx} \\
\text{pittuxah nè'um YHWH tsè'ba'òt... Zc 3.9 (twice)} \\
\text{dioti ho lithos, hon edwka pro proswpou Iesou,} \\
\text{epi ton lithon ton hena hepta ophthalmoi} \\
\text{eisin; idou egw orussw bothron, legei kurios} \\
\text{pantokratwr ...}
\]

In Malachi (6xx) **hinneh** is represented by **idou** (5xx) and **houtos** (once; 1.13):

\[
\text{wa'amartem hinneh mattèla'ah}^{186} \quad \text{Ma 1.13} \\
\text{kai eipate tauta ek kakopatheias}^{187} \text{ esti}
\]

As in other passages\(^{188}\) the demonstrative pronoun with [e] parallels **hinneh**.

The wide variation between the books of MP noted with, e.g., \'^òd\' (above) is again seen with **hinneh**, which is rendered consistently in the majority,\(^{189}\) but not in Zc (95%), Ma (83%), Hb (25%), or Hg (0%), again calling into question the assumption that MP represents a translation unit.

---

\(^{186}\) Read mah tèlla'ah "What a nuisance".

\(^{187}\) Only here in G.

\(^{188}\) Cf. on Hb 2.13 (above).

\(^{189}\) **hinneh** is represented only by **idou** in Am (15xx), Na (4xx), Ho and Jl (3xx each), Mi (2xx), and Zp and Ob (once each).
In Psalms (28xx) hinneh is rendered by idou in every case but one. The exception is also its only occurrence with a suffix in Ps (139.8), where hinneh is represented by pareimi in a rendering which parallels that of the personal pronoun in the preceding line:

'im-'essaq shamayim sham 'attah wè'atstsi'ah shê'ôl hinneka Ps 139.8
ean anabw eis ton ouranon, sê ekei; ean katabw eis ton haden, parei.190

Psalms is thus quite consistent when representing hinneh, rendering it as idou (96%) except where it occurs with a pronominal suffix.

In Job (17xx) hinneh is rendered by idou (8xx) and de (2xx), and once each by alla (3.7), ecaiphnes (1.19), eigar (4.3), and ti [e] (38.35). It is not represented twice,191 one verse in which it occurs is lacking in G (32.12).

The usual rendering occurs in Jb 2.6, although its clause is paraphrased heavily:

hinnô beyadeka idou paradidwmi soi auton

hinneh192 is also represented by idou in Jb 13.18, despite the heavily paraphrased remainder of the verse:

190 It is also consistent with the pattern of renderings of the predicators of existence with suffixes in general (cf. on 'ayyeh, et al., above).

191 Jb 9.19; 33.7.

192 Actually hinneh-na'.
hinneh-na' `araktî mishpaT yada`tî kî-`ănî 'etsdaq
idou egw eggus eimi tou krimatos mou, oida egw hoti dikaios anaphanoumai.\textsuperscript{193}

In Jb 4.3 hinneh is represented by \textit{ei gar}, probably because the translator misread \textit{hinneh} as \textit{hen}, or because he wanted to make the protasis of the condition explicit:

\begin{quote}
in Jb 4.3 hinneh is represented by \textit{ei gar}, probably because the translator misread hinneh as \textit{hen}, or because he wanted to make the protasis of the condition explicit:
\end{quote}

\textit{hinneh yissarta rabbîm \textit{ei gar \textit{su enouthetesas pollous}}}

\textit{alla corresponds to hinneh in Jb 3.7. hinneh here seems to emphasize that the night already cursed in verse 6 is further cursed here ([6] hallaylah hahû' ... [7] hinneh hallaylah hahû' ... )}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{hinneh hallaylah hahû' yêhî galmûd \textit{alla he nuc ekeine eie odune}}
\end{quote}

The last two occurrences of hinneh\textsuperscript{194} occur in consecutive verses (40.15f), where they are both rendered by \textit{idou}. 40.15, however, prefixes \textit{alla} to \textit{idou}, perhaps reflecting a lost \textit{waw}, or to reflect the change of subject:\textsuperscript{195}

\begin{quote}
\textit{hinneh-na' bêhemôt `asher-`asîtî `immak \textit{alla de idou theria para soi};}
\end{quote}

Another conjunction, \textit{de}, corresponds to \textit{hinneh} in

\textsuperscript{193}G may have read \textit{garabtî} for `araqtî. Cf. Dhorme, \textit{JOB}, 188.

\textsuperscript{194}Both \textit{hinneh-na'}.\textsuperscript{195}

\textsuperscript{195}To bêhemôt (G: \textit{theria}).
Jb 5.17 and 32.19. Although it may reflect the existence of hinneh, it does not represent its function:

\[ \text{hinneh 'ashrê 'ênôsh yôkixennû 'êlôâH Jb 5.17} \]
\[ \text{makarios de anthrwpos, hon elegcen ho kurios} \]
\[ \text{hinneh-biTni k'yayin lo'-yipptaeâx Jb 32.19} \]
\[ \text{he de gaster mou hwspdr askos gleukous zewn dedemenos} \]

In YHWH's scathing (and rhetorical) interrogation of Job he asks about Job's ability to command the lightning so that it (they) responds as a servant to its master (hinnenû). In G the lightning responds to Job's attempted commands by asking "What is this [that commands us]?":

\[ \text{hattâshallax b'raqîm weyelekû weyo'merû le'ka hinnenû Jb 38.35} \]
\[ \text{aposteleis de keraunous kai poreusontai? erousin de soi Tí estin?}^{196} \]

In Jb 1.19, as a messenger describes the loss of Job's flocks and herds, another comes to tell of the death of his children, who had been feasting in the house of their elder brother:

\[ \text{wêhinneh rûâx gedôlah ba'ah me'eber hammidbar Jb 1.19} \]
\[ \text{ecaiphnes pneuma mega epelthen ek tes eremou ecaiphnes "suddenly, unexpectedly" is an excellent idiomatic rendering of wêhinneh in this verse.} \]

\[ ^{196} \text{H: Do you send the lightnings so that they go and so that they say, "Here we are"? vs. G: "Do you send lightnings and they go? Will they [not rather] say [of] you "What's this?" tî [e] occurs elsewhere only in Gn (4xx) and Ex (once).} \]
Jb 9.19, in which hinneh is preceded by the adjective, has been paraphrased heavily; it is unclear which Greek form, if any, parallels hinneh. It does not seem to be represented:

'îm-le'koax 'amîts hinneh wê'im-le'mishpaT mî yô'idênî
hoti men gar isxui krâtei tîs oun krimatî autou antistesetai

In Jb 33.7 hinneh is also a minus in G. Perhaps the need to front the negative adverb made it superfluous:

hinneh 'emâtî lo' te'ba'âteka
oux ho phobos mou se strobesei

The translator of Job was thus not consistent in rendering hinneh (57%), this variety resulting in part from his use of various conjunctions to represent hinneh.

In Proverbs (3xx) hinneh is represented once each by idou (1.23) and ean (24.31). It is not represented in Pr 7.10.

Pr 24.31 is heavily paraphrased, although the imagery of G reflects that of H:

wê'hinneh 'alah kullô qimmêsonîm
ean aphes auton, xerswthesetai

197 H: "All of it had come up thorns"; G: "If he lets it, it will become barren."

198 xersoumai occurs 3xx (Pr 24.31; Na 1.10; Jr 2.31) in G. In none of these passages does it clearly reflect a form in H.
In Pr 7.10, however, hinneh is a minus in G by haplography probably due to parablepsis (wenha'ishshah for wenhinneh 'ishshah):

\[
\text{wenhinneh 'ishshah ligra'to} \\
\text{he de gune sunanta autw}
\]

\[\text{Pr 7.10}\]

Ruth (5xx) and Qoheleth (6xx) are consistent, using only idou to represent hinneh.

In Esther (3xx) hinneh is represented by idou (2xx) and by ei (8.7).

In Es 7.9, where the predicatory function of hinneh seems clear, the translator rendered the subordinate relative clause as the main clause, although the sense of H is preserved, and hinneh is represented by idou: 200

\[
\text{gam hinneh-ha'ets 'asher-`asah haman} \\
\text{l'emordi`ay} \\
\text{Es 7.9}
\]

Idou kai culon hetoimasen Aman Mardoiaiw

ei corresponds to hinneh in Es 8.7, where the translator has syntactically paraphrased the king's declaration as a conditional question, 201 and expanded

199'\text{H: "And there was a woman [coming out] to meet him"; G: "The woman met him."} \]

200'H: "There is the gallows which Haman made for Mordecai"; G: "See! Haman has even prepared a gallows for Mordecai".

201'What does hinneh add to this sentence, which could be translated in two ways: hinneh bêt-haman natatti l'ester "Here is the house of Haman [which] I have given to Esther" or "Here is the house of Haman. I have given [it] to Esther" (Es 8.7). The translator has
bêt into panta ta huparxonta for greater emphasis or
clearly:

hinneh bêt-haman natatti 1'ester Es 8.7
ei panta ta huparxonta Aman edwka kai
exarisamen soi

The translator was fairly consistent, representing

hinneh by idou (2/3xx = 67%).

hinneh occurs 10xx in Daniel, where it is rendered only
by idou (9xx). It is not represented in 8.3, where the
translator's approach to his text may have led him not
to represent hinneh:202

wa'essa' 'ênay wa'er'eh wêhinneh 'ayil 'exad
'ômed liphnê ha'ubal wêlô qarnayim Dn 8.3
G: anablepsas eidon krion hena megan hestwta
apenanti tes pules, kai eixe kerata

paraphrased Artaxerxes' declaration, adding the question
of further reward ti eti epizeteis? "[If I have given
you ...] what more do you want?"

202 The idiomatic nature of G is readily apparent
when it is contrasted with the rather literal Th: kai
era tous ophthalmous mou kai eidon kai idou krios heis
hestekws pro tou Oubal, kai autw kerata (Dn 8.3).

In Dn 10.5, however, their renderings of the
introductory idiom coincide:

wa'essa' 'ênay wa'er'eh wêhinneh 'îsh-'exad
labûsh baddîm Dn 10.5
kai era tous ophthalmous mou kai eidon kai
idou anthrwpos [Th: aner] heis endedumenos
bussina [Th: baddin]

The rendering of hinneh is reversed, however, in Dn
10.20, where it is represented with idou in G, but is a
minus in Th:

wêhinneh sar-yawan Dn 10.20
G: kai idou strategos hellenwn eiseporeueto.
Th: kai ho arxwn twn hellenwn erxeto.
The translator of Daniel was thus consistent in representing *hinneh* (100%).

*Hinneh* occurs once in *Ezra* where it is rendered by *idou* (9.15).

In *Nehemiah* (3xx) *hinneh* is rendered once each by *idou* (6.12) and *idou [e]* (9.36a). The verse in which it occurs is lacking in *G* (9.36b (vv 36b-37a < G)).

In *1 Chronicles* (8xx) *hinneh* is represented by *idou* (5xx). In its other three occurrences it is not represented in *G.*

In *Cl* 9.1 *hinneh* is not represented and the pronominal suffix is rendered with a demonstrative rather than a personal pronoun: 203

\[
\text{wεkol}-\text{yisra'el hityaxsũ wεhinnam kεtūbím 'al-}
\text{sepher malḵē yisra'el C1 9.1}
\]
\[
\text{kai pas Israel, ho sulloxismos autwn, kai}
\text{houtoi katagegrammenoi en bibliw twn basilewn}
\text{Israel}
\]

*Hinneh* is also a minus in *G* at *Cl* 11.25, where the pronoun (not the suffix) is again rendered by *houtos*:

\[
\text{min-hashshlōshim hinnō nikbad hũ' C1 11.25}
\text{huper tous triakonta endocos houtos}
\]

---

203 Cf., e.g., *houtos [e]* (Hb 2.13; Ma 1.13) and *dia touto* (Zc 9.4).
In a familiar verse, C1 29.29, hinneh is not represented in G, since eisin merely functions as part of the analytic tense:

\[
\text{wedibre dawid hammalek hari'shonîm weha'axronîm [sic BHS] hinnam kêtûbîm 'al-dibrê shêmû'el haro'eh ... } \quad \text{C1 29.29}
\]

hoi de loipoi 204 logoi tou basilews David hoi proteroi kai hoi husteroi gegrannmenoi eisin en logos Samouel tou blepontos ...

The translator of 1 Chronicles thus represents hinneh consistently by idou (100%), but did not represent it at all in three of its eight occurrences.

In 2 Chronicles (40xx) hinneh is rendered by idou (36xx), idou [e] (2xx), and by ei (once; 6.18). Its second occurrence in 16.11 is not represented.

In C2 6.18 hinneh is represented by ei, which makes the sentence conditional rather than absolute, but is a reasonable interpretation of the passage in H:

\[
\text{hinneh shamayim ûshêmê hashshamayim lo' yêkal'ēlûka } \quad \text{C2 6.18}
\]

\[
ei ho ouranos kai ho ouranos tou ouranou ouk arkesousin soi,
\]

The translator of C2 used idou to represent the first occurrence of hinneh in C2 16.11, but combined the two clauses and so did not represent its second occurrence as superfluous:

---

\(^{204}\)hoi de loipoi reflects the standard formula in Chronicles closing the description of a king's reign (we'yether dibrê ...).
In C2 18.12 *idou* represents *hinneh*, but the non-verbal clause is made verbal—perhaps the translator *misread* *dibrê* as *dabbêrû*:

> hinneh dibrê hannêbi'îm peh-'exad Tôb 'el-hammelek  
> idou elalesan hoi prophetoi en stomati hen agatha peri tou basilews

In C2 20.24 *hinneh* is also translated by *idou*, but here the participle, normally represented by a finite verb, remains a participle:
hinneh is rendered by idou in C2 33.18, but the elision of the last two words of the clause is difficult to explain, especially given the syntactical requirement of a genitive for a patently construct form:

hinnom 'al-dibreb malkhe yisra'el [19] utephillahto ... C2 33.18 idou epi logwn [19] proseuxes autou, ...

The translator of 2 Chronicles was thus quite consistent, regularly using idou to represent hinneh (92%).
RENDERINGS OF hinneh WITH AFFIXES

hinneh occurs with the conjunction we- (364xx), with pronominal suffixes (226xx), and with both together (20xx). It is not used with any other prefix or preposition. These combinations did not affect the translators' renderings of hinneh.

With pronominal suffixes, the consistency of its rendering (85%) is essentially the same as that for all occurrences of hinneh (83.2%), although the range of renderings is much smaller. Two renderings, tí and pareimi, represent hinneh with a suffix, but not hinneh alone.

hinneh with a pronominal suffix in non-verbal syntagms is rendered less consistently by idou (67.1%).

205 These 20 occurrences are not included in the previous totals for use with the conjunction and pronominal suffixes, but are included in the figures given in the charts (below).

206 This sets it off from the other predicators of existence (above).

207 hinneh also occurs with independent pronouns (87xx), of which 77 are rendered by independent pronouns in G (92%).

208 Of 12 common renderings, 1 of 6 shared, and 2 of 28 unique renderings represent hinneh with a pronominal suffix.

209 Only in Gn 22.7a; 31.11; 46.2; Ex 3.4; Jb 38.35.

210 A "shared" rendering (limited to Is 52.6; Ps 139.8).
than its occurrences in verbal (77.8%) or participial (85.2%) syntagms.

*hinneh* with pronominal suffixes apparently did not present the same difficulty to the translators as did the other words investigated (above). The exceptions to this general rule are Ps and SS. The translator of SS (9xx) rendered *hinneh* without a suffix by *idou* (4xx), but *hinneh* with a suffix by *idou [e]* (5xx).\(^{211}\) *hinneh* only occurs once with a suffix in Ps (of 28xx), but this is its only occurrence in Ps not rendered by *idou.*\(^{212}\)

\(^{211}\)It might appear that this is because *hinneh* with a suffix occurs only in non-verbal syntagms in SS, but one of its occurrences without a suffix is also non-verbal (SS 3.7), and is rendered by *idou*. SS therefore is the book which distinguishes most strikingly between the two forms.

\(^{212}\)The translator used *pareimi*, a rendering shared only with Is 52.6 (where *hinneh* also has a suffix).
### Renderings of hinneh with Pronominal Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sfx (%)
85 7 2 <1 2 1 2

### KEY TO RENDERINGS of hinneh

| 1 idou | 7 nun | 13 Shared (2 bks) |
| 2 idou [e] | 8 idou houtos | 14 Unique |
| 3 ei/ean | 9 ginomai | 15 < G (clause, verse) |
| 4 hode | 10 houtos/ekeinos [e] | 16 --- (hinneh not rep'd) |
| 5 [e] | 11 idou de[eta] | 16 --- (hinneh not rep'd) |
| 6 hoti | 12 ti [e] | 16 --- (hinneh not rep'd) |
Pronominal suffixes with hinneh are fairly consistently rendered by an independent pronoun in G (77%). When suffixed hinneh occurs in a participial clause (136xx), the participle is usually represented by a finite verb, and the preferred rendering of the suffix is an independent pronoun (84%). The suffix is also represented by the person/number inflection of either the verb which renders the participle or of [e] (when hinneh with suffix is rendered by idou [e]; both 11%). Once it is represented by ekeinos (K1 3.21).

In non-verbal clauses (71xx) the independent

---

213 Twelve books consistently use [only] an independent pronoun; most of these, however, have only one or two suffixed occurrences of hinneh: Zc and S2 (5xx each), Jo, Am, Na, and Ma (2xx each), and Ho, Mi, Hb, Zp, Dn, and Ez (once each).

Five others (with the majority of occurrences, 129/236xx = 55%) are fairly consistent: Ek (38xx; 97%), Jr (68xx; 95%), S1 (11xx) and K1 (10xx; both 90%), and Ex (8xx; 88%).

Six books are somewhat consistent, but only Gn and K2 have enough occurrences for this distinction to be significant: Jg and Cl (both 3xx; both 67%), Gn (18xx; 59%), and K2 (12xx; 55%), and Nu (4xx), Dt and Js (2xx each). The latter three all use an independent pronoun in 50% of the occurrences.

The least consistent group of books, including three in which the pronominal suffix is never rendered by an independent pronoun includes Is (12xx; 33%), C2 (19xx; 10%), and SS (5xx), Jb (2xx), and Ps (once). The latter three never use an independent pronoun.

214 The participle is rendered by a finite verb in 79% of these passages (vs. 83% of all occurrences). This is not surprising, given the difference in function between participles in G and H, especially in these clauses, where it is primarily verbal, not adjectival.
pronoun is again the preferred rendering, although it is not nearly as frequent (65%).

When hinneh with a suffix occurs in a verbal clause (29xx) the person and number of the suffix tend also to be indicated by an independent pronoun (76%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl Occ</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>[e]</th>
<th>Othr</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>PN (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptc 136</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Vb 71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vbl 29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 236</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the conjunction (wēhinneh; 364xx, represented 336xx), hinneh is represented by idou (259xx = 77%), which is slightly lower than, but does not vary significantly from, the renderings of all the biblical occurrences of hinneh (83.2%). This is doubtless because these passages represent such a large percentage of the whole (364/1063xx = 34.2%) and because their distribution is approximately the same as hinneh generally. Thus wēhinneh did not pose any particular complication for the translators who, with the exception

---

215 On the rendering of wēhinneh see Johannessohn, "Das biblische kai idou".
of the translator of Gn, rendered it fairly consistently by *idou* with a conjunction (usually *kai*, occasionally *de*).

\[216\] Although *idou* is the most frequent rendering in Gn (24/49xx = 50%), the translator tended to translate *wehinneh* with infrequent renderings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rendering</th>
<th>This Rendering in Gn</th>
<th><em>wehinneh</em></th>
<th>This Rendering in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 (also Ex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horaw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (only Gn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>euthus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (only Gn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oiomai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (only Gn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwsper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (only Gn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hode [e]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (only Gn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hode</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idou hwsper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (only Gn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (also Is)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not represented 11xx (of 14xx in Gn), once because its clause is a G minus.
In addition to asking about the effect of affixes on the representation of hinneh in G, I also asked whether or not the syntagm in which hinneh occurs affected its translation. It does not appear, however,
In addition to asking about the effect of affixes on the representation of *hinneh* in G, I also asked whether or not the syntagm in which *hinneh* occurs affected its translation. It does not appear, however, that the syntagms within which *hinneh* occurs was significant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings of <em>we</em> hinneh by Type of Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl Oc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>we</em>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings of <em>hinneh + Suffix</em> by Type of Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptcpl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-vrbl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>+sfx</em> (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYNONYMS OF hinneh IN G

Did the translators of G render hen (98xx) and re'eh (139xx) as though either was a synonym of hinneh (and thus by idou), or did they view and render them as different words with different functions?¹

hen²

hen, which is distributed quite unevenly in H,³ does

¹See the background to this discussion under 'ayyeh (above).

²Cf., inter alia, Waltke & O'Connor, INTRODUCTION: "... the two particles do not differ in their use" (#40.2.1a); their statement is based on that of Labuschagne, "hen and hinneh", whom they cite. Cf. discussions of hen among the literature cited on hinneh (above).

³Three books contain 70% of its occurrences: Jb (32xx) is the only book in which it occurs more frequently than hinneh; Is (25xx; 22xx in Is 40-66); and Gn (12xx).
function as a predicator of existence, although relatively infrequently. Cf., e.g.: 4

\[
\text{wayyo'mer YHWH hen 'am 'exad w\textsuperscript{\textregistered}saphah 'axat le\textsuperscript{kullam} ...} \quad \text{Gn 11.6}
\]

YHWH said, "They are all one people and speak one language ..."

\[
\text{hen-tawî shadday y\textsuperscript{\textregistered}anêî} \quad \text{Jb 31.35}
\]

Here is my mark! Let Shaddai answer me!

\textit{hen} occurs with a participle only once, but even here the participle does not have the predicate function that so dominates the syntagms of hinneh:

\[
\text{hen kull\textsuperscript{\textregistered}kem god\textsuperscript{\textregistered}x\textregistered} 'esh m\textsuperscript{\textregistered}azz\textsuperscript{\textregistered}rê ziq\textsuperscript{\textregistered}t} \quad \text{Is 50.11}
\]

All of you who kindle a fire--who gird yourselves with firebrands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings of hen</th>
<th>Bk Occ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb 32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT 69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Occurrences of hen</th>
<th>TOT 98</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinneh</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4Cf. Joüon, who, however overstates the difference between the two: "hen voici, particule qu'on emploie notamment pour attirer l'attention, est parfois employé avec la valeur de si, ... Par contre hinneh ne semble pas avoir jamais la valeur propre de si" (GRAMMAIRE, 516; §1671).
The translators of G did not interpret hen as a synonym of hinneh.\textsuperscript{5} This is clear given the various renderings which they used to represent it.\textsuperscript{6}

The three books in which hen primarily occurs use idou and ei/ean equally to represent hen (above).

\textsuperscript{5}Only Nu and Dt use idou to represent most of the occurrences of hen (both \(3/4xx = 75\%\)). No other book uses idou in more than half (actually 46\%) of its occurrences.

\textsuperscript{6}Three renderings (8 occurrences) are shared between two books: de (Is 49.21; Jb 33.10; 40.4), which was also shared by [Limited to] Is and Jb for hinneh; idou de [eta] (Is 33.7; Jb 27.12), which also renders hinneh (5xx; S1, K2, Is); and idou gar (Is 51.7, 8; Is 32.1).

Twelve renderings (13 occurrences) are unique:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Renderings of hen vis à vis hinneh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epeide Gn 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e] Gn 27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idou nun Ex 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idou [e] Ex 6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ean gar Ex 8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai Is 23.13; 44.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me Is 59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai nun Is 64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epei Ps 78.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwste Jb 21.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwsper Jb 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pws Jb 33.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusion that the translators did not interpret hen as a synonym of hinneh is not obviated by the shared and unique renderings of the two, although if hen occurred more frequently it might need modification.
re'eh

re'eh is partially synonymous with hinneh—their functions overlap. re'eh is usually followed by a verb, although it occurs absolutely as well as in participial and non-verbal clauses.

Another question with regard to the identification of re'eh with hinneh is the extent to which re'eh is used of sight. The passages in which re'eh is followed by an object that is either a physical entity or observable action is confined to those passages in which its function does not parallel that of hinneh—the minority its occurrences. The probability is greater, therefore, that re'eh (2ms) "borrowed" the deictic 7

---

7 2ms occurs 82xx in H; the other imperatives occur an additional 58xx in qal.

8 This despite Simcha Kogut's assertion that "hinneh (without a conjunctive waw) must be seen as having "absorbed" the imperative of the verb of seeing re'eh ("Behold!"), ..." ("Meaning and Syntactical Status", 150).

Cf. also Waltke & O'Connor, who include re'eh in their list of "presentative exclamations" (INTRODUCTION, #40.2.1a, fn 4); BDB "hen ... (nearly = hinneh)" (907); Joüon, in his brief discussion of interjections: "On emploie souvent aussi l'impératif re'eh vois! voici!, ... même en s'adressant à plusieurs personnes (donc = voici!) (GRAMMAIRE, §105d).

9 The verb that most frequently follows re'eh is natan (11/82xx).
function of the far more frequent hinneh than vice versa.\textsuperscript{10}

\textit{ré'eh} usually functions as the simple 2ms qal imperative of \textit{ra'ah} (51xx). In this function it is fairly consistently represented by \textit{ide} (43/48xx = 90\%).\textsuperscript{11}

When it functions like hinneh,\textsuperscript{12} however, \textit{ré'eh} is rendered by \textit{idou} (18xx), \textit{horaw} (9xx), and by \textit{ide de [eta]} and \textit{epiblepws} (once each).\textsuperscript{13}

Although \textit{idou} most frequently represents this latter use, the use of \textit{horaw} for this function and its preponderance when rendering the "normal" use of the

\textsuperscript{10}This does not solve the question of the origin of hinneh, which is Kogut's concern. It merely demonstrates how unlikely is their synonymity.

\textsuperscript{11}This differs from the representation of hinneh, rendered by \textit{ide} once (Gn 27.6). hen is also rendered by \textit{blepws} (C2 10.16), \textit{ginwskw} (Ex 33.13), \textit{idou} (S1 24.12), and \textit{huperphainws} (Jb 40.12). In this function it is not represented 3xx (all Jb).

This compares favorably with the renderings of the other qal imperatives of \textit{ra'ah} (although these themselves may occasionally function as equivalents of hinneh): \textit{ide/idete} (50xx = 91\%); \textit{blepete} (3xx = 5\%); \textit{idou} (2xx = 4\%).

\textsuperscript{12}It is followed by \textit{natan} (above) only in this function.

\textsuperscript{13}In Kl 12.16 it was read as \textit{ra'ah} "shepherd, tend" and rendered by \textit{nun boskw}. Three of these occurrences are minuses because part or all of the verse in which \textit{ré'eh} occurs is lacking in G (Gn 31.50; S1 24.12; Jr 40.4).
imperative show that the translators\textsuperscript{14} did not interpret \textit{re'eh} as a synonym of \textit{hinneh}.\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings of \textit{re'eh}</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{re'eh}</td>
<td>horaw</td>
<td>idou</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>\textless{} G</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT 58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Renderings of \textit{re'eh} Compared to Other Imvs of \textit{ra'ah} |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Form                        | horaw     | blepw     | idou      | Other     |
| \textit{re'eh} 68\%         | 25\%      | 7\%       |            |           |
| Other Im'ves 91\%           | 5\%       | 4\%       | --        |           |

It is evident that the translators regarded \textit{re'eh} primarily as a form of \textit{ra'ah} rather than an equivalent of \textit{hinneh}, even though they used \textit{idou} in a not insignificant number of occurrences (25\%). They did distinguish this from the other imperatives of \textit{ra'ah}, however, since they did not use \textit{idou} for (even) the 2fs forms of the imperative.

\textsuperscript{14}This conclusion does not contradict Bauer-Leander: "Umgekehrt können Imperative aus dem Verband mit ihrem Paradigma heraustreten und zu Interjektionen werden. Das ist im Hebr. mit folgenden der Fall: . . . \textit{re'eh}". They add "[which is] auch als Anrede an mehrere" (HISTORISCHE GRAMMATIK, §83.IV).

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{idou} represents only one-quarter of the occurrences of \textit{re'eh}; \textit{id}e represents two-thirds.
**idou in G**

Given the presence of *idou* where its parallel in *H* cannot be established with certainty, it is reasonable to ask whether or not the translators of *G* at times simply inserted *idou* for emphasis.

In the other occurrences forms other than *hinneh* are rendered by or (at least) correspond to *idou*: *hălo'* (41xx), *ra'ah* (22xx), *zeh* (5xx), *'attah* (4xx), *raq* (3xx), a personal pronoun (3xx), and *'abal, xazah, koh, ki, he'/ha', and 'anna* (once each).

This rendering is most frequent in *Kl* and *K2*, where *idou* normally represents *hălo'* in the regnal summaries: "Are they not written in the books of . . ." (Dt is the

---

16 Of 120 occurrences of *idou* marked with dash or dagger in *H-R*, 37 have no observable correspondence between *idou* and a form in *H* (see the next note).

17 Cf. the background of this question—asked of *pou*—under *ayyeh* (above).

18 This regnal formula occurs in *K1-2* and *C1-2* (48xx). In *K1*, *C1*, and *C2* both rhetorical *hălo'* and positive *hinnam* were rendered by *idou* (*K1 and C1, 100%; C2, 92%). This probably means that the translators of those books saw *idou* as the most appropriate representation of the concept, regardless of the actual formula in *H*. In *K2*, however, *idou* (11xx: *hinnam* (4xx), *hălo'* (7xx)) and *ouxi* (11xx: *hălo'*—only in *K2*) are equally frequent.

The rhetorical (but non-regnal) formula in *Es 10.2* is rendered with *idou*:

\[hălo'\text{-}hem \, kֵֽ֥t̄úbîm \ldots\]  
\[idou \, gegraptai \ldots\]  

*Es 10.2*

as is *hinnam* in *C2 35.25* (referring to Jeremiah's letter).

Although *C2* quite consistently uses *idou* to
only other book in which idou represents a form other than hinneh more than ten times—as often as hinneh itself occurs in Dt!).

In nearly one quarter of these passages idou seems to have been added under the influence of another idou (usually representing hinneh) in the immediate context, often in the same verse (11xx). In Gn 17.20 the first idou was added to parallel the second but also to set off YHWH's declaration of hearing from the specific actions to be taken on Ishmael's behalf:19

represent either formula in H, in two passages G "reverses" H:

\[ h^\text{alo'}-\text{hem k^\text{etubim} ... } \]
\[ \text{idou gegrammenoi ... } \]
\[ hinnam k^\text{etubim} ... \]
\[ \text{ouk idou tauta gegrammena ... } \]

19 Nu 22.11 can also be explained in this way: idou makes Israel's actions parallel.

In S1 (2xx) idou parallels preceding occurrences of hinneh rendered by idou in the same verse (S1 12.2; 14.26).

In Ek (4xx) idou also parallels preceding occurrences of hinneh rendered by idou, but not in the same verse. These plusses can probably better be explained as arising out of a desire to introduce items in parallel fashion (40.20 (under the influence of 40.24; cf. BHS), 44; 42.1; Ek 43.6 (cf. 43.2, 5)—note that here an object (phwne) is also added to maintain or strengthen the parallelism. This also applies to Jb 1.14 (cf. 1.6, 12,19).

Es 6.4 is a more difficult text, but idou was added in G (o') for consistency with the following verse.
Gn 17.20

peri de Ismael idou epēkousa sou; idou eulogēsa auton kai aukanw auton kai plethunw auton sphodra;

Is 41.28 also illustrates this:

\[ wē'ere\ \ wē'ēn\ 'īsh \ ūme'elleh \ wē'ēn \ yō`ets \]

Is 41.28

apo gar twn ethnwn idou outheis, kai apo twn eidwlwn autwn ouk en ho anaggellwn

Another example, more complicated, but still clear, is KI 3.21. The first occurrence of hinneh was rendered by ekeinos, and the second by idou, which was probably also added to the second clause to make the two parallel:

\[ wēhinneh \ met\ wa'etb̄onen \ 'elayw \ babboqer \ wēhinneh \ lo' \ hayah \ bēnî ... \]

KI 3.21a

kai ekeinos tethnekws; kai idou katenoesa auton prwi, kai idou ouk en ho huios mou ...

idou was also used as an emphatic plus in G

(26xx): 20

20 In addition to the examples cited, cf. Gn 31.44; Ex 17.9; S1 17.10; Is 26.1; 44.22; 49.6; 66.9 (ouk idou represents 'im); Jr 4.10 (cf. 4.13, 16, where hinneh > idou); 11.10; Ek 22.18; 34.3; Jb 30.26 (a very difficult verse, given its confusion with 30.27); Dn 9.21 (where it points out the content of Daniel's dream); 10.8; Cl 29.3; C2 25.18.

In KI 13.4 idou points out the withering of Jeroboam's hand when he stretched it out against the man of God; it also marks the coming of the bears who avenged the slight given Elisha (K2 2.24).

Twice in Is idou is a plus following ra'ah, which may account for its insertion, given its general use with verbs of perception (Is 49.18; 60.4).

Given the nature of Jg B as generally conforming more closely to H than Jg A, it is interesting that three of four occurrences of idou as a G plus in Jg occur only in Jg B (1.24; 8.5; 16.13).
Although various forms in H can be aligned with idou in several passages, it is unclear whether idou represents the form in H or the translator misread H.\(^{22}\)

It does not seem that the translators of G arbitrarily added idou, since in some of the passages in which it cannot be aligned with a form in H idou appears to have been added under the influence of a nearby hinneh. On the other hand, it was apparently added at appropriate points because of its emphatic function.

\(^{21}\) Did hinneh in the middle of the verse (hinneh-hi'luTah bassimlah 'axarē ha'ephōd) influence the translator in the other two clauses? If so, why did he not render this occurrence of hinneh?

\(^{22}\) In Jg 18.22 should we restore wēhinneh mîcah before wēha'ēnashîm (omitted by homoioarchton)? Did the translator read ken as hen (K1 20.40 (21.40))? Was wayhi read as wēhinneh (K1 6.5; Ek 1.25)?
SUMMARY

hinneh occurs 1036xx in H, ranging from Jr (135xx) to four books in which it occurs just once. It is rendered primarily by idou (84%).

Six renderings are limited to two books ("shared" renderings). Twenty-nine renderings (representing thirty-seven occurrences) are unique. The frequency of idou, the usual rendering, covers the spectrum from 100% (twelve books) to 25% (Hb; 4xx) and 0% (Hg; once).

Twelve books consistently render hinneh into G using idou (100%): Am (15xx), Dn (10xx), C1 (8xx),

23 It does not occur in Jn or La.

24 Ob, Zp, Hg, Ez.

25 alla (Is 5.7b; Jb 3.7), de (Is 5.7a; Jb 5.17; 32.19), exw (Gn 8.11; Is 62.11c), horaw (Gn 24.63; 26.8; 37.29; 40.6; Ex 2.13), hwde (hinneh was read as hennah; Jg 19.9b; Sl 20.21b, 22), pareimi (both are suffixed: Is 52.6; Ps 139.8 (not by coincidence the only suffixed occurrence of hinneh in Ps).

26 9 (32%) of these occur in Gn. 24 occur only once; 6 are limited to Gn, they occur more than once: epeide (Gn 18.31; 19.19), euthus (Gn 15.4; 24.45; 38.29), hode [e] (Gn 25.24; 38.27), hwsper (Gn 37.9b; 41.18, 22), oiomai (Gn 37.7a; 40.16; 41.1; 41.17).

27 Hb, Hg and SS (44%) are the only books in which idou represents fewer than one-half of the occurrences of hinneh.

28 Am is the only book in which hinneh occurs more than ten times and is rendered by idou alone.
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Qo (6xx), Ru (5xx), Na (4xx), Ho and Jl (3xx each), Mi (2xx), and Ob, Zp, and Ez (once each). Only one never uses idou: Hg (once).  

Four books are highly consistent in rendering hinneh, each using only one rendering in addition to idou:  

- S2 (97.9%), Zc (95.2%), Ps (96.4%), and Ma (83.3%).  

In the Pentateuch Gn (62.9%), Ex (69.4%), Nu

- hinneh is not represented once.  
- Although it is not represented (3xx).  
- Cf. on 'ên (above), where Hg was also the only book of MP never to use the usual rendering.  
- hinneh occurs three times in both Pr and Ne. Only two occurrences in each book are represented, one by idou and the other by ean (Pr 24.31) and idou [e] (Ne 9.36a).  
- hoti represents hinneh in S2 5.10 (hoti also renders hinneh in Gn, Ex, and Jr (2xx each), and Dt, S1, Is, and Ek (once each)).  
- dia touto (Zc 9.4) is a unique rendering.  
- pareimi occurs in Ps 139.8. This shared rendering occurs elsewhere only in Is 52.6.  
- houtos [e] occurs in Ma 1.13 (this rendering also occurs in Ek (2xx) and Gn, Js, K1, and Hb (once each)).  

Gn is the only book in which hinneh is translated more than thirty-nine times and in which it is rendered by idou less than 80% of the time. It also contains the largest number of unique and shared renderings, including five renderings that occur nowhere else in G, although they occur several times in Gn (above).

Those books with more occurrences (and the consistency with which they represent hinneh) are Jg (43xx; 93%), S1 (75xx; 90.6%), S2 (26xx; 97.8%), K1
(69.2%), and Dt (70%)\textsuperscript{38} are consistent relative to each other, both in overall percentage and in other renderings used.\textsuperscript{39} Lv, however, renders \textit{hinneh} far more consistently than the other members of the Pentateuch (83.3%),\textsuperscript{40} probably due to its occurrence in what is very nearly a fixed [cultic] formula.

The variation among the various books of MP noted for the other words (above) appears also with \textit{hinneh}.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{38 hinneh} occurs, however, only ten times in Dt, so this number should not be pressed in comparison with the other three.

\textbf{39 Although this latter number fluctuates according to the occurrences of hinneh. Js (63.6%) and Jb (57.1%) also belong to this "strata" of consistency, although the total occurrences and occurrences rendered are significantly lower than for Gn, Ex, and Nu. Es (66.7%) uses only one other rendering (ei; Es 8.7), but its total occurrences (3xx) again make its characterisation by inclusion within a group unhelpful.}

\textbf{40} 83.3\% may not seem especially high when compared to, e.g., Am (100\%), but it is significantly higher than Gn, Ex, Nu, and Dt.

\textbf{41 See the excursus "Is MP a Translation Unit?" in the Conclusion (below)1}
The consistency with which *idou* represents *hinneh* ranges from those seven books which are absolutely consistent (100%)\(^42\) to Hg, which does not use *idou* (once; 0%).\(^43\) Hb (4xx; 25%) also stands somewhat apart, using three other renderings, only one of which occurs elsewhere in MP.\(^44\)

Although the translators did not have "trouble" deciding how to represent *hinneh*, their understanding of its function was quite different from that evidenced by modern grammars and lexica. To them it appeared a fixed form, essentially apart from its syntagmatic context;\(^45\) to us it appears an integral and essential part of its syntactical and discourse contexts.\(^46\)

\(^{42}\)Am (15xx), Na (4xx), Ho and Jl (3xx), Mi (2xx), Ob and Zp (once each).

\(^{43}\) *ginomai* represents *hinneh* (Hg 1.9), a rendering also found in Ex, Is, Ek (once each). Hg again stands alone among MP in rejecting totally the usual rendering (cf. *'ên* which was rendered by *ou [e]* 0/5xx).

\(^{44}\) *houtos [e]* (Hb 2.13; Ma 1.13). The other renderings used in Hb (*eăn* and [*e*]) occur elsewhere in G, but not in MP.

\(^{45}\) But cf. Kogut, "Meaning and Syntactical Status" (above).

\(^{46}\) See the discussion of its "Function in H" (above).
TABLES AND CHARTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>hinneh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>20613</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>16713</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>11950</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>16408</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>14294</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>10151</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>9886</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>13264</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>11040</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>13140</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>12284</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>16943</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>21836</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>18730</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>14363</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>19587</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>8351</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>6915</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>5312</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>10746</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13315</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>05634</td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk</td>
<td>Occ Rep'd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kl</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the sake of space renderings #7-12 are not included in the main table. Each of these represents less than one percent of the occurrences of hinneh, but they all occur in three or more books (and so are not "shared"). They are, however, included in the column marked "Total Other", and in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Renderings</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7 nun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8 idou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9 ginomai</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 houtos/ekeinos [e]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11 idou de[eta]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12 ti [e]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings</th>
<th>idou (%)</th>
<th>these words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent    | .5%  | .3%  | .4%  | .7%  | .5%  | .5%  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 idou houtos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ginomai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 5.2.1

hinneh: Summary of Renderings

- idou (77%)
- < G (6%)
- (2%)
- Other (14%)
CONCLUSION

This dissertation examines the predicators of existence—both their function in H and the means by which the translators of the Septuagint represented them in Greek.

This conclusion addresses their identity in this light, the translation technique of the various books of G, and two implications of this study, viz., the identity of MP as a translation unit and the study of the translation of synonyms.

THE PREDICATORS OF EXISTENCE

The major factor in choosing these words (and no others) to study was their potential identity as a form-class in H. \(^1\) The prerequisite for a group of words to be identified as a form-class—their intersubstitutability—is the degree to which they can be substituted each in the syntagms of the other members of the group. \(^2\)

\(^1\) See also the "Introduction" (above). I had also wondered whether or not the translators of G rendered them as though functionally related.

\(^2\) See the Introduction (above). Since there are no native speakers on whom to test such substitutions, such a conclusion can be reached only by comparing the syntagms within which they occur and deciding whether or not they can be "exchanged". [Even if there were native speakers, there is little reason to think that they would have the ability to explain or even to express
The distribution of 'ayyeh, yesh, 'ôd, 'ên, and hinneh overlaps syntagmatically. 'ayyeh occurs only in non-verbal clauses and yesh is very nearly limited to them. 'ên occurs with participles as well as in non-verbal clauses. hinneh occurs primarily in verbal clauses, but also quite often in both non-verbal and participial clauses. 'ôd also occurs primarily in verbal clauses, but only secondarily in non-verbal or participial clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Verbal</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ayyeh</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesh</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ên</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinneh</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ôd</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite this distribution these words should be considered syntagmatic synonyms. All five predicate distinctions which are primarily emic rather than etic.


It should not go unnoticed, however, that whereas 'ayyeh and 'ên often have definite subjects, those used with yesh are primarily indefinite.

'ôd and hinneh obviously do not function as predications of existence in verbal clauses.

This is the meaning of intersubstitutability in the sense in which it is used here; they are obviously not semantically synonymous.
existence (locative, negative, continued) of their subjects\(^6\)—existence that is contemporaneous to the speaker or narrative situation. They also use suffixes to indicate their pronominal subjects.\(^7\) Thus far, they may be considered mutually inter-substitutable, and distinct in H.

On the other hand, their distribution reveals that they are completely inter-substitutable only in non-verbal syntagms;\(^8\) their use suggests that predication of existence is more central to the function of 'ayyeh, yesh, and 'ên than to that of hinneh, and that 'ôd,  

\(^6\)For specific explanations and examples, see "Function in Hebrew" in chapters 1-5 (above).

\(^7\)Although to widely varying degrees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use with Pronominals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>`yyh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their occurrence with suffixed pronominal subjects cannot be the factor that determines their identity as a form-class, however, since pronominal suffixes can indicate the subjects of both infinitives absolute and participles (with [subjective] suffixes, a different specie of "subject"). The latter cases, however, are not predications of existence, but of the action or state indicated by the [fientive or stative] verb.

\(^8\)Syntactically, 'ayyeh, 'ên, hinneh, and yesh normally front their clause, but this is rarely true for 'ôd.
which occurs primarily in verbal clauses predicates existence relatively infrequently. The intersubstitutability of the class, therefore, is limited to non-verbal clauses—the only syntagm common to the members of the group.

A further clue that this distinction is correct comes from their representation in G. Each word has a usual rendering. A fundamental difference, however, between the primary renderings of 'ayyeh, yesh, and 'ên and those of 'ôd and hinneh reflects the functional division within the group (the presence or lack of [e] in the usual rendering):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings</th>
<th>with [e]</th>
<th>without [e]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ayyeh</td>
<td>pou [e] 74.5%</td>
<td>pou 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesh</td>
<td>[e] 77.1%</td>
<td>ou 14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ên</td>
<td>ou [e] 72.5%</td>
<td>eti 76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ôd</td>
<td>eti [e] 5%</td>
<td>idou 84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinneh</td>
<td>idou [e] 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usual rendering of 'ayyeh, yesh, and 'ên (in which the predicate function predominates) includes [e]. The usual rendering of 'ôd and hinneh, on the other hand, lacks [e]; the corresponding rendering with

9The locative (pou) or negative (ou/me) needed to convey their semantic content are also part of this usual rendering.

This is the average of their renderings throughout G—the consistency with which they are rendered in individual units of G varies considerably.
[e] occurs in both cases, but infrequently. This reflects their general distribution in non-verbal clauses, which is in turn an aspect of their function.

Of special interest is the occurrence of the members of this group with pronominal suffixes. In discussing their translation (above) I noted that their occurrences with pronominal suffixes have been rendered less consistently than their occurrences without suffixes. In the cases of yesh, 'ôd, and 'ên this difference is significant. I suggested that this was perhaps due to the translators' uncertainty regarding how best to render this construction, or, at least, to their recognition of the morphological (not functional) difference of these forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renderings with Suffixes</th>
<th>Frequency of Suffixed Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'yyh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Sfxs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sfxs %</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of the Usual Rendering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Sfxs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10It is also not un-related to their occurrence with participles. See the discussion of the renderings of each word with affixes (above).
The evidence of G thus corroborates the results of the studies of the grammar and syntax of H. It does not establish it, since the translators (or a translator) may well have misunderstood and so misrepresented their function. When, however, the lines of evidence from the two coincide—as they do here—it seems reasonable to conclude that the translators understood what they were rendering and that their renderings were choices consciously based on their knowledge of both H and G, which reflects favorably upon ours also.

THE PREDICATORS OF EXISTENCE IN G

Given the limitation of this dissertation to only one aspect of the matrix that contributes to developing a typology of translation style—consistency of rendering—these remarks concerning the various units of G are necessarily limited to that aspect as well. 11

Another question, however, contributes tangentially to this discussion: the effect of the distribution or frequency of a word in H upon the consistency of its representation in G.

It seems reasonable to assume that the more frequently a given word occurs, the more ready (and

11 Cf. the Introduction (above); Tov, TCU (54-60); Barr, TYPOLOGY.
obvious) an equivalent for it would be. Rare or unusual words might likewise tend to be rendered inconsistently, because they did not occur frequently enough to have developed a "stereotyped" representation. On the other hand, the more frequent a word and the greater the variety of its contexts, the lower its consistency of rendering, if a translator chose to indicate that diversity.

A comparison of the frequency of a given word in a unit to the consistency with which that word is rendered in the same unit should at least begin to answer whether or not the frequency with which the translator encountered a particular word affected his consistency.

12 Cf. Tov's discussion of stereotyping in TCU (54f, especially the example of bërît/diatheke (55, n32)).

13 Tov, ibid. This concept is probably more critical for full words (nouns and verbs) than for function words (on this distinction see the Introduction).

14 This is not necessarily the case, however, as demonstrated by, e.g., 'ên (above).

15 "Frequency" represents the degree to which a word occurs, expressed as a percentage of the total number of words in a book.


17 This type of study would ideally need to be done for every vocabulary item in H that occurs frequently enough to have a "usual" [majority] rendering (for statistical validity, at least 10-15 times).
When the frequency of these words in a given book is compared with the consistency of their representation, however, there is no apparent correlation between frequency and consistency. 18

---

18 I here compare only the consistency and frequency of hinneh (as the most frequent, and therefore most accurate statistically) for reasons of space. The data for the other words reveals nothing with regard to the existence of a pattern.
### hinneh: Frequency & Consistency by Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk hnnh Rep</th>
<th>Usual Freq'y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zc 22 21</td>
<td>95.2% 0.735%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 9 9</td>
<td>44.4% 0.720%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na 4 4</td>
<td>100.0% 0.717%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl 82 75</td>
<td>90.7% 0.709%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 6 6</td>
<td>83.3% 0.885%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr 135 120</td>
<td>94.2% 0.832%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek 113 102</td>
<td>86.3% 0.809%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn 119 105</td>
<td>62.9% 0.806%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb 4 4</td>
<td>25.0% 0.596%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 55 32</td>
<td>57.1% 0.508%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Is** 75 66 80.3% 0.460%
- **K2** 54 52 80.8% 0.440%
- **Jg** 44 43 93.0% 0.435%
- **Kl** 55 49 91.8% 0.426%
- **S2** 46 46 97.8% 0.417%
- **Ru** 5 5 100.0% 0.386%
- **Ob** 1 1 100.0% 0.334%
- **Jr** 3 3 100.0% 0.313%
- **C2** 40 39 92.3% 0.300%
- **Ex** 41 36 69.4% 0.245%
- **Am** 15 15 100.0% 0.224%
- **Lv** 25 24 83.3% 0.218%
- **Jb** 17 13 61.5% 0.204%
- **Qo** 6 6 100.0% 0.201%
- **Da** 10 9 100.0% 0.186%
- **Hg** 1 1 0.0% 0.167%
- **Nu** 28 26 69.2% 0.165%
- **Ps** 28 28 96.4% 0.148%
- **Ja** 15 9 77.8% 0.148%
- **Mj** 2 2 100.0% 0.143%
- **Zp** 1 1 100.0% 0.130%
- **Ho** 3 3 100.0% 0.126%

**Average:** 87.3%

* = one occurrence in book

### hinneh: Frequency & Consistency by Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk hnnh Rep</th>
<th>Usual Freq'y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na 4 4</td>
<td>100.0% 0.717%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru 5 5</td>
<td>100.0% 0.386%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob 1 1</td>
<td>100.0%* 0.334%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl 3 3</td>
<td>100.0% 0.313%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am 15 15</td>
<td>100.0% 0.224%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qo 6 6</td>
<td>100.0% 0.201%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da 10 9</td>
<td>100.0% 0.186%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi 2 2</td>
<td>100.0% 0.143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp 1 1</td>
<td>100.0%* 0.130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho 3 3</td>
<td>100.0% 0.126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl 8 5</td>
<td>100.0% 0.074%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez 1 1</td>
<td>100.0%* 0.027%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average:** 87.3%

* = one occurrence in book
When G is listed by frequency rather than consistency, there is still no apparent pattern, which demonstrates conclusively that for these words (at least) there is no positive or negative correlation between frequency and consistency, and that the consistency with which a particular unit renders H has more to do with the nature of that unit than with either the use or frequency of the words being examined. We should therefore beware assuming, expecting, or imputing consistency of rendering on the basis of a word's frequency either in G or in a particular unit.\(^{19}\)

When we compare the renderings of the predicators of existence in G several books stand out as consistent and several as inconsistent. The majority, however, lie along the continuum between these extremes.

\(^{19}\)Another question, however, involves the intrasegmental relationship between consistency and frequency. When the books of G are arranged along the "literal-free continuum" according to a typology of translation technique, some which render one or even two words with absolute consistency (100%) are nonetheless characterized as "relatively consistent" or even "relatively inconsistent" because the words which were rendered consistently occurred too few times to offset the occurrences--and inconsistent renderings--of the other words. If these renderings themselves correspond to the frequency of the words' occurrence, they may reveal a tendency or pattern within that unit's general typology.

An examination of one-third of G (Gn - Ek; Qo, C2) shows that there is no correlation between the frequency of these words and the consistency of their rendering within the confines of a unit.
Six books are either completely or highly consistent in representing the predicators of existence by the usual rendering: \(^{20}\) Ob, Ru, and Cl (all 100%); Qo (94.4%), K1 (90.4%), and C2 (91.1%).

Four books are inconsistent, representing the predicators of existence by the usual rendering in fewer than half of their occurrences: Es (46.7%), Mi (42.9%), Pr (33.3%), and Hg (25%).

Between these extremes are two other groups. Eleven books may be called relatively consistent; they range from 89.7% (S2) to 81.1% (Ps): S2, S1, Na, Ez, Jr, K2, Zc, JgA, Dn, Ne, Dt, Ps. The largest group (seventeen) ranges from 75.8% (Ek) to 50% (Hb, Zp, Jn), and may be called relatively inconsistent: Ek, Is, Lv, Am, Js, Nu, Gn, MP, Ho, Ex, La, Ma, Jb, Jl, SS, Hb, Zp, Jn.

This does not demonstrate the literal or free nature of any of these units since, as noted above, consistency of rendering is too narrow a basis for such a judgment. It is instructive, however, to compare these conclusions with those of others who have made similar assays of the comparative analysis of

---

\(^{20}\)Note that this relates to consistency vis à vis the usual rendering for G; on the question of internal consistency apart from G, see below. [All lists are in descending order of consistency.]
transformation technique. I here therefore compare the results of several recent studies of various aspects of transformation technique in order to groove toward a typology of the translation technique of the various units.

Each book of G can be assigned a category along the continuum from "consistent" to "inconsistent" on the basis of this dissertation.  

---

21 Cf. (chronologically) Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Infinitive"; —, "Der Gebrauch des Verbes 'EXEIN"; —, "Renderings of the Hebrew Comparative Expressions; Sollamo, RENDERINGS OF HEBREW SEMIPREPOSITIONS; Aejmelaus, PARATAxis; Tov & Wright, "Computer-assisted Study"; Wright, "Statistical Analysis"; —, "Quantitative Representation".

Note that few of these treat all of G, as I have (Tov & Wright, e.g., confine their investigation to Nu, Dt, Jg A, S1, S2, K2, Ez, Ne, Jb 1-5, Ps 30-65, Pr, Qo, SS, Jr, La, Ek, MP, Ben Sira).

For further references, see Emanuel Tov, A CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL STUDIES ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE SEPTUAGINT AND ITS REVISIONS (Jerusalem: Academon, 1979); revised and enlarged edition, 1982 (especially 8-22, 28-33).

22 MP are listed both collectively and individually.

23 The arbitrariness of setting absolute boundaries (i.e., 90-100% = "consistent"; 75-90% = "relatively consistent", etc.) quickly becomes apparent when books are assigned separate designations because their consistency differs by a fraction of a percent. In a statistical study, however, demarcations are necessarily arbitrary and may differ somewhat between studies.
### Various Classifications of Translation Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Krft</th>
<th>Tov</th>
<th>T&amp;W</th>
<th>S-S</th>
<th>Sol</th>
<th>Wrgt</th>
<th>Ptnm</th>
<th>Aver</th>
<th>Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Literal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JgB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JgA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;Mixed&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is helpful to see how the results of my study compare to those of others. It is striking, given the

---

24The columns refer to the following works, respectively:
Robert A. Kraft, "Septuagint", IDBS: "The following tentative classifications ... may provide some impression ..." (813). He analyzes the books in to the following categories: (A) Relatively more focus on parent text (1 mechanical, relatively wooden/stilted); (B) Relatively more focus on producing acceptable Greek
uni-dimensional approach of this dissertation, that its results agree in large measure with the others cited.

Jg B and Qo are labelled "literal" or "slavish". My designations of Gn, Ex, Lv, Es, and Pr are also in general agreement with the others listed here.

The greatest disagreement concerns the nature of SS, Dt, Dn, Nu, and Is. SS appears to be much more free

(2 relatively stilted; 3 more idiomatic Greek); (C) Free translation less concerned with the parent language/text (4 non-paraphrastic free renderings; 5 free paraphrase) (813f).

In a brief comment Tov lists only two categories:
(1) Literal; (5) Free, even paraphrastic (TCU, 63).

Tov & Wright "Computer-Assisted Study" classify books into five categories: (1) Literal; (2) Relatively Literal; (3) Inconsistent; (4) Relatively Free; (5) Free (182f).

Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Infinitiv": (1) Literal; (3) Tending toward free; (5) Free (177f, 186, 189).

Sollamo, RENDERINGS OF SEMI-PREPOSITIONS: (1) Most slavish; (2) Relatively literal; (4) Relatively free; (5) Free (284-86).

Wright, "Consistency", only discusses Ek (417).

This dissertation: (1) consistent (90% - 100%); (2) highly consistent (80% - 89%); (3) relatively consistent (50% - 79%); (4) relatively inconsistent (10% - 49%); (5)

This chart may appear misleading because these studies are based upon different sorts of data (consistency, word order, etc.), and because the legitimacy of assigning numerical values to the conclusions of other scholars in order to compare them to my own is questionable, especially since they might be unwilling to present a conclusion [usually carefully and tentatively stated] by assigning it a number.

This could be done by using the actual statistics from each study (in, e.g, Tov & Wright), so that every element was represented by a percentage; the comparison and averaging of these might affect the final column--it would certainly increase its apparent validity. Such a study would, in fact, be necessary either to accurately represent a single unit or to compare more than one units.
in this study than in the others, but Dt, Dn, Nu, and Is
more literal,\(^25\) perhaps because of the variable
introduced by comparing unlike studies, or because they
rendered certain words more consistently than others.

It is clear, however, that despite the relatively
limited frame of reference of this study, its results
are in general accord with the analyses of others. This
in turn partially vindicates the general practice of
assigning particular books to points along the continuum
of translation technique on the basis of a limited
study, whatever aspect of the translational matrix that
study might address.

---

\(^25\) This demonstrates the need for continued
examination of the various aspects of translation
technique, especially those which, because they can be
described quantitatively, allow direct and relatively
unbiased comparison of units.
EXCURSUS A: IS MP A TRANSLATION UNIT?

A recent study compared Joel and Nahum in G in order to address the perennial question of "The Unity of the Minor Prophets in the Septuagint".\(^{26}\)

A comparison of the frequency (use and the non-use) of the usual rendering in MP for each word studied reveals little consistency within this alleged unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>pou [ε]</th>
<th>pou</th>
<th>Unq</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP (%)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ma (3xx), Jl and Zc (once each) use only pou [ε]; Ho (3xx) and Mi (once) never use it. The usual rendering of G is the usual rendering of MP as well.

\(^{26}\)C. Robert Harrison Jr., "The Unity of the Minor Prophets in the Septuagint", BIOSCS 21 (1988):55-72 (cf. his introduction to the history of the discussion (56-8) and the literature cited (72)).

He analyzed four aspects of their translation: (1) lexical flexibility (the subject of this dissertation); (2) plusses in G; (3) word usage; (4) quality of translation (errors in translation due to some type of scribal misunderstanding).
although much less frequently (MP: 55%; G: 75%). The variation between (especially) between Ho and Ma is striking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>huparxw</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>[e]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mi (Zxx), Jn, and Ma (once each) never use [e] (the usual rendering of yesh in G. Not only is MP thus set apart from G as a whole, it is also divided from within, using three different renderings and misreading yesh once (Mi 2.1; above).

---

27These are the only occurrences of yesh in MP.

28Only one other book (Es; one occurrence of yesh) does not represent yesh by [e].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>eti</th>
<th>ouk</th>
<th>eti</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>eti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP (%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (%)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hg (2xx), Hb, Jn, Ma (once each) use only eti; Zp (3xx), Jl (3xx), and Am (7xx) use eti in fewer than 50% of its occurrences. Mi (4xx) never uses eti. Note again the range in consistency, although the variety of rendering is quite a bit smaller (these two renderings account for 92% of all occurrences in MP but only 78% in G). 31

---

29 This includes eti huparxw (Am 6.10), above.

30 The "other" renderings in Ho (once) and Am (2xx) are unique; that in Mi (once) is hews (1% of G).

31 Which includes MP! Cf. the "other" renderings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk Occ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MP (%) | 57| 11| 18| 7 | 4 | 2 | 2  |     |
| All (%)| 73| 4 | 15| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2  |     |

**KEY**

1 ou [e] 7 ou heuriskw  
2 ou huparxw 8 a- privative  
3 ou 9 Shared (2 bks)  
4 oudeis [e] 10 Unique  
5 oudeis 11 < G  
6 ou exw 12 --- (‘ên not rep’d)

Na (7xx) and Ob (once) only use ou [e]; Jl (3xx) and Ma (6xx) use ou [e] fewer than 50% of the time; Hg (5xx) never uses ou [e]. The usual rendering of G is also most frequent in MP, but it represents a far smaller majority of the occurrences of ‘ên (MP: 57% vs.

---

Renderings which were not used are listed in the key for the sake of completeness and comparison.
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G: 73%—-the difference is comparable to that noted for `od (above). The greater frequency of huparxw is also striking, given its frequency in representing yesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hinneh in MP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bk Occ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc 22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl 62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP (%)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (%)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

1 idou
2 idou [e]
3 ei/ean
4 hode
5 [e]
6 hoti
7 nun
8 idou houtos
9 ginomai
10 houtos/ekinos [e]
11 idou de[eta]
12 tî [e]
13 Shared (2 bks)
14 Unique
15 < G (clause, verse)
16 --- (hinneh not rep'd)

33Cf. Harrison, "Unity", who notes other examples of "lexical flexibility" (67, esp. n17).

34huparxw represents 25% of the occurrences of yesh in MP (vs. 4% for G), but the low occurrence of yesh in MP (4xx) makes this relatively insignificant.
Am (15xx), Na (4xx), Jl, Ho (3xx each), Mi (2xx), Ob, Zp (once each) use only idou; Hb (4xx) uses idou once (25%); Hg (once) does not use idou. The frequency of the renderings of hinneh in MP reflect those of G more closely than those of any of the other words, which probably reflects the general consistency of its rendering (although yesh, which is rendered nearly as consistently (yesh: 81%; hinneh: 84%), is never represented by its usual rendering in MP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk</th>
<th>hinneh</th>
<th>yesh</th>
<th>'od</th>
<th>'ayyeh</th>
<th>'en</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zc</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zp</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35A "blank" means that the word does not occur in that book; 0.0% means that the word is never represented by the usual rendering.
This diversity in consistency of rendering makes it difficult to assume or impute the unity of the translation of MP, although it does not disprove that theory. The question is not, of course, the occurrence of the usual rendering in MP—this is merely a convenient way to express it, since the work in this dissertation was done on that basis—but the consistency within MP of the rendering of each word, i.e., determining the usual rendering for MP and each book's conformity to it (or lack thereof).

It seems best to conclude, with Harrison, that

... the uncritical assumption of translational unity within the collection which comprises the minor prophets must be rejected. . . . at the very least, it becomes apparent that the question of the unity of the Minor Prophets in the Septuagint is still open.

36 The question of their unity can only be answered [and even then only provisionally] when the translation of each of the Twelve is analyzed as a unit using, e.g., Tov's criteria of literalness, and the results of those analyses compared. Even this might prove statistically meaningless in the sense that differences between the individual books are statistically insignificant, once the whole is considered.

37 Harrison, "Unity" (71f).
EXCURSUS B:  THE STUDY OF SYNONYMS

This study also demonstrates the benefit of investigating the translation technique of alleged synonyms.\(^{38}\)

Most of the alleged synonyms investigated were not rendered in the same way as the main word being studied. This could be either because they so differ in function\(^{39}\) that they are not synonyms, despite our interpretation of them as such, or because the translators did not represent them as synonyms. The translators could have represented them differently despite recognizing them as synonyms,\(^{40}\) or because they did not so recognize them.

When, however, as great a difference in representation as exists between, e.g., 'ayyeh and 'ay/'ê appears, it should give the lexicologist of H

\(^{38}\) Allegations of synonymity may be drawn from lexica, grammars, and works on syntax, as well as from observation of the text.

\(^{39}\) I am still using "function" to represent the word's location in the semantic and syntactical matrix of H.

\(^{40}\) Cf. Aquila's largely etymological approach.
pause concerning their identity, \(^{41}\) and cause him to investigate their function more fully. \(^{42}\)

This seems to benefit the lexicon of \(H\), but not that of \(H\) only. It also helps the lexicologist of \(G\), since the study of the meaning of the renderings (the lexicon of \(G\)) cannot be based merely on a comparative study of the inner- and extra-biblical Greek lexicon, \(^{43}\) but must also consider that which the translators were trying to represent. \(^{44}\) This bi-directional consideration is therefore of prime importance for a

\(^{41}\) On the other hand, the renderings of, e.g., \(\text{hen}\) and \(\text{hinneh}\), should not cause us to assume their non-synonymity, but at least to re-examine our assumptions concerning their function.

\(^{42}\) Thus avoiding, e.g., the erroneous statement of BDB that \(\text{'ephoh}\) occurs primarily in verbal clauses (under \(\text{'ayyeh}\), above).

It should also encourage the lexicographer of \(G\) to pursue renderings of alleged synonyms in \(H\), since all definition is both positive (what the word denotes and connotes) and negative (what delineates the word from other words—especially those with which it is allegedly synonymous). This complements Tov's insistence that "LXX lexicology must concentrate on the intentions of the translators, mainly by an analysis of the translation technique employed" (Emanuel Tov, "Three Dimensions of LXX Words", RB 83 (1976):532).

\(^{43}\) Except, of course, for those books originally composed in \(G\).

\(^{44}\) Cf., e.g., the constant stress on "... from the translator's viewpoint" in Tov, TCU (54-60).
future lexicon of G. 45

---

45 Cf. the canon of lexical semantics which says that meaning is ascribed both positively (what a word signifies) and negatively (what it does not, or what distinguishes it from other words, especially its putative synonyms).
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