LITERARY DEVICE IN THE SEPTUAGINT

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA

Anyone who ever made a serious use of Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford 1897)\(^1\) knows well that the number of those passages which the authors mark with an asterisk, as being unable to identify the Hebrew underlying a given Greek word, is fairly large.\(^2\) On the other hand, even where they did not use any asterisk or dash, nor marked the identification number with a question mark, one meets with apparently impossible or improbable identifications, judging according to our present knowledge of Biblical Hebrew and Koiné Greek vocabulary. One of the main reasons for the multitude of such improbable identifications undoubtedly derives from HR’s basic procedure. The Massoretic text with its vocalization and the Qere-Kethib instructions was the only text-form with which they sought to identify the Greek text-form or forms.\(^3\) Whatever view they held on the complex relationship between possible different text-forms of the Hebrew and those of the Greek translation, they seem to have decided to proceed according to this principle for the purpose of the Concordance. It is easy to see how the adoption of such method occasionally resulted in too mechanical and superficial identifications.\(^4\) Indeed, anyone who comes to prepare such a list of Hebrew equi-

---

1 Hereafter abbreviated as HR.
2 This procedure was justly criticized by, for example, M. L. Margolis, in his article “Entwurf zu einer revidierten Ausgabe der hebräisch-aramäischen Aquivalente in der *Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint* ...,” *ZAW* 25 (1905) 311-19, while nothing has been done in the meantime to improve this part of the otherwise useful work. The writer of the present article has been working for some time upon the preparation of a new Hebrew-Greek index, incorporating the results of his fairly extensive reexamination of problematic passages and identifications.
3 By saying “forms” in the plural I mean that they took into account variant readings presented by the major uncials.
4 That HR were aware of these deficiencies is clear in the following words in the Preface (p. vi):

... There are consequently many passages in which opinions may properly differ as to the identification of the Greek and the Hebrew: it must be understood in regard to such cases that the aim of the present work, from which philological discussions are necessarily excluded, is rather to give a tenable view than to pronounce a final judge-
valents, or vice versa, one of Greek equivalents, should clarify both to himself and to possible users of such a work precisely what he means when he says that he identifies a given Greek word with a given Hebrew word; and this must be made clear not only in the preface, but also throughout the body of such a work. This may be achieved by introducing clearly-defined and unequivocal abbreviations or other appropriate technical devices, and making consistent use of them.

Basically speaking, there are two ways in which one can view the relationship between a given Greek text form and the underlying Hebrew form; either the Hebrew Vorlage was the same as the MT or it differed from the latter. It is in the second case that the textual critic of the Hebrew Bible may draw upon the Greek evidence, or evidence offered by any other ancient version or daughter version, for that matter, to re-establish the Massoretic text form accordingly. In the first case, on the other hand, there are places where the identity of the MT and the translator’s Vorlage must be maintained for some reason or other, but not on the basis of the Hebrew–Greek equivalence. The deviation may be explained in a variety of ways: expansion, omission, influence of parallel or related passages or expressions, special theology, etymology, and manipulation of the Hebrew text form, not to mention purely inner-Greek alterations or corruptions. In what follows, attention will be called to some new and interesting causes of a literary-stylistic nature, which the present writer believes point to an underlying Hebrew text-form that is prima facie different from the MT form.

A) We have just mentioned influence of parallel passages as one of the causes leading to apparent discrepancy between Hebrew text-form and its translation. We shall begin our discussion by observing a special way in which parallel or related passages may affect the rendering of a particular passage. The probability of such influence must be fairly high when the passages concerned are believed, on other grounds, to be ascribable to a single translator.

Suggestions were made to the present Editor from more quarters than one, that, where the variant reading followed by the Septuagint version was obvious, such readings should also be noted in the list of Hebrew equivalents at the head of each article; but it has been found impossible to do this without altering the scope of the whole work. On the other hand, Hebrew words may occasionally be found in this Concordance, of which the connexion with the Greek is not very obvious: such cases may well be pardoned on the ground that it is better to err by inserting too many references than by rejecting some which after all upon further investigation may be found to have considerable importance with regard to the matter in hand.

\[\text{Cp. the recent criticism by J. Barr, } JSS 12 (1967) 296-304, \text{ against similar methodological unclarities and deficiencies found in J. Reider–N. Turner, } An Index to Aquila, Supplements to VT, 12 (Leiden 1966).\]
In Am. 5:24 we read καὶ κυλίσθησαι ὡς ὕδωρ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνη ὡς χειμάρρους ἄβατος, which renders ἄβατος with θηρί, the only case in the LXX supporting such an identification. But strict equation is impossible between θηρί which means “perennial, ever-flowing” and abatos, which means “untrodden, inaccessible, impassable,” or, in other words, the use of abatos does not mean that the translator understood θηρί in the sense that is ascribable to the Greek word. Our contention is that he was ignorant of the meaning of the Heb. word, in view of its only other occurrence in the Minor Prophets (hereafter XII) at Mi. 6:2, where מַשֵּׁר כָּל־גֶּ רָ שִׁי אֵל תֵּ רָ בָר שַׁ לִי נֶ בְּרָתִי עַבְּדֵי אֲדֹ נָ הָי בּּ לָ הָ חָ פָרָ יִ שֵׁ יַ נֶ בְּרָ תַיָּ נָ פָי לַ כְּ לָ זַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ لַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ לַ שֶּׁ יַ LXX... (Leipzig 1820–21), s.v. ἄβατος; “sensum expresserunt.”

5a The text cited in this article is that of Biblia Hebraica² and, for the Septuagint, the Göttingen edition, or Rahlf’s³ (Stuttgart 1935) where the former is not available yet.

6 Cp. J. F. Schleusner, Novus Thesaurus Philologico-criticus, sive Lexicon in LXX... (Leipzig 1820–21), s.v. ἄβατος; “sensum expresserunt.”

7 The Gk. translation of the Minor Prophets is most probably the work of a single translator; see J. Ziegler, Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölffprophetenbuch (Braunschberg 1934). Aquila has στήριξ, Sym. παλαια, Theod. ἁρχιτ., Pesh. יָדַּבַּר רַעַת, Trg. יָדַּבַּר רַעַת, Vulg. fortit in Mi. 6:2, all of which, except Pesh. (= LXX), attest the MT form. The difficulty felt by LXX translators is to be seen in the other cases of θηρί as epithet of a stream: Dt. 21:4 μετ’ αὐτοῦ θηρίνα φάραγγα ὑπαίθρων, Ps. 73:15 τῆς ὑπαίθρου ποταμοῦ Ἡσαυ, taken as a place name.


9 Cp. Xenophon, Anabasis, 5.6.9, where the adjective is used of a river.
read ἀφέσεις (ὑδάτων), which however appears to be based on the Aramaizing analysis, namely ἀφέσις = Αφ'el of ἀφέσις; cf. Sym. in 1:20 ξοδοτ. 10

Let me adduce here another instance illustrating the above technique of the translator of XII–Ez. α. In Hos. 4:13 we read ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν δρέαν ἐδισέαξαν καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνοὺς ἔθουν, ὑποκάτω δρῦς καὶ λεύκης καὶ δένδρου συσκεύαζοντος; ὥστε καλὸν σκέπη, while the MT read ὧν ἡ δέντρα ἡ θάμνος καλὸν τὸ θάμνος ἀλάσχος ἠρίζετο καὶ ἔστρεψεν ἡ δέντρα ἡ θάμνος. Our attention is naturally drawn to the striking rendering of ἀλάσχος by δένδρον συσκεύαζον “thick-shading tree.” With the aid of the Concordance we discover the right parallel passage in Ez. α, 6:13 Β ἐπὶ πάντα βουνόν ἔσβηλον [A + καὶ ἐν πάσαις κορυφαῖς τῶν δρέαν] καὶ ὑποκάτω δένδρον συσκεύαζον [A + καὶ ὑποκάτω πάσης δρύος δασσείας], where the MT runs ὧν ἡ δέντρα ἡ θάμνος καλὸν ἡ δέντρα ἡ θάμνος. Seeing that in 20:28 our translator renders ὧν ἡ δέντρα ἡ θάμνος καλὸν ἡ δέντρα ἡ θάμνος as εὐσκητία κατάσκευα, one may identify συσκεύαζον with εὐσκητία. We should also note that in Ez. α εὐσκητία almost always (the two exceptions being found here and in 47:7) renders ἅν (20 times), whether it means standing tree or timber, but not δένδρον. Indeed, the right word δένδρον could be chosen here just because the translator was not bound by the Hebrew due to his ignorance of ἀλάσχος. Furthermore, the second addition in A and others is most likely a doublet of the original B; there is no reason to think that the parallel members were transposed in the Hebrew. Since δρῦς never translates ἅν, but rather ἀλάσχος, which may be easily related to ἀλάσχος by false or true etymologizing, this addition cannot be the rendering of ἀλάσχος. The conclusion is then that our translator’s Vorlage lacked this phrase, which may easily have been added to the Heb. text by a later hand on the basis of a number of parallel passages such as Dt. 12:2, III Kg. 14:23. The form of the Vorlage in Ez. 6:13 shows considerable resemblance to our Hosea passage, both having ἀλάσχος (and perhaps μιμετική ἄραι),11 apart from the related content. This assumption, that the phrase including ἄναρ τῆς was missing in the Vorlage (and nowhere else in Ez.) also accounts for the rendering in Hos. 14:9 ἄναρ πυκνῶσα “covering.” It is true that the Heb. word is occasionally rendered in a similar manner outside XII–Ez.: III Kg. 14:23 (εὐσκητία) συσκεύαζον, Jer. 2:20 (εὐσκητία) κατασκευαζόν, ib. 11:6 εὐσκητίας. 12 Our cumulative argument, however, seems to carry more weight. Further, I see no absolute necessity to correct συσκεύαζοντος into εὐσκητία, as

10 HR identify ἀφέσεις in Ez. 47.3 δόξωρ ἀφέσεως ἰρυμήματος with ἰρυμήματος, which is however nothing but a pseudo-transliteration; so already J. Ziegler, Biblica 34 (1953) 450.
11 I shall not go here into the discussion whether this phrase stood in the Vorlage of our translator or not.
12 Other equivalents are δασοῦς Dt. 12:2, Is. 57:9, ἀλογόθης IV Kg. 16:4, 17:10, Jer. 3:6, 13, 17:8, I Ch. 28:14. Δασοῦς also renders τῶν ἀνάθεων in Lev. 23:40, Neh. 8:15.
Ziegler suggests. *Συμ., although such a correction might suit Ziegler’s suggestion that we have here a doublet rendering ἄγων τῆς ἁπλῆς. His alternate view, that ἀνοικτός was added because δέντρον alone would be “zu nichtssagend” is untenable, because it still remains inexplicable how our translator came to use the word δέντρον at all (from the Aram. שֶׁם). Is. 2:13 δέντρον βαλάνου Βασσαν quoted by Ziegler is no real parallel, since βαλάνος is a tree-name by itself (see J. Ziegler, Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekapropheton (Göttingen 1943), 354, 382).

We may note in passing that the influence of related passages discussed above could work only in one direction, that is, from Ez. a to XII, which implies the earlier date of the Greek Ez. a. How much earlier, is a matter of pure guess.\(^{13}\)

Thus we have seen how the translator of XII–Ez. a managed to find his way out when faced by an unknown word: when he has two or more components in two related passages he is translating, in one of which one parallel component is unknown to him, he fills it in by the known corresponding one. Schematically, \(a + b + c: a' + b' + x \rightarrow x = c'\).

B) Jer. 2:6

ό καθοδηγήσεις ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἐν γῇ ἀπείρῳ καὶ ἀβάτῳ, ἐν γῇ ἁνίδρῳ καὶ ἀκόρφῳ, ἐν γῇ, ἐν ἡ οὐ διώδεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ οὕθεν καὶ οὗ κατάκλησιν ἀνθρωπος ἐκεῖ;

τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν μεσομερείς διάφορα ὑπάρξεις ταύτης ἡμῶν ταύτης ἡμῶν καράτοις ἀνανεώσει καὶ ἐμβλητικαὶ ἀναθηματικαὶ ἀναφερόμενα

HR identify ἀβατος with ἀξιωθ. As Streane thinks,\(^{14}\) the Heb. word was difficult for the translator, as one can see from its other occurrences in Jer.: 18:20 ἀφρός Ἀδριαταὶ κατά τῆς ψυχῆς μου and 22 (Qere הָעָשָׁה) הָעְשָׁתָה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה הָעָשָׁה (instead of ש). Thus, in view of this ignorance, it would be wrong to think that our translator took the word ἀξιωθ “pit” as meaning abatos. Rather, it seems to me that his choice is based on a stylistic consideration, namely, to obtain four adjectives in succession, all of them beginning with alpha privatium, and that in the context of “desert” or “wilderness”, for this Greek word often translates ἁμρ (7 times) and ἁμοῖον (6).

For the same reason it is equally wrong to say that to the Greek translator of Jeremiah ἀπλαμάτων meant “fruitless” ἀκραπος. At 13:16, its only other occurrence in our book, it is rendered σκία θανάτου. Therefore, he did not aim at

\(^{13}\) There are additional evidences leading to the same conclusion, but this is not the place to discuss them.

a precise word-for-word translation, but at stylistic elegance, which was not entirely out of place in this passage, where the Heb. text is no less exalted in its poetic style. Hence no need to assume the Vorlage to have read

(see Streane and Biblia Hebraica). This rare Heb. word is rendered in the LXX: Is. 49:21 χήρος, Job 3:7 ὁδῶνη, 15:34 θάνατος, 50:3 ἄγωνος (Origenic supplementation). That the rendering θάνατος at 15:34 lends no support to the above-mentioned conjecture for our Jer. passage becomes clear when we check how the translator of Job understood the Heb. מלחם: בקע θανάτου 3:5, 12:22, 24:17bis (Orig.), 28:3 (Orig.); בקע 16:16; γνωσερός “dark, gloomy” 10:21.

One might argue in the same fashion with regard to ἀπειρος in our Jer. passage, meaning “boundless, infinite”, attested nowhere else in the Greek OT. 15 HR identify it with הבין, but nothing is more unlikely than that such a common word should be misunderstood by our translator.

Another comment in the same vein. It is nothing but a product of over-mechanical treatment to identify ὀδὴν with שֵׁם (so HR). What is intended is stylistic variation, to have both personal ἄνθρωπος and impersonal ὀδὴν. The use of the neuter gender instead of ὀδηδίς or ὀδηδίς is a praiseworthy literary achievement. Ziegler is surely right in preferring the lectio difficiliora ὀδὴν attested by Btx A-410 26 (οδὴν) to other variants to be mentioned here. ὀδηδίς in 538 (on whose relationship to B, see p. 51 in the Introduction to Ziegler’s edition of Jer.) is an improvement upon ὀδὴν. ἄνθρωπος in S 46 is an attempt to harmonize with the corresponding member in parallelism, while ἄνηρ in the rest including Q-V seems to be Hexaplaric. The Index to Aquila shows us, with a limited number of exceptions, the equations ἄνηρ = שֵׁם and ἄνθρωπος = בֹּקֵץ as belonging to Aquila. Another very plausible reason, which, without contradicting the one mentioned above, may account for the rejection by our translator of ἄνηρ, is that its use in the singular in the sense of man (not male) in general and as a synonym of ἄνθρωπος was felt to be below his literary standard; the Isaiah translator rather thoughtlessly uses the two in parallelism, e.g. 2:9 καὶ ἐκουσεν ἄνθρωπος (םוֹר), καὶ ἐπανεινόθη ἄνηρ (םוֹר). For the kinship of Q-V with the Aquilanic recension, cp. Ziegler, op. cit., pp. 63 f. Ziegler also is right, although the argument for his decision is unknown, in not seeking the unity of text-form between our passage and the parallel 28 (51): 43 γῆ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἄβατος, οὐ κατοικήσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὀδηδίς, ὀδηδή μὴ καταλύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ τοῖς ἄνθρωποι, οὐκ θὰ τίνι τούθεν ἀρχῇ λα ἐν τῷ χείλε ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐν θεῷ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις. The reading is that of S-130 Qxnt-538–613–544, while

15 All the other passages registered by HR should be listed under the homophonous ἀπειρος II “inexperienced.”
ανθρωπος is added in O-Qmg L′ and ουδεις is decomposed into ουδε εις in
the rest. One of the reasons for our judging ουδεις as original is that the
translator himself did not aim at such unity, as is to be seen by an alteration
introduced by him in writing καταλογη for יincare in seeking stylistic variation
(note not only the similarity in meaning, but also the common prefix κατα-).

We may mention in this connection another example of an impossible
Hebrew equivalent of abatos, as proposed by HR, namely הָלָא “curse.” The
passage concerned is Jer. 49(42):18
καταλογη δρες λαον και έσσας εις οβατον και υποσχηριο και εις άφν και εις ονειδισμουν. Streane
(op. cit., ad. loc.) justly comments that הָלָא is omitted in G, i.e. is absent
from G, according to his cautious definition of the term “omission” (p. 3),
and he also suggests that υποσχηριο may well be a gloss. The secondary
nature of υποσχηριο can be recognized by the syntactic construction as well,
namely, not εις υποσχηριους, which is actually the Lucianic amendment. Its
introduction, whether by the original translator or by a later hand, may well
have been intended to produce the same number of co-ordinated substantives
as in the MT. The Vorlage without הָלָא is unlikely, since the addition of הָלָא
to the Hebrew text is much more difficult to explain than the intentional
omission by the Greek translator. The most probable reason for the omission
is the translator’s ignorance. Note its only other occurrence in Jer. β16, 51
(44):12, where exactly the same Hebrew expression appears as our passage,
while הָלָא is again left untranslated ותים לאה ותים ותים ותים ותים ותים
Therefore, at Jer. 49(42):18
abatos is to be identified with ותים. Note that it translates in Jer. β ותים or ותים,
words belonging to the typical vocabulary of our prophet, six and four times
respectively. The other equivalents in Jer. β are ותים, each of them once. On
the other hand, ותים is rendered in Jer. β: ותים (30(49):2, έρημος 41(34):
22, and ותים επάτος six times excluding 49(42):18 under discussion.

C) Job 1:1
ם ירח וירח לפני ולאו

BS αληθινος, άμιμπτος, δικαιος, θεοσεβης.
ib. 1:8 BS άμιμπτος, αληθινος, θεοσεβης.
ib. 2:3 BS ακακος, αληθινος, άμιμπτος, θεοσεβης.

In striking contrast with the perfect textual uniformity presented by Codex

16 Jer. a cp. 1–28, β 29–51. See Thackeray, JThS 4 (1903) 245–66, and The Septuagint and
Jewish Worship (London 1920), 28–37, 116 f. In 36(29):18 the whole passage is missing
in the LXX. Cp. 23:10 הָלָא תָּוָהוּ (reading הָלָא).
17 The same Heb. description of Job’s character recurs at 1:8 and 2:3 with the minute
difference that in the latter two places the Waw before the third epithet is missing, which
has now relevance to our discussion.
Alexandrinus, which reads *amemptos, dikaios, alêthinos, theosebêς* in all three places — no doubt the result of later harmonization, for which very reason it must be judged as being secondary and left out of the discussion — B and S show very remarkable variations in their text-form, in considerable proximity and in translating the same Heb. idiom. HR’s identifications are as follows:18

1:1 alêthinos = רִשְׁי, amemptos = מִת, dikaios = רַשׁ
1:8 amemptos = מִת, alêthinos = רַשׁ?
2:3 akakos = מִת, alêthinos = רַשׁ?, amemptos = רַשׁ vel מִת.19

Here again their over-mechanical treatment is by no means justifiable. It is imperative that for the purpose of identification we take recourse to other passages in Job where these words occur, but where we need not bother ourselves with such textual complexities as here. Once the correspondences are established between the Gk. and Heb. words under discussion, the real question facing us here is how to explain the different ways of arranging the epithets. The examination of these Gk. and Heb. words, including their derivatives,20 in Job enables us to set up the following formulas of equation: \( \sqrt{דְִּקִ{אִיָּו} = \sqrt{דְִּק} = \sqrt{דְִּקִ{אָיָו} \text{ or }} \sqrt{דְֵּקִ{אָי} \text{ and }} \sqrt{דְֵּקִ{א} = \sqrt{דְֵּקִ{א} \text{ or }}} \). For the former equation, see 9:20, 12:4, and for the latter 4:7, 6:25, 8:6, 17:8, 23:7. Hence our second passage, 1:8, is the text-form most faithful to the Heb. in the choice of the Gk. equivalents, in their way of arrangement, and in the number of the epithets. The added epithet dikaios at 1:1 is not to be identified with any Heb. equivalent. Dhorme comments on the Gk. text at 2:3: “G (BS) a une double traduction de מִת, tandis que G (A) a une double traduction de רַשׁ.”21 The first part of his note is right, but not the latter half, רַשׁ = dikaios + alêthinos. Nowhere in Job, except our three passages under discussion, is dikaios = רַשׁ, and such an equation is also very rare outside Job (Nu. 23:10, Prov. 3:32, 11:4, 14:9, 21:2, 18 — in none of these places the reading is restricted to the Codex Alex.).22 In my opinion, the addition of dikaios is perfectly in place in the opening verse of the book, which, as it were, serves as the title of the whole drama. Indeed, the central theme of the book is the vindication of our hero’s righteousness versus God’s.

---

18 I leave out of account the adjective theosebêς whose identification is beyond any doubt.
19 How HR identified the forms in the variant AS2 is not clear. However, our tabulation is sufficient to point to their confusion.
20 In order not to fall into the pit of “root fallacy” of J. Barr, I have restricted myself to the passages where these words are used in the moral sense with reference to a man’s character or conduct.
22 For derivatives of \( \sqrt{דְֵּק} \) and \( \sqrt{דְֵּקִ{א} \text{ see Prov. 17:26 (דְֵּקִ{א} = רַשׁ) and I Ch. 29:17 (דְֵּקִ{א} = רַשׁ)}} \).
Another addition at 2:3, *akakos*, is to be explained as an attempt at stylistic variation. The translator was apparently pleased with this bit of innovation, maintaining it a little further below in the same verse: ἔτι δὲ ἔχεται ἀκοικιας ὃσοι ἦσσονες. As to the apparently redundant *amenétops*, the most probable explanation is that the translator did not want to abandon the already fixed equation at the expense of the identity of the number of the epithets in the Gk. and Heb.

Finally, we must attempt to answer the question whence come the strange variations in the arrangement of the epithets. It is important to note here at the outset that the question of arrangement arises only when we have a superfluous epithet, so that the second case can be safely left out in our discussion. When our translator decided to add, for the reasons mentioned above, *dikaisos* at 1:1 and *akakos* at 2:3, there was a priori nothing to prevent him from adding them somewhere else, for instance, *dikaisos* either at the beginning or end of the whole series, and *akakos* either immediately before or after its synonym *amenétops*. My suggestion is that he arranged the words in alphabetical order: *aléthisinos-aménètops-dikaisos-theosebês, akakos-aléthisinos-aménètops-theosebês*. This offers a fairly reasonable explanation for the otherwise incomprehensible variation, for it is hard to see why the translator could allow himself to indulge in such a measure of variation at a time when he was quite clear about the right Heb.–Gk. correspondence, and in translating the same Heb. idiom occurring in passages so close to each other. This solution of ours renders untenable the one proposed by Gray, who writes “The original text of G was probably in all three places *amenétops, aléthisinos: dikaisos will then be a doublet of aléthisinos, akakos of amenétops.*”23 Or more precisely, we cannot be perfectly sure whether the text as presented by B and S stood in the original translation or is a modification introduced between the time of the original translation and that of the production of these two codices, although the latter supposition is less likely. At any rate, this question of the originality of the reading given by BS does not affect our solution described above.

This suggestion of ours may sound a little too ingenious. But the so-called acrostic principle preserved in Biblical Hebrew poetry must have been familiar

---

23 G. B. Gray and S. R. Driver, *Job, ICC* (Edinburgh 1921), *ad loc.*, 377. How will the explain, however, the initial position occupied by *aléthisinos* at 1:1? Moreover, the equation *dikaisos = ἔσσον* has been demonstrated above as faulty for Job. F. Horst’s explanation in *Hiob* (Neukirchen 1968) on 1:1 is confused and unsatisfactory. G. Beer’s suggestion in his *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (Marburg 1897), *ad loc.*, *καί* = *aléthisinos + aménètops*, is no less fallacious.
to our translators, revisers and perhaps also scribes, or at least to part of them. That such literary device in Biblical Hebrew was part of the common and living knowledge of these cultured Jewish translators must be presupposed in a passage where the translator seems to have rearranged his Hebrew text before putting it into Greek. The Greek text in Jer. 31(48):43 παγίς καὶ φόβος καὶ βόθυνος represents משא יברות תונש תונש as against MT משא יברות תונש תונש תונש. That the following exposition upon each of these three terms proceeds according to the order shown by the MT precludes the possibility of a different Vorlage. Our translator did not go so far as to introduce further alterations in the exposition part in vs. 44, for its rather complicated structure defies such an attempt. The verse reads עינית (הכתוב) משא יברות תונש תונש תונש תונש תונש (Qere מפרים יברות תונש תונש תונש תונש תונש) and נבש (הכתוב) משא יברות תונש תונש תונש תונש תונש, in the minuscule q (120 of Rahlf's) ta martyria post krimata. No such variant is attested for the same phrase in ib. 6:20. Ib. 8:8 ἀμπελοι, συκαϊ, ῥόαι, in h (55 of Rahlf's) sykai post roai, which incidentally results in the alphabetical order in the Heb. as well.

D) The above case of adjectives with alpha privativum in succession may not only be seen in terms of word-formation, but as a case of alliteration. In the classical languages fairly wide use was made of this literary technique. Such acoustic effect of euphony would be better produced by means of the more sonorous sounds like /g/ and /p/ than through vowels as in the case of the alpha privativum. Two examples may be quoted from Plato, Menexenus 238Α οδ γάρ γη γνώσις μεμήκει καὶ γεννήσει, ἀλλὰ γνώσις γην, 247Α διν ἐνεκα καὶ πρόων καὶ ὅταν καὶ διὰ παντὸς τάσαν πάντως προθυμίας πειράσθη ἔχειν. There follow a few possible examples of alliteration in the Septuagint:

a) Job 1:1, 8, 2:3 ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηρῶν πράγματος (עך קם ר). Note the same Heb. idiom at 28:28 rendered ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ κακῶν. No such literary play is applied to the idiom outside Job; cf. Pr. 3:7 ἐκκλίνε ἀπὸ παντός κακῶν, 16:17 ἐκκλίνουσιν ἀπὸ κακῶν, Ps. 33(34):15 and 36(37):27 ἐκκλίνου ἀπὸ κακῶι.

b) Nu. 12:12 ὥσει ἵσε θανάτῳ, ὥσει ἐκτρομώμονεν ἀπὸ κακῶν. The translator of Job, with his literary taste, could not restrain himself from borrowing verbatim the whole expression

24 I do not know of such technique in the extra-biblical Greek literature.
25 In the parallel Is. 24:17f. the Greek version adheres to the order in the MT.
26 Quoted from E. Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa, (Leipzig-Berlin 1923) 60.
when he came to render יבָּשָׁה at 3:16; just two words in the Heb. come out as δισπέρ εξεφερμένων ἐκ μήτρας μητρός.

E) As a case of another possible literary play one might note Job 38:27 τοῦ χορτάσαι ἀβατον καὶ αἰωκίττων ἄμεσως καὶ ἀβατον. If abatos is used here in its association with “uninhabited, desolate, inaccessible” desert, one may adduce a number of examples from outside Job (the Greek Job uses aoiōxtos and abatos together only here) where the same semantic association of aoiōktos with desert is recognizable: Jos. 8:28 χώμα αἰωκίττων εἰς τὸν αἰώνα τὸν λατρεύειν Ἰσραήλ, Prov. 8:26 χώρας καὶ αἰωκίττως τινάξας ἔτη; cp. Hos. 13:5 ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν γῇ αἰωκίττῳ, Wis. Sol. 11:2 ἔρημον αἰωκίττων καὶ ἐν ἀβατοίς, 1 Macc. 3:45 αἰωκίττως ὡς ἔρημος. It seems however that the combination of the adjective with οἶκος was more deeply rooted in the mind of our translator, as may be shown by passages like 8:14 αἰωκίττως γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐσται ὁ οἶκος (free rendering) and 15:28 εἰσελθον δὲ εἰς οἰκους αἰωκίττος ἡμῶν. ἐμένα. The possibility is then not entirely excluded that he wanted to reproduce the Heb. bayit under the Greek shape -bat-, and this may have been prompted by his desire to reproduce the Heb. schema etymologicum כַּמָּשֵׁה כַּמָּשֵׁה as bat-oik (κοῖκος). Ex. 17:14 ἀλοιφὴ ξαλάλασῳ τοῦ μημόσυνον Ἀμαλήκτων ἐτήσιον ὡς ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν μειλήτῳ beaver may be cited as an additional example illustrating the Greek translator’s attempt to reproduce this typically Hebraic syntax, basing himself on the etymological analysis, ξαλάλασῳ and ἀλοιφή both being derived from the same root, as if it did not matter that the resultant Greek would mean “By an unguent I shall blot out the memory of Amalek”.

We have seen that utilization of a related or parallel passage, preference of a special word-formation pattern, elegance of style, arrangement of coordinate terms in alphabetical order — these and other literary-stylistic considerations also played a part in the choice of Greek equivalents, the final fixation of the translated text-form and its revision. They possess no small significance for the precise identification of Greek-Hebrew correspondences in the Septuagint.

Another general principle to be followed in this kind of enquiry needs to be re-emphasized: each book or portion of Scriptures, believed to stem from a single translator, first must be examined by itself and as a whole, and thereafter compared with the rest of the larger body that is the Septuagint. One should bear in mind that no such useful tool as Hatch and Redpath was available to those Bible translators who laboured two thousand years ago.