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This article examines the Septuagint's treatment of Janus parallelism in the book of Job. Janus parallelism is a type of wordplay device in which a polyseme reflects what has preceded it in one of its meanings and anticipates what follows in another. Six examples of the device are chosen from the Hebrew text (Job 3:25-26, 10:7-8, 20:23-24, 28:9-10, 29:18-19, 39:19-20) and are found to have been rendered in the LXX through exegesis or equally punful translations. The study proposes that an awareness of Hebrew ambiguity might account for some instances of textual variance in the LXX in particular, and in the various other ancient translations in general.

Translation technique in the Septuagint (LXX) has been studied for decades and has provided the scholarly world with important insights into the aesthetics, idiolectic systems, and religious biases of the LXX translators. While scholars often dispute the degree to which such factors determined the translation, it is commonly accepted that some personal and socio-religious forces played roles.

Analogous research on translation technique in the other ancient versions, e.g., the Targumim and Peshitta, also has shown that the translator often attempted to preserve the most subtle literary features in the Masoretic text, including repetition and variation, parallelism, and ambiguity.

This naturally raises the question of whether the LXX also attempted to preserve such literary features. While some headway has been made in regard to the Greek aesthetic preference by H. Orlinsky, it is clear from the dearth of studies on the subject that the topic needs to be examined more closely, a task which I intend to undertake, at least in part, below.

One literary feature in particular, though ubiquitous in the Hebrew Bible, has received no attention with regard to LXX studies, namely wordplay. Nevertheless, an examination of wordplay in Classical Greek and Latin literature has yielded many interesting results. Among them, is the realization that any serious hermeneutical study of a text also must take into consideration the more allusive poetic devices such as paronomasia (soundplay) and polysemy (plays on multiple meanings). In the words of Frederick Ahl:

The ancient text, be it philosophical or poetical, is a texture not only of sound and words, but of soundplay and wordplay. These are the means by which the ancient writer, poet or philosopher, weaves his text in a fabric of horizontal and vertical Varronian threads. Ovid’s or Vergil’s Varronian declensions of literary

language are not, I suggest, an occasional ornament of the writer's art: they are his art... Once we are comfortable with these larger and more complex associations we will be ready, I think, to begin the long overdue revaluation and reinterpretation of Latin and Greek literature as a whole, to relish the multiplicity and complexity of what we have so long taken to be, at heart, simple, sincere, and classical.5

The relative frequency of wordplay in the Hebrew Bible and in Classical literature, therefore, suggests that it will be worthwhile to look anew at the LXX to see if it reflects an awareness of wordplay in the Masoretic Text. To facilitate this examination I will limit my remarks to a well-defined corpus, the book of Job, and to a specific literary device, a type of wordplay known as Janus parallelism. The latter term was coined by Cyrus Gordon to describe a literary device in which a middle stich of poetry parallels in a polysemous manner both the line that precedes it and the line which follows it. Gordon's initial discovery was in Song 2:12.

12. The blossoms have appeared in the land
the time of פָּרְסָע has arrived,
the call of the turtledove is heard in our land

As Gordon pointed out, the word פָּרְסָע may be read both as "singing" and as "pruning." As "singing" it connects with the expression רֻפָּד "the voice of the turtledove" and as "pruning," with


"blossoms." Gordon's discovery added to the then known sophisticated literary devices of the biblical authors.

Gordon was preceded by David Yellin, who, though he did not use the term "Janus Parallelism," spotted this device in Job 7:6-7.

6. My days are more trifling than a weavers shuttle. They go without gpr
7. Remember, my life is but a wind, my eyes will see no more good.

As Yellin noted,10 the word gpr means both "thread"11 and "hope."12 As the former, it parallels a weaver’s shuttle in line 6,13 and as the latter, it parallels line 7, my eyes will see no more good, an expression of Job's failing hope.14

The evidence garnered thus far has led to the general acceptance of Janus parallelism as a literary device utilized by the poets of ancient Israel. Thus, standard works on Hebrew poetry, such as those by W. G. E. Watson and A. Berlin,15 mention and illustrate this device.

In my monograph on the subject16 I have made an exhaustive study of the device and have found it to be ubiquitous in the Hebrew Bible, especially in the book of Job. Indeed, in Job it is essential to the referential nature of the theological debate and the demonstration of witty one upmanship depicted in the book.17 For the purpose of this study it is important to note that the "consistency in form"18 of Janus parallelism and its relative frequency make it a perfect case study for an examination of the LXX's treatment of wordplay. Moreover, typically when the Hebrew text presents multiple possibilities for interpretation, the other versions, e.g., Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate, often differ in respect to the

11. As found in Josh 2:18, 21. BDB, p. 876; KB, p. 1038; HALAT, IV, p. 1636.
12. BDB, p. 876; KB, pp. 1038-1039; HALAT, IV, p. 1636.
13. It also may be connected to two roots in line 5: בל "clothed" and בצ "dust," which may reflect the garment called gpr in Ugaritic. See UT 465, s.v. gpr, (1106:7, cf. 24): "20 gpr garments."
18. Of the 70 total Janus constructions examined in my book I found 64 to be symmetrical in form, i.e., they are accomplished in three stichs. Of these 64, 20 place the polyseme at the head of the stich, 20 in the middle, and 24 at the end. This suggests that the author's primary concern was the placement of the polyseme in the second of three stichs, and only secondarily with its position within that stich. Similarly, of the 6 asymmetrical Januses (which are accomplished in two stichs), 3 place the polyseme at the head of the stich, and 2 in the middle, and one at the end.
verse’s treatment or capture the pun through equally punful renderings or through exegesis. Usually, this multiplicity of meaning is picked up by the medieval and modern commentators who reflect it in their differences of opinion. Thus, with each of the Janus passages discussed, I will demonstrate how a recognition of these divergent and polysemous translations can lead to the discovery of wordplay in the LXX.

With this in mind I turn now to a few Janus parallels in the book of Job beginning with Job 3:25-26.

25. That which I have feared has come upon me, and that which
26. I have no rest, no quiet, no repose, but continual agony.

In line 25 may be understood in two ways: as "I have dreaded" or "I have stirred up, strived with, quarreled with." Both roots are well-attested: "stir up strife" occurs in Isa 54:15; Ps 56:7; and Hos 7:14, and "dread," a by-form of the root "to dread," can be found in Num 22:3; I Sam 18:15; Deut 18:22; and Job 41:17.19 As "I have dreaded" it echoes פחד פחדתי "I have feared" and as "I have stirred up," it parallels the following stich's מנוחת מנוחתי "I have no rest, no quiet." Though the roots נוח and נוח III are not parallel elsewhere, they do have a word parallel in common—ירד. For example, ירד appears with ירד in Ps 22:24; 33:8. פחד occurs with פחד in Deut 2:25; 11:25; 28:67; Ps 27:1; and Isa 44:8.

As for Job 3:25-26, most of the versions are in agreement as to the meaning of ירד, deriving it from "dread, " while the Vulgate's verebar,20 the Sages,21 and modern commentators,22 restrict their understanding to "fear, dread," a few of the versions were able to capture the pun. For instance, the Targum translates our pivot word with the root ילד, both "fear, dread" and "stir up, make turbid, trouble,"23 and the Syriac employs the root ירד, which means both "fear, quake," and "stir up, set in motion."24

---

19. ירד II "sojourn" is not applicable here. BDB, 158-159.
20. As are the dictionaries. BDB, p. 158; KB, p. 176; HALAT, I, p. 177.
When we look to the LXX we find a similar desire to translate the pun. It renders our pivot word with ἐδείκτηκα "(that) which I feared" which is derived from δείξω. Like the Hebrew רָעָב, δείξω carries two meanings: "fear, dread," and "flee from," in the sense of being "stirred up" or "alarmed." Thus the LXX used this verb in order to retain the pun inherent in the Hebrew original.

To further demonstrate the LXX’s penchant for polysemous preservation I turn to Job 10:7-8.

7. Though you know that I am not wicked, there is no one who can deliver me from your hand.
8. Your hands ἐδείκτηκα me, they have made me, altogether, yet now you swallow me.

The form ἐδείκτηκα may be derived from two different roots: from ἐδύναμαι I (cf. Arabic gzipaba) "hurt, pain, grieve," or from ἐδύναμαι II (cf. Arabic ażababa) "shape, fashion," both of which are employed in the Bible. That the Hebrew represents both PS roots with the same orthography provides the poet’s pen with a visual pun. We may read the phrase ἐδύναμαι either as "your hands hurt me" or as "your hands fashioned me." With the sense of "hurt" the stich follows nicely upon the expression of grief in 7b ἐδύναμαι. That the latter expression refers to destruction can be seen in Job 5:4 where ἐδύναμαι occurs alongside ὁ ἐν τῇ θάλασσῃ "may they be crushed at the gate." As "fashioned" ἐδύναμαι parallels equally well ἐδείκτηκα "they have made me" in 8a. Such expressions of Job’s wit befit the label "crafty word-hunter" which is placed on him later by Bildad in 18:2.

The Targum is able to render the pun perfectly into Aramaic with ἐδείκτηκα both "fashion, form," from ἐδύναμαι and "vex, harm," from ἐδύναμαι. That the second meaning of ἐδείκτηκα was known to the ancients is suggested also by the Syriac which renders ἐδύναμαι יָצְבִּיתִי "your hand troubles me." Yet, the Vulgate translates ἐδείκτηκα with plasmaverunt me "they have fashioned me."

The Rabbis also are divided on this word. Rashi and Ra’bag opt for the meaning "form, make," whereas Ibn Ezra and both Metsudat David and Metsudat Zion take it as "harm, grieve." Interestingly,
Saadiah Gaon rendered both meanings of "your blows have cut me and bruised me." On the other hand, the moderns invariably derive the word from "shape, form." When we consult the LXX we again find lexemes carefully selected in order to translate the pun, namely ἐκλείδωσιν με "have formed me," from πλάσω, which plays upon πλησώ "smile, strike."

Note both the similarity between πλάσψω and πλησψω and the documented confusion between the two roots. Thus the LXX, like a few of the other versions, attempted to construe the polysemy here. The poet again displays his talent for polyvalence in Job in Job 20:23-24.

23. To fill his belly to the full. He will send his wrath against him. And rain down upon him

24. If he flees from an iron weapon, a bronze arrow will pierce him.

The word "battle-fury" typically has been understood as "in his battle-fury," as if derived from the root מַלֵּא "to do battle." However, as the phrase follows, with a slight interruption, the line "to fill his belly," there is some question as to whether we may translate מַלֵּא as "for his food, food" from מַלִּים "bread," (c.f., the segholate noun מַלָּא דָּרָם and its derived nominal form מַלָּא דָּרָם). Consequently, in Job 20:23-24 there is reason to see in מַלֵּא both meanings. In its rendering "with his food" it reminds us of "and send his wrath against him." If rendered "in his battle-fury," it foreshadows the following remark: "if he flees from an iron weapon, a bronze arrow will pierce him." That the roots מַלָּא מַלָּא and מַלָּא מַלָּא as "battle" are word pairs in Jer 33:5 supports our connecting מַלָּא מַלָּא with the previous stich. That the root מַלָּא מַלָּא occurs with מַלָּא מַלָּא as "bread," e.g., in Prov 20:17 and Exod 16:32, adds weight to the interpretation of מַלָּא מַלָּא as "for his food."

The Targumist rendered the pivoting lexeme מַלָּא לְכַלֶּרֶם: "with his burning (matter)," or "flake of flesh," which suggests an awareness of the meaning "battle-fury." On the other hand, the Peshitta seems to favor the meaning "battle-fury" rendering it with מַלָּא לְכַלֶּרֶם "with war-like strength." Similar is the Vulgate's bellum suum "his own warfare.

34. Pope, p. 78; Gordin, pp. 98, 112; Tur-Sinai, pp. 176-177; Michel, p. 235; Guillaume, pp. 29, 89; Hartley, p. 185. Note that though Tur-Sinai remarks that "there is no connection between this word and מַלָּא מַלָּא 'grief'" (p. 177), that he fails to explain why.

35. LS, p. 1412.
36. LS, p. 1421.
37. See e.g., Iliad, 21.269 and Odyssey, 5.389.
38. So BDB, p. 535.
39. Along with HALAT, II, 499. Others choose to emend the word, e.g., KB, p. 478.
40. This is how the Targum translates מַלָּא מַלָּא in Job 41:15. Jastrow, pp. 1577-1578.
41. Payne Smith, p. 517.
42. OLD, pp. 228-229.
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Saadiah Gaon, Rashi, and the commentaries Metsudat David and Metsudat Zion render "battle-fury," whereas Ibn Ezra and Ralbag translate "on his flesh." Moshe Qimhi renders: "'his flesh' or 'his food.'" The modern commentators, Yellin, Pope, and Gordis, render with the LXX and Vulgate, but Tur-Sinai and Guillaume differ greatly, the former giving the reading "upon their cheeks" (which requires him to emend and revocalize) and the latter opting for "into his very bowels" without comment. Of special interest is Hartley's remark (even though he does not note the forward parallel to the weapons of war):

With its first meaning MT is understood as 'on his flesh.' This affords a good parallel with 'his belly' in the first line. With the second meaning MT reads 'in his wrath'; the parallel is then with 'his burning anger.'

The divergence between the Vulgate and Peshitta, on the one hand, and the Targum, Ibn Ezra, and Ralbag, on the other, demonstrate that this passage was understood in multiple ways.

The divergence, therefore, should alert us to the possibility of pun retention in the LXX as well. Interestingly, the LXX translates our Janus with τὸ μέγας ὁ φόβος "torrent of pain (lit. anger)." This expression probably was chosen because δήμος also can mean "appetite, desire for food and drink." With a slightly different accent, not required for puns to be effective, we also may hear in the translator's word δήμος "a mixture of thyme with honey and vinegar," that is, a food item. Note also that δήμος "an animal slaughtered for food," is used by the LXX in Genesis 43:16. Thus again, despite the extraordinary differences between the source and target languages, the LXX translated the verse with an eye toward preserving the polysemy.

The Jobian poet again pens a pun in Job 28:9-10.

9. To flint he sets his hand. He overturns the mountains by the roots.
10. He carves out channels. Every precious thing his eyes behold.

43. Yellin, p. 144; Pope, pp. 150, 153; Gordis, pp. 210, 219.
44. Tur-Sinai, p. 318.
45. Guillaume, p. 43.
47. Note that δήμος means "make angry, provoke." LS, p. 810.
48. LS, p. 810. See e.g., Iliad, 4.263 and Odyssey, 17.603.
49. See the comments of Ahl, Metamorphoses, pp. 35-40.
50. LS, p. 810.
51. LS, p. 809.
Here the poet has utilized the construction כֶּלֶמָיָה to mean both "from the rock"53 and "precious ore" (from the root בָּלְדֹן).54 The first echoes the previous mention of "flint" and "mountains," and the second anticipates "every precious thing" in the next stich. Though such a shift requires revocalization, it is important to remember that we are dealing here with a pre-masoretic consonantal system in which either reading would have been possible. Moreover, support for the parallels comes from elsewhere in the Bible. כֶּלֶמָיָה and כֶלֶמָיָה are parallel also in Job 14:18 and occur together in Job 24:8 and Isa 30:29. As "precious ore," כֶּלֶמָיָה parallels כֶּלֶמָיָה in Job 28:10. Though the two roots are not parallel elsewhere in the Bible, the close association between them can be demonstrated on the basis of a parallelism between כֶּלֶמָיָה, כֶּלֶמָיָה, and כֶּלֶמָיָה in Prov 3:15, 20:15, between כֶּלֶמָיָה and כֶּלֶמָיָה in Job 22:24, and between כֶּלֶמָיָה and כֶּלֶמָיָה in Job 22:25. Interestingly, just a few verses later, in Job 28:16, we find כֶּלֶמָיָה parallel with כֶּלֶמָיָה in Job 28:10 and כֶּלֶמָיָה in 28:11. Thus, Job 28:9-10 is a strictly visual and symmetrical polysemous parallel.

The Targum leaves no doubt that its writers understood the Hebrew as "rock," as it translates it with כֶּלֶמָיָה, "in the rock, flint."55 Similar is the Vulgate's in petris.56 On the other hand, the Peshitta's use of כֶּלֶמָיָה, "in a fortress,"57 suggests that it understood the beth in כֶּלֶמָיָה (translated as "fortress") as part of the root.

Though the medieval commentators I examined translated כֶּלֶמָיָה as "in the rock," it is important to note that each found it necessary to clarify the reading, suggesting the presence of an element of ambiguity. With the exception of Tur-Sinai, who espied the second meaning here by translating the stich: "He broke through to the treasure of the rivers,"58 modern translators all have opt for the reading "in the rock."59

Interestingly, the LXX translates כֶּלֶמָיָה with διόνος ἐκ ποταμῶν "whirlpools of rivers."60 While this might suggest that the translators understood the Hebrew as referring to a channel in the rock, it also may represent a play on διόνος "wonderous, marvellous," i.e., "precious." Note also the use of διόνος for a precious item, namely, "a jewelled goblet made of silver."61 Third, it is possible that, like the Peshitta, the LXX translation understood the Hebrew as "fortresses, enclosures."62 διόνος can be anything that is enclosed and rounded, and this is the root meaning of בָּלְדֹן.63 Thus, once again, despite the large difference between the languages, the LXX was able to hint at the wordplay.

---

53. See BDB, p. 849; KB, p. 799; HALAT, III, pp. 952-953.
55. Jastrow, p. 533; Sokoloff, p. 224.
56. OLD, p. 1370.
57. Payne Smith, p. 152.
60. LS, pp. 431-432.
61. LS, p. 374.
62. Note that διόνος is "frequently... found in puns with διόνος." LS, p. 432. For other uses of διόνος in connection with precious metals, see Iliad, 3.391, 13.407 and Odyssey, 19.556.
63. See BDB, pp. 130-131; KB, p. 142; HALAT, I, p. 142; HALAT8, p. 167.
Another example of where the LXX translates a pun with a pun occurs in Job 29:18-19, also a Janus parallel.

18. I thought I would end my days with my nest. And be as long lived as 흘.
19. My roots reaching water, and dew lying on my branches.

These lines are a famous *crux interpretæm*. Part of the difficulty lies in the ambiguous use of וחרל normally "sand, coast," 65 but here also the mythological bird "Phoenix." 66 Also ambiguous is יָמָן, either literally "my nest" or metaphorically "my family" (cf. Hab 2:9 where it parallels בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל "dynasty" and Isa 16:2 where it is used figuratively for בֵּית מָלָכֵי). 67 That the context and parallelism fit either for each of the lexemes has led scholars to debate the priority of one or the other renderings. Yet, it is precisely this ambiguity with which the poet charges his lines. 68 As the Janus examples above demonstrate, such ambiguity is part of the telling, and so it is with Job 29:18-19. 69 As "sand," the first stich in v. 18 parallels the mention of מים "water," and as "Phoenix," it echoes יָמָן in the previous stich as "my nest." The former parallel is buttressed by the commonly attested expression vrolet יָמָן, e.g., in Job 6:3, Ps 78:27, and Jer 15:8. The latter, though it cannot be demonstrated on the basis of a hapax, nonetheless, seems obvious if the meaning "Phoenix" is permitted. In addition, it is clear from extra-biblical sources that the Phoenix was a favorite subject for Classical Greek and Latin punsters as well. 70

The Targum preserves the Janus on "sand/Phoenix" by rendering with בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, 71 and perhaps also the pun on רַעַשׁ with בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל. 72 The Vulgate renders our pivot word palma "palm tree," 73 and for יָמָן and רַעַשׁ it uses nidulo "nest" and radix "root." 74 It is unclear whether the Syriac preserves the pun on the two meanings of יָמָן, though it translates like the Targum, בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל. 75 For דָּרֵס and רַעַשׁ the Peshitta gives תְּרֵס "reed item (i.e., nest)," 76 and שׁוּשִׁנ "root." 77

The Rabbis were aware that יָמָן bore the meaning "Phoenix" as well (it is attested in Bereshit Rabbah 19:9), and Rashi and Minhat Shai translated Job 29:18 as such. 78 Modern commentators typify the current additude toward polysemy by choosing an "either/or" policy when translating, i.e., it is to be translated either "sand" or "Phoenix." In the "sand" camp are Driver, Dhorme, Pope, Tur-Sinai, and

---

65. So BDB, pp. 296-297.
67. BDB, p. 890; KB, p. 842; HALAT, III, p. 1036. So also the Targum; Yellin, p. 156; Hartley, p. 392, n. 1.
68. Note also that this pericope is called a "crux" in 29:1. As David Stern has shown, wordplay is quite common to the יָמָן. See his Parables in Midrashic Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 41, 44, 71, 73, 74, 59, 92, 111, 141, 146, 149, 155-156, 170-171, 181, 217.
69. What has not been noted in this passage is the presence of another polysemous word, namely שׁוּשִׁנ "root," but also "kin."
70. See Ahl, Metaformations, pp. 120-123.
71. Jastrow, pp. 433, 463.
72. Note that Moshe Qimhi regards יָמָן as דָּרֵס.
73. OLD, p. 1286.
74. OLD, pp. 1571, 1176.
75. Payne Smith, p. 142.
76. Payne Smith, p. 599. It is not certain whether יָמָן and שׁוּשִׁנ are polysemous in Syriac.
77. Ibn Ezra is strangely silent here.
Hartley, while in the "Phoenix" camp are Gordis, Guillaume, Ceresko, and Grabbe. By contrast, Yellin astutely remarks that "..."

The divergence in opinion again suggests that we closely examine the LXX’s word choice. In so doing we find that the LXX conflates Ἰον and ὄλυνι by rendering them with στέλεχος φοίνικος "the stem of a palm-tree." While most who have commented on this rendering have noted the relationship between palm trees and the Phoenix and how the Vulgate adopted this reading (palma), only Pope has seen it as an "oblique" reference to φοίνικη "Phoenix." In addition, the word φοίνικη also means "Phoenician(s)," i.e., a "coastal" people, which suggests that the author wanted to catch the other meaning of Ἰον, namely "sand, coast." Note here also that φοίνικη translates well the Hebrew וּשור both as "root" and as "family." Thus, the LXX again favors lexemes which translate the polysemy of the Hebrew text.

The sophistication with which LXX translators captured Hebrew puns may be demonstrated by one final example of Janus parallelism in Job 39:19-20.

19. Do you give the horse its strength? Do you clothe his neck with ὑφάσματα?
20. Do you make him quiver like locusts, his majestic snorting, (spreading) terror

The poet has long stood as a crux to scholars, both ancient and modern. Its root suggests the meaning "thunder," or by extension "terror." As such, it serves an excellent parallel for the expression ἵππος ὑφάσματα ὑποδημάτων ὑπώνυμα "Do you make him quiver like locusts, his majestic snorting [spreading] terror?" in the next line. This parallel finds support in Ps 77:19, where the roots ὑφάσματα and ὑπώνυμα are parallel and also Isa 29:6, where ρυθμός and ὑπώνυμος occur as a hendiadys. However, as Pope and Gordis note, the word may be akin to the Arabic expression ʿumm riʿm "mother of the mane." If we take ʿumm riʿm as "mane," the stich parallels ἰον ὄλυντος βόραρας "do you give the horse its strength?" Again, the poet expresses two ideas with one word.

80. Yellin, p. 268.
82. Pope, pp. 214-216.
83. LS, p. 1948.
84. LS, p. 1947.
85. See BDB, p. 1057; KB, p. 1012; HALAT, IV, pp. 1530-1532.
86. LS, p. 1570.
87. See e.g., Israel W. Slotski, "A Study of אָדַר," AJSL 37 (1920-21), pp. 149-155.
88. So BDB, p. 947.
89. So KB, p. 901; HALAT, IV, p. 1182; Pope, p. 311; Gordis, p. 461.
The Targum and Qumran fragment translate with the words "strength, anger" respectively, both "strength, anger." The Vulgate's "hinnitum" "neighing" seems an ad sensum attempt. The Peshitta, on the other hand, takes a compromise position between the two meanings by rendering with a word which means "terrifying clothing," i.e., "armour." 

The word has evoked numerous comments from biblical exegetes. Saadiah Gaon, Rashi, and Ibn Ezra read it as "terror," and Moshe Qimhi, Y. Altschuler's Metsudat David, and Ralbag suggest, along with the Vulgate, that the "thundering" refers to the horse's neighing. Driver understood it as "might." Yellin read it as "quivering." Dhorme, Pope, Gordis, and Hartley each see in "vibrating," "a mane." Tur-Sinai hedgingly translates "with [power]." Guillaume, attempting to bridge the two translations gives "quivering mane" without comment. 

Note how craftily the LXX handles the ambiguity. It employs "terror" in order to render the word. In accordance with the examples, above we may see in the LXX's word choice an attempt to capture the pun by way of a play on "mane." That the LXX translators chose to render the root only here, though typically they chose to render the root with a variety of different Greek words, e.g., "vibrating," "mane," "shaking," "trembling," "shaking," and especially "vibrating" (e.g., in Ps 77:19 and Is 29:6), argues in favor of this. Thus again, the LXX selected its lexemes carefully in order to capture the puns in the Hebrew text.

Translators and exegetes have long struggled with the Hebrew text in an effort to find the closest possible meaning and to come to an understanding of the text that is based on, if not absolute, then relative certitude. This desire to find the "correct" translation or interpretation, I would aver, has clouded to some extent the richness and abundance of meaning extant in the biblical text. As the above examples demonstrate, the Hebrew bards penned their thoughts with an openness to the multiplicity of nuance; to the possibility of simultaneous meanings.

Moreover, a desire to retain the multiplicity of meaning extends into the periods which gave rise to the various translations. That the versions demonstrate an attempt to render the polysemous passages of the Hebrew text suggests the need for a fresh examination of the LXX. Typically, in order to explain instances of textual variance among the versions, especially in the LXX, a different Vorlage has been posited. The evidence above suggests that in some cases the variance may be due to the translators' desire to preserve the sacred word by rendering it fully, i.e., by capturing its polysemy.

---

90. DISO, p. 333; Jastrow, pp. 1655-1666; Beyer, pp. 726-727; Sokoloff, p. 590. The word is used to translate the root in Job 35:15.
91. OLD, p. 797.
92. Payne Smith, p. 115.
94. On the basis of Is 29:6 where it appears with the root ויה. Yellin, p. 163.
95. Dhorme, p. 554; Pope, pp. 305, 311; Gordis, pp. 440, 461. Interestingly, Hartley notes that "there may be a play on the homonyma 'quiver' and 'mane.'" Hartley, p. 310, n. 1.
96. Tur-Sinai, pp. 546-548.
97. Guillaume, pp. 71, 134.
101. The excellent work of the aforementioned scholars notwithstanding.
102. The best discussion on this remains Orlinsky, HUCA 28 (1957), pp. 53-74.
While the above does not imply that all problems of variance between the LXX and the Masoretic text can be explained in this way, it does suggest that an awareness of polysemy in the Hebrew text might shed light on a few textual problems.\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{103} For a concurring presentation of the LXX as it regards the Torah see John Wm. Wevers, "The Earliest Witness to Jewish Exegesis," in Barry Walfish, ed. The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume. Vol 1. (Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1993), pp. 115-127, especially 115.