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ABSTRACT

It has been recognised for more than two hundred years that the basic style of poetry in the Hebrew Bible is parallelism, and its system has been minutely studied. More recently ethnographers have noted the same style in numerous ancient and traditional languages. Within the last half-century, an identical feature of parallelism has been found in classical Hebrew and one cognate language, as well as in several unrelated traditional languages. This feature, the presence of certain specific pairs of words in contiguous lines of verse, has attracted the interest of linguists, ethnographers, and biblical scholars. A concerted effort, which still continues, was started by Mitchell Dahood to collect the word pairs cognate between Ugaritic and classical Hebrew; before 1982, three volumes consisting of 1019 pairs were published as Ras Shamra Parallels. The widespread use of parallelism in traditional languages and its documented use in cognate languages before and after the heyday of classical Hebrew suggests that word pairs also are present. In order to determine to what extent, if at all, authors writing in the classical Hebrew style were aware of the nature and significance of word pairs, this study has been undertaken to assess the degree to which the translators of the Septuagint were consistent in their choice of words. Unusual consistency argues that the Seventy were aware of the special role of the specific words which form pairs.

A selection of Dahood’s pairs was made consisting of the words that pair with “earth” (thirty in number) and those that pair with the thirty, totalling about 220. This number, about 20% of the total, is regarded as statistically significant. A concordance programme, AnyText, developed by Linguists’ Software, Inc. was used to determine the number of occurrences of each of those words in the Hebrew Bible. The same programme was then used to find and record the references where the members of each word pair appeared in close proximity. Finally, each reference was checked against the Septuagint and the Greek translation of each member of the word pair was recorded.

Taken as a whole, translations were remarkably consistent. Those words which appeared many times as members of word pairs were usually translated in the same way wherever they appeared. Those which appeared in few word pairs were less consistent in translation, though the correlation was not absolute. A complex of word pairings that appeared frequently was identified and assessed for consistency of translation; those results confirmed what had already been found. It appears that the Seventy were aware in an implicit sense of the significance of word pairs.
Retracing the steps by which one has arrived at a certain intellectual orientation is, at best, a tricky procedure. Who knows herself well enough to understand the route by which she arrived at her present state of mind?

My father started his academic career as an entomologist, was later captured by comparative anatomy, and ended his life as a paleontologist. The common thread that tied all his interests together was taxonomy, and I have a melancholy suspicion that I am more like him than I had hitherto supposed. My interest in oral formulaic analysis is, at bottom, taxonomic and lies in the broad area of literary criticism loosely designated genre studies.

Somewhere along the line, I began to wonder how an oral formula performs in translation. Word pairs are a type of formula that appears in the Hebrew Bible; the ones found there seem to have originated in parallel language, and are part of a long history of Canaanite tradition that goes back at least as far as Ugaritic. The translators of the Septuagint read these same pairs and may have spoken them; what did they do with them when they came to the problem of translation? Did they recognise them as an integral part of the language?

The Bible is the most studied literature of all time. Anyone who seeks to make an original contribution has an enormous body of information to sift and assess in order to lay the groundwork for what is to come. Inevitably much must be made of other people's work before embarking on a description of one's own. I am painfully aware of the danger of interpreting previous work in such a way as to bolster the credibility of mine. For this reason, I have deemed it best most often to use previous scholars' own words to describe their arguments. This policy has resulted in long and frequent quotations in those chapters which lay the foundations for the rather specific work that this thesis consists of. It is not to say that the nucleus of the study is not original. Indeed, its originality lies in several directions:

1) it brings together the insights of people whose work appears to be unknown to each other,

2) in it I have developed a general classification for word pairs which is intended to function not only in Ugaritic/Hebrew but across language lines,
3) I have described a matrix of semantically related word pairs which appear and re-appear in the Hebrew Bible. The way this matrix causes meanings to overlap adds substantially to our understanding of the mental framework in which the ancient Israelite mind worked.

4) for the first time several Late Hebrew texts have been examined for word pai cognate with those in Ugaritic and classical Hebrew

5) the study seeks to illuminate the nature of word pairs and their use by observing how some of those in the Hebrew Bible were translated in the Septuagint

As far as I have been able to determine, no one has yet looked at the way word pairs were used in translation at all, outside the observation that they are cognate in Ugaritic and Hebrew. When I began this work, the only result I envisioned was 5). The others have emerged as it were gratuitously along the way.

A major component in the successful completion of this thesis has been the unfailing support, indeed enthusiasm, of my supervisor, Albert Moore. His contribution has not been because of his profound knowledge of word pairs, for his areas of expertise lie elsewhere, but rather because he has encouraged me to pursue my scholarly interests to their logical conclusions. He has also insisted that the integrity of my work be checked along the way, and that my writing be, like that of the man Francis Bacon describes, exact. For all this and much more, I am profoundly grateful.

I also wish to record my deep appreciation to the staff of the Faculty of Theology for the generous assistance they have given me. In particular, Paul Trebilco made it possible for me to use the Linguists' Software programme, *AnyText*. And the staff of the Religious Studies Department, who sympathised with me and ignored me when appropriate, had a major part to play in the success of this venture.

Finally, to my friends and family, who support me in every way possible and whose reward has been to know more about word pairs than anyone could wish, I owe all I do or could ever hope to do.
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INTRODUCTION

The original title of this thesis was "Folk Proverbs in the Ancient Near East". The intention was to trace, through several Ancient Near Eastern traditions folk proverbs which shared a common semantic feature, using a selection culled from the Hebrew Bible as a starting point. This idea foundered when I discovered that not only is there little agreement about which sayings in the Hebrew Bible are folk proverbs but there is even less agreement about what a proverb is and how it can be identified.

In the flush of enthusiasm attendant upon beginning a project of this scope, it seemed that the thing to do was to attempt a definition. One way to approach definition is through context, that is, a proverb is a proverb when it behaves like a proverb. However, that approach only serves to push the question back from "what is a proverb?" to "what does it mean to behave like a proverb?" and this issue has been discussed in depth by Carole Fontaine in *Traditional Sayings in the Old Testament* (1982). Therefore, I chose to work on structural criteria which, in any case, interested me more. (As I say, I am a taxonomist at heart.) To that end, I began a study of proverbs from the point of view of oral formulaic analysis. This, in the context of the Hebrew Bible, inevitably led straight to parallelism, which seemed likely to be a fruitful source of material about what structures go into the making of formulaic language.

Along the way, my attention was caught by the phenomenon of word pairs. There has been considerable interest in them among biblical scholars, though the discussion has for the most part generated more heat than light. Some have hailed word pairs as the Semitic equivalent of the Homeric epithet, while others have declared them to be an incidental language phenomenon of no inherent significance. It is notable, however, that few studies have collected hard data. Where information is available, few scholars have followed it up. For instance, that parallelism is an important feature of classical Hebrew poetry has been known since the eighteenth century. In the first half of the nineteenth century, reference was made to the parallel structures of Chinese poetry, drawing specific comparison with Hebrew. In this century, linguists and ethnographers, led by no less a scholar than Roman Jakobson, have studied parallelism in the cross-cultural context and have shown that it is an extremely widespread cultural phenomenon, more common in non-IndoEuropean languages. Because it is relatively uncommon in the IndoEuropean languages (though very common in the others), Western academics of the last two centuries have met it in the only non-IndoEuropean language with which they were acquainted, classical Hebrew. Many biblical scholars still believe that parallelism is a Semitic language.
phenomenon. Parallelism to them equals Semitic, and to be Semitic is to be capable in religious matters, if a bit fanatic, but as far as literature is concerned not a patch on Western Europeans.

However, parallelism is very far from being confined to oral, pre-industrial or primitive societies. Rather, from the remarkable similarity of its organisation in different language stocks, it seems to reflect some inherent pattern in the way human beings try to make sense of the world. In the chapter on parallelism and the one on word pairs I will describe the extent to which biblical scholarship has failed to see these important points, and what that implies about conclusions that have been reached. I will also show some of the useful aspects of analogous cases, while frankly admitting that analogy takes us only so far and acknowledging that it cannot, in the end, answer every question.

The focus of this study is on word pairs, generally acknowledged to be a feature of parallel language, itself a feature of classical Hebrew poetry. But the phenomenon of word pairing is not confined to parallel language, nor is parallel language confined to poetry. The situation is similar to the phenomenon of rhyme in English. Rhyme is a feature of English poetry, but is found in all sorts of language not poetical, while poetry does not need to exhibit rhyme. In other words, the two are not co-extensive. Further, rhyme may be studied, not as an essential feature of poetry (which it isn’t), but as a thing in itself. When studied that way, it throws light upon the way our minds shape language and are in turn shaped by it. So it is with word pairs: the chapter on parallelism explores that topic in depth because it is relatively unfamiliar to speakers of Indo-European languages. Later chapters develop the nature of word pairs, in parallel language and in other styles of speech. All the above is discussed in considerable detail because this thesis brings together several different disciplines to throw light upon the continuity of word pairs.

Having set the stage, as it were, I reach the real centre of this study, the translation of word pairs into the Greek of the Septuagint. The pairs shed light upon several interesting aspects of language use. Most biblical scholars have focussed on what the pairs (may) tell us about the composition of poetry in parallel lines. But the very recognition that certain words are regularly used together gives insight into the linguistic framework of biblical Hebrew. Another way of throwing light upon the same issue is to look at the way those words were translated in the Greek of the Septuagint. This particular approach - of considering how word pairs were used by looking at how they were translated - has, as far as I have been able to determine, been attempted by no one else.

As the study progresses, I explore what the translation of the pairs tells us about the consciousness of the Seventy concerning the Hebrew language. Given the nature of Jewish belief in revelation and the function and inerrancy of
Scripture, this is inextricably if tangentially linked with contemporary theology. However, I wish to make it clear at the outset that theology, contemporary or otherwise, is not the focus of this study and therefore is dealt with only in brief comments or left to readers’ implicit awareness.

The Influence of the Parry-Lord Theory
Judging by their bibliographies, linguists and ethnographers who study parallelism are aware that they owe their terminology at least to the abiding interest of modern Jews and Christians in the workings of the Israelite mind. Biblical scholars are not generally so well informed about their secular counterparts. About one area of literary criticism they are very well informed, however. The Parry-Lord theory appeared in its classic form when Alfred Bates Lord published *The Singer of Tales* in 1960. That theory was in essence formulated by the time of Milman Parry’s accidental death in 1935, but underwent refinement and verification by Parry’s student and colleague, Lord. The disruption caused by Parry’s untimely death and then by World War II delayed Lord’s thesis, which was eventually published as *The Singer of Tales*. But by the 1950’s, enough was known about Parry and Lord’s findings (through the publication of papers since the early 1920’s and through Lord’s thesis, which was submitted in 1949) to cause scholars studying other oral traditions to consider how the Parry-Lord theory might be applied to their own work. Francis Peabody Magoun’s seminal article, “The Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry” appeared in 1953, James Ross published “Formulaic Composition in Gaelic Oral Literature” in *Modern Philology* in 1959, and *Formulaic Diction and Thematic Composition in the Chanson de Roland*, by S.G. Nichols, jr., appeared in 1961. On the other hand, also appearing in 1961 was Birger Gerhardsson’s *Memory and Manuscript: oral tradition and written transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity*; it makes no mention of any of Parry’s articles or anything about Lord.

Not surprisingly, the first person to apply oral formulaic analysis (the generic term for the Parry-Lord theory) to biblical texts was a classical scholar. At least one article by William Whallon on the Homeric epithet had already been published in *Yale Classical Studies*; his “Formulaic Poetry in the Old Testament” appeared in 1963. Whallon expressed the central thesis of that article several times:

[A] primary characteristic of the poetical books in the Old Testament was a hemistichal parallelism of meaning, and a similar or identical form of expression has subsequently appeared dominant in ancient Egypt and Sumeria, as in Finland and Mongolia from the latter half of our own millenium. Aural devices such as meter are relatively incidental; semantic rhythm is the essential property of the genre.
Hebraic parallelism may therefore be considered a prosodic requirement analogous to the Homeric hexameter and Anglo-Saxon alliteration. Each existed from the beginning and cannot be derived. The Hebraic poet associated the swords and spears [of Isaiah 2:4] to express himself under the schema of parallelism, as the Homeric poet augmented his own swords with epithets that would provide segments in the hexameter, and as the Anglo-Saxon poet replaced his swords with kennings that would alliterate as he wished. The Old Testament combines nouns; the Iliad modifies them; Beowulf supplants them.¹ He followed this article with “Old Testament Poetry and Homeric Epic”, but since both were published inComparative Literature, they were little noticed in the field of biblical studies. Whallon made his point even more forcibly inFormula, Character, Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English, and Old Testament Poetry (1969). That book, I think, brought oral formulaic analysis to the attention of biblical scholars who had previously failed to notice it.

Few scholars today dispute the oral background of the Hebrew Bible or even the formulaic nature of many of its texts.² What is hotly disputed, however, is the meaning of formulaic in the biblical context, the extent to which a particular passage is formulaic, and how much influence oral formulae had on the shape of pieces that came to be written down. Probably because information about the Parry-Lord theory is readily available rather than because of any demonstrated similarity to Homeric Greek, biblical scholars most often apply Parry and Lord’s conclusions to the Hebrew Bible. In theory, there is nothing wrong with this:

In the past much light has been shed on dark areas of the people of Israel and their literature by exploring parallel situations in the history of other peoples about whom more is known. When faced with an embarrassing lack of information about conditions prevailing at a given time, scholars have often sought to sketch in the background of the few and insufficient facts available by drawing an analogy from another historical situation that is more fully documented, and so more completely understood. This method is in principle quite sound, since very often the discovery of a parallel about which more is known offers the only hope of interpreting the meagre facts at our disposal. But the extent to which such a study succeeds depends upon a careful and judicious treatment of the evidence.³

The Iliad and Beowulf have an obvious flaw when considered as parallels with the Hebrew Bible. Neither exhibits parallelism, which on anyone’s terms is the prominent feature of Hebrew verse. It is necessary to make some accommodation for this fact, though many biblical scholars have been content to assume a similarity that is by no means self-evident.

¹ Whallon, 1963, pp. 1-2
² In many of his articles John Van Seters seeks to correct the facile attribution of “difficult” texts to oral tradition. See for example Van Seters, 1986.
³ Culley, 1967, p. 4
Culley in the very book quoted above sounds a warning that should have been taken far more seriously by everyone, himself included. In reference to the work done by James Ross on "Formulaic Composition in Gaelic Oral Literature" he comments that Ross's examples come from a tradition of oral composition that is no longer living and so there appears to be no way of discovering how individual singers employed recurrent ideas in a line or two-line form. Further investigations will have to be made in different kinds of oral literature to see how common such a device might be.

Parallelism Is More Common Than Was Once Thought
At the very time the words quoted above were being written, "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet" was published by Roman Jakobson (1966). Like other articles of importance to biblical scholars, it was little noticed by them at the time because it appeared in a journal not devoted specifically to biblical scholarship. Not until Stephen A. Geller's *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (1979) did anyone attempt to discuss biblical poetry in the light of Jakobson's observations. This is in spite of the fact that the Bible is the most studied literature of all time, as well as being the most studied of the works which exhibit parallelism.

Some fifteen years earlier than Geller however, Stanley Gevirtz drew upon the previous study of Ugaritic parallelism and particularly the word pairs found there. His book, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, was first published in 1963, with a second edition in 1973. It turned out to be the most influential book on the subject written before 1980. Gevirtz saw what he did as only a beginning, a way to help discover the meaning of obscure texts.

We began these studies with what appeared to us to be a verifiable and self-evident truth: the pervasiveness of a tradition in the fashioning of early Hebrew poetry. This Syro-Palestinian tradition to which the biblical poets were heir, which seems to have had its origins in remote antiquity and which may have been motivated, we suggested by the requirements of oral verse formation, consisted for the most part in the employment of fixed pairs of words set in parallel structure. Through a close investigation of five poems we set out to examine the use made of this tradition by the early Hebrew poets and the applicability of the resultant patterns as a literary-critical tool for the elucidation of the meaning of these several texts.\(^5\)

Gevirtz acknowledged in his Prologue that he learned of the Parry-Lord theory only at the end of his work, but emphasised that he appreciated the similarity of principle that lay behind his own and Parry's work.

---

\(^4\) Culley, 1967, p. 20

\(^5\) Gevirtz, 1973, p. 97
Only after the present work in all its essentials was completed, the evidence assembled, and the ideas formulated, was I introduced to the theories of the late Professor Milman Parry, whose studies of the Homeric poems and other epic literature led him to recognise the importance, and to stress the significance, of tradition in the composition of ancient poetry. The literary traditions of Greek and Hebrew differ widely and fundamentally, but to have learned that the force of tradition was as much a factor in early Greek as in Hebrew poetry and to have arrived independently at a similar explanation for such reliance upon it have helped strengthen my own convictions concerning the essential validity of the position reached.

Since Geller's book, most biblical scholars writing on parallelism have made some use of the ever-increasing volume of literature concerning that phenomenon. They have, however, almost without exception, failed to make use of the linguistic studies that have been done on the many languages that exhibit this trait. There have been fine studies of parallelism in Mandarin Chinese (Boodberg, 1979), Toda (Emeneau, 1966), Nahuatl (Léon-Portilla, 1985), and Rotinese (Fox, 1988), to mention only a few.

A Hebrew Metrics?

Some mention should be made of the ongoing attempts of generations of scholars to discover metres which would enable biblical poetry to be scanned, and so bring it into line with other (mainly Western) systems of poetry. The reason for this persistence appears to be an ethnocentric belief, reinforced by the pervasive study of classical texts, that led to the conviction, often subconscious, that "real" poetry has metre. Prior to the last century or two, understanding of language groups was minimal, leading to an assumption that what was true for Greek and Latin was also true for Hebrew. Comments made by Jerome (c. 340-420 CE) demonstrate this clearly.

Well, then, from the beginning of the book to the words of Job, the Hebrew version is in prose. Further, from the words of Job where he says, "May the day perish wherein I was born, and the night in which it was said, a man child is conceived," to the place where before the close of the book it is written "Therefore I blame myself and repent in dust and ashes," we have hexameter verses running in dactyl and spondee: and owing to the idiom of the language other feet are frequently introduced not containing the same number of syllables, but the same quantities. Sometimes, also, a sweet and musical rhythm is produced by the breaking up of the verses in accordance with the laws of metre, a fact better known to prosodists than to the ordinary reader.

---

6 Gevirtz, 1973, pp. 4-5
7 Fremantle, 1893, p. 491
The Budde hypothesis is the most sustained modern attempt to find a metrical pattern. In 1882 Karl Budde first described in detail his hypothesis on the structure of ancient Hebrew poetry. Qina meter, or falling rhythm, is a succession of lines of two colons, unequally divided in terms of syllables or accents, so that the first exceeds the second. Normally in the Heb the longer colon consists of three words and the shorter is two words, with some recognized variation. Budde held that the line is never equally divided. He described the falling meter as a rhythm that always dies away and he attempted to establish rules for its structure. He associated the rhythm with the lament or funeral song. The concept of Budde's falling rhythm has attracted scholarly attention up to the present time. The paradox is that, while one can find classic examples of the falling rhythm in Lamentations and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, there is no general agreement on a rationale for the numerous exceptions found in the same poems. There are clearly many examples of the qina meter in Hebrew poetry that have nothing to do with lament, and some laments are not written in that pattern. Perhaps the only consensus is that great caution is in order when characterizing falling rhythm.

Conventional statistical tests have the ability to distinguish patterns, differences, or relationships that may not reasonably be attributed to chance. Thus it is possible to analyze Budde's hypothesis by means of statistics in order to determine which patterns of syllable or stress structure may be attributed to the freedom of the poet to express each thought without regard to structure, and which patterns may fairly be laid to nonchance factors, technically called significant differences. A nonchance pattern would imply the presence of design crafted into the structure of the poem under study in terms of line length, colon length, and stress pattern. If all fluctuations and exceptions are nothing more than chance factors, the argument for design could not be sustained. The advantage of such analysis is that it examines only the overall design, rather than the usual stanza-by-stanza analysis. ABD fails to note that there is not even any scholarly agreement on what constitutes a syllable, let alone how stress should be determined. That fact rather undermines the value of statistical analysis.

Statistical analysis provides substantial support for the structural aspect of Budde's hypothesis when the colons and stresses of the poems are taken as a whole. One possible interpretation of this evidence is that the poems were sung in ancient times in such a way as to emphasize the qina pattern, and that the chanter had ways analogous to modern liturgical chanting of accommodating to those lines which did not conform to that pattern.

While it is tempting to be scathing about efforts like Budde's (and Freedman's more recently), biblical scholars generally agree that stress and/or

---

8 ABD, vol. 1, pp. 783-4
9 ABD, vol. 1, p. 784
syllable count is significant, even if the specifics are debated. Therefore ongoing attempts at analysis are valuable in spite of what seems like a slight air of desperation that attends the efforts. To be fair, the same could be said of the way the poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins are scanned - if we didn't have the scansion from the author's own hand.

The difficulties are summed up by Gevirtz in a measured paragraph. Meter in Hebrew poetry has generally been described in terms of the number of stressed syllables. But meter, in the strict sense of the word, must account for unstressed syllables as well. Lowth's argument against the likelihood of defining meters in biblical Hebrew poetry has never been adequately refuted: namely that the correct pronunciation of ancient Hebrew, the syllabification of many words, and the quantity and accent of the syllables are all highly uncertain....In addition, the fact of a Syro-Palestinian literary diction, common also to the biblical poets, with origins in remote antiquity, makes metrical schematizations as currently fashioned hazardous in the extreme. Ugaritic preserves case endings, while Hebrew, with rare exceptions according to the received text, does not. Since Hebrew does not preserve the case endings found in Ugaritic, while it does preserve the very specific word pairs, the meters would necessarily differ. It is merely a begging of the question to ignore all these difficulties and, in counting stresses alone (when even the exact placement of them is often uncertain!), to speak of meter. For what is counted most often is simply the number of words, or "significant" elements, in each colon.  

Pardee's more recent exploration of the same issue reaches the same conclusion: The reasons for this study are two: 1) When reading various studies on Hebrew and Ugaritic metrics I am frequently struck by the degree of arbitrariness which goes into the erection of the system, one which often leads to unacceptably extensive transformations of the text (hence a certain scepticism towards any metrical system); 2) Even when the metrical systems are erected and applied to the text, they appear to me not to meet the accepted definition of the word 'meter' as used in describing the structure of poetry in other languages.  

After discussing various definitions of metre: I wish to argue that it is this regular, predictable, or at least observable recurrence which is lacking in Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry and that it is this lack which renders usage of the term 'meter' inappropriate.

I feel that Pardee has fairly settled the issue of metrics in these two languages until more information changes the picture.

A system of accented syllables accompanied by a set number of unaccented syllables appears to me to be out of the question for Ugaritic, or Hebrew poetry. On the other hand, Ugaritic poetry, the lines of which are on the whole more regular in length than those of Hebrew poetry, could have a meter based on accented syllables only, if

10 Gevirtz, 1973, pp. 12-3
11 Pardee, 1981, p. 113
12 Pardee, 1981, p. 116
we assume that long words could have more than one accent and that short words could combine to furnish one accent....Since this is undeterminable owing to our ignorance of Ugaritic vocalization, without mentioning poetic intonation, such a system cannot be proven. The same may be said of the more regular of Hebrew poetry. A large amount of Hebrew poetry, however, has lines that vary a great deal in length, and none of the accepted metrical systems may be easily applied to such poetry, i.e., no metrical system which I have seen can scan a significant portion of Hebrew poetry, without emendation, and come up with anything approaching a predictable pattern, or any kind of regularly repeated pattern.¹³

The Parry-Lord Theory

Sometime around 1932, Milman Parry, who was Assistant Professor of Classics at Harvard University, became dissatisfied with his efforts to elucidate the oral background of Homer's poetry. [Parry in 1930] was arguing deductively from his analysis of style. In his second article on the same subject, published in 1932, written before his Yugoslav trips, he made use of evidence from other poetries and from the reports of collectors. It was because he was dissatisfied with both of these methods that he decided to conduct his own investigations of oral poetry.¹⁴

Parry's own words make it clear why he chose to study the Yugoslav epics. [The aim of the study was to fix with exactness the form of oral story poetry, to see wherein it differs from the form of written story poetry. Its method was to observe singers working in a thriving tradition of unlettered song and to see how the form of their songs hangs upon their having to learn and practice their art without reading and writing. The principles of oral form thus gotten would be useful in two ways. They would be a starting point for a comparative study of oral poetry which sought to see how the way of life of a people gives rise to a poetry of a given kind and a given degree of excellence. Secondly, they would be useful in the study of the great poems which have come down to us as lonely relics of a dim past: we would know how to work backwards from their form so as to learn how they must have been made.¹⁵

Parry's hopes were more than justified; his work began the discipline of oral formulaic analysis.

A New Methodology

The most pressing need in the study of biblical poetry has been for a firm methodology - at a time when many disciplines recognise the need for a thorough overhaul. The work of those scholars who have used the insights of

¹³ Pardee, 1981, p. 117fn
¹⁴ Lord, 1991, p. 40
¹⁵ quoted in Lord, 1960, p. 3
Parry and Lord to develop their theoretical understanding has foundered on the difference between Homeric epic and biblical poetry. Those insights have been too slavishly applied to any composition loosely described as "oral". Are we therefore to dismiss a whole generation of classical scholars? By no means. Still less would I suggest that the fruits of their labours should be confined to the compositions of Homer and his Greek contemporaries. No, rather, it is necessary to take a step back from what is specific in the Parry-Lord theory in order to learn from the creative insights that lie behind it.

For instance, Parry defined the formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea". That definition does not work for the formula in Hebrew poetry. So much is clear. It is not only that, as explained above, our understanding of the role of metre is unclear. In addition, if the definition of formula is separated from the idea of metre, then a new definition must be constructed. It might be (with Parry's well-known words in mind) that a formula in Hebrew poetry is "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same conditions to express a given essential idea". But what conditions are those? "Stylistic" appears too loose. We have already accepted that the conditions are not metrical, which may be why those familiar with Homer find Hebrew poetry very much less rigorous. This observation does not mean however that we should dismiss the idea of "formula" in connection with Hebrew poetry. To be sure, we must treat it with caution because it was originally formulated from the observation of narrative poetry which is rare in the Hebrew Bible. Even Whallon, who relies largely on twentieth century classical scholarship for his insights, counsels caution:

In the first chapter of Mimesis...Erich Auerbach contrasted the narrative about Odysseus' scar (from the nineteenth book of the Odyssey) with the narrative about Abraham's offering of Isaac (from the twenty-second chapter of Genesis). The analysis is brilliant; and yet the two texts do not seem wholly comparable. For Homeric epic is no more analogous to Old Testament prose than to the poetry; it is episodic like the one, but formulaic like the other - the argument from style that Homeric epic derived ultimately from an oral culture cannot be extended to Old Testament prose but can in large measure be extended to the poetry. So the passage about Odysseus' scar answers, in one way, to the passage about the offering of Isaac, but in another way, equally good, to a chapter from Habakkuk.1

But the idea that formulae are used in performance composition to facilitate the construction of songs remains valid for (as far as we know) all oral traditions.

---

1 quoted in Lord, 1960, p. 4; my emphasis
17 Whallon, 1969, pp. 173-4
Likewise, the study of a living culture that exhibits the particular style of language construction under consideration remains a contribution to a valid methodology.

There is one characteristic of parallel language which strikes the observer as formulaic. Gevirtz goes so far as to call word pairs clichés:

From a modern perspective, conditioned by its prejudices of literary canons and taste, such fixed pairs are clichés. The charge is legitimate; but in the hands of a skilled poet, as we hope to show, the cliché can be transformed into an instrument of immense power and a most able vehicle for intense emotional expression.  

Gevirtz related these “clichés” to the traditional ways of expression found in oral societies.

When we ask why poets, who were capable of the most original, profound, and moving thoughts world literature has ever known, should have had such regular and continual traffic with clichés, the answer must lie in an understanding of their dependence upon, and regard for, tradition. Reliance upon tradition, in turn, must find its raison d'etre in some particular need to which it answered. This need, it may be suggested, had its genesis at a time when poetry was being composed without the aid of writing tools, that is to say, when poetic composition was an oral art. The poet had to construct his verses “on his feet,” as it were, and to retain them in his memory. He was therefore forced to rely upon some mnemonic device, in this case upon a conventional diction and traditional patterns of composition. Syro-Palestinian poets, who formed their verses primarily in parallel lines, apparently found it expedient to employ conventionally fixed pairs of words.

Gevirtz went on to compare the traditional diction found in Hebrew poetry with that of the early Greeks.

Parry similarly found the need for the reliance upon a fixed poetic diction in the limitations imposed upon the poets who composed their verses orally. Writing, he argued, permits a poet to leave his thought unfinished and sufficient leisure to search for, to find, and to alter new groupings of words with which to satisfy the requirements of his creation. In a society where writing is unknown, however, a poet is able to fashion his verses only if he has available to him a diction ready-made, a number of formulaic phrases at his command which he can easily arrange and rearrange to suit the specific needs of his poem’s action. The sources of these phrases, necessarily, are the poems of his predecessors and contemporaries which he has heard and whose poetic, or stock, phraseology he has mastered.

Word pairs answered the same need for Hebrew poetry as Parry’s formulae did for Greek:

---

18 Gevirtz, 1973, p. 9
19 Gevirtz, 1973, p. 10
20 Gevirtz, 1973, p. 11
Unlike the Greek, the Hebrew poet structured his verses not with whole formulaic phrases (though on occasion, as we shall indicate, this technique also was employed) but with fixed pairs of parallel terms. Thus, word pairs are formulaic, without being formulae in Parry’s definition because that definition makes metre integral. Whallon, who makes the word pair the Semitic equivalent of the Homeric epithet, hypothesises beyond what we know of how parallel language is constructed.

Further, this characteristic appears independently in several languages which are not closely, or even remotely, related. Word pairs appear to be a feature, but not a necessary feature, of parallel language. They also occur in some language which is not parallel, such as the Eddas and the writings of Montaigne. This entire issue is discussed at length in the following chapters.

A Living Tradition of Parallelism

William R. Watters touched in 1976 on the problem of a valid comparative living literature. He started by noting the inconsistency of Culley’s criticism of Ross.

Culley has lodged a criticism against J. Ross’ work in Gaelic poetry which is applicable to himself. Culley says that Ross has studied a now dead tradition of oral composition, namely Gaelic poetry. Thus there is no way to determine how that poetry was created, but certainly, so is Culley’s examination of Old Testament poetry a study of a now dead tradition....

He even suggested where a parallel might occur: “It would be wiser, we think, to seek out a Semitic oral tradition, if one exists, rather than unrelated parallels from diverse literatures.” But later, for himself, he rejected the comparative study of living traditions because he believed it was not able to elucidate his material. “We have no interest in field studies of living oral verse-making be they taken from the South Seas or the Ukraine.” Watters was unable to take the step back from Parry and Lord’s work to see that while the specific conclusions drawn are not valid for the study of the Hebrew Bible, the methodology that inspired those conclusions is.

Where then are we to find a living tradition that exhibits both parallelism and word pairs? Luckily there is just such a one available that has been much studied over a period of some three decades. James J. Fox has devoted his life to
the study of Rotinese, and has published a great deal of material on parallelism in general and on word pairs in particular. I shall draw on his work intermittently throughout this study as I regard his investigation of the living tradition of parallelism and word pairs in Rotinese as relevant to the study of word pairs in the Hebrew Bible as the study of Avdo Mededovic’s work was for Parry’s analysis of Homer. We cannot, however, get all our questions about ancient texts answered by modern practitioners of a similar poetic style. It is a case of using the similarities with skill and discretion, while maintaining a close study of the primary text.

We can and must take cognizance of the work of a modern ethnographers like James Fox. (Later we shall also look at the work of William Bright for the same reason.) They are not however the final answer to questions about biblical parallelism. Those examples, like others from Toda and Vietnamese, Russian and Icelandic, remain valid only by analogy. They tell us in no direct way what classical Hebrew practitioners thought they were doing when they composed in parallel language and when they used word pairs. We have, as I have said, no direct information on the subject. Yet parallel language was used, and so were word pairs in ritual language and in narrative prose through all the centuries of the Hebrew Bible and those of the early Christian era, at least by speakers and writers of Aramaic and Late Hebrew. In the later centuries, parallelism was not recognised consciously as such in scripture, and this at the very time and by the very people who used it in their secular writing and in pieces like prayers composed more or less in scriptural style. That fact constitutes another argument that such composition was intuitive or at least culturally conditioned.

Why Word Pairs?
It has been an object of the study of word pairs almost from its inception that specific rules governing their practice should if possible be found. If it were possible to find what determines their usage, then one could extrapolate from the rules and discover when they were being broken and why.

Fortunately, in the texts under investigation, many of the errors can be corrected with a reasonable degree of certainty. Nevertheless, the critic may not rule out the ever present possibility that what may appear as unintelligible to the modern reader may well have been perfectly intelligible to the ancient writer; while, on the other hand, apparent textual intelligibility can on occasion be shown to have been the result of later scribal activity. But in so far as poets have ever delighted in casting old materials in new forms, and new materials in old forms, the critic must be ever alive also to the possibility that the poet may have deliberately altered his manner in order to produce a new effect.27

27 Gevitz, 1973, p. 4
The paremiologist Lutz Rohrich has argued that "traditional formulaic language like the proverb has an inner tendency to be parodied." 28 Stanley Gevirtz discusses an example, not of parody but of intentional departure from the accepted pattern, in Lamech's song to his wives (Gen 4:23-4).

Lamech vaunts himself even beyond his infamous forebear, and his exaggeration is underscored by the very composition of his pretentious bravado. The parallelism in which this may be seen and which commands our attention is that of the numbers "sevenfold" // "seventy and seven." We have already noted in the preceding study the tradition of number parallelism so common in Syro-Palestinian verse, a tradition which required a gradation of numerals in successive lines such that the figure employed in the second of the two parallel lines was one unit larger than the first. The significance of this pattern, it was stressed, lay in the "equivalence" of the two numbers. Had the present couplet, therefore, been fashioned after this pattern of Syro-Palestinian number parallelism the sequent of "sevenfold" would of necessity have been "eightfold," or, conversely, the correspondent of "seventy and seven" appearing in the second colon would have had to be "sixty and six" in the first colon. But, had either of these parallelisms been employed, Lamech's meaning would have been that his claim to revenge was as great as that of Cain. And this is the point of the poem and of its nontraditional final couplet: Lamech pretends to an even greater -- an exaggerated -- measure of revenge and is made to do so through a disproportionate parallelism of numbers.29

If subsequent research indicates that the matter is not quite as simple as Gevirtz suggests, still the principle he enunciates -- careful examination of texts to determine patterns -- remains a model for research in this field. He says himself that

no attempt, as far as I am aware, has been made to apply this principle of poetic tradition systematically to any poem or group of poems within the corpus of biblical Hebrew literature for the purpose of noting its significance as a literary-critical, that is to say, an interpretative, tool. The present monograph represents an initial attempt at filling this gap; "initial," because I am only too aware of the insufficiency of what has here been done and of how much has yet to be done. But if these studies may for others serve as stimulus to further exploration and investigation the attempt will have been justified and the writer's efforts amply rewarded.30

In the work which follows, I have been concerned to look only for the presence of word pairs within the parameters set by the concordance programme. We are too ignorant of the mechanics of their use to be able to draw firm conclusions about the significance of how they are used. At this stage we simply do not have enough information to know whether it is significant that word...

28 Mieder, 1982, p. 381
29 Gevirtz, 1973, pp. 28-9
30 Gevirtz, 1973, p. 4
pairs are used in different types of parallelism, in reversed order, and as different parts of speech, for example. Once we have accumulated sufficient hard data, it may be that this sort of information will be forthcoming later. In the meantime, the most pressing need -- in association with a sound methodology -- is the accumulation of that data. To that end first and foremost this study is devoted.

One of the difficulties inherent in understanding the Hebrew Bible is the uncompromising fact that classical Hebrew has not been a living language for more than two thousand years. Those for whom it was a mother tongue are separated from us not only by culture and language but by rather more than two millennia. Little remains to enable us to understand the basic mechanics of their everyday lives, let alone their thought patterns.

The "discovery" of parallelism in the eighteenth century, followed by the "discovery" of word pairs, first in Ugaritic and then in Hebrew sixty years ago, has greatly deepened our insight into the mechanics of Semitic versification. Nevertheless, we remain almost wholly ignorant of the extent to which practitioners of the art were self-consciously aware of parallelism and specifically of word pairs. For example, when a "singer of psalms", to paraphrase Lord's words, performed, did (s)he consciously cast his/her composition into pairs of cola for which the lynch-pin as it were was the word pair? Evidence from Roti ("our ancestors spoke in pairs") suggests that he may have. On the other hand, when very much later rabbinic scholars attempted an analysis of parallel language, they failed to comprehend it at all. My personal feeling, and it is more feeling than anything else, is that the pairing of words is almost wholly culturally conditioned, whether in parallel language or in language structured other ways; ("fish and chips" or "shark and taties", but never "shark and chips" or "fish and taties".)

Along the way, on the continuum with the "singer of psalms" (whether Ugaritic or Hebrew, or both) at one end and the proto-rabbinic commentator at the other, there is a point where the trajectory has been as it were frozen, and it is possible to gain an insight into the linguistic workings of one group of people who used parallel language. This was the group of Jews, probably men, who lived in Alexandria and perhaps other Hellenistic cities, who undertook the momentous task of translating Hebrew scriptures into Greek. It seems not to have been done by committee, but by a group of people each of whom did a portion:

We are fortunate that it was individuals who translated the biblical Books into Greek; and even when a Book was translated by two men, they each worked on a different portion of the Book, the second Septuagint translator beginning where the first left off. So that when
the modern scholar studies the Septuagint translation of a Book of the Bible, he is studying the work and temperament of one man.\(^1\)

My conclusion in this study is that the Seventy were probably not consciously aware of the significance of word pairs; they were however subconsciously aware, and this subconscious awareness expressed itself in an unusual consistency in the translation of those pairs. This consistency is greater than any other discovered for the Septuagint so far, and greater than that found in some other contexts. Evidence for these contentions will be brought forward from time to time as my argument develops.

Nevertheless, the translation made in Alexandria of the Hebrew Bible during the closing centuries of the first millennium before Christ remains the most significant translation ever achieved.\(^2\) Through the exertions of the Seventy, we have for nearly all the Hebrew scriptures both the Greek of the Septuagint (LXX) and the Hebrew that has come down to us as the Masoretic Text (MT). That the latter has not changed substantially in two thousand years has been verified by comparison of the MT with Qumran texts. Thus it is possible to compare the two texts and to consider ( make a stab! ) at what may have been in the minds of the Seventy as they struggled to render the parallel cadences of classical Hebrew into something approaching the grandeur of Hellenistic Greek.

Since it is not my intention to argue for or against the inclusion of any particular two words as part of the corpus of recognised word pairs, I have chosen those for which I search the ones collected by Dahood and his associates in the three volumes of Ras Shamra Parallels (RSP). While I am aware that some points about RSP are contentious, such as the inclusion of two identical terms as word pairs, the focus of this study is on translation rather than on provenance. Therefore I have accepted RSP as they stand, with a few exceptions which are noted in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs?.

It is a tall order to analyse the translation(s) used by the Seventy for RSP word pairs. Therefore, I have confined my efforts to certain pairs only: those which pair with יֵושָׁבָה "earth", which number thirty; those which pair with the thirty, bringing the total to about 220, and those which pair with the ones that pair with יֵושָׁבָה, which are noted but not analysed. The reasons for choosing these words are described in detail in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs?. Suffice to say here that the number is statistically significant and the spread of occurrences is satisfyingly broad. Further, the words conveyed important concepts to the Jewish mind, for they appear as a veritable galaxy in which constellations such as "heaven", "house", "way", "king", and "sea" manoeuvre. To extend the

\(^{1}\) Orlinsky, 1975, pp. 89-90

\(^{2}\) It has been called "Egypt's greatest gift to Western civilisation." Quoted without citation in the Forward to Pietersma and Cox, 1984.
metaphor, this galaxy provided a universe in which Jewish exegetes navigated through the ever more difficult stratosphere of an increasingly monotheistic theology.

The same issues are relevant to the Christian scriptures. It is not only that by entering into the minds of Jews in the later pre-Christian centuries and early Christian era, we can begin to appreciate their style of thinking, though this is true. It is not even that everything we learn about the time goes toward building up a picture that is still disturbingly meagre, though this too is true. It is far more specific than either of those. First century Jews (at least those who eventually wrote the Christian scriptures) used the LXX. Not only were they so familiar with it that they used it in the great majority of their OT quotations, but they took it for granted that their readers would appreciate their choice. While we do not know at what time or to what degree the LXX was used in worship in Palestine, it was undeniably there in the first century CE, for fragments are found among the Qumran documents. And, because it was used in Christian scripture both by verbal allusion and by direct quotation, the influence of the LXX version on subsequent patterns of Christian thought is profound. Presumably the LXX was also used in Christian circles in that first century, as scripture always has been, in preaching and in liturgy. In support of the idea that the LXX was used in synagogues throughout the Hellenistic world, it is logical to assume that where life was conducted in Greek, preaching at least was also in that language. On the other hand, we know that in the eastern Roman Empire quite ordinary urban people were often multi-lingual, to facilitate communication in a polyglot society. (Acts 2:5-11 describes Jerusalem in such terms; how much more could the cities founded by Greek colonists be so characterised.)

Whatever may have been the situation regarding the day-to-day use of the LXX in subsequent centuries, it is clear that the more insight we can gain into reasons, linguistic or theological, for the choice of words by the Seventy, the better. And this analysis of the translation of word pairs is one small attempt at that. It is logical that by selecting lexical items in common currency, like word pairs, we may reduce the likelihood of being misled by idiosyncratic translation. For the same reason, translations are taken from all the books found in the BHS which are also found in the LXX. Which is to say that we are not concentrating on Psalms, for instance, or even on the Prophets. Scope is important if we are to establish the continuity of a principle as pervasive as that of word pairing.

Methodology
As explained earlier in this chapter, I feel that the academic study of the Hebrew Bible suffers considerably from a lack of what might be called for want of a better

---

3 About 80% of cases. See Smith, 1972, p. 8, citing Pfeiffer I:511.
term "scientific method". By this I mean that terminology often is not strictly or explicitly defined, generalisations are made from woefully inadequate data, there is little explicit description of how data are collected, etc. It will be clear that I intend that this study suffer from none of these.

It used to be said that the essence of the scientific method was that "if one fool can do it, any fool can do it.", that is, the rationale and method should be so clearly and carefully explained that anyone can follow the same technique and achieve the same results. That is what I intend in this study. I have described in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs? the means by which I selected the word pairs for study and how I discovered specific examples from the Hebrew Bible. In Chapter VII How Were They Translated? there is an explanation of the attempts I made to find a convenient way to discover the LXX Greek of those Hebrew words. In the end, the way I chose was to simply look up the reference in the LXX. At the places where the LXX does not directly follow the MT, for instance in the different numbering of the Psalms, I have noted the correct LXX reference.

In order to throw the word pairs I have chosen into sharper focus, I have developed a stylised perspective from which to view them. As mentioned already, the word יָמָן “earth” is the focus around which all the words I chose revolve. Those that pair with it I call the first shell, those that pair with the first shell I call the second shell, and those that pair with the second shell I call the third shell. This is an artificial way of examining the word pairs, intended only to highlight perceived relationships. In no way do I mean to imply that the shells constitute anything inherent in the Hebrew words themselves.

The status of data is different from that of conclusions. You may criticise me for the way I developed the methodology or you may point out that I did not correctly follow my own method, but once you have accepted those, the results are beyond dispute. Conclusions fall into a separate category and are, like all conclusions, forever vulnerable.

One of the benefits this study has to offer is that it has brought together the work of scholars who are not, as far as I can tell, known to each other. Adele Berlin does not appear, for instance, to know of the work of Peter Boodberg on parallelism. I have been able to use insights from several disciplines - linguistics, ethnography, and biblical studies - to produce a coherent, if tentative, description and classification of word pairs. This classification is carried through and used in each example discussed in the case studies that lie behind the discussions in Chapters IV and V. In turn this classification serves as a basis from which to work when assessing the Greek translation of the same words in the Septuagint.

The concordance programme AnyText (a product of Linguists' Software, Inc.) was used on a MacIntosh LC personal computer in conjunction with the text of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS), grammatically tagged and indexed.
The information generated by this programme was the primary source of my data. Using references produced by AnyText, I then consulted Rahlf's edition of the LXX (1935) for the translation of the word pairs. I constantly checked my interpretation against those in English translations of the LXX, as well as translations given in HR and LS. For meanings of Hebrew words, I have deemed as correct any which are accepted by both BDB and KB. It is unfortunate that the new Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, presently in publication by the Sheffield Academic Press, is not yet complete. Both of those I am using have faults (the former is very old, and the latter, being a German work, uses somewhat idiosyncratic English), but in the absence of the Sheffield dictionary I feel the combination of the two offers the best possibility for accuracy.

All data accumulated is compiled in appendices that appear at the end of the chapters most relevant to their use. The first appendix appears at the end of Chapter III How Word Pairs Mean; it contains the complete classification of word pairs given by three writers whose methods are analysed in that chapter. There is another appendix consisting of tables of all the word pairs in RSP, analysed by part of speech, and a full listing of "the Major Complex". They are found at the end of Chapter VI Which Word Pairs?. The appendix which contains the examples of Late Hebrew text which I analysed for the presence of word pairs is found at the end of Chapter V Did Word Pairs Persist?. The final appendix is the most comprehensive; it consists of all the word pairs analysed for their translation, in the order of their RSP number, with numbers of occurrences both Hebrew and Greek, and other relevant information. Thus, whenever a word pair is mentioned in the text, it may be checked according to its RSP number for specific data by looking in that appendix. It appears just before the Bibliography.

Finally, I feel that I cannot do better than to quote Matitiahu Tsevat:

I am aware that I may be criticised for counselling underinterpretation. My response: underinterpretation, while bad, is a shade better than overinterpretation. Overinterpretation breeds a host of untestable hypotheses; like the hoped-for nuclear fusion reactor it produces its own fuel. Yet facile hypotheses (in the biblicists' jargon, "bold hypotheses") are more a hindrance than a furtherance in Old Testament science.3 4

3 4 Tsevat, 1980, p. 203
WHEN CORRECTLY VIEWED
THE MERELY METAPHORICAL
BECOMES THE SUPERBLY THREE DIMENSIONAL

“As my two eyes make one in sight”
Robert Frost 1

Seeing As A Stylistic Device
The camera is only one of many remarkable devices invented by the early Victorians. It enables a person to record instantly what is seen, to freeze action as it were. But it also has is a disadvantage. A photograph records in two dimensions what exists in three dimensions. This results in distortion. What appears to be near is in fact far away; what appears large is in fact small.

Natural human sight is able to see in three dimensions. This is because two eyes are involved in the process. The left eye sees the image and the right eye sees the same image, but from a slightly different angle. The two eyes are not seeing from exactly the same place. The result is that humans see in three dimensions; a camera “sees” in two dimensions because it has only one “eye”.

Daguerre’s successors used the two-dimensional character of photography to create the illusion of a three-dimensional image. One looked through a pair of lenses at a pair of photographs set in a rack 30-40 cm away. Stereoscopic vision produced a three-dimensional effect which was very striking. Since the advent of aerial photography in this century, the same principle has been exploited to measure land heights using a stereoscope. Two photographs separated by about 7 degrees (because that is the angle of difference between the eyes) are taken of the same geographical feature. These stereo pairs are placed on a table or drawing board, and the stereoscope is fitted over them. It consists of two lenses on a four-legged frame of convenient size to accommodate the two photographs placed so that neither obscures the other. [See Figure 1 overleaf.] By viewing the two photographs together, an illusion of three dimensions is achieved. One calculates land height using a fixed formula. The same method is applied to photographs taken through a scanning electron microscope.

There is an important principle at work here: it is possible to “describe” three-dimensional things in a two dimensional way. It is also possible to create

1 from “Two Tramps in Mud Time”, Latham, 1969, p. 277
the illusion of three dimensions by simultaneously “viewing” two representations of the same thing from slightly different points of view.

This principle works the same way when it is transferred from the discipline of optics to that of literature. In language, things may be “described” using metaphor, which creates a picture. Just like a photograph, a metaphor can be stunningly effective, particularly in the hands of a person who combines skill with genuine love for the art form. But it remains two-dimensional because the thing is “seen” through a single “eye”.

Just as in photography, there is a way to use the natural advantage of two human “eyes” to produce the illusion of three dimensions. And the method by which it is done is exactly the same as in photography. Two metaphors (“pictures”) are placed side by side, and are “viewed” simultaneously. The result is three-dimensional as a single metaphor never is, be it ever so striking. When Brooke-Rose describes parallelism as a pointing formula, she demonstrates the sort of confusion a person unfamiliar with this technique might feel:

In Parallelism, there is in fact no pointing to the proper term at all, but the repetition of the same construction, or the use of and, or other methods, implies that it is equal to the metaphoric term. And because the link is suggested rather than stated, both metaphor and proper term can sometimes look like the two terms of an unstated simile, or two literal statements.²

The analogy of the stereoscope has been derived from apparently independent comments culled from several writers. Parallelism is constituted by redundancy and polysemy, disambiguation and ambiguity, contrast within equivalence. Parallelism focuses the message on itself but its vision is binocular. Like human vision it superimposes two slightly different views of the same object and from their convergence it produces a sense of depth.³

The same thing has been noted in a study of word pairs in the writing of Michel Eyquem, Seigneur de Montaigne (1533-92). “In these cases of duplication based on distinction we can see an essential quality of Montaigne’s mind which might be called, literally, duplicity, the tendency to polarize, to see everything from two points of view at once.” ⁴

The word stereoscopic itself was used some years ago by the distinguished philologist of Chinese, Peter Boodberg, in a short note about “what may be called the principle of ‘stereoscopy’ in parallelism. Indeed,” he went on, parallelism is not merely a stylistic device of formularistic syntactical reduplication; it is intended to achieve a result reminiscent of

² Brooke-Rose, 1958, p. 79
³ Berlin, 1985, p. 99
⁴ Sayce, 1971, p. 387
binocular vision, the superimposition of two syntactical images in order to endow them with solidity and depth. 5

The metaphor of the stereoscope is not a perfect representation of every aspect of parallelism. It is offered as a model because it counteracts the all too prevalent belief that parallelism is a defective mode of expression which requires people to say the same thing twice, that "parallelism is monotonous and presents a perpetual tautology" 6.

The Point Has Not Been Lost Upon Traditional Societies

Now, the poetic possibilities of "double" metaphors are recognised in notably divergent literatures.

As numerous scholars have observed, in many cultures of the world tradition demands that certain compositions be given dual expression. Words, phrases, and lines must be paired for a composition to be defined as poetry, ritual language, or elevated speech. 7

Paired composition -- i.e. parallelism -- is found in texts from ancient Egypt, 8 ancient Ugarit, 9 in classical Hebrew, 10 classical Mandarin, 11 Vietnamese, 12 Toda, 13 Mayan, 14 to name only a few. The list could go on and on. Parallelism is arguably the most pervasive speech form found in traditional societies.

In those societies, the nature of parallelism is understood. We know that it is understood because it is used with skill, not to say ease, by its practitioners. That much no one disputes. Indeed, it is instructive that disagreement about parallelism -- what it is and how it works -- comes only amongst modern ethnologists and literary critics. Those who actually use it have no trouble with it; the problem lies with those who look at it from the outside.

The "Discovery" of Parallelism

---

5 Boodberg, 1979, p. 184
6 quoted in Jakobson, 1966, p. 160
7 Fox, 1988, p. 3
8 Foster, 1975
9 Craigie, 1971
10 Yoder, 1972
11 Liu, 1983
12 Fox, 1977
13 Emeneau, 1966
14 Bricker, 1974
Modern scholarship on this subject starts with Bishop Robert Lowth's now classic definition of parallelismus membrorum formulated in 1753 and refined in 1778.15

Lowth was something of a poet, and he read biblical poetry with the mind of a poet. For one thing, he recognised the wide range of poetic utterance in the Old Testament, and drew the consequences of this literary form for the interpretation of the sacred records. He was aware, too, that poetry has its special techniques: thus he sought to discern its cadences and rhythms, its lineaments and configurations. But he was more than a technician or craftsman. He had an acute sensitivity to the connotations which words possess beyond all the precision of their denotations, and he perceived the ever-changing nuances which words achieve in fresh contexts. His description of the sententious quality of Hebrew speech has never been surpassed; his feelings for imagery and the effects that imagery produces upon the reader gives his work an aesthetic authenticity...; his openness to the spontaneity, immediacy, concreteness, and primitive vitality of the Hebrew mind classes him among the peers of Old Testament study. 16

Another whose poetic soul had been touched by the rhythms of Hebrew commented a century later on that same parallelism.

The artificial part of poetry, perhaps we shall be right to say all artifice, reduces itself to the principle of parallelism. The structure of poetry is that of continuous parallelism, ranging from the technical so-called Parallelisms of Hebrew poetry and the antiphons of Church music to the intricacy of Greek or Italian or English verse. 17

Hopkins was writing, of course, from a nineteenth century point of view. It will be noted that he compared Hebrew poetry with Greek, Italian, and English poetry. He, like his contemporaries, did not take into account possible differences in style caused by different language stocks (Semitic vs. Indo-European), let alone the possible influence of an oral background. In this he was no different from Lowth.

The Confluence of Three Theories

The renewed interest shown in parallelism in the last two or three decades is a result of three great projects. All these scholars write out of their deep understanding of language transmission: Roman Jakobson (1894-1982) studied parallelism for most of his life; Milman Parry (1902-1935) and Albert Bates Lord (1912-1991), who continued Parry's work after his accidental death, formulated

---

15 De sacra poesi Hebraeorum was published in 1753 and Isaiah: A New Translation with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes Critical, Philological, and Explanatory in 1778.
16 Muilenburg, 1984, p. 193. Muilenburg here wrongly cites Lowth's first name as Richard. It was, in fact, Robert.
17 Hopkins, 1959, p. 84
the Parry-Lord theory of oral composition; Walter J. Ong (1912--) highlights the difference between modes of thought in oral cultures and those in literate ones. These projects are too well known to require extensive discussion. Nevertheless, we will briefly summarise each in order to consider how their work in combination -- its confluence -- has brought a new impetus to the study of oral tradition. This in turn has made us at the end of the twentieth century ask new questions about what parallelism is, how its practitioners compose it, and how its hearers understand it.

One would be hard pressed to overestimate the importance of Roman Jakobson's work for the study of parallelism. His own description of his lifelong interest sums it up nicely. "Apparently there has been no other subject during my entire scholarly life that has captured me as persistently as have questions of parallelism." His early interest focussed on Russian folk poetry, but the comment quoted above from the youthful Gerard Manley Hopkins worked most powerfully upon him. Contact with written texts and with "carrier[s] of the oral tradition" consolidated his interested enthusiasm into what might fairly be termed a crusade.

From my student years, I have been struck by the internal structure evident in the recitative verse of the Russian oral tradition, namely that parallelism which ties together contiguous verses from beginning to end. I was particularly astonished to realize that this important point seemed hardly to interest the specialists in Russian folklore. The organization of texts into couplets was well known from Biblical versification -- the very term "parallelism" had been introduced to describe it two hundred years earlier -- and the equally consistent parallelism of Finnish epic verse was often compared to it. In 1917 I undertook to analyze...a single text...It was a short specimen...[and] I promised to contribute an article on the subject....The issue appeared in 1919, but without my article, which I rightly considered as an immature sketch that needed extension and revision in the light of more precise principles of linguistic analysis. I allowed this analysis of the twenty-one lines of the "Misfortune" poem to ripen for half a century before using it in my monograph on grammatical parallelism and its Russian facet, published in 1966 in the American periodical Language. Even this monograph is in my eyes only a preliminary sketch. 19

Judging by the amount of material which uses that 1966 article as a starting point, Jakobson's observation is more than justified. Fox's admirable survey 20 of the breadth of Jakobson's influence -- ranging from Hebrew to Chinese, through

18 Jakobson and Pomorska, 1980, p. 100
20 Fox, 1977
Malagasy, Rotinese, Toda, Finnish, and central American languages such as Nahuatl, Mayan, and Tzotzil -- provides ample evidence.

A major shift in emphasis among folklore theorists in this century appeared as a result of the discovery of formulae in Homeric and Baltic epic poetry. Known as the Parry-Lord theory or the Oral-Formulaic theory, it focusses (unlike previous theories of folklore) on the actual performances of folkloristic phenomena, their compositional elements, and eventually their impact upon the audience. What a folklore item is and how it behaves replaced the earlier speculations about its possible origin.21

Work begun by Milman Parry in the 1930's, interrupted by his untimely death and again by the Second World War, was completed and published by his associate Albert B. Lord in 1960. The impact of The Singer of Tales (1960) has...been enormous. Suffice it to say that the book has held its position as the bible of Oral Theory for more than twenty-five years; it will always be the single most important work in the field, because, simply put, it began the field as we now know it.22

Parry scarcely had time to develop a theory of oral composition. Any description of it, however, must take account of Lord's use of Parry's definition of formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea." 23 Later implementation of the theory has applied that definition too narrowly, and has failed24 to take account of Lord's reflections upon some thirty years of study:

Yet after all that is said about oral composition as a technique of line and song construction, it seems that the term of greater significance is traditional. Oral tells us "how," but traditional tells us "what," and even more, "of what kind" and "of what force." When we know how a song is built, we know that its building blocks must be of great age. For it is of the necessary nature of tradition that it seek and maintain stability, that it preserve itself. And this tenacity springs neither from perverseness, nor from an abstract principle of absolute art, but from a desperately compelling conviction that what the tradition is preserving is the very means of attaining life and happiness. The traditional oral epic singer is not an artist; he is a seer.25

---

21 Foley, 1988, p. ix
22 Foley, 1988, p. 41
23 quoted in Foley, 1988, p. 41
24 See Magoun, 1953. Objections were raised in Rogers, 1966, and were further developed in Fry, 1967. A more recent review article is Windleberg and Miller, 1980.
25 quoted in Foley, 1988, p. 44
We may exemplify the insights of Walter Ong by examining how Lowth (he who coined the term *parallelismus membrorum*) viewed the phenomenon of parallelism in language. He thought that parallelism was a literary device, in keeping with the contemporary belief that the Psalms were written by David. The same mistake was made by Horace who understood the epic beginning *in medias res* as a literary device. "In his *Ars Poetica*, Horace writes that the epic poet 'hastens into the action and precipitates the hearer into the middle of things' (lines 148-9)...Homer wants to get immediately to 'where the action is'."26

But "Horace's *res* is a construct of literacy."27 Ong holds that the modern "discovery" of the paradigm shift from the oral mind-set to the literate mind-set has taught us to be careful of labelling literary devices according to a predetermined set of suppositions. The point here is not so much whether Ong is right, but that his analysis has caused people to look at oral and written composition in a different way. The value of the interest and discussion that his work has sparked far outweighs concern about truth claims.

Ong would say that we should not blame Lowth for his mindset any more than we blame Horace for his. Both were deeply literate men living in functionally oral societies. The fact that Lowth lived in a time when printing had been used for centuries is not particularly relevant, because for 350 years the hand press had existed without much modification. Its production was extremely limited, but so was the demand for print. The era of widespread literacy did not arrive before the end of the eighteenth century. Even when, around 1800, the wooden press was superseded by Lord Stanhope's iron press it turned out no more than 200 impressions of a single side in an hour, and twice that time was needed for perfected copies.28

Seen from Ong's viewpoint, the literacy of Lowth's world differed from Horace's only in degree; both were functionally oral. (The same is true of Montaigne, whose "tendency to...see everything from two points of view at once" was mentioned above.) It has taken electronic print, Ong points out, to make us see the way a literate mindset has been encroaching for about five thousand years. "Our understanding of the differences between orality and literacy developed only in the electronic age, not earlier. Contrasts between electronic media and print have sensitized us to the earlier contrast between writing and orality."29

26 Ong, 1982, p. 142
27 Ong, 1982, p. 143
28 Clair, 1976, p. 355
29 Ong, 1982, p. 3
It was, I submit, the work of these men -- Jakobson on parallelism, Parry and Lord on oral composition, and Ong on orality and literacy -- that brought about the current explosion (and it can be termed no less) of literature focussing on parallelism in traditional societies. The question is not “are they right?” or even “do I agree?”, but rather “stimulated by their work, have people thought and written with creative insight on the subject?”. And the answer is a resounding yes.

The study of parallelism, as indeed the initial terminology for its study, derives primarily from the recognition of canonical parallelism in specific oral traditions. Roman Jakobson's contributions to the study of parallelism have been to draw together the separate, and at times isolated, linguistic studies of these phenomena, to call attention repeatedly to their comparative significance, and to suggest directions for further research. 30

One further question remains which, while admittedly a side issue, is nevertheless interesting. How closely were these people associated? They surely were acquainted with each other's work, but did they know each other? Did they work together? Parry and Lord of course knew each other and worked together, for Lord was Parry's field assistant in Yugoslavia in the months preceding the latter's death. Lord also knew Roman Jakobson and valued his advice, for as well as several references in the notes, his Preface to The Singer of Tales includes this tribute, which suggests a dynamic relationship between them. Thanks also are due to Roman Jakobson, Samuel Hazzard Cross Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Harvard, who has always given unstintingly of his breadth of learning, particularly in the field of folklore and epic poetry. He also read the manuscript and suggested a number of criticisms. I was not able in every case to follow his suggestions, but I have noted them where I could. 31

Walter Ong uses the writings of Parry and Lord extensively, but he doesn't mention Jakobson at all in Orality and Literacy (1982). It leaves open the question of how well they knew each other.

The work of Parry and Lord came to bear upon the problem from a different direction. It focussed, as we saw above, on the formula, what it is and how it works. To be sure, it transpires that Parry's definition, which holds metre to be integral, is too narrow. But the very fact that a good deal of work was done in the 60's and 70's attempting to define formula in such a way as to encompass a variety of oral traditions indicates the profound influence of The Singer of Tales.

30 Fox, 1977, p. 60
31 Lord, 1960, p. viii
Hebrew had the particle *waw* 'and’ as almost its only connective; Homeric Greek had syllables of just two different lengths; Old English had the accent at the beginning of the word; and Old French had the accent at the end of the word and the clause. The one poetic style was therefore based on parallelism, the second upon meter, the third upon alliteration, and the fourth upon assonance.\(^32\)

It seemed so straight-forward in 1969.

Walter Ong’s book is the most recent of the three. It seeks to clarify the nature of the shift from a world-view based on orality to one based on literacy. Like Parry and Lord, he does not discuss parallelism as such. Nevertheless, the whole tenor of his argument resonates strongly for those who study the nature of parallelism. For instance, the observation that language in oral societies is additive\(^33\) provides some support for the contention that parallelism is a linguistic device originating in traditional societies. (It may also be a function of short term memory.) Ong would say that almost total reliance on “and” as the conjunction of choice is not only a literary device found in classical Hebrew, as Whallon suggests above. Describing it that way, he falls into the same error, one with a long and noble history, as Horace and Lowth. Parallelism is a mode of expression which is found in the oral tradition to which it can trace its roots, even when the example we have is in the strict sense literary. Ong sees reliance on “and” as the conjunction of choice centring the language of the Old Testament firmly in oral tradition; for him, it has nothing to do with the development of literary devices.

In Jakobson then we find appreciation of the pervasiveness of parallelism, of its importance as a fundamental mode of expression. In the writings of Lord, the nature of the formula is explored, as well as its significance for an understanding of the role of performance in the transmission of folk composition. And finally, Ong again and again points out ways in which we literates fail to understand traditional compositions because we fail to understand the traditional (oral) mind-set. The quotation from Brooke-Rose given at the beginning of this chapter pinpoints one of those failures. Jakobson has encouraged us to look at more than just the Hebrew poetry of the Bible for parallelism, Lord has emphasised the need to be ever mindful of the way the formula is used, and Ong has cautioned us to judge oral composition on its own terms, not ours. The result is a veritable flowering of work on parallelism.

\(^{32}\) Whallon, 1969, p. 158

\(^{33}\) Ong, 1982, pp. 37-8
The key word here is scope, and so studies of the Vietnamese and Montaigne find word pairs, studies of the Shih Ching, of American newspapers, modern Rotinese, and sixteenth century Nahuatl find parallelism. It is a very much extended and richer way of looking at things for ethnographers, linguists, and literary critics.

The Effect Upon the Study of the Hebrew Bible
Not surprisingly, since it was where parallelism was first found, the Hebrew Bible is still the text most often examined with that in mind. Indeed, many studies of parallelism in other languages make reference at the beginning to the classic work done on Hebrew. Nevertheless, the study of parallelism in the Hebrew Bible was given its greatest impetus by the discovery in 1929 of the remains of the great Ugaritic library at Ras Shamra. The language, written in cuneiform, proved after decipherment to be cognate with classical Hebrew and to exhibit numerous similarities to the language and motifs of the Hebrew Bible. The on-going translation of this library has not attracted the attention of the popular press as has that of Qumran, but the results are every bit as significant for the study of the Hebrew Bible as are those of Qumran for the study of the Christian scriptures. Before we understood parallelism as we do now (and that, it must be noted, is far from complete), the existence of pairs of words was noted in successive lines of verse.

Not only did Ugaritic and Hebrew prove to be closely related languages, but the two poetic traditions had so much in common that some considered them part of one Canaanite tradition. The most obvious similarity was that both Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry used parallelism extensively and, upon closer examination, it was found that the two even used the very same parallel terms in many cases. This observation led to the monumental effort of collecting what came to be known as fixed word pairs -- parallel terms that occur frequently in the Bible and in Ugaritic texts. Begun a half century ago, it continues still, and it is one of the major achievements of modern biblical research.

The pairs themselves proved to be cognate, and have been collected in a series called Ras Shamra Parallels, which has to date identified over a thousand. The great scholar and biblicist, Mitchell Dahood (1922-1982), posited a “Canaanite thesaurus from whose resources Ugaritic and Hebrew poets alike drew.” However, further study has shown that word pairs are an integral part of the

34 See Fox and Sayce above.
37 Berlin, 1985, p. 65
38 Dahood, 1970, p. 74
phenomenon of parallelism, not unique to Semitic languages. More, the very pairs are frequently the same, even in situations where no possibility exists (because of distance in time or space or both) of poets drawing on a common “thesaurus”. We will return to this point in subsequent chapters, for it is the very stuff of our argument.

Theoretical Views of Word Pairs
Inevitably scholars’ opinions about what word pairs are shape their criteria for translation and interpretation. A comprehensive evaluation of every author’s exposition would enlarge this chapter beyond reasonable bounds because theories of parallelism influence the perceived value of word pairs. And every shade of opinion is represented. Some scholars hold that word pairs are absolutely central to the way parallelism functions, while others maintain that they are coincidental and largely irrelevant. At the same time, some scholars are prepared to amend text on the basis of a word pair classified elsewhere39, whilst others regard regular use of certain words together as part of the way any language works, no more to be regarded are significant than English pairings like “kith-and-kin”. However, in the next chapter How Word Pairs Mean, we shall see how these pairings as well as word pairs in the stricter sense may be classed as significant language phenomena.

Because of the (unfortunately still prevalent) view that parallelism is a linguistic phenomenon chiefly if not wholly associated with the Hebrew Bible, most writers on the subject are biblical scholars. However, in the new climate caused by the confluent work of Jakobson, Parry-Lord, and Ong, several who are not biblical scholars have addressed the issue of the nature of parallelism. Three of the latter group are included in this survey. For the sake of simplicity, writings are taken in chronological order.

It is my intention that wherever possible writers should speak for themselves. It may be objected that some of the quotations are rather too long. This may be so, but I have been particularly concerned that each of the authors, so far as possible, be fairly represented and that their views be set out in such a way as to correctly represent what each believes about word pairs. It seemed to me that the best way to achieve this is to use their own words, and if the author said

39 The rationale behind amending the Masoretic Text on the basis of the Ugaritic is not that Ugaritic is “better” because it is older than classical Hebrew. Rather, because we have Ugaritic tablets that were actually written in the second millenium BCE, they constitute texts that have not undergone centuries of scribal transmission. Therefore, in theory, they should be “purer”. Needless to say, this principle should be used with great caution.
much about word pairs, then I would be obliged to quote much. It is for the same reason that this survey does not include specific criticism. My remarks are confined to positioning each writer in the context of the unfolding scholarly debate. This chapter concludes with a general criticism of that debate.

Robert Lowth (1778)
Word pairs were first found in Ugaritic writings from Ras Shamra discovered early in this century. Subsequently they were recognised in the Hebrew Bible as well. Robert Lowth therefore did not know about them as such. Nevertheless, word pairs would have come as no great surprise to him:

The correspondence of one verse or line with another, I call parallelism. When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it, or drawn under it, equivalent, or contrasted with it in sense, or similar to it in the form of grammatical construction, these I call parallel lines; and the words or phrases answering one to another in the corresponding lines, parallel terms.

As far as I know, this is the earliest reference to what we now recognise as word pairs.

Roman Jakobson (1966)
While Jakobson did not directly address the issue of word pairs in his seminal article "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet", his remarks apply to all the lexical elements found in parallel systems, as Fox is at pains to make clear. Instead of a ready-made typology or a hasty assignment of word pairs to a limited set of formal categories, Jakobson has urged a decidedly more open exploration of the pairing of elements in corresponding sequences. The essential feature of this pairing - whether it is based on supposed synonymy, antonymy, or "synthetic" determinations - is that it involves simultaneously both identification and differentiation. In this sense, parallelism is distinguished from repetition, which involves identification alone. In any parallel composition, the relation of parallelism to repetition must be carefully considered but these two principles should not be confused. As Jakobson has phrased it: "Any form of parallelism is an apportionment of invariants and variables.

---

I am referring here to word pairs as an integral part of parallel language. Word pairs as they are used in Germanic languages, in the Eddas and in Old English, have been known for very much longer. Gurevic, 1986, for instance, refers to a study of word pairs in the Eddas conducted by Richard Meyer in 1889.

Lowth, 1778, p. ix; my emphasis

It is not, I need hardly say, the earliest reference to parallelism. As Watters, 1976, p. 92, points out, there are references much earlier. He cites Menahem ben Saruch from 960 CE.
The stricter the distribution of the former, the greater the discernability and effectiveness of the variations."\(^{43}\)

As we will see later, the contribution of Jakobson that has proved most far-reaching was his comment that

\[\text{the only living oral tradition in the Indo-European world which uses grammatical parallelism as its basic mode of concatenating successive verses is the Russian folk poetry, both songs and recitatives. This constructive principle of Russian folklore was first pointed out in a paper devoted to the Kalevala and published anonymously as an item of } \text{'Miscellany'} \text{ in a popular Petersburg periodical of 1842 with an eloquent subtitle: 'The identity of foundations in Hebrew, Chinese, Scandinavian and Finnish versification, as well as in the verse art of Russian folklore -- Parallelism.'}^{44}\]

Jakobson was influenced in his study of parallelism by the work of Lowth, of course. In fact he quoted the exact passage above, but his more immediate inspiration came from a quite different source.

When approaching the linguistic problem of grammatical parallelism one is irresistibly impelled to quote again and again the pathbreaking study written exactly one hundred years ago by the juvenile Gerard Manley Hopkins:

\[
\text{The artificial part of poetry, perhaps we shall be right to say all artifice, reduces itself to the principle of parallelism. The structure of poetry is that of continuous parallelism, ranging from the technical so-called Parallelisms of Hebrew poetry and the antiphons of Church music to the intricacy of Greek or Italian or English verse.}^{45}
\]

Robert C. Culley (1967)

Culley’s discussion of word pairs is embedded in his broad perspective of the theory of oral formulaic analysis. Of course, when he wrote, the comparative study of parallelism, let alone word pairs, was in its infancy. Jakobson’s seminal article had been published only the previous year, and Culley does not include it in his bibliography. Nor, I might add, does he include Lowth, though \textit{parallelismus membrorum} as it is commonly understood lies behind his discussion of the poetry of the Psalms.

He confines his remarks to a discussion of Gevirtz and an article by Whallon that provides a foretaste of Whallon’s book published two years after Culley’s.\(^{46}\)

---

\(^{43}\) Fox, 1977, p. 73

\(^{44}\) Jakobson, 1966, p. 405

\(^{45}\) Jakobson, 1966, p. 399

\(^{46}\) Whallon, 1963
Both Gevirtz and Whallon suggest that the fixed pair was a device of oral composition for Hebrew poets corresponding to the formula used by poets in other traditions. The theory is undeniably an attractive one. It seems sensible for a number of reasons. This phenomenon of fixed pairs goes back very early to a time when oral composition was likely practised. Then again, fixed pairs appear to have been a convention, and conventional language plays a part in oral composition. Furthermore, it seems that the need to produce parallel cola would be one of the problems facing an oral poet of Hebrew, and one might expect that he would have a device to assist him in this.

On the other hand, there appear to be good reasons for not accepting this proposal. The main objection is that a study of the repeated phrases in the biblical psalms has turned up formulas and formulaic phrases very similar to those found in other poetic traditions. The major device in Hebrew oral composition was the formula. Nor does Hebrew poetic structure strongly suggest that oral poets would be more likely to develop fixed pairs rather than formulas and formulaic phrases as the major device for composition. The freedom permitted by Hebrew metre does not necessarily mean that formulas would not be used. There is a great deal of latitude in the number of syllables in a line in Russian oral narrative poetry, and yet it appears that formulaic composition developed there in much the same way as it did elsewhere. Then again, while parallelism is dominant in Hebrew poetry, it is not necessary that every line show this characteristic. In other words, there is something more fundamental to Hebrew poetry than parallelism, and this probably has to do with metre, which, although we cannot as yet say precisely how, restricts the cola within certain limits. Consequently the concern of the poet was not just to get parallel cola but to produce cola which also did not transgress the limitations of poetic structure. Thus the precise relationship of fixed pairs to oral composition is not clear and remains to be defined more fully.

Culley does not include Lowth in his bibliography, though he does have the first edition of Gevirtz’s book and Whallon’s 1963 article, “Formulaic Poetry in the Old Testament”. He does not have Jakobson’s article, which only been published the previous year, though the presence of other articles from Comparative Literature , Modern Language Notes , and the Journal of American Folklore suggests that he might have seen references to Jakobson’s work shortly after he finished Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms.

William Whallon (1969)
Whallon appears to have been the first scholar to have attempted to fit an understanding of word pairs into a general theory of parallelism. Having devoted the first part of his book Formula, Character and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old

47 Culley, 1967, pp. 118-9
English, and Old Testament Poetry to describing the way the formula is used to generate Homeric verse and the second part to the same for the kenning in Old English verse, Whallon goes on to describe the poetry of the Hebrew Bible. He maintains that the generative force in parallelism is the word pair:

a. They determine the kinds of parallelism.
b. The word pairs assisted composition rather than memory.
c. The word pairs raise the question of economy.
d. The word pairs may all have been traditional.\(^4\)\(^8\)

The insights of the Parry-Lord theory have been brought to bear upon the workings of the Hebrew text, which shows evidence of the performance composition which lay behind it.

Whallon cites Lowth on parallelism, but mentions only Gevirtz's (first edition) work on word pairs; he seems unaware of others and particularly of Culley.

Stanley Gevirtz (2nd edition, 1973)

This work was first published in 1963 and was not modified substantially for the second edition. It is certainly the most influential work on the subject until O'Connor's in 1980. Gevirtz richly deserves his position of influence because of he demonstrates outstanding scholarship and a clear and succinct exposition. Because I have had access to the second edition, it is the one to which I refer.

In his prologue, Gevirtz describes the discovery of word pairs in this century by H.L. Ginsberg and their classification by Cassuto and Held:

By isolating the pairs of fixed parallel words in the Ugaritic texts and locating these same pairs in biblical Hebrew poems they marshalled a significantly large array of irrefutable evidence in support of the theory that the two literatures, despite the difference in their age, locale, and stage of linguistic development, were in reality not two distinct literatures but merely represented two branches of a common, Syro-Palestinian, literary tradition.\(^4\)\(^9\)

At that time, "more than sixty"\(^5\)\(^0\) pairs had been found in Ugaritic and Hebrew literatures.

Gevirtz goes on to explain the significance as he sees it of the word pair: When we ask why poets, who were capable of the most original, profound, and moving thoughts world literature has ever known, should have had such regular and continual traffic with clichés, the answer must lie in an understanding of their dependence upon, and regard for, tradition. Reliance upon tradition, in turn, must find its raison d'être in some particular need to which it answered. This need,

\(^4\)Whallon, 1969, pp. 140-157
\(^4\)Gevirtz, 1973, p. 3
\(^5\)Gevirtz, 1973, p. 8
it may be suggested, had its genesis at a time when poetry was being composed without the aid of writing tools, that is to say, when poetic composition was an oral art. The poet had to construct his verses “on his feet,” as it were, and to retain them in his memory. He was therefore forced to rely on some mnemonic device, in this case upon a conventional diction and traditional patterns of composition. Syro-Palestinian poets, who formed their verses primarily in parallel lines, apparently found it expedient to employ conventionally fixed pairs of words. Such stylization enabled the poet more readily to compose and to retain his verses; for, once he had set forth a line of two, three, or four words or phrases, the formation of the parallel line was virtually at hand since the parallel terms, which would complete the thought, were already determined. The fixed pairs, therefore, constituted for the Syro-Palestinian poet what we have termed one of the “essentials of his craft.” He doubtless acquired these through listening to the poems of his contemporaries and adapting for his own poetic needs those patterns of diction and verse structure that most pleased. New patterns could be, and were formed; and as they conformed to the traditional modes of versification, and struck the poets’ fancies as apt, would tend by repeated use to find their way into the repertory of poetic diction.

He then, in five detailed studies, shows specific examples of the use of word pairs in both Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew; all are poetic, in keeping with his belief that word pairs are a poetic phenomenon. The passages studied are “The Women’s Eulogy of Saul and David” (1 Sam 18:7), “Lamech’s Song to his Wives” (Gen 4:23-4), “Isaac’s Blessing over Jacob” (Gen 27:28-9), “Balaam’s First ‘Mashal’” (Num 23:7-10), and “David’s Lament over Saul and Jonathan” (II Sam 1:18-27).

Gevirtz mentions only Lowth, though he freely acknowledges his debt to both Ginsberg and Cassuto for references in Ugaritic and other Ancient Near Eastern languages.

William R. Watters (1979)

Watters begins with a comprehensive survey of 20th century Homeric studies and goes on to the work of William Whallon. Chapter II is called “The Nature and Occurrence of Word Pairs”.

Gevirtz...deals with about one hundred occurrences of word pairs. We have listed and examined thousands. We wish, in other words, to see what the practicalities of cataloguing word pairs tell us about composition, authorship, and traditional diction. We have no interest in field studies of living oral verse-making be they taken from the South Seas or the Ukraine. Theories are fine to propose and thereon cite a few supporting examples. But do the theories hold up under the scrutiny of many supporting examples?

51 Gevirtz, 1973, pp. 10-1
52 Watters, 1979, p. 39
And he goes on to discuss at some length the confusing terminology employed by scholars on the subject. Culley terms the repeated phrase a formula; Gevirtz calls the repeated word pair a formula; and Whallon deals with repeated word pairs and repeated hemistichs and distichs, both of which he calls formulas. We shall try to simplify matters by saying that a word pair or phrase is a formula if it is repeated....The key to the formula is its necessary repetition. 53

What then is a word pair in Watters' terminology? It turns out to be difficult to determine. Watters is more concerned to distinguish them from phrases than he is to define them. Word pairs may be determined, then, with little degree of speculation....Word pairs are a poetic construction easily recognizable, while phrases by their primary nature are merely a series of words....While fixed pairs are certainly determined by meaning, the pairs stand out very easily in the texts....We can see a word pair in a line from its association and meaning, repeated or not.54

And he concludes that they are not traditional: As far as we are able to ascertain, the pair had no life in the transmission of the poetry, nor is their activity in the transmission of the poetry needed to understand why the pairs repeat.... the pairs are the result of common association fostered by a limited root vocabulary, and are freely created by the poet whenever and wherever he wished. [We have] now liberated the Hebrew poet from membership in the regimentation of the “stockpile of traditional diction”.55

So what does Whallon make of Ras Shamra Parallels, the collection of word pairs cognate between Ugaritic and Hebrew? One might well ask; it does not appear in his bibliography, even though the first volume was published in 1970. However, based almost entirely on Stanley Gevirtz's book Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel (1963), he concludes:

When a new word pair is located in Ugaritic, it is almost always present in Hebrew. But the amount of Ugaritic literature available is still limited in extent compared to Hebrew. So it is Gevirtz's suggestion that if a word pair is found in Hebrew poetry, but is not found in extant Ugaritic verse, it probably did once exist in Ugaritic. There are many more word pairs in Hebrew because we have more lines of Hebrew verse than we have Ugaritic available to us....In this way, Gevirtz once again affirms, as does Culley, a traditional poetic diction, but for Gevirtz, it resides now within a Syro-Palestinian literature.56

53 Watters, 1979, p. 43
54 Watters, 1979, p. 44, p. 27
55 Watters, 1979, p. 80, p. 94-5
56 Watters, 1979, pp. 23-4
Watters makes some use of Lowth, much more of Culley and Whallon. He does not mention Jakobson.

James J. Fox (1977)
Fox has provided a comprehensive survey of the comparative study of parallelism. He begins, logically enough, with Lowth and very quickly notes the discovery of word pairs.

[The 1928 discovery, at Ras Shamra, of Canaanite or Ugaritic texts has led a host of recent scholars to examine, in meticulous detail, the extent to which Lowth's "parallel terms" constitute, in the ancient oral traditions of Syria and Palestine, a standardized body of fixed word pairs by means of which verse forms were composed.57]

While describing the breadth of Jakobson's influence on the study of traditional language, Fox specifically mentions word pairs found in Vietnamese (p. 63) and in Mayan (p. 69), as well as Toda, Hebrew, Ostyak and Vogul, and finally Fox's own specialty, Rotinese (p. 78). Having cautioned that one scholar's definition of parallel terms is not the same as another's, he points out that

Perfect synonymy in language is illusion. The choice of similar words in parallel lines is intended to have a "stereophonic" effect. "Parallelistic juxtaposition," as Boodberg has illuminatingly argued, gives us "the satisfaction of re-experiencing the build-up step-by-step, first viewing the panorama presented by the poet from one syntactical angle, then from another, and fully savoring the stereoscopic aftersensation or afterimage." Thus an analysis that reduces lexical congruence to identity misrepresents the essential features of the language of this poetry. Similarly, as Hale has made clear, a tradition of parallelism based primarily on a principle of antonymy, such as intji liwiri or 'up-side-down Walbiri' used only in the context of Australian aboriginal ritual, cannot be reduced exclusively [sic] to this single principle. Many of the fundamental oppositions intji liwiri turn out to be what Lowth would have called "synthetic" pairs. And in every tradition of parallelism, it is these synthetic pairs that present the most interest for an analysis simply because they defy simplistic categorization based on synonymy or antonymy. A further and, perhaps, more serious criticism of this typologizing of word pairs is that this procedure generally assigns each pair to a specific category without examining the possibility of systematic connections among lexical elements in different paired relations.58

In addition to an eloquent acknowledgement of Jakobson's role in the study of parallelism, Fox naturally mentions Lowth; there is no mention of Culley, Whallon or Watters in his bibliography.

57 Fox, 1977, p. 61
58 Fox, 1977, p. 61
T. Collins (1978)
Unfortunately, I have not been able to examine a copy of Collins’ book *Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry*, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978. I have, however, an extended resumé, prepared by James Barr, of the original dissertation which formed the basis for the book. It sounds a cautionary note to the enthusiasm with which some scholars took up the study of word pairs.\

Our study shows that lines with the same syntactic form may carry a variety of different semantic contents. Two hemistichs may be perfectly parallel in syntactic terms, but their relationship on the level of meaning is quite unpredictable. It does not follow that two nicely balanced nouns are going to be synonymous. In fact the skilled poet will bring in quite surprising semantic relationships and developments between the two. Hence, if one noun is obscure or textually corrupt, we cannot automatically appeal to a parallel noun of known meaning to provide a “meaning” for the unknown.

Lowth is the only member of our survey cited in the resumé.

Stephen Geller (1979)
Geller acknowledges his debt to Roman Jakobson at the outset by declaring that the immediate stimulus for this study was an article by Roman Jakobson, ‘Grammatical Parallelism and Its Russian Facet,’ whose approach was provocative to one who had been dissatisfied with the treatment of parallelism in biblical literature.\[61\]

But he goes on to state that the kind of analysis advocated by Jakobson is beyond our reach for ancient languages. “It is clear that ancient texts are not immediately accessible to the sophisticated analysis which Jakobson and Steinitz can apply to languages which are fully understood.”\[62\] His discussion is not so much comprehensive as focused, being a methodological suggestion (with illustrations) of how to begin grammatical analysis of biblical poetry. He does not refer to word pairs as such, but in his preliminary chapter comments that “[w]ithin the structure of the couplet, structures may be isolated by semantic parallelism or repetition. Within A and B Lines certain terms are parallel in meaning, either totally or partially.”\[63\] One must assume that this is a reference to word pairs, as among his works consulted are those by Dahood and Gevirtz.

Of those authors we include in this survey, the only ones consulted by Geller are Culley, Jakobson, Gevirtz, and Lowth.

\[59\] Juxtaposed against the previous quotation, the two point with the utmost clarity the broad spectrum of opinion surrounding the study of word pairs.
\[60\] Collins, 1978, p. 244
\[61\] Geller, 1979, p. 1
\[62\] Geller, 1979, p. 3
\[63\] Geller, 1979, p. 6
1980 saw the publication of O'Connor's massive *Hebrew Verse Structure*. It is certainly the most comprehensive work on the subject thus far and is the first to draw on diverse sources to illuminate the issues.

O'Connor is of the opinion that much of the difficulty experienced by scholars in connection with defining parallelism is because the term covers such a number and variety of phenomena. "No such definition exists because no single feature exists."\(^{64}\) Word pairs are only one of those phenomena, and therefore must be examined in conjunction with the others, all of which go together to make up what is uncritically lumped together as "parallelism".

O'Connor begins his discussion of word pairs thus:

The psychotherapeutic exercise of free association reveals, if it is not obvious, that any single word in a language can be paired with any other. Irrespective of its psychological usefulness, the exercise will elicit many word complexes which are related to the structure of the world as it is perceived through the medium of language.\(^{65}\)

That being a truism, he moves right along to the principles set out by the Sanskrit grammarian Panini, and to those developed by Cooper and Ross in a paper for the eleventh regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.\(^{66}\) These involve not so much the words themselves as the ordering of words within pairs, what Cooper and Ross call "freezes". They note that some pairs are always frozen (like "kit and caboodle") while others are when they appear in idiomatic constructions, but otherwise are not. Constraints are both semantic and phonological, but the former seems to predominate, except in reduplicatives.\(^{67}\)

The focus of what O'Connor has to say lies not in how word pairs function in parallelism nor in their identification. Rather, O'Connor is concerned to agree that they are oral and formular (within the wider meaning of that term); he then discusses Dahood's lists of word pairs.

It is a sign of vitality when research outstrips hypothesis formation as vastly as Dahood's work on dyading has done; his critics have frequently remarked that Dahood's approaches show signs of confusion. We hope to have said enough to suggest that, though they

\(^{64}\) O'Connor, 1980, p. 89

\(^{65}\) O'Connor, 1980, p. 96

\(^{66}\) Cooper and Ross, 1975

\(^{67}\) Reduplicatives in the technical sense do not seem to occur in parallel language. What I have called reduplicatives later in this work are actually double occurrences of the same word. True reduplicatives function linguistically as a single word. This subject is discussed at length in Chapter III How Word Pairs Mean.
are in part right, the confusion is a token of astonishing vitality. A further approach to dyads, foreshadowed for Hebrew by Kaddari (1973), is suggested by Fox who notes that “an element or word [in Rotinese verse] may form a pair with more than one other element. Most elements are not confined to a single fixed dyadic set but rather have a variable range of other elements with which they form acceptable sets.” (1974:76). He suggests that underlying all poetic expression is “a stable network of semantic elements whose interrelations can be formally represented.”

O’Connor’s citations are the most extensive we have found in our survey so far. Apart from Collins and Geller, every other author mentioned so far occurs in his bibliography. It is evident that he has cast his net rather further than others, from his use of Fox’s work on Rotinese, for example.

James L. Kugel (1981)
Kugel’s central thesis is that parallelism is a misnomer, as the two lines of Hebrew verse are not separated by an equals sign (=). The very word parallelism has made scholars assume an equality that simply does not exist. Rather, parallelism should be seen as a statement of “A and what’s more, B”. A and B are parallel in so far as B builds on the principle of A, but it does not simply restate the case; it goes beyond and in so doing reinforces A.

Kugel’s discussion of word pairs follows on from what he has already said about parallelism:
As far as the workings of parallelism are concerned, the function of such fixed pairs is obvious. They strongly establish the feeling of correspondence between A and B. Indeed, the more stereotypical the pairing the greater the bond; with the most frequently used pairs, the appearance of the first in itself creates the anticipation of its fellow, and when the latter comes it creates a harmonious feeling of completion and satisfaction. In another way the pairs themselves may bring out the “what’s more” relationship of B to A, for, as has been pointed out, the second word in the pair sequence is most often the rarer and more literary term; when both terms are common, the second is sometimes a going-beyond the first in its meaning.

He goes on to criticise implicitly those who suggest that the sense of the line is in the word pairs:
[It is an error to see the pairs themselves as the essence of the line. On the contrary, the pairs often function to bring into equation the other words of the line — words that are rarely connected, or in any case words whose apposition is the whole point....The use of pairs does not mean that the clauses are equivalent, and what is interesting...are the subtle variations....This point is important, for in the enthusiasm

68 O’Connor, 1980, p. 108
69 Kugel, 1981, p. 29
following the discovery of the pairs, the differences between A and B have sometimes been overlooked.70

The next idea to come under fire is that of the “Canaanite thesaurus”, the suggested stock of word pairs upon which both Ugaritic and Hebrew oral poets may have drawn when composing.

Where do the pairs come from? Initially this subject suffered from some wishful thinking on the part of writers who wished to see in the “pair” phenomenon the “regular stock in trade of the Canaanite poets,” specially created to serve the poetic device of parallelism. This judgment is only partially correct. It is true that the recurrence of certain pairs -- “house-palace,” “earth-dust” -- suggests something of a literary stereotype, and their frequency is consistent with what was noted above concerning premodern fondness for oft-repeated, solemnizing formulae. But one ought not to conclude more than the evidence warrants. Hebrew and Ugaritic, like most languages, had their stock of conventionally associated terms, of synonyms and near-synonyms, and of antonyms and near-antonyms. Some of these were regularly paired to make a single merismatic phrase: “day and night” meant “all the time,” “silver and gold” meant “everything of value,” “ox and ass” meant “beasts of burden,” etc. Other pairs, while not merismatic in a strict sense, are nevertheless frequently used in a single phrase -- “love and faithfulness,” “teaching and law,” etc....Again, the fact that some of the “pairs” consist of nothing more than conventionally interchangeable concepts, synonyms and near-synonyms, is witnessed by textual variants within the Masoretic Text (or between the MT and other texts or versions) which consist precisely of the substitution of one such “word-pair” for another. Thus there is nothing “poetic” or literary in the pairs per se, any more that there is in “far and near,” “law and order,” “bag and baggage,” etc. in English. What is “poetic” is the breaking up of such proverbial pairs, or, more generally, of any conventionally associated concepts into adjacent clauses to establish the interclausal connection and the feeling of closure.71

The last idea about word pairs that is demolished by Kugel is the way the Parry-Lord theory has been applied to Hebrew poetry:

Finally it should be noted that there is no evidence to show that these pairs functioned as “oral formulae” comparable to those described by Milman Parry and Albert Lord in the poetry of ancient Greece or modern south-Slavic epics. As remarked earlier: the function of the pairs is no different from the use of similar syntactic structures, alliteration, etc. -- all establish the sense of correspondence between A and B. The fact that certain pairs recur may indicate that they had achieved a certain formulaic popularity, or perhaps simply that they expressed a concept adaptable to a wide variety of lines. But in no way

70 Kugel, 1981, pp. 30-1
71 Kugel, 1981, pp. 33-4
does their presence in a line suggest the line was the extemporaneous production of "poet-performers" who composed "on their feet."...Formulaic language is not necessarily spontaneously composed language. No doubt some of the Bible's parallelistic passages were composed spontaneously in front of their intended audience, and perhaps even some of the lines exhibiting stereotypical pairs are among them. But parallelism is a far less exacting requirement than the meter of Greek epics.... There is no reason, logical or empirical, to associate the frequent use of such pairs with spontaneous composition, still less to search out their origins in the conditions of oral poetry.\(^2\)

Of the authors that we have surveyed, Kugel uses Lowth, Jakobson and Culley. He relies heavily on Stanley Gevirtz (2nd edition, 1973) for the specifics of word pairing.

**Edward L. Greenstein (1982)**

Greenstein sees the whole problem of parallelism, including word pairs, from a different point of view altogether.

The study of Biblical poetics has until recently devoted itself largely to the side of the author or bard. Analysis has focused on compositional techniques, as well as on evidence of oral composition and performance. Parallelism, conventional motifs and topoi, meter, chiasm, and other variations in word-order, and perhaps above all word-pairs in parallelism have typically been explained as devices to help the bard in composing and memorizing his poetic pieces, or (in the case of variation) as methods of avoiding monotony. There can be no doubt that the ancient Hebrew poets were heirs to a literary tradition with an array of sophisticated techniques. Nor can anyone question the fact that the biblical poet had to train in order to master the conventional methods of versification. But upon reflection it seems almost trivial to understand the art of Biblical verse as being of chief importance to the bard who proclaimed it. The truly significant question is: In what ways do the devices of Biblical poetry control the audience's perception of the message? In what ways does Hebrew verse attract, appeal to, and move its audience? Certainly the ancient Hebrew poets sought to affect their hearers, perhaps to amuse them as well. If the use of parallelism, meter, word-pairs, and the like had chiefly served the needs of the bard and did not engage an audience, the poets and prophets of ancient Israel would have played to an empty house?\(^3\)

And he goes on to apply transformational-generative analysis to selected texts. He does not again mention word pairs.

Although Greenstein concentrates on transformational-generative analysis, his bibliography includes every writer previously mentioned in this survey except for Watters and Fox. He also takes account of Berlin, whose "Grammatical
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\(^2\) Kugel, 1981, pp. 34-5

\(^3\) Greenstein, 1982, pp. 42-3
Aspects of Biblical Parallelism" (1979) he criticises. Her book *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (1985), which expands and develops the themes touched on in her earlier article, is covered later in this survey.

**Wilfred G.E. Watson (1984)**

Watson has contributed to the debate by pointing out that parallelism is a term from geometry, and by discussing the implications that has for the use of the term in literary criticism. He has not been satisfied with simply stating that the word becomes a metaphor when applied to literary criticism. Instead, he shows in detail how parallelism works in geometry, and goes on:

Parallelism, it is now evident, belongs within a larger group of mathematical analogues and cannot be exalted to the rank of 'the characteristic of Hebrew poetry', quite irrespective of the fact that it is by no means the only form in which such poetry is cast. The significance of what has been set out is that it accounts for chiastic patterns as well as parallelism, and sets parallelism in its proper context.4

What implications this scheme has for the study of word pairs is left unstated. Watson defines word pairs, following Yoder (1971), thus:

1. each must belong to the same grammatical class (verb, noun, etc.);
2. the components must occur in parallel lines;
3. such word-pairs must be relatively frequent.5

And he sounds a cautionary note regarding the tendency to regard them as confined to certain languages, though he does not seem to know of their existence in those not found in the Ancient Near East.

[Parallel word-pairs are not confined to Ugaritic and Hebrew: they occur, too, in other languages (notably, Akkadian), but to date full listings have not yet been drawn up for the related languages. Therefore, pending the availability of these lists it is difficult to evaluate the significance of data collected so far. It does seem that there was a common core of word-pairs for several of the languages concerned, but the extent of this core has not yet been determined.6

In discussing the implications of word pairs for the presumed oral origins of Hebrew verse, Watson accepts the idea that the word pair (as well as the stereotyped expression described by Culley) "played the same role in Hebrew poetry as did the formula (in the Parry-Lord sense) in classical Greek verse."7

The function of word pairs he sums up under three headings:

1. From the poet's point of view the main function of parallel pairs was to assist him in composing verse....It must be noted...that use of word-
pairs is not exclusive to oral poetry; the writing prophets, for example, though well schooled in the traditions of oral poetry, were able to use word-pairs with a certain degree of freedom betokening mastery.

2. The word-pair effectively slowed down the flow of verse-making and at the same time reiterated keywords in each line, enabling the audience (or reader) to follow the meaning better. Also, as bard and listeners (or readers) shared the same traditional stock of word-pairs -- though, of course, the poet's repertoire was very much larger than that of the average person -- communication became easier not least because of the rapport which must inevitably have been created between them. There does not seem to be much support for the view that word-pairs, in themselves, were ever props to the memory of either poet or audience.

3. The third function of parallel word-pairs, operative at a linguistic level, is cohesion: the use of stock word-pairs helps bind together the parallel lines of couplets. Lexical cohesion 'is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur'. This is collocation.\(^7\)\(^8\)

In taking word pairs seriously as a linguistic phenomenon, Watson has contributed considerably to the debate. His bibliography includes Watters, Jakobson, and O'Connor.

Adele Berlin (1985)

Berlin undoubtedly has produced the most sustained discussion of word pairs found amongst the biblical scholars of our survey. The emphasis she places on them is in keeping with her comment that both Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry used parallelism extensively and, upon closer examination, it was found that the two even used the same parallel terms in many cases. This observation led to the monumental effort of collecting what came to be known as fixed word pairs --parallel terms that occur frequently in the Bible and in Ugaritic texts. Begun half a century ago, it continues still, and it is one of the major achievements of modern biblical research.\(^7\)\(^9\)

Thus she examines word pairs from several different angles --grammatical, lexical, semantic and phonological. Her chart of aspects and levels clarifies the way she sees word pairs fitting within the general scheme of parallelism.\(^8\)\(^0\)

\(^7\)Watson, 1984, p. 140
\(^8\) Berlin, 1985, p. 65
\(^9\) Berlin, 1985, p. 29
Given her scheme, in this survey I address only the portion she calls word pairs. In the next chapter, in the more general discussion of the pairing of words, I will also mention briefly what she calls sound pairs, because the pairing of words by sound is part of the general phenomenon of word pairing. She also contributes substantially to the debate by the classification she has developed for the relationships between the members of word pairs. That classification is discussed at length in the next chapter, in the section Word Pairs in Parallel Language.

Berlin's bibliography includes every author we have surveyed so far. Her only acquaintance with Fox seems to be through his article “Roman Jakobson and the Comparative Study of Parallelism.”

Miguel Léon-Portilla (1985)
1985 saw the publication of the Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians, under the general editorship of Victoria Bricker. Volume 3, “Literatures”, contains an important discussion of the stylistic significance of word pairs.

The concept of parallelism can be employed again in application to the very frequent use of phrases of related connotation appearing within the units....By way of complement, contrast, diminution, or reference to a third reality, the frequent parallelisms within the units of expression are a stylistic attribute shared by the Nahuatl poems with those of other literatures of the ancient world, as for instance in the case of the Hebrew psalms. [Another stylistic element] should be mentioned,...what Garibay...describes as difrasismo (diphrasis), which he defines as “pairing two metaphors which together give a symbolic means of expressing a single thought.” To illustrate this I shall adduce
the very difrasismo that Nahuas used to express an idea akin to our poetry: in xochitl, in cuicatl 'flower and song' …

[From Romances:
Chalchihuitl on ohuaya in xihuitl on in
motizayo in moihuiyo, in ipalnemohua
ahuayya oo ayye ohuaya ohuaya.
Jades, turquoises: thy clay, thy feathers,
Giver of life.

The interest of this example takes off from the fact that it interrelates two different kinds of difrasismo. On the one hand we have the words chalchihuitl and xihuitl 'jades, turquoises' which together evoke 'something precious'. On the other hand mo-tiza-yo, mo-ihui-yo possessed forms of tiza-tl 'clay' and ihuitl 'feather', are evocations of the color white for warriors' dress, of which the feathers are the decoration. Tizatl and ihuitl together evoke war. The sense of the doubled difrasismo is to assert that struggle and confrontation are par excellence a precious thing.  

Léon-Portilla is describing word pairs, though he calls them difrasismo. He is aware in general terms of work in biblical studies on parallelism, as can be seen from the quotation given above, but does not cite any specific scholars.

Dennis Pardee (1988)
Pardee's work looks at specific examples, one of Ugaritic and one of Hebrew poetry. He is not concerned to cover every aspect of the debate about parallelism, but points out some areas of concern. In particular, several of his remarks about the word pairs debate are of relevance here.

[Repetitive parallelism] brings together into one pair of words semantic, grammatical (both morphological and syntactic), and phonetic parallelism. (Even with the grammatical parallelism excluded, repetitive parallelism constitutes a great concentration of like elements.) Thus repetitive parallelism functions as the strongest recall device in distant parallelism: if the same word is repeated at ten lines' distance it is more likely to be noted than another word meaning the same thing, than a like grammatical form with a different meaning, or than the repetition of a single sound or grouping of sounds.

He then proceeds to discuss the on-going debate about the role of traditionalism vs. the role of creativity in the composition of parallel verse.

'It appears to me impossible to rule tradition out of poetic production in an ancient society -- just as impossible as to rule creativity completely out of an artistic production. Though the extent of each element is certainly variable, and though the study of traditionalism is more the work of anthropologists and sociologists rather than of philologists, it is nonetheless inconceivable to me to devise a theory of
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81 Léon-Portilla, 1985, p. 19
82 Pardee, 1988, p. 170
artistic production which absolutely excludes either element. This said, however, I believe that we must accept that it was the principle of parallelism which was the guiding principle of poetic production, rather than a hide-bound tradition, but that, at least in the forms of poetry which have come down to us, the production of poetry had reached a highly sophisticated level and traditional forms and usages had taken their place as a part of the poet's craft.\textsuperscript{3}

Pardee follows this with comments on the "international character" of semantic parallelism.

\textit{[N]ew progress has been made in recent years with the conscious seeking out in other Semitic languages of parallel pairs which are cognate or equivalent to the Ugaritic-Hebrew pairs. According to Watters, S.E. Loewenstamm and Y. Avishur are preparing a catalogue of all the parallel pairs which occur in Hebrew, Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Aramaic. This work should eventually be broadened to include the other Semitic languages and to include the study of parallelistic devices in Semitic languages which rely on poetic devices other than parallelism as main structural features (meter, rhyme, etc.). And, finally, once the Semitic picture becomes clear, the various aspects of parallelism within the Semitic languages should be compared with the uses of parallelism in other linguistic groups. Such broad studies may do something to cure the study of Northwest Semitic poetry of the narrow provincialism from which it suffers.}\textsuperscript{4}

Pardee's bibliography includes Lowth, Jakobson, Culley, Whallon, Watters, Collins, Geller, O'Connor, Kugel, Greenstein, Watson, Berlin. In short, he knows every author we have included in our survey, with the exception of Fox and Léon-Portilla.

William Bright (1990)

Bright is an ethnographer; his interest in parallelism, more specifically word pairs, is through his interest in early contact between the Nahua people of central Mexico and Europeans. In this he resembles Léon-Portilla, discussed earlier. [It should be noticed that a particular type of couplet, of specifically METAPHORICAL function, has long been recognised by Nahua scholars under the name of 'difrasismo'...; the term has been translated as 'couplet kenning'....Several well-known difrasismos are exemplified in the Coloquios, e.g. \textit{in atl in tepetl}, lit. 'the water, the mountain',... i.e. 'the city'. Other examples are \textit{in tloque in nahuque}, lit. 'the lord of the adjacent, the lord of the near'... i.e. 'the Omnipresent One, God'; \textit{cententli ontentli}, lit. '(with) one lip, (with) two lips'..., i.e. 'speaking indirectly'; \textit{in itop in ipetlalac}, lit. 'its coffer, its chest',... i.e. 'that which is hidden'; \textit{in impetl in imicpal}, lit. 'their mat, their seat',... i.e. 'their

\textsuperscript{3} Pardee, 1988, pp. 173-4

\textsuperscript{4} Pardee, 1988, pp. 174-5
throne, their power'; and in cuiilapilli in atlapalli, lit. 'the tail, the wing', i.e., 'the people'.

Such metaphorical phrases can occur in a variety of morphological contexts, both inflectional and derivational. This suggests that difrasismos, although they may represent semantically specialized constructions, need not be given special grammatical status.

In his bibliography, Bright mentions Jakobson, O'Connor, Léon-Portilla and Fox.

Conclusion

Even this brief survey has made it clear that while a great deal of work is going on, much of it has been or is being conducted in relative isolation. People within a single discipline are generally well-informed about each other, but not about those outside. An excellent example of the situation is a work published in 1968 by Inna Koskenniemi, *Repetitive Word Pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose*. With the subtitle "Expressions of the Type Whole and Sound and Answered and Said and Other Parallel Constructions", it seems likely that we will find there discussion of the same sorts of linguistic styles that we have already considered. To some degree, this proves to be true. We find in the bibliography Benson (1966), Magoun (1953), one of Sayce's earlier works (1958), and Thun's volume on reduplicatives (1963). But, in spite of a solid recognition that most word pairs in translations of the Hebrew Bible are a reflection of the original, there is no reference to any of the work which has followed the discovery of the Ugaritic library in 1929.

In any translation of the Old Testament the original source of word pairs is to be found mostly in a Hebrew expression. Parallel phrases are very dominant in classical Hebrew. It is true, on the other hand, that the Hebrew parallelism (based on the poetic principle of parallelismus membrorum) often concerns larger syntactic units than single words, and as such differs from word parallelism which is more typically Germanic.

The relationship between Germanic word parallelism and word pairs like those found in the Ugaritic/Hebrew corpus will be discussed in the next chapter. That classification, which I deliberately developed across linguistic lines, allows for many different kinds of relationships between words.

After about a generation, information begins to filter through to other disciplines. For example, most people working with texts that may come from an oral tradition now have a nodding acquaintance with the principles of oral formulaic analysis, more than thirty years after the publication of *The Singer of Tales*. In a similar way, those of structuralist bent know of Jakobson's interest in
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85 Bright, 1990, p. 440
86 Koskienniemi, 1968, pp. 40-1
parallelism a little less than thirty years after "Grammatical Parallelism and Its Russian Facet" appeared in 1966. While Fox, Léon-Portilla, and Bright know of work in biblical studies on parallelism and even word pairs, only Berlin and O'Connor know of Fox's work. And none of them seem to know of Bright and Léon-Portilla. I myself found Bright by accident, and traced Léon-Portilla from Bright's bibliography.

And yet Watters' book *Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament* opens with the words:

"It is characteristic and a tragedy of modern scholarship that few writers in one field are aware of work being done in another. The man for all seasons, able to encompass all available knowledge, is certainly no longer with us....And it is an unfortunate result of singular attention to one's own studies that discoveries in one field, especially with regard to new methodology, go completely unnoticed in another." 8

He then attempts to apply the insights of oral formulaic analysis to classical Hebrew poetry, without apparently ever having noticed that what may hold good for the iambic hexameter of classical Greek does not necessarily work for the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry. Furthermore, there were numerous examples in the literature, even when Watters wrote in 1976, of oral traditions that exhibited marked parallelism and which were much more rational sources of comparison than the Iliad. Reference to some of these examples may be found in Jakobson's 1966 article "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet".

At the other end of the scale, we have Watters announcing that "[w]e have no interest in field studies of living oral verse-making be they taken from the South Seas or the Ukraine." 8 About the same time, J. C. de Moor and P. van der Lugt declared in the face of published information that "the principle of parallelismus membrorum was invented by the Sumerians and was taken over by the Akkadians and other Semitic peoples of the ancient world." 8 And yet we have the example, described in the introduction, of Fox, who has studied a living tradition of parallelism; it can shed light on a tradition long dead. We do not seek to adopt Milman Parry's conclusions; however valid they may be for the classical Greek tradition, their relevance to Hebrew poetry is in only the most general terms. No, it is Parry's methodology we wish to adopt. When frustrated by his inability to gain insight into the workings of the Homeric bard's mind, he talked with Slavic guslari and recorded their singing. Culley gives an example of the same type of thinking:

---

87 Watters, 1976, p. 2
88 Watters, 1976, p. 39
89 quoted in Pardee, 1988, p. 170 fn
In the past much light has been shed on dark areas of the people of Israel and their literature by exploring parallel situations in the history of other peoples about whom more is known. When faced with an embarrassing lack of information about conditions prevailing at a given time, scholars have often sought to sketch in the background of the few and insufficient facts available by drawing an analogy from another historical situation that is more fully documented, and so more completely understood. This method is in principle quite sound, since very often the discovery of a parallel about which more is known offers the only hope of interpreting the meagre facts at our disposal. But the extent to which such a study succeeds depends upon a careful and judicious treatment of the evidence.\textsuperscript{90}

So, let us be "careful and judicious", but let us not reject parallels completely. And let us be selective about the "parallels" we do choose.

\textsuperscript{90} Culley, 1968, p. 4
HOW WORD PAIRS MEAN

The previous chapter introduced the idea of parallelism and offered a survey of scholarly opinion on its nature. This chapter develops an analysis of how words pair -- not necessarily in the context of parallelism or of biblical studies, but in the broadest possible terms and using examples from English, both spoken and literary, and from English translations of the Hebrew Bible. Thus it will serve to introduce terms and concepts that will be used freely in later chapters.

We begin this chapter with a discussion of word pairs in their most general sense, i.e. any two words which tend to be spoken and/or written together. We go on to discuss word pairs in a narrower sense. This narrower sense will need defining, and the latter portion of this chapter is to a large degree an attempt to do just that.

The Primacy of Paired Structures

From the outset we are convinced that pairing is fundamental to the way thought processes make language. If Walter Ong's viewpoint, as described in the last chapter, is right then these thought processes are much more obvious in oral literatures than in written ones because oral literature has not been restructured by the world view which dominates literacy. To some degree this is correct, if a survey of those literatures in which parallelism has been found is anything to go by. On the other hand, it has also been found in surprising places, like American newspapers. It seems likely that the matter is a good deal more complicated than Ong would have us believe. Nevertheless, parallelism and word pairs are frequently found in oral literatures and in those written documents which are based on oral tradition. Parallelism also occurs in several literatures which are heavily influenced by an ancient (and functionally oral) tradition.

It does not end there. Graves cites numerous examples demonstrating the prevalence of parallel structures in modern English. His concern is not so much to show its presence as to enter a plea that conscious use of it be taught in creative writing courses. In so doing, however, he cites work analysing the nature of art. Suzanne Langer describes symmetry as a fundamental principle of art....[H]er most interesting contention is that symmetrical form is not only fundamental to human experience but capable of expressing "our deepest vital feeling." She writes, "The safest device to achieve living

1 Hiatt, 1973
2 Graves, 1984, pp. 175-8
form is symmetrical composition." Thus seen, symmetry is not merely a cold, static form, but, rather, a potentially dynamic, life-giving force. At the beginning of Chapter II When Correctly Viewed..., we suggested that parallelism -- symmetry, in Graves' phraseology -- offers a three-dimensional view of reality. Here it is seen to be a dynamic force in the expression of human experience.

**Word Association**

By its nature language associates words. If two words are spoken one after the other, the mind is more likely to associate them than it is to associate words which are separated by several sentences. On the other hand, if there are other mitigating factors that act as "glue", such as rhyme or alliteration or voice emphasis, the more widely separated words may be those which the mind links. Sound, too, associates words. The way that similarity of sound promotes a mental link between words will underpin much of the following discussion and is a constantly recurring factor. Alliteration, the repetition of initial phonemes, is extremely common: "diddle, diddle, dumpling". Even when the association is denied, it remains: "Not this but rather that" forges a link between "this" and "that" which is difficult to dispel. Evidence that the bond is very strong is seen in the number of words found in word pairs but otherwise obsolete, like "fro" in "to-and-fro" and "kith" in "kith-and-kin".

For a few word pairs, we know how the association came about. For instance, Tom and Jerry was a drink popular at the turn of this century and is more recently applied to a pair of cartoon mice. The names, however, go back to a best-seller called *Life in London*, which was published in 1820 by the first sports journalist Pierce Egan. The book, in which Corinthian Tom and his country cousin Jerry experience Regency London, became an equally popular stage play. And the names Tom and Jerry are forever linked in the minds of English speakers. [See Figure 3 overleaf.]

**Panini's Rules**

Note too that they are not Jerry and Tom; they are Tom and Jerry. That fact brings us to an aspect of word pairing which was noted more than two millennia ago. In an agglutinative language such as Sanskrit, the order of the combination of word roots is critical to meaning. The rules they follow are described in Panini's wonderful book (fourth century BCE), so discerning and comprehensive a work.

---

3 Graves, 1984, pp. 172
4 Reid, 1971
that it is "to this day...the unsurpassed authoritative text on Sanskrit grammar".5

There is little doubt that these rules apply to Indo-European languages; we are much less certain of their application to other language stocks.

Panini describes a number of principles, two of which are especially significant for us:

II.2.29 (Deux ou plus de deux noms fléchis forment un composé portant le nom de) dvandra ("paire" = composé copulatif) pour exprimer le sens (que note la particule) "et" (à savoir, en fait, jonction mutuelle et collection). plaksasokau"les arbres plaksa et asoka" jonction mutuelle); vaktvacam"l'ensemble formé par) la parole et la peau" (valeur collective)....

II.2.34 (Dans un composé copulatif), le mot ayant un plus petit nombre de voyelles (forme le membre antérieur, par préférence à l'application éventuelle de 32 et de 33). plaksanyagrodham"le p0 et le n0" et (malgré 32) vagagni"la parole et le feu". En cas de plus de deux noms, la restriction ne vaut que pour un: sankhadundubhivnah"conque, tambour, cithare". Vt.: est aussi membre antérieur le mot notant l'être (plus) digne de respect: matapitarau"le père et la mère". -- le frère aîné: yudhisthirarjunau"Y0 et A0". -- le mot dont les syllabes sont (plus) légères: kusakasam"herbes k0 et k0". -- le nom de la caste plus importante: brahmanaksatriyavitsudrah"brâhmane, noble, éleveur-artisan, sudra". -- le nom de la saison ou de l'astérisme qui viennent en tête, si le nombre des syllabes est égal: hemantasisiravasantah"hiver, frimas, printemps". -- le plus faible de deux noms de nombre: navatisatam"90 et 100".6

We will encounter these principles again when we consider one class of word pairs below. The laws that Panini describes help to explain the ordering of word pairs, but give no clue to the origin of the links. Panini also helps to explain the irreversability of some word pairs. The linguist Yakov Malkiel draws very similar conclusions about English, but does not seem to know Panini.

Modern English displays a very marked partiality to SHORT PLUS LONG: either monosyllable plus (normally paroxytonic) disyllable, or two monosyllables of unequal size....Exceptions do exist (chapter and verse,...hither and yon...), but fail by a wide margin to exceed 10% and can almost invariably accounted for by powerful constellations of special circumstances inimical to this deep-rooted predeliction.7

Mental Processes Leading to Word Pairing

In the end, it is tradition that pairs words. And that may be the most significant thing we know about them. Study of the tradition can help to discover how pairs

5 Eliade, vol. 11, 1987, p. 165
7 Malkiel, 1968, p. 345
form; it can even throw light upon why, provided the question is asked in the right way.

There are a number of different ways of viewing relationships between words. The following schema treats them as figures of speech. [A figure's] existence depends completely on the awareness that the reader has, or does not have, of the ambiguity of the discourse that is being offered to him. Sartre was to observe that the meaning of a literary object is not contained in the words, 'since it is he [the reader], on the contrary, who enables the significance of each of them to be understood.' This hermeneutic circle also exists in rhetoric: the value of a figure is not given in the words that make it up, since it depends on the gap between these words and those that the reader perceives, mentally, beyond them, 'in a perpetual supersession of the written thing.'

The terminology for the schema below was inspired by Jakobson's terminology for the two types of aphasia described in Fundamentals of Language:

Any linguistic sign involves two modes of arrangement. 1) Combination. Any sign is made up of constituent signs and/or occurs only in combination with other signs. This means that any linguistic unit at one and the same time serves as a context for simpler units and/or finds its own context in a more complex linguistic unit. Hence any actual grouping of linguistic units binds them into a superior unit: combination and contexture are two faces of the same operation.

2) Selection. A selection between alternatives implies the possibility of substituting one for the other, equivalent to the former in one respect and different from it in another. Actually, selection and substitution are two faces of the same operation. In order to delimit the two modes of arrangement which we have described as combination and selection, F. de Saussure states that the former “is in presentia: it is based on two or several terms jointly present in an actual series,” whereas the latter “connects terms in absentia as members of a virtual mnemonic series.”

The two types are called “similar” and “contiguous”:

The development of a discourse may take place along two different semantic lines: one topic may lead to another either through their similarity or through their contiguity. The metaphoric way would be the most appropriate term for the first case and the metonymic way for the second, since they find their most condensed expression in metaphor and metonymy respectively.

In his clinical work Jakobson noted that aphasiacs struggling to select a word err in one of two basic ways: either the word selected was related to the desired word as a metaphorical figure is related to the proper term (what he called the

---

8 Genette, 1982, p. 54
9 Jakobson, 1956, p. 60
10 Jakobson, 1956, p. 76
similarity disorder), or the word selected was related to the desired term as a metonym is related to the proper term (the contiguity disorder). Thus, to use Jakobson's own examples, a patient with the similarity disorder would respond to the stimulus word "champagne" with "ginger pop", "geyser", or "mistress". [We might say "sparkling wine" or "bubbly "] A patient with the contiguity disorder will readily resort to metonymical shifts from the cause to the immediate or further effect (tipsiness or hangover), from the thing contained to the container (bottle), from the goal to an auxiliary tool (corkscrew), and from the whole to the part (foam).

As with practically everything else, what seemed quite straightforward forty years ago no longer appears so simple:

It is easy to criticise attempts to make large generalizations about aphasia as oversimplifications and no one would claim that the generalizations Jakobson and Sabouraud have made in their typologies are meant to be complete descriptions of the nature of different disturbances. They are, rather, proposals from which hypotheses can be generated. But the question is not so much whether or not the typology is an oversimplification, which is admitted, but whether the principles on which it is based are sound.

We are not here presenting any claims, or even suggestions, about the validity or otherwise of Jakobson's typology of aphasia. Rather, we wish to acknowledge our debt to him for the ideas which sparked our terminology.

Words are paired in three types. In order to facilitate understanding, a schematic description precedes the discussion (See Figure 4 overpage):

---

11 Jakobson, 1971, p. 236
12 Lesser, 1978, p. 43
1) metaphor
both words present
a. adjective + noun
i) Homeric epithet
ii) kenning
b. two nouns
i) collocation
ii) merismus
zeugma

2) metonymy
one word present
a. rhyming slang
b. euphemism
i) figure of rhetoric
ii) pun
iii) meaning x 2
iv) cognate accusative
v) idem per idem
b. reduplicatives
i) identical
ii) ablaut
iii) rhyme

3) repetition
word x 2
a. studied

1) Metaphor. One word (the figure) directs the hearer's/reader's attention to another (the proper term). The words are combined so that the figure elucidates the proper term. The key is that both words are present in the text; the speaker/writer perceives them to be related in some way and this perception is conveyed to the hearer/reader by means of the metaphor.

a. Some traditions have developed formulaic adjective/noun word pairs.
   i) The classical tradition produced the Homeric epithet; its function, though studied since the 1920's, is still not completely understood. We do know, however, that for its hearers as well as for its practitioners, it contained special emphasis.

   The shorter formulae may best be examined in the noun-adjective combinations, which are used not merely for gods and men [sic] but for all sorts of inanimate objects such as spears, swords, the sea, and the sky. In using these Homer follows marked rules with few variations from them, and the rules are determined by the demands of the hexameter and the inflected nature of Greek syntax. Just because Greek nouns are declined and have different metrical values according to their cases, so the formulae have been worked out with consummate care and skill to be ready for all cases in the declension and for every space or place to be occupied in the hexameter. For instance, there are 56 different noun-adjective combinations for Achilles, but each is determined by the case of the noun and the position to be occupied in the verse. With certain exceptions..., this is Homer's normal practice, and it indicates an ancient and powerful tradition which has invented such combinations for almost every need. At times it looks a little
mechanical, as when certain epithets are not so much otiose as out of place. Thus we hardly expect the Cyclops Polyphemus to be called ‘god-like’...or great-hearted..., or the mother of the beggar Irus to be ‘lady mother’...or the herdsman Philoetius to be ‘leader of men’....Such cases suggest that even for Homer some epithets had little meaning and were used chiefly for filling a place in the verse. At other times epithets, which in most places are suitable and even charming, do not fit their contexts, as when the sky by day is called ‘starry’...or beached ships ‘swift’...or dirty linen ‘shining’.... Here the familiar epithet is retained in its usual place in the verse, even though it conflicts slightly with the sense.13

ii) The Old English and Old Norse kenning is similarly on a continuum bounded at one end by rigid tradition and at the other by the fluidity of performance composition. Study of the nature and use of epic formulae continues to fascinate while it frustrates scholars, since “[Parry’s] definition... has proved inadequate and, in spite of further study during the last fifty years, the formula has resisted definition.”14

An epithet is a simple name applied to someone; a kenning is an adjectival phrase that becomes a standard feature of references to a person, place, or thing, and is thus used repeatedly....Throughout world literature kenning phrases are common: thus Oedipus is ‘club foot,’ Hamlet is ‘melancholy Dane,’ Cassius is ‘lean and hungry.’15

The pairing of noun + adjective occurs, but rarely, in Ugaritic/Hebrew

word pairs:

There is no Holy One like the Lord,
no one besides you;
there is no Rock like our God.
(1 Samuel 2:2 NRSV)
RSP II 49, III 157

b. Two words of the same grammatical type are paired.
i) The collocation is found in Old Norse and Old English. The formula is a habitual collocation, metrically defined, and is thus a stylization of something which is fundamental to linguistic expression, namely the expectation that a sequence of words will show lexical congruity, together with (and as a condition of) lexical and grammatical complementarity. It may be said of ‘wide’ and ‘way’, for example, that in Old English they set up a reciprocal expectancy of each other, which may operate strictly within the ‘half-line’ structure..., but equally across

13 Bowra, 1962, p. 29
14 Windelberg and Miller, 1980, p. 30
15 Packard, 1989, p. 107
half-lines..., and also of course in prose.... An example with a thematically more powerful connexion (and in consequence one still more widely exploited) is the pair mod and maegen ....16

Collocations are very much more common in Ugaritic/Hebrew word pairs than are those of the kenning type.

For the son treats the father with contempt,
the daughter rises up against her mother
(Micah 7:6 NRSV)
father/mother RSP I 47
son/daughter RSP I 114

ii) Another type of word pairing is a little-understood figure of speech common in oral traditions:
Merismus, a figure of speech akin in some respects to synecdoche, consists in detailing the individual members, or some of them - usually the first and last, or the more prominent - of a series, and thereby indicating either the genus of which those members are species or the abstract quality which characterises the genus and which the species have in common. Symbolically expressed, merismus is the brachylogous use of A + Y or A + B + Y or A + X + Y in place of the complete series A + B + C... + X + Y to represent the collective Z of which the individuals A to Y are members or the abstract z which is their common characteristic, and the terms selected for mention are commonly joined to each other by the copula.17

As long as the earth endures
seedtime and harvest, cold and heat,
summer and winter, day and night
shall not cease.
(Gen 8:22 NRSV)

The four word pairs here -- seedtime/harvest, cold/heat, summer/winter, day/night -- are not intended to refer simply to the occasions, events or activities mentioned. In each case, the two designated are representative of a whole category. Seedtime/harvest does not refer only to those activities, but to everything involved in the agricultural cycle, such as ploughing, cultivating, weeding, threshing, and winnowing as well as sowing and harvesting. Likewise the word pair summer/winter does not exclude spring and autumn, but rather

16 Quirk, 1963, pp. 150-1
17 Honeyman, 1952, pp. 13-4
includes them under the general category of seasons, of which summer and winter are but two examples. It is noteworthy that, when reading or hearing a text which contains examples of merismus like the verse just cited, most people intuitively understand the author's intention.

An interesting example of word pairing occurs in the book of Isaiah:

[You] turn aside the needy from justice
and rob the poor of my people of their right,
that widows may be your spoil,
and that you may make orphans your prey!
(Isaiah 10:2 NRSV)

The text gives us a word pair which is the series needy/poor and follows it with another word pair which gives two examples of that series: widows/orphans. The first pair is a collocation, and the second a merismus.

2) Metonymy. The figure is present in the text; the proper term is not present but suggested. The writer/speaker of the word pair relies on the quick-wittedness of the auditor to identify the word intended. Because so much word association is culturally dependent, this kind of pointing can be used to prevent understanding as well as to emphasise the exclusivity of the knowing group.

In parallel language both the figure and the proper term are sometimes present. Here the metonymic type of word pairing is signalled both by the context and by the semantic distance between the two members of the word pair.

a. A very well known example of this type of word pairing is the phenomenon of rhyming slang. Patterns of speech are larded with successive word pairs in juxtaposition, the second of which rhymes with the unstated proper term. The extent to which the listener understands the allusion is a measure of how close s/he stands to the inner circle.

Rhyming slang, Cockney rhyming slang, is not ancient. It developed in the first half of the nineteenth century, perhaps under the influence of thieves' cant. Just where did it start? Matthews states that one origin was in the language of beggars but, since they have no pressing desire to meet each other, this can hardly have been the main source. Julian Franklin maintains that it arose via the secret language of thieves and was then studied by the police. That seems very plausible because tea-leaves (thieves) need a language code to baffle eavesdroppers and to catch them the police need to break the code. A third impetus may have come from bricklayers' slang, which Coleman states was 'the most picturesque, involved and unintelligible' of all the rhyming slang he had heard and was similarly used 'to baffle newcomers'. His examples
show that he was referring to exactly the type we are discussing: 'Now then, my china plate (mate); out with your cherry ripe (pipe), off with your steam packet (jacket) and set your bark and growl (trowel) a-going'; 'More Dublin tricks (bricks)!' ‘Give me some fisherman’s daughter’ (water); 'He’s elephant’s trunk (drunk)’. A fourth origin, suggested by Dodson and Saczek, is that it started from gangs of Cockney navvies, the period 1800-1850 being the era of navvy gangs building canals and railways, and was used by them to confuse rival Irish construction gangs. In my view, Cockney rhyming slang seems to have arisen chiefly from the second and fourth causes outlined above, namely navvies’ language taken over by thieves.18

That same Pierce Egan who coined the bound structure Tom-and-Jerry was the first writer to bring into fiction a faithful and friendly portrayal of the Cockney.... We do not get a great deal of the Cockney dialect in Egan, although he has some delightful passages, but he is generous with the lively, colourful slang that peppers London popular speech. More than that, he portrays with relish and affection, and without a hint of condescension, not only the Cockney character, but the rich diversity of typical London types which the city had thrown up in the early nineteenth century.... Here, brought into print for the first time, is the world of characters Dickens was to make his own and give immortality to.19

The popularity and ubiquity of Egan’s books, followed by those of Dickens, brought Cockney speech into the immediate English language where it remains today. Nevertheless, however popular, rhyming slang would not have enjoyed a vogue of a century and a half had it not struck a chord for those who heard it. To some degree the appeal lies in the way words pair, and the fun of learning those rules so as to be a member of the inner circle, one who knows.

Berlin, 1985, discusses phonological pairing. I have not covered it here because it would enlarge this topic beyond reasonable limits. Also, owing to our minimal understanding of the pronunciation of ancient languages, any application of this issue to RSP pairs is highly conjectural.

Not all word pairing by metonymy falls into the category of slang, rhyming or otherwise. Ancient writers on rhetoric identified many --

\[ a.euphemism \] : “to pass away” for “to die”

Where it appears in parallel language, the word pair may provide the figure and follow it with the proper term:

But when Reuben heard it, he...[said], “Let us not take his life .”

Reuben said to them, “Shed no blood ....”

---

18 Wright, 1981, pp. 94-5
19 Reid, 1971, p. 207
bantiphrasis, which uses a word whose meaning is the opposite of what the author intends the reader to understand.

Then nightly sings the staring owl

Tu-who;

Tu-whit, Tu-who -- a merry note,

(Shakespeare, Love's Labour's Lost, V, 2, 908)

The following example of this usage from the Hebrew Bible is not in parallel language, but it is an example of the way a particular style of speaking/writing flows over from its original usage. The antiphrasis is so clear that modern translations simply give the proper term rather than the figure.

Then his wife said to him, "Do you still persist in your integrity? Curse [Heb = "Bless"] God, and die." (Job 2:9 NRSV)

dixit autem illi uxor sua
adhuc tu permanes in simplicitate tua
benefic Deus et morere
(Vulg.)

The LXX retains antiphrasis, but does not use the verb found either in the MT or in the Vulgate. Also, it has several verses just here that are not present in the MT.

c. synecdoche, the part for the whole
"the Beehive" for "the New Zealand government".

Again, as with euphemism, in parallel language the proper term may be present along with the proper term.

They climb up into the houses,
they enter through the windows like a thief.
(Joel 2:9 NRSV)
**d. Hendiadys** is another kind of pairing, this time two nouns joined by a conjunction. Its name describes it perfectly — one (idea is expressed) through two (words). In the example “odds-and-ends”, one does not think of a pile of “odds” here and one of “ends” over there. Rather, odds-and-ends is a single entity. There is as such no proper term, not even implied; it is suggested by the stated figure which is the word pair. In this it differs from rhyming slang. In rhyming slang, the word pair is the figure which points to the unstated proper term. In hendiadys, there is no specific word which is the unstated proper term. Rather, the idea is suggested by the word pair that forms the hendiadys.

The way hendiadys works is elucidated by the image with which we started the last chapter. The stereoscopic nature of “seeing” allows more of the imagined proper term to be appreciated than any number of stated figures could. What is arguably the most famous hendiadys ever occurs in the Twenty-third Psalm "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life" (Ps 23:6a NRSV). ידוע and ידוע together point to an attribute of Yahweh which, though ineffable, is more nearly described this way than any other.

**Zeugma** may be regarded as being of either the metaphorical or the metonymical type of word pair. It contains the figure and the proper term, and thus appears to be of the metaphorical type. But it is also of the metonymical type because it requires the hearer/reader to supply something not already present. Zeugma is defined as “a figure of speech in which a word stands in the same relation to two other terms, but with a different meaning.”

“The room was not light, but his fingers were.”

The relationship between room and light is literal, but the relationship between light and fingers is figurative. While both the figure and the proper term are present in the text, the hearer still needs to understand something not present in the text in order to make the necessary double association. The hearer/reader must understand the difference between the two relationships. There is an identical figure of speech in parallel language. “[Janus parallelism] hinges on the use of a single word with two different meanings, one of which forms a parallel with what precedes and the other with what follows. Thus, by virtue of a double entendre, the parallelism faces both directions.”

---

20 Cuddon, 1976, p. 761

21 ABD, vol. 5, p. 157
"Lie amid lions" has literal meaning, while "lie amid men's flaming tongues" has figurative meaning. Many, even most, translations fail to appreciate Janus parallelism, a difficulty frankly acknowledged by Mitchell Dahood:

How can we tell that such a phenomenon is objectively present in the text and not just the projection of the critic's aesthetic faculty? The Masoretic and versional unawareness of this pattern counsels caution, but the enriched sense and the improved syllable count that result from its recognition permit, even oblige, the translator and exegete to move beyond the Masoretes and the ancient versions. 22

In the above example from Psalms, "[s]chematically represented, the tricolon reads A + B // C // B' + A'." 23 The syllable count is 7 // 3 // 7.

3) Where a word is repeated.
   a) studied repetition
   i) "True" repetition is that done deliberately for emphasis.

   Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow,
   Creeps in this petty pace from day to day...
   (Shakespeare, Macbeth V, 5, 19)

   And Jacob said, "O God of my father Abraham,
   and God of my father Isaac...."
   (Genesis 32:9 NRSV)
   RSP I 001

forbalance

   He did not know the Somali proverb that says a brave man is always frightened three times by a lion: when he first sees his track, when he first hears him roar and when he first confronts him. (Ernest Hemingway, "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber")

   orto pick up a train of thought after one or more intervening words.
   Ah! must --

22 Dahood, 1967, p. 574
23 Dahood, 1967, p. 578
Designer infinite! --
Ah! must Thou char the
wood ere Thou canst
limn with it?
(Francis Thompson, "The Hound of Heaven")

He leads counselors away stripped,
and makes fools of judges....
He leads priests away stripped,
and overthrows the mighty.
(Job 12:17+19 NRSV)
RSP I 165

ii) A word may appear to be repeated but actually be used indifferent senses. This kind of repetition resembles zeugma in that the hearer/reader must understand that the sense of the second usage is different from that of the first.
"The cook was good as cooks go, and as good cooks go, she went." "Never trouble trouble till trouble troubles you."

If you offer to the starving your victuals מַעַדְתָּו, and the appetite מַעַדְתָּו of the oppressed satisfy.
(Isaiah 58:10, Dahood)
RSP III 218

iii) The meaning of a word may be repeated even though the actual words used are different: "common or garden variety". This is very common in parallel language, and is what most people understand by the term.

Be lord over your brothers,
and may your mother's sons bow down to you.
(Genesis 27:29 NRSV)
RSP I 017

In some cases, the roots of the members of the word pair come from different languages: "last will and testament ".

Tyre has built itself a rampart,

24 RSP III, p. 116
and heaped up silver יִכְסֵפָה like dust,
and gold יִכְסֵפָה like the dirt of the streets.
(Zechariah 9:8 NRSV)
RSP I 301

but there is also another pair:

two hundred shekels of silver יִכְסֵפָה
and a bar of gold יִכְסֵפָה weighing fifty shekels,
(Joshua 7:22 NRSV)

The latter word pair is not attested in Ugaritic because בַּדַּל "gold" is thought to be
a word of the South Canaanite dialect. In support of this hypothesis, יִכְסֵפָה יֹדֵב is
by far the more common of the two word pairs in the Hebrew Bible. "יִכְסֵפָה, in
Hebrew, appears to have been the more archaic form, having cognates in
Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Phoenician, while בַּדַּל has cognates in various Aramaic
dialects and in Arabic." Gevirtz comments that
[it] is of interest to note that no biblical poet ever made use of the
parallelism יִכְסֵפָה // בַּדַּל, "gold_1" // "gold_2" from which we may
perhaps infer (1) that tradition did not countenance this pair and (2)
that the alteration in the regular parallelism, יִכְסֵפָה // בַּדַּל to
יִכְסֵפָה // יִכְסֵפָה, may perhaps have been dictated by metrical
considerations.

iv) The classical languages have favoured a construction which lends its use
in English an air of archaicism and pedantry. Juvenal’s well-known comment
"Sed quis custodiet ipsis custodes ?" is customarily translated as "But who is to
guard the guards themselves?", which retains the form as well as the sense of
the cognate accusative. Strictly it is an internal accusative, that is, the noun in the
accusative case refers to the same occasion as does the verb: “Fight the good
fight...."

Now and then in Hebrew a verb and noun are used which both have the
same word root, though they do not really qualify as cognate accusatives:

The bricks have fallen,
but we will build with dressed stones

26 Gevirtz, 1973, p. 13
v) In 1874 Lagarde wrote of the Semitic language phenomenon now known as *idem per idem*, illustrating its form and function in both Arabic and Hebrew. The *idem per idem* consists of a verb in the principle clause repeated in the subordinate clause, and linked by some form of the so-called relative pronoun. The number and person of the subject in the main clause is mirrored in the attached relative clause. Furthermore, the repeated verb has the same sense in both clauses, thus distinguishing it from *paronomasia*, in which similarities of form do not have the same sense. 27

Far and away the most famous (and therefore the most influential) example of this construction is the enigmatic remark of Yahweh found in Exodus 3:14:

\[ \text{"I Am Who I Am." (NRSV)} \]

b) *Reduplicatives* are different again. Only sometimes are they genuinely repetitive; at other times they "involve partial or total repetitions of a single morpheme or word." 28 In every case, they function linguistically as a single word, which is probably why they do not appear in parallel language.

i) *Identical reduplicatives*: tom-tom, ack-ack, goody-goody

ii) *Ablaut reduplicatives*: The vowel changes from short to long, as described by Panini: sing-song, zig-zag

iii) *Rhyme reduplicatives*: Only the initial phoneme changes: hell's bells, ding-a-ling

On the face of it O'Connor is right that "[t]he psychotherapeutic exercise of free association reveals, if it is not obvious, that any single word in a language can be paired with any other." 29 But it needs very little reflection to perceive how far practice falls short of theory, and how that which seems self-evident is often grossly inaccurate.

As happens so often in cultural patterning, one finds relatively few of the total number of theoretical possibilities actually occurring.

---

27 Ogden, 1991, p. 107
28 Dundes, 1974, p. 1
29 O'Connor, 1980, p. 96
discussing rhyme reduplicatives, [Henry Wheatley] observed, ‘There is a remarkable peculiarity connected with this division, viz, that nearly half of the words embraced within it commence with the letter h....’ Except for the obvious error in referring to orthography rather than phonological realities, Wheatley’s observation seems to be sound.30

But there is more point to these remarks of Dundes than the mere recording of speech patterns. Clearly each...idiom has its own individual history and it would be absurd to attempt to explain them solely in terms of what I am calling the Henny-Penny phenomenon. Many of the reduplicatives themselves are loanwords from other leanguages [sic], e.g., hoi polloi from Greek. Clearly the formation could not be explained entirely on the basis of the Henny-Penny phenomenon in English. On the other hand, the borrowing itself may have been encouraged by the existence of an /h/:/p/ predeliction in English. It seems safe to say that folk phonological esthetics may well play a hitherto unappreciated role in both the formation of idioms as well as the determination of which new formations or borrowings gain acceptance 31.

The pairing of words by sense and/or euphony is a cross-cultural phenomenon. We have examined some common types of pairing in English, in order to provide a sense of the scope of what we are dealing with and as an introduction to concepts and terminology. We have further shown how that same classification may be applied to a parallel language to elucidate the use of some words.

Word Pairs In Parallel Language
A great many languages (and these are mostly oral or with a high oral component) exhibit a marked predeliction for parallel structures. “Parallelism, as it is most often called, can be defined as the repetition of the same or related semantic content and/or grammatical structure in consecutive lines or verses.”32 It may be objected that a definition like this is so open-ended as to be practically meaningless. Certainly, it is very broad, but that is because parallism itself is such a broad phenomenon. As a result the open-endedness is a virtue rather than a defect. Indeed, some scholars, following Hopkins and Jakobson, see parallelism as a (perhaps the ) principle underlying all poetry.

Because there are infinite possibilities for activating linguistic equivalences, there are infinite possibilities for constructing parallelisms. No parallelism is ‘better’ or ‘more complete’ than any

30 Dundes, 1974, p. 2
31 Dundes, 1974, p. 6, my emphasis
32 Berlin, 1992, p. 155
other. Each is constructed for its own purpose and context. The device of parallelism is extraordinarily flexible, and its expressive capabilities and appeal are enormous.\textsuperscript{33}

Western scholars prior to the upsurge in the study of parallelism noted in the previous chapter were inclined to equate oral with primitive. Thus a widespread belief grew up that in parallel language everything has to be said twice because hearers are incapable of grasping it at one hearing.

Herder, 'the great advocate of parallelism' according to his own expression, resolutely attacked the afterward repeatedly enunciated bias that 'parallelism is monotonous and presents a perpetual tautology' and that 'if everything has to be said twice, the first saying must have been only half achieved and defective'. Herder's succinct reply -- \textit{Haben Sie noch nie einen Tanz gesehen?} -- followed by a comparison of Hebrew poetry with such a dance, transfers grammatical parallelism from the class of genetic debilities and their remedies into the proper category of purposive poetic devices.\textsuperscript{34}

One of those "purposive poetic devices" is certainly word pairs.

We have already seen what several important modern scholars think of word pairs. Now we must discuss at some length how the members of the pairs are related to each other and what in fact may be the "glue" that holds the members together.

[I]t may not ultimately seem surprising that structural analyses of episodes from Genesis, or of the mythology of Borneo or of Highland Burma, or even a portion of American Indian myths should yield a rich array of binary oppositions, since this may - directly or indirectly - have been their composing principle. Conversely, it would suggest that a comprehending analysis of these forms of elaborate dualism ought to examine this underlying principle of composition.\textsuperscript{35}

But Fox goes further than this in his assessment of the "glue".

The curious feature of the dyads in elaborate traditions of parallelism is that they make -- though commentators on parallelism have attempted to make these distinctions -- no distinction between similars and opposites. Complementary, contrary, and contradictory terms have in common their relation to one another as a pair. So that possibly, at a first-order level, there is a fundamental unity of similars and opposites, a primacy in polarity. Thus the creation of a semantics of relations would be a prerequisite to a semantics of reference. Binary analysis would, therefore, be an essential tool in this investigation, but its field would be more clearly delimited. Roman Jakobson has repeatedly argued that the binary principle appears to underlie much linguistic expression and most poetry. Systems of parallelism are clearly extreme

\textsuperscript{33} Berlin, 1992, p. 160
\textsuperscript{34} Jakobson, 1966, p. 423
\textsuperscript{35} Fox, 1975, p. 102
and relatively transparent developments on a binary principle and for this reason suitable for such analysis.\textsuperscript{36}

Let me emphasise once again that word pairs do not appear only in parallel language. To be sure, it appears that originally they were found there, but the force of that tradition caused their use to spread widely into other styles of language. At the same time they also began to appear in composite forms such as construct phrases and in hendiadys. These are no less examples of word pairs.

\textbf{Some Analyses of Word Pairs}

In the literature I have examined there are surprisingly few attempts to analyse the relationship between the members of word pairs, at least those in parallel language. A number of studies of the Germanic type of word pairing (such as that described by Koskenniemi) are available. However, as noted in the previous chapter, these make no serious attempt either to compare or to contrast that type of word pairing with the type found in parallel language. In this study, the analysis by Elena Gurevic of Eddic poetry\textsuperscript{37} will serve as an example of the Germanic type, while the preliminary report by James Fox of Rotinese\textsuperscript{38} is the only example for parallel language apart from Ugaritic/Hebrew. In addition, there are three on word pairs in Biblical verse which I will discuss.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{Elena Gurevic}

Gurevic defines word pairs in Icelandic thus, where $oc$ means “and”:

Formulaic pairs are formulas that follow the pattern $x_1 oc x_2$, where $x_1$ and $x_2$ are words from the same morphological class having the same inflectional form (except possibly differing in number). Meyer classifies these formulas according to the presence of alliteration or rhyme: all formulaic pairs fall into one of three groups, alliterating, rhyming, or rhymeless. Our model has three possible variants: $Ax_1 oc Rx_2$, $Rx_1 oc Ax_2$, and $x_1 oc x_2$, where $A =$ alliteration and $R =$ rhyme.\textsuperscript{40}

Recognising that Meyer had been too narrow limiting himself to just antithetical and tautological formulas, Gurevic goes on:

Thus we identify three ways of structuring the semantic content of the formulaic pair: the two members of the pair may be opposed, they may complement each other, or they may be synonymous, forming a tautology. All the formulaic pairs found in the \textit{Edda} can be assigned to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} Fox, 1975, p. 128
\item \textsuperscript{37} Gurevic, 1986
\item \textsuperscript{38} Fox, 1975
\item \textsuperscript{39} Watson, 1984; Berlin, 1985; Geller, 1979
\item \textsuperscript{40} Gurevic, 1986, p. 33
\end{itemize}
one of these groups, according to the structure of their content, that is, according to their internal form as opposed to the external form defined by the pattern $x_1 \circ x_2$ described above.\textsuperscript{41}

Examples of formulaic pairs based on opposition are "morning :: evening", "speech :: silence". Examples of those which are complementary are "food :: clothing", "strong :: brave". Examples of those which are tautological are "sabres :: swords", "valuables :: treasures".

Although her formula $x_1 \circ x_2$ would seem to suggest otherwise, members of the pairs do not exclusively occur with each other. This is shown by Gurevic's examples, which list under complementary formulas, for example, "lands :: warriors", "victory :: lands", "weapons :: lands", "gold :: lands". Interestingly, a significant number of the word pairs Gurevic identifies turn up in other unrelated languages which exhibit the kind of word pairs associated with parallelism. These include "morning :: evening", "food :: clothing", "strength :: power".

**Stephen Geller**

Stephen Geller's study of early biblical poetry is one of three that goes beyond the identification of word pairs and seeks to describe the relationship between the members. In order to facilitate matters, these three studies will be described in a group and in chronological order.

Geller's interest in typing word pairs derives from his belief in their importance to semantic parallelism. Thus he describes a typology which seeks to combine the concept of semantic paradigm with the recognition that the relationship of the B Line term to its A Line parallel involves in every case what might be called a 'rhetorical relationship,' that is, one which is intended to produce a certain literary effect.\textsuperscript{42}

How this works is not immediately obvious from the categories, though they are fairly straightforward. They are based on two general types which he calls "simple" and "modified", plus a third category "compound" which consists of a few combinations of the first two types. Simple categories are those in which the two members of the word pair are of the same type, e.g. proper noun, number, etc. Modified categories are those where they are not, e.g. proper noun :: epithet, metaphor :: synonym, and so on.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41} Gurevic, 1986, p. 34
\textsuperscript{42} Geller, 1979, p. 32
\textsuperscript{43} Geller's categories in full may be found in the appendix at the end of this chapter.
There is one further aspect of Geller's typology worth noting. He introduces into his analysis the concept of semantic grades, "another type of semantic distinction".44

By this term is meant inherent degree of parallelism; for example, "house" is felt by most speakers of English to be closer to terms like "home," "residence," "domicile," and also "door," "wall," "roof," than terms which also belong to one of the possible semantic paradigms of the word, like "street," "insurance," "contract," "plumber." Of course, since no procedure exists for hierarchical classification within semantic paradigms, any dogmatism on such matters is misplaced: rather, the distinction described above is useful only from that most shifting of bases, common sense, to which may be added literary sense. An empirical basis for discrimination may be partially established for biblical Hebrew by recourse to the concordance or to related literatures; however, this is by no means a safe guide, in view of the limited extent of surviving ancient Hebrew literature and its distribution over a period of approximately a thousand years.45

The distinction of semantic grades seems to be feeling for the same sort of separation as that promoted between "metaphoric" and "metonymic" in my classification of word pairs.

Even the brief overview of word pairs found in this chapter has been sufficient to introduce the reader to the frustrations inherent in trying to find categories for them. Nevertheless, I feel that the particular problem addressed by Geller with his semantic grades can be elucidated by Jakobson's discussion of the types of word displacement occurring in aphasia. Jakobson's terminology was used earlier in this chapter to help provide a way of classifying word pairs in general. The same terminology may prove useful for classifying word pairs in parallel language.

Wilfred G.E. Watson

Wilfred G.E. Watson is another biblical scholar who has made an attempt at classifying the way word pairs go together. His first concern is that he not be misunderstood, so his definition of word pairs (given in the previous chapter under the survey) is repeated here for ready reference:

Parallel word-pairs can be recognised as such if they fit the following requirements:
1. each must belong to the same grammatical class (verb, noun, etc.);
2. the components must occur in parallel lines;

44 Geller, 1979, p. 41
45 Geller, 1979, p. 41
3. such word-pairs must be relatively frequent. It should be noted that both Gurevic and Watson insist that word pairs must belong to the same grammatical class, even though the former is not concerned with a language that exhibits parallelism.

Watson’s discussion of types of word pairs begins by clarifying the factors involved in how such types emerge. In classifying parallel word-pairs two factors are significant. The first is the semantic element -- for example, the pair ‘father / mother’ belongs to the semantic class PARENT. The second is the restrictive context of the two parallel lines. It is at the intersection of these two components that the various categories (to be listed) arise. The second component (parallelism within a couplet) is necessary, otherwise the semantic class of a particular word-pair would be undetermined. To take our example: ‘father / mother’ could also be hyponyms of the classes SEX (as male / female), ADULT (contrasted with CHILD) and so on. The second co-ordinate fixes the class by narrowing the context and determining which ‘rhetorical relationship’ is operative between components of a particular pair. However, although such considerations must be kept in mind, we are here dealing with the use of poetic technique in practice. Accordingly, rather than remain at the theoretical level, it makes more sense to categorise the different kinds of parallel word-pairs in line with the way poets employ them....Whatever classification is adopted or posited there will inevitably be some overlap: a particular pair may belong under two or more heads, or the same class type may apply to more than one kind of word-pair. Watson’s contribution to the problem of classifying word pairs, in spite of his curious belief that they must be of the same grammatical type, is considerable. It consists in pointing out that the relationship between the pairs is of more significance than what they are in themselves. Thus the pairs need not be of the type A :: A or even A :: B, where A is, say, a proper noun and B is an epithet. In addition, Watson declares, word pairs may be of the type A :: A + B, e.g. PN1 :: son of PN2. This insight, as well as several other of the same type, broadens the scope for understanding word pairs.

It is immediately obvious that the first three of Watson’s categories are those of Gurevic, and that the remainder are largely subsumed under types of word pairing that were discussed earlier in this chapter. For instance, one example that Watson gives of a correlative pair is “blind / lame”, which he suggests might indicate a crippled person. It is more reasonably described as a merismus for

---

46 Watson, 1984, p. 128
47 Watson, 1984, pp. 130-1
48 Watson’s categories in full may be found in the appendix at the end of this chapter.
disability. Identical or repetitive pairs may qualify as reduplicatives. And Watson notes under his comments on reversed word pairs that “[t]here seems to be no reversal for either epithetic word-pairs or numerical pairs”.49 It is possible that that may be explained by reference to Panini’s explanation of word order, or there may be some other explanation hitherto unrealised.

Adele Berlin

The third Biblical scholar in this group has produced by far the most comprehensive and detailed classification of word pairs. Adele Berlin has described three interlocking approaches to classification, which are invoked simultaneously to elucidate the relationship between the members of word pairs. A schematisation developed by her of the relationships existing among their various aspects was reproduced in the previous chapter to describe what she thinks they are, as well as their importance. That diagram is inserted here again to facilitate the discussion of Berlin’s categories (Figure 5).
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<th>Level</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
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<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>

The sorts of categories that we have seen from other biblical scholars Berlin inserts under the grammatical heading. But because the three

---

49 Watson, 1984, p. 135
aspects of her analysis work simultaneously, she does not therefore intend that pairs of words which show "morphological equivalence and/or contrast" only be classified in that section and not elsewhere. This is because all words in context have these three aspects simultaneously.

Word pairs are no different, which only goes to show how difficult it is to describe them in isolation. Berlin's solution, as well as the three aspects as it were superimposed, is a series of rules which may be applied to the lexical and semantic aspects. They are further subdivided into paradigmatic rules and syntagmatic rules, with a third grouping called "syntagmatic pairing in Hebrew", a catch-all for those cases which fall into none of the others. Interestingly, the lexical, grammatical, and semantic patterns she describes are identical and so require no "fit" to allow them to be superimposed in a single situation.

James J. Fox

Another study of the relationship between the members of word pairs is "On Binary Categories and Primary Symbols: some Rotinese perspectives", by James J. Fox. He gives examples of word pairs from Isaiah 2:2-5, parallelism in the Hebrew Bible being a good place to start the discussion:

Biblical scholarship ... has shown that Hebrew oral poetry shared, with Ugaritic and Canaanite traditions, a standardized body of conventionally fixed word-pairs.... In these lines [Isaiah 2:2-5], the sets nations // peoples, ways // paths, word // instruction, Zion // Jerusalem, swords // spears give a translated approximation of the word-pairs of the original translation.

He then focuses specifically on Rotinese:

A dyadic language of the kind used by Rotinese in their rituals is a formal code comprising the culture's stock of significant binary relations. It is a complex code, not arbitrarily restricted to a particular 'domain' of natural language and it is relatively stable.... Furthermore, it is capable of formal study, since it is itself a formal system.... Each dyadic set is a unique semantic grouping that brings into conjunction two separate elements, thereby 'affecting' their individual significance. What is more, an element that forms part of a dyadic set may pair with other elements to create new dyadic sets. Thus whereas the binary categories may be considered as ordered pairs, they are not exclusive pairs. A ready example is civet-cat.... Civet forms dyadic sets with 'cat', 'pig', and 'bees', each set signalling an altered significance for its constituent elements. This feature makes possible the study of these relations, as a system, because any element may have a whole range of

---

50 Fox, 1975
51 Fox, 1975, p. 101
elements with which it forms a set and these elements, in turn, may pair with still other elements, creating an extensive network of interlinkages. In fact, the present stage of analysis suggests that the code for Rotinese ritual language can be displayed as a large constellation of complexly interrelated elements with only a limited array of unconnected elements.52

Gurevic, however, without as far as I can tell any knowledge of Fox’s work, yet manages to suggest how it is possible to determine which sets are “closed” and which “open”.

If we compare the concepts expressed by the opposed formulaic pairs with those expressed by the complementary pairs, we cannot help noticing that they reflect different levels of consciousness: the former are conceptual (mythological, associated with the order of the family and the world), unchanging and primeval; the latter are behavioral, essentially dynamic and changing, reflecting either explicitly or implicitly the realities of heroic and domestic life. The behavioral pairs lack the closed, rigid quality of the conceptual pairs; on the contrary they are open and linked together not necessarily, but potentially. Thus we can easily find open chaining of concepts:...“wise-taciturn”...“silently-comprehendingly”...“comprehending-eloquent”...“eloquence-wit”...“praise-wit”...“praise-good will”....If the opposed formulaic pairs reflect and affirm a fixed, eternally consistent picture of the world and can no more be changed than that world picture can, then the complementary formulaic pairs, embodying fluid and shifting ways of life, inevitably change as life does and easily form and dissolve. The stability and invariability of the contrasts expressed by the opposed formulaic pairs testify to the antiquity of the formulas themselves, while the instability of the complementary formulas indicates the reverse, although complementarity as a device may be no less archaic than opposition.53

It is interesting that both Gurevic and Watson (one of whom does not study parallel language and one of whom does) are of the opinion that word pairs must be of the same grammatical class. Berlin and Geller make it clear from their classifications that they disagree and Fox specifically denies it for Rotinese:

[1]Interlinkages cross-cut conventional grammatical categories, such as verb, adverb, preposition, and noun, joining elements instead by what seems to be some other underlying system of semantic values. Tracing relations among these semantic elements -- the chains and cycles along edges of what is a symmetric graph -- provides a glimpse of the structuring of the cultural code of the Rotinese.54

Reference to the work of Dahood in RSP requires that word pairs (at least those in Ugaritic/Hebrew) need not be in the same grammatical class.

52 Fox, 1975, p. 110
53 Gurevic, 1986, p. 39
54 Fox, 1975, p. 111
In our discussion earlier in this chapter, we looked at word pairs in a general sense -- Homeric epithets, ablaut reduplicatives and the like. It was clear from that discussion that like grammatical class was not a prerequisite for all types of pairing. Is the same true for word pairs in the narrower sense, i.e. those that derive from their inevitable role in parallel language? Do these several ways of classifying word pairs throw light upon the "glue" that joins the members? Or do they seem to be a case of lining up some labelled baskets into which word pairs may be thrown more or less at random? We will address some of those questions in the next chapter. We will examine in detail three texts from vastly divergent cultures, all of which exhibit both parallelism and word pairs. By this means we will be able to see examples of the sorts of things that have been discussed so far.

The authors we have surveyed, Gurevic, Geller, Watson, Berlin and Fox, have provided us with different but potentially complementary approaches to a study of what holds word pairs together. In later chapters we will use some of the concepts that they have described to help elucidate what kinds of consciousness underlay formulaic word pairs in Hebrew. Then we will go on to see how the persistence of these same kinds of consciousness also underlie the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek.
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III

Geller's classification of word pairs:¹

1. Simple Categories
   a. synonym
      i. epithet
      ii. proper noun
      iii. pronoun
   b. list
      i. whole-part; part-whole
      ii. concrete-abstract; abstract-concrete
      iii. numerical
   c. antonym
   d. merism
   e. identity
   f. metaphor

2. Modified Categories
   a. rhetorical category//proper noun or reverse
      i. proper noun//synonym
      ii. proper noun//part-whole
      iii. whole-part//proper noun
      iv. proper noun//whole-part
      v. epithet//proper noun
      vi. proper noun//epithet
      vii. proper noun//antonym
      viii. metaphor//proper noun
   b. rhetorical category//pronoun or reverse
      i. pronoun//synonym
      ii. part-whole//pronoun
      iii. pronoun//whole-part
   c. rhetorical category//rhetorical category
      i. epithet-whole-part//proper noun-epithet (?)
      ii. epithet//synonym

3. Compound Categories
   a. antonym and whole-part
   b. epithet and identity
   c. whole-part and identity

¹ Geller, 1979, pp. 34-40
Watson's classification:
1. synonymous word pairs
2. antonymic word pairs
3. correlative pairs
4. augmented word pairs
"Symbolised as A/AB, they differ from repetitive or identical pairs...by the addition of the modifier B to the repeated element, hence the name 'augmented'...The function of such augmented pairs is metrical, serving to fill out the line as expletives." ³
5. epithetic word pairs
"usually of the pattern PN₁/son of PN₂" ⁴
6. figurative word pairs
"include metaphorical words in parallel and metonymic pairs such as abstract nouns in parallel with concrete and synecdochic couples" ⁵
7. identical or repetitive pairs
8. fixed + variant word pairs
"parallel pairs in which the first element is unchanging while the second is varied (symbolised as A/AB₁B₂B₃, etc.)." ⁶
9. distant word pairs
"are pairs which normally occur in consecutively parallel lines, but are occasionally found in lines which are distant from each other. The recognition of these pairs is dependent on establishing straightforward word-pairs (perhaps even in a different literary tradition such as Ugaritic) and on being able to determine correct stichometry." ⁷
10. reversed word pairs
11. numerical word pairs

Berlin's classification:⁸
1. THE GRAMMATICAL ASPECT
   Morphologic Parallelism

² Watson, 1984, pp. 131-5
³ Watson, 1984, p. 132
⁴ Watson, 1984, p. 133
⁵ Watson, 1984, p. 133
⁶ Watson, 1984, p. 134
⁷ Watson, 1984, p. 134
⁸ Berlin, 1985, pp. 32-126
A. morphologic pairs from different word classes
   i. noun // pronoun
   ii. noun/pronoun // relative clause
   iii. prepositional phrase // adverb
   iv. substantive (noun, adjective, participle) // verb

B. morphologic pairs from the same word class
   i. contrast in tense
   ii. contrast in conjugation
   iii. contrast in person
   iv. contrast in gender
   v. contrast in number
   vi. contrast in definiteness
   vii. contrast in case
   viii. miscellaneous contrast

Syntactic Parallelism
   A. nominal // verbal
   B. positive // negative
   C. subject // object
   D. contrast in grammatical mood

2. THE LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC ASPECTS

The Lexical Aspect: Word Pairs
   A. the paradigmatic rules
      i. the minimal contrast rule
      ii. the marking rule
      iii. the feature deletion and addition rule
      iv. the category preservation rule

   B. the syntagmatic rules
      i. the selection feature realization rule
      ii. the idiom completion rule

   C. syntagmatic pairing in Hebrew
      i. conventionalized coordinates
      ii. binomination
      iii. normal syntagmatic combinations

The Relation Between the Lexical and the Semantic Aspects

Lexical, Grammatical, and Semantic Patterning
   A. lexical patterning
      i. aabb
      ii. abab
iii. abba

B. grammatical patterning
   i. aabb
   ii. abab
   iii. abba

C. semantic patterning
   i. aabb
   ii. abab
   iii. abba

The Semantic Aspect
   A. disambiguation and ambiguity
   B. parallelism as metaphor

3. THE PHONOLOGIC ASPECT: SOUND PAIRS

The Patterning of Sound Pairs
   A. aabb
   B. abab
   C. abba
   D. multiple sound pairs
   E. other occurrences of sound pairs
This chapter seeks to establish by example the principles of parallelism and word pairs that were described in previous chapters. We have written a good deal about the theory, and have accompanied it with descriptions in linguistic terms of what goes on in this style of language. We have also dealt at length with the phenomenon of word pairing, which occurs in conjunction with, though not exclusively with, parallelism. Now it is time to look at examples in order to see what actually happens.

In keeping with our contention that the use of parallelism and its attendant word pairs is a language phenomenon as widespread and pervasive as it is deeply ingrained, we have selected texts from places and times as widely separate as possible. In each case, the language type has been intensively studied by specialists. In fact, it appears that where there is parallel language there are also word pairs, but not necessarily the other way about. The examples of parallel language cited in this chapter all exhibit word pairs. So do Germanic languages, notably Icelandic, though it does not show parallel structure.

The example we use of Nahuatl is one of the earliest New World texts recorded. Since its transcription in 1524, many Meso-American languages have been recorded and studied. But not until the latter half of this century, when anthropological linguistics came of age, did a systematic study of these languages reveal what Jakobson has called "canonical" parallelism.

Parallelism, in its other aspect, refers to the specific manifestations of this binary principle as a strict, consistent, and pervasive means of composition in the traditional oral poetry of a wide variety of peoples of the world. Parallelism is promoted to canon "where certain similarities between successive verbal sequences are compulsory or enjoy a high preference." Jakobson has described this form of parallelism as "compulsory" or "canonical" parallelism - what Hopkins referred to as "the technical so-called Parallelisms of Hebrew poetry."

The study of parallelism, as indeed the initial terminology for its study, derives primarily from the recognition of canonical parallelism in specific oral traditions.1

Sympathetic study by Angel Maria Garibay, Miguel Léon-Portilla2 and, most recently, William Bright3 has revealed the existence of word pairs, which had

---

1 Fox, 1977, p. 60
2 Léon-Portilla, 1985
3 Bright, 1990
been independently christened *difrasisimo*. The close association of word pairing with parallelism, itself a widespread linguistic phenomenon, was not generally known when Garibay conducted his study (1953-4).

The second language we use as an example of parallelism and word pairs is modern Rotinese. The east Indonesian island of Roti was known and to some degree studied by Dutch explorers; some texts were transcribed just prior to World War I. But there is no doubt that the most intensive and deeply involved study has been done over a period of some thirty years by James J. Fox. He it was who first translated the text we are using, aided by Rotinese chanters, and who discovered canonical parallelism in it. And his identification of word pairs greatly enriched their study in other languages because he has been able to show us living examples, much as Milman Parry and Albert B. Lord did when they studied the formula among Balkan Slavic *guslari*.

The *Didi* (reduplication of *di*: 'pole') is a species of giant stick-insect of the order/suborder *Phasmita*. These insects are at least eight to ten inches long and resemble a mantis in form. They become active only at night and are especially visible in the light of the full moon, hence their association with the moon. The set 'spider'/*stick-insect' (*bolau*/ /*didi*) is illustrative of the translation problems one encounters in dealing with ritual language. On my first field trip, I never saw a *didi* and when I asked what this word referred to, I was told by several informants that the *didi* was an insect, 'like a spider'. One night on my second field trip, I discovered the *didi*, was actually a stick insect: it being 'like a spider' had nothing to do with its shape and appearance, but only its co-occurrence in the same set.4

The final example selected was classical Hebrew, because the points of view that are here being promoted will bear fruit in this study of word pairs in Ugaritic/Hebrew. At present it is of the utmost importance to establish their persistence and resilience. Once that has been established, such comparative lines as are drawn will be far more believable. It is for this reason that the text we chose is one widely acknowledged to owe much to Ugaritic influence. As well as demonstrating recognised Canaanite motifs, it contains numerous word pairs for which cognate examples have been found in Ugaritic texts.

All three of these texts have been selected specifically because there could not have been any influence among them. These are not the only possibilities, but in these cases distance in both time and space is so wide that their independence is striking. Other possible texts were excluded for various reasons,

4 Fox, 1975, p. 130
for example -- the absence of a readily available transliterated text, or the admittedly conjectural link with Elamite where Toda is concerned.\(^5\)

I myself have competence in neither Nahuatl nor Rotinese. For information about these languages I am indebted to the scholarship of William Bright and James J. Fox respectively. It is their translations I have used, complete with transliterations. To some extent I have also used their interpretations; but, as will be seen, both parallelism and word pairs are obvious in the transliterated texts even when the translations are laid aside. Specific links made between languages are my own interpretation.

Certain language situations seem to attract parallelism. As numerous scholars have observed, in many cultures of the world tradition demands that certain compositions be given dual expression. Words, phrases, and lines must be paired for a composition to be defined as poetry, ritual language, or elevated speech.\(^6\)

Thus it is no accident that our examples include a theological debate (Nahuatl), a funeral lament (Rotinese), and a hymn (classical Hebrew).

Nahuatl

Nahuatl is a language of ancient origin spoken in central Mexico by people we know as Aztecs. Though it is still spoken, this example was recorded by a Spanish historian shortly after the arrival of the Europeans. It is part of an extraordinary account of a theological debate of 1524, between Spaniards and Indians: on the one hand, twelve Franciscan friars sent to Mexico by Pope Adrian VI and Emperor Charles V, and on the other hand, a group of native Aztec priests and scholars. These proceedings were reported in both Nahuatl and Spanish by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, who is often called the first ethnographer of the New World, working in collaboration with the native elders.\(^7\)

*Coloquios y doctrina cristiana* is the name under which that debate is known today. In the first few chapters, the Spanish friars present the argument that the Nahuatl are ignorant of God; he has sent the Spanish to enlighten them. We will examine a part of the response by the Nahuatl to the argument of the Spaniards.

*Coloquios y doctrina cristiana* VII, 933-71
translated by William Bright

Anquimitalhuia

933 You tell them (the chiefs)

---

\(^{5}\) McAlpin, 1974

\(^{6}\) Fox, 1988, p. 3

\(^{7}\) Bright, 1990, p. 439
ca amo tictiximachilia
   in tloque nahuaque,
   in ilhuicahua
   in tlalticpaque:
   anquimitalhuia
   ca amo nellli teteo
   in totehuan
Ca yancuic tlattoli
   in anquimitalhuia,
   auh ic titotlapololotlia,
   ic tiiotetzahuia.
Ca in totechiuhcahuan
   in oyeco,
   in onemico
   tlalticpac,
amo iuh quitotihui:
ca yehuantin
   techmacatihui
   in intlamanitiliz
   yehuantin quinetlocatihui,
   quintlayecoltitihui,
   quimmahuiztilitihui,
   in teteo:
yehuantin techmachtitiaque
   in ixquich intlayecoltitoca
   in immahuiztitiloca:
inic imixpan titlalqua

   inic titizo
   inic titoxtlahua,
inic ticopaltema,
auh inic titlamictia.
Quitotihui
   ca yehuantin
teteo
   impal nemoa
   yehuantin techmaceuhque

that we did not know
the Omnipresent One,
He who owns the heavens,
He who owns the earth;
you have said
that our gods are not
true gods.
Indeed it is a new message
that you have told them
and we are disturbed by it,
we are frightened by it.
Indeed our ancestors,
those who came to be,
those who came to live
on the earth,
they did not speak thus;
indeed it was they who
gave us
their way of life,
they who believed in
served,
reverenced
the gods;
they who taught us
all their ways of worship.
their ways of doing
reverence;
thus in their presence we eat
earth,
thus we bleed ourselves,
thus we discharge our debts,
thus we burn incense,
and thus we offer sacrifices.
It used to be said,
indeed it was they,
it was the gods,
by whom we live,
they who are responsible for us
This text exhibits to a high degree that canonical parallelism identified by Jakobson and described earlier in this chapter. Often it is so strict that only a single word is changed from one line to the next. In the Coloquios, 964-6:

Indeed it is they who give us
our evening meal
our morning meal
and everything
that we eat
that we drink

The repetition induces a stateliness in the rhythm of the words that heightens the formality of the occasion.

The major feature of the parallelism that we wish to examine here is word pairs. As we saw in the previous chapter, these may be in juxtaposition or in contiguous lines, but the essential feature is that they occur in reasonable proximity and are thought of as a pair. One brings the other to mind, as Fox vividly describes from his encounter with the stick insect. Often (though not
always), in parallel language, one member of the word pair occurs in each of the contiguous lines.

As we saw in the survey of scholarly opinion at the end of Chapter II When Correctly Viewed,... there is a variety of speculation about the function of word pairs in literary and/or performance composition. Some scholars described them simply as mnemonic devices. From what we know about “a belief long held by Gestalt psychologists, namely, that symmetry has a positive effect on memory.”8, we can “observe what might be called a consistent tendency toward the symmetrical pattern being easier to remember.”9 The fact is, though, that the exact way the mechanism of word pairs functions in the composition of parallel language is not understood. Early descriptions of their role constructed by analogy with performance composition among guslari simply do not hold water. More realistic comparison may be made with Rotinese, a living language which exhibits both parallelism and word pairs. To this we will turn after the discussion of Nahuatl.

In lines 964-6 of the Coloquios, the words translated “evening meal/ morning meal” ("tocochca //toneuhca ") are an example of a word pair. Let us at this stage see how well the classifications we described in the last chapter fit these examples. Perhaps the characteristic that springs most immediately to mind here is their alliteration and assonance, characteristics that are common, as we saw in the previous chapter, to all sorts of word pairs. The next most noticeable characteristic is the association in meaning between them, what Gurevic calls opposition, what Geller classes as a simple antonym (1.c). Watson makes this type of pairing his second, called antonymic word pairs. The recognition that some types of pairing are based on opposition goes back to Lowth:

The second sort of parallels are the antithetic -- when two lines correspond with one another by an opposition of terms and sentiments; when the second is contrasted with the first, sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only.... 10

Berlin’s three interlocking types of classification may be applied here as well. In its grammatical aspect, this word pair exhibits morphological parallelism, in its lexical aspect, conventional pairing. We may also appreciate the pairing in its phonological aspect. If we were using Watson’s classification, it would focus on the semantic element of “morning//evening”; the restrictive nature of the

---

8 Graves, 1984, p. 172
9 Graves, 1984, p. 173
10 Lowth, 1778, p. xv
second member helps to fix the context within which the word pair functions, similar to Geller’s “rhetorical relationship”. And Fox's insights bring to bear other potential pairings -- “morning//dawn”, “morning//sunrise”, “evening//nighttime”, etc. -- which remind us of the universe (technically, semantic field) within which this piece of composition is working. Seen from this point of view, Fox's and Watson's methodologies for classification are very similar.

Rotinese

Ana-Ma Manu Kama ma Falu-Ina Tepa Nilu comes from the island of Roti in eastern Indonesia. It is a funeral chant collected about 1900 by the Dutch linguist J.C. Jonker. Though the Rotinese text was published in 1911, Jonker did not translate it and it remained untranslated until 1965 when J. J. Fox undertook the work with the help of several practising Rotinese chanters. His account is contained in an article called “'Manu Kama's Road, Tepa Nilu's Path': theme, narrative, and formula in Rotinese ritual language”.

For Rotinese people, a metaphor frequently used to describe the human condition is “orphan and widow”. There is no more appropriate opportunity to elaborate this metaphor than in a funeral chant. Manu Kama’s Road, Tepa Nilu’s Path tells the story of Everyman as orphan and widow. Lines 189 - 232 describe one episode in the quest -- a feast which offers the hero no joy.

Ana-Ma Manu Kama ma Falu-Ina Tepa Nilu 189-232
translated by James J. Fox

Ma nae: ata uma-t-ala uma leon 189 And she says: Our home, come to our home
Ma ata lo-t-ala lo leon! 190 And our house, come to our house!
Te au sama leo inam boe 191 For I will be like your mother
Ma deta leo te’om boe 192 And I will be similar to your aunt.
Bolok-ala tao do 193 Late in the evening,
Ma fatik-ala tao lada 194 In the middle of the night,
Boe ma lama-nene lololo 195 They constantly listen to,
Ma lama-nia ndanda 196 They continually hear,
Labu kapa behoe 197 The resounding buffalo-skin drum
Ma dele bi’i bendena 198 And the booming goat-skin beat.

11 Fox, 1988
Boe ma na-tane neu inan
Ma teteni neu te'on nae:
Labu sila leme be mai
Ma meko sila leme be mai?
Ma nae: leme Elu Ladi mai
Do leme Tata Feo mai
Te Bulan ana tati hani
Ma Ledo ana soe usu
Nae: na la'o le'a au dei
Ma lope nuni au dei
Fo meko teu taka-teni
Ma labu teu ta-nilu
Boe ma leo Elu Ladi leu
Ma leo Tata Feo leu
Leu te Bulan ana tao feta
Ma Ledo ana tao dote
Boe ma la-lelak Manu Kama
Ma la-lelak Tepa Nilu
De ala ko'o fe Manu Kama nesuk

De lae [do] kana
Ma ala keko fe Tepa Nilu batu
De lae [do] kandela
De malole-a so
Do mandak-a so
Te boe ma ala ke te'i
Ma ala sore ndu'i
De ala fe Tepa Nilu betek
Ma ala fe-n neu lu'ak
Me fe Manu Kama bak
Ma ala fe-n neu lokak
Boe ma Manu Kama nasa-kedu
Ma Tepa Nilu nama-tani
Boe ma ana fo'a fanu de la'o
Ma ana lelo afe de lope

199 So he asks his mother
200 And questions his aunt, saying:
201 The drums come from where
202 And the gongs come from where?
203 And she says: From Rainbow Crossing
204 Or from Thundering Round,
205 For the Moon kills his animals
206 And the Sun slaughters his stock.
207 He says: Lift your legs, carry me then,
208 And move your arms, lead me then.
209 Let us go and see the gongs
210 And let us observe the drums.
211 So they go to Rainbow Crossing
212 And they go to Thundering Round.
213 They go, for the Moon gives a feast
214 And the Sun has a celebration.
215 They recognise Manu Kama
216 And they recognise Tepa Nilu.
217 They pick up a rice mortar for Manu Kama

218 And they call it a small table
219 And they push over a rock for Tepa Nilu
220 And they call it a chair.
221 This was good,
222 And this was proper.
223 But then they cut and divide the meat
224 And they spoon and scoop food.
225 They give Tepa Nilu millet
226 And they give it to him in a rice basket,
227 They give Manu Kama lung
228 And they give it to him in a meat bowl.
229 So Manu Kama begins to sob
230 And Tepa Nilu begins to cry.
231 He gets up and leaves
232 And he stands up and goes.

We find in this composition the same “canonical parallelism”, e.g. parallelism in the stricter sense, that we saw in the example from Nahuatl above. Lines 201-2
show the same change of only one word. The only difference between the two lines occurs with the word pair “drums//gongs”. We may use this word pair to assess the value again of the typologies outlined in the previous chapter, because what may have been proved valid for Nahuatl need not also apply to Rotinese. “Drums//gongs” is, on Gurevic’s classification, a word pair based on complementarity. This means the members in it are 

behavioral, essentially dynamic and changing, reflecting either explicitly or implicitly the realities of heroic and domestic life. The behavioral pairs lack the closed, rigid quality of the conceptual pairs; on the contrary they are open and linked together not necessarily but potentially....[T]he complementary formulaic pairs, embodying fluid and shifting ways of life, inevitably change as life does and easily form and dissolve.1 2

But is Gurevic’s assessment correct for Rotinese? Is “drums//gongs” (Labu // Meko ) one of those pairs the different members of which can also be paired with other words? Within the section of Manu Kama’s Road, Tepa Nilu’s Path that we are considering, the word pair Labu //Meko occurs only one other time (lines 209-210), and there the previous order is reversed. Labu, however, occurs in line 197 where, instead of being paired with Meko, it is paired with Dele (line 198). It would seem, then, from the very limited sample that we have examined, that Gurevic’s analysis has some validity.

But of course Gurevic’s classification is only one of several. If we use Geller’s categories, Labu //Meko is a simple merism (l.d). The very act of classification provokes several questions in this context: are variable elements in pairing to be associated with merism? E.g., are the members of any individual word pair two words selected from the group of many that makes up that class? If so, are the members of those word pairs selected on some other criterion, such as rhyme, assonance, or metrical considerations?

Watson’s typology allows this particular example to be classed under several categories: (3) correlative pairs; (6) fixed + variant word pairs (A//B1, B2, B3, etc.); (10) reversed word pairs.

An attempt to use Berlin’s classification is correspondingly more complex because her classification is so much more complex. It involves, as explained in the previous chapter, the use of three interlocking typologies, which focus in turn upon the grammatical aspect, the lexical/semantic aspect, and the phonological aspect. In the grammatical aspect, the word pair Labu //Meko in lines 201-202 appears, as did “morning//evening” in Nahuatl, to exhibit morphological parallelism. This is to say nothing more than that they both appear to be plural.

1 2 Gurevic 1986, p. 39
nouns used as the subject of the sentence. In the face of my total ignorance of the
grammar and stylistics of Rotinese, I feel unable to comment further on the
relevance here of Berlin’s classification.

Fox himself makes much more of the matrices formed by the pairing of one
word with several others than he does of specific pairs. Unfortunately for the
example we have used above, he does not seem to have turned his attention to
musical instruments, as he has to plants. It may well be that analogous types of
patterning would emerge, if he did.

Classical Hebrew
Classical Hebrew is the language of the Hebrew Bible. It has probably not been
spoken as an everyday language for well over two thousand years. Our example
from that language is Psalm 29, a hymn whose provenance is fiercely debated. We
do not know if it is an Ugaritic hymn to Ba’al the god of thunder reworked for the
Israelite deity Yahweh, or if it is an Israelite composition written using motifs and
a style which were traditional in the region (to name just two of the possibilities
that have been suggested). In any case, its antecedents are very old, as it has
stylistic features and motifs which also occur in the early Canaanite language
Ugaritic.

Psalm 29

Give to Yahweh, children of El.
Give to Yahweh a mark of honour
and power.
Give to Yahweh the honour of his
name;
Bow down to Yahweh at (his) holy
appearance.
The voice of Yahweh is over the
waters;
The glory of El thunders;
Yahweh over the vast waters.
The voice of Yahweh is in strength;
The voice of Yahweh is in grandeur.
The voice of Yahweh splinters
the cedars;
Yahweh has splintered the cedars.
of Lebanon.
He makes Lebanon skip like a bull-calf
And Sirion just like the young of the wild oxen.
The voice of Yahweh stirs flames of fire.
The voice of Yahweh makes the wilderness tremble;
Yahweh makes the wilderness of Kadesh tremble.
The voice of Yahweh brings to labour the does of fallow deer;
And he brings kids to premature birth.
In his temple everyone is saying, “Glory”.
Yahweh sat enthroned before the Flood;
Yahweh has been king for ages.
Yahweh will give his people strength;
Yahweh will bless his people in peace.

The parallelism Hebrew exhibits is as striking as in the other examples we have encountered. The very simple type where only one word is changed occurs in verse 4. Here the word pair involved is “strength/grandeur” (יָפָה/יִפְנָה). By now we have sufficient familiarity with the typologies we have been using to classify it immediately as the complementary type, possibly a merismus.

Classical Hebrew offers an advantage to the curious scholar that the other two languages we have examined don’t. For this reason we shall examine the word pairs in this psalm in more detail than we have those in the previous examples. Many, though apparently not all, word pairs in Hebrew also occur in the cognate language Ugaritic, which exhibits even more rigid canonical parallelism than does Hebrew. And, since 1929, we have had access to the library in Ugaritic found at Ras Shamra. Careful study of the language has shown us that “[t]his habit of the Hebrew poet of balancing thought against thought, phrase against phrase, word against word, was also that of his Canaanite
predecessors.”

It transpires that in Psalm 29 fourteen word pairs occur that have cognate examples in Ugaritic:

v. 1 בְּנֵי אֵל “sons” :: “god”
RSP III 017
The two members of the word pair are here joined to form a composite phrase.

1. Give to Yahweh, children of El, ....
classification: two words joined in a construct relationship to form a composite phrase

v. 2 נַחֲשֶׁת נוֹחַד “honour” :: “bow down”
RSP I 174
Here is an example of a word pair the two members of which are not in the same grammatical class, “honour” being a noun and “bow down” a verb. This may be part of the reason why, though they are in adjacent lines, they do not hold parallel positions. If the pairing were “give honour” :: “bow down”, this pair would be more nearly what is generally thought of as parallel.

2. Give to Yahweh the honour of his name;
   Bow down to Yahweh at (his) holy appearance.
classification: modified collocation?

v. 4 קְצָל קֶצֶר “voice” :: “voice”
RSP I 487
An identical repetition which occurs not only in this verse but which begins phrases throughout the central portion of the psalm.

4. The voice of Yahweh is in strength;
   The voice of Yahweh is in grandeur.
classification: studied repetition

v. 5 שָׁפֵל שָׁפֵל “splinters” :: “has splintered”
RSP I 598
An identical repetition, here used in two different aspects.

5. The voice of Yahweh splinters the cedars;
   Yahweh has splintered the cedars of Lebanon.
classification: studied repetition

v. 5 "Lebanon" :: "cedar"

is paired with "Lebanon" on twenty-six of the ninety-one occasions on which the former occurs in the Hebrew Bible.

5. The voice of Yahweh splinters the cedars;
Yahweh has splintered the cedars of Lebanon.
classification: modified collocation

v. 6 "like" :: "like"

Identical repetitive prepositions in parallel positions in contiguous lines.
6. He makes Lebanon skip like a bull-calf
And Sirion just like the young of the wild oxen.
classification: studied repetition

v. 6 "Lebanon" :: "Sirion (Hermon)"

Two place names which occur as a word pair. The grammatical parallelism is obvious. Nevertheless, because the pair is a *hapax legomenon*, there has been scholarly dispute about its provenance. It has now been settled from Ugaritic texts.
6. He makes Lebanon skip like a bull-calf
And Sirion just like the young of the wild oxen.
classification: collocation or merismus

v. 6 "Lebanon" :: "wild oxen"

This seems like a most unlikely pairing, and would certainly never be picked if it were not for its presence in Ugaritic as well. This is a good example of the principle that, while we may recognise word pairs by stylistic clues, there are many we would never predict because of their cultural dependency.
6. He makes Lebanon skip like a bull-calf
And Sirion just like the young of the wild oxen.
classification: unknown (perhaps wild oxen were associated with the Lebanon)

vv. 6 + 9 "does of fallow deer"

---

14 RSP I, 1972, p. 248
This is a word pair the members of which are set at a distance.

6. He makes Lebanon skip like a bull-calf
   And Sirion just like the young of the wild oxen....

9. The voice of Yahweh brings to labour the does of fallow deer....
classification: collocation or merismus

If the pairs "Lebanon :: cedar", "Lebanon :: Sirion", "Lebanon :: wild oxen", "wild oxen :: does of fallow deer" are considered, along with associated pairs such as "Lebanon :: tree" (RSP I 327), "tree :: cedar" (RSP I 442), "tree :: earth" (RSP I 068), "earth :: heaven" (RSP I 71) as well as its reverse (RSP I 554), "doe of fallow deer :: goat" (RSP II 002), "bull :: wild ox" (RSP I 508), "bull :: El" (RSP I 607) and "wild ox :: ox" (RSP I 10), etc., a matrix of the type described by Fox could be developed. All the word pairs in such a matrix resonate together to evoke a semantic field that it would be difficult to enter by any other means.

We will discuss in detail a very complex example of this kind of matrix in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs?. The words in it all pair with more than one word.

v. 10 בָּשַׁלְכָּה :: בָּשַׁלְכָּה, "sat" :: "has sat"
RSP I 271
Identical repetitive verbs in parallel positions in contiguous lines; the first is in the perfect aspect and the second in the imperfect waw consecutive, and therefore is construed as though being in the perfect.

10. Yahweh sat enthroned before the Flood;
    Yahweh has been [lit. has sat as ] king for ages.
classification: studied repetition/one word used twice with two different meanings

v. 10 בּ :: בּ, "before" :: "for"
RSP I 313
Identical repetitive prepositions in parallel positions in contiguous lines.

10. Yahweh sat enthroned before the Flood;
    Yahweh has been king for ages.
classification: two words with the same meaning?

v. 10 מָלָא :: מָלָא, "king" :: "eternity"
RSP I 363
The word pair יִבְשָׂם/יִבְשָׂם has here been joined to form the phrase “king for ages”.

10. Yahweh has been king for ages.
classification: two words joined in a construct relationship to form a composite phrase

v. 11 יִבְשָׂם/יִבְשָׂם, “strength” :: “peace”
RSP I 545

Note that יִבְשָׂם (“strength”) here is not the same word as יִבְשָׂם (“strength”) in v. 4.

11. Yahweh will give his people strength;
Yahweh will bless his people in peace.
classification: collocation or merismus

v. 11 יִבְשָׂם/יִבְשָׂם, “give” :: “bless”
RSP II 022

This example of the word pair exploits the cognate relationship between the noun יִבְשָׂם (“knee”) and the verb יִבְשָׂם (“to bless”).

11. Yahweh will give his people strength;
Yahweh will bless his people in peace.
classification: collocation or merismus

How Much Richer

We have now briefly considered the richer textual analysis made possible by an appreciation of word pairs. This enrichment proceeds on two levels. In stylistics, the study of parallelism has been freed from the prejudice which some people still hold, that it is used by those who are too underdeveloped for “higher” forms of versification. In semantics, the discovery of traditional pairs of words and of the matrices that multiple pairings produce has added greatly to our appreciation of the sorts of mind sets within which people who use parallel language move.

We have seen that the habit of thought which produces parallelism and word pairs exists across cultures and languages where there is no possibility of influence. Further, in some cases the very word pairs themselves are identical. This should not surprise us too much. After all, “morning :: evening” is a reasonable word pair in any culture, as is “female :: male”, “hungry :: satisfied”, and so on. And what we expect turns out to be so: the pair “heavens :: earth” occurs in the Coloquios 936 as well as in Hebrew (RSP I 71), and the pair “widow :: orphan” forms the basis for Manu Kama’s Road, Tepa Tilu’s Path in Rotinese, as we saw. It occurs also in Ugaritic/Hebrew (RSP I 40), as well as its reverse
“orphan :: widow” (RSP I 262). We may posit that some of these pairings are universal, and that they may serve to illuminate the way humans structure their perceived reality in order to interpret it.

On the other hand, we should resist the temptation to reduce word pairings to the obvious associations. Fox’s experience with the stick insect is an example already cited. RSP I 329 “silver :: clothing” is not a pair that would spring immediately to mind on semantic grounds. Nor does it show stylistic features that might encourage pairing, such as alliteration, assonance, or a form of reduplication. Nevertheless, it is paired in both Ugaritic and Hebrew. The pairing was a source of puzzlement to scholars; as long ago as the translation of the Septuagint (3rd century BCE) “clothing” was corrected to “gold” in Job 27:16. On the basis of the Ras Shamra texts, we can now confirm that the Masoretic Text preserves an original sense.
DID WORD PAIRS PERSIST?

Twentieth century scholarship has established the prevalence of parallelism in various language systems throughout the world. Word pairs have been shown to be important to the way those systems work. But we still do not understand exactly how speakers and writers use them. In spite of contemporary work with speakers of parallel language, we have little knowledge of the mechanics of such usage.

This is hardly surprising, as relatively little is known about the mechanics of any language use. We do not know, for instance, exactly how children learn to speak. Imitation is a large part of it, to be sure; children who grow up hearing English spoken speak English themselves, and the same thing happens with children who hear Swahili. But there is a qualitative (not merely quantitative) difference between a child learning to speak and a parrot learning to speak. And it is that difference we cannot yet fully describe.

Another example which shows our imperfect knowledge of the way language is used is the problem of nativelike speech. We are not at all certain what constitutes it nor how to define it, though an occasion where it is missing is instantly identifiable to a native speaker. Nativelike is not the same as idiomatic, still less as grammatically correct. It is some obscure combination of context, idiom, timing, pronunciation, and what for want of a better word we might call sensitivity that gives native speakers *le mot juste*.

The Tradition That Carried Word Pairs

The question at issue here turns on the way users of Ancient Near Eastern languages understood their own use of word pairs. Some light is thrown upon the matter by the study of contemporary speakers of parallel language. They, as we have seen, use it with skill and ease; but people following an oral tradition usually do not analyse speech patterns nor the rationale behind them beyond a firm anchoring in the tradition of the elders. The title of one of Fox's articles says it all: "Our ancestors spoke in pairs." (1974) And that fact may be enough to explain the continuity between Ugaritic and Hebrew word pairs, because the Ugaritic of the library found at Ras Shamra predates classical Hebrew by perhaps as much as five hundred years. But does the power of this same tradition account for the next five hundred years or the thousand years after that?

---

1 See Pawley and Syder, 1983.
2 Fox, 1974
For evidence about that we need to consider which language took the place of classical Hebrew when it ceased to be spoken. That language was Aramaic, sadly under-studied by the majority of biblical scholars even though it was the primary international language of literature and communication throughout the Near East from ca. 600 B.C.E. to ca. 700 C.E. and was the major spoken language of Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia in the formative periods of Christianity and rabbinic Judaism.  

Scholars have paid relatively little attention to Aramaic because, with a few exceptions, it is not the language in which scripture was originally written. It has, however, had considerable influence on the way scripture is viewed, not least on the Syriac translation, the “Peshitta”. The term “Peshitta” refers to the whole Bible, which was translated into Syriac a few books at a time during the first and second centuries CE. The translation of the Pentateuch in particular has some literary connection with the (oral) Aramaic tradition of the Targums, though it was basically done from the Hebrew with an occasional side look at the LXX.

Aramaic is a language which is in its most standardised form contemporary with the later portions of the Hebrew Bible, for which there has been found preserved a large variety of documents of a formal and informal nature, as well as several that have undergone prolonged textual transmission. This language is in addition cognate with classical Hebrew, and indeed later Jews spoke Aramaic after the classical language of the Hebrew Bible fell into disuse as a spoken language, which may have happened not long after the Exile. (Some groups, like those at Qumran, seem to have continued to speak a late form of Hebrew.) Aramaic remained the spoken language of ordinary Jews in Palestine during the Greek period, a fact attested both within and outside biblical sources.

Most admirable...was the mother, who saw her seven sons perish in a single day, [but] exhorted...each of them in the language of their forefathers...Antiochus, suspecting insult in her words, thought he was being ridiculed. 2 Maccabees 7:20-4 (NAB)

The most important considerations in the study of the comparisons are: that it has relatively standardised forms which are known from many documents of different kinds, that it is cognate with another language with which we are already acquainted, and that it was used widely in both spoken and written forms by those people whose self-consciousness about language we wish to study. Together they make Aramaic texts ideal places to look for parallelism in general.

3 ABD, vol. IV, p. 173
4 Daniel 2: 4-7:28; Ezra 4: 8-68, 7:12-26; Jeremiah 10:11; two words in Genesis 31:47; a few words here and there in the Christian scriptures
terms, and word pairs in particular. If the latter are present, and particularly if the ones found happen to be those in RSP, i.e. cognate with Ugaritic and Hebrew, it indicates a trajectory which we may document from about the middle of the second millennium BCE in Ugaritic, through classical Hebrew and Late Hebrew, into Aramaic.

For this purpose then, we must first consider the language styled "Imperial" or "Official" Aramaic, that which lasted to about 200 BCE.

From a linguistic perspective, what characterizes this period above all is that it witnessed the development of a literary, standard form of both the language and its orthography - an ideal to be strived for, at least in literary texts and formal documents. The model for this standard appears to have been Babylonian Aramaic as spoken and written by educated Persians. This ideal, in the guise of Standard Literary Aramaic, was to last more than a thousand years.5

The Aramaic found in the Hebrew Bible is written in the same Imperial Aramaic. However, since the Masoretic consonantal text of the Old Testament (Biblia Hebraica) was first definitively established along with the canon in the 1st cent. A.D., later orthographic conventions and grammatical forms (as well as a few Hebraisms) were able to penetrate the text..., while the fragments from Qumran (...before 68 A.D.) show the usual Hasmonaean orthography of their time.6

And, it transpires, the trajectory remains unbroken, for Aramaic too exhibits parallelism.

While in their own compositions the Rabbis showed ample awareness of the elements of biblical style, as exegetes they seem singularly blind to the same procedures. Stated bluntly, the point is this: the ways of biblical parallelism are everywhere apparent in rabbinic prayers and songs: yet nowhere do the Rabbis speak of parallelism or acknowledge it in their explanation or interpretation of biblical verses, even when -- to our eyes -- it is so obvious that the greatest industry seems necessary to devise a reading that does not comment on it. The resolution of this apparent paradox is not difficult to find, but it is an important step in understanding what happened to parallelism after the close of the biblical period -- why, specifically, it was "forgotten" by the Jews.7

And in a footnote on the same page, Kugel notes that this "forgetting" was pointed out by G.B. Gray, Forms of Hebrew Poetry , p. 27: 'At the very time that the Rabbis were examining Scripture with eyes blind to parallelism, other Jews were still writing poems that made all the old use of parallelism.' Not 'other Jews' -- the very same!8

5 ABD, vol. IV, p. 174
6 Beyer, 1986, p. 19
7 Kugel, 1981, p. 97
8 Kugel, 1981, p. 97
The problem of the way Aramaic-speaking people used parallelism is complicated by the variety of dialects (from the 8th century BCE to the present) for which we have examples. Nevertheless, there was a standard form, simply for ease of communication throughout the Near East.

Aramaic had already in the 8th cent. B.C. become the *lingua franca* of the Near East: between 735 and 732 B.C. a Phoenician from Tyre writes a non-extant Aramaic letter to the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser III..., in 701 B.C. the ambassadors of the Assyrian king Sennacherib and the Judaean king Hezekiah negotiate in Aramaic so that the people of Jerusalem do not understand (2 Kings 18:26) and c. 600 B.C. a Canaanite king, Adon, writes an Aramaic letter to the Egyptian Pharaoh. Aramaic was influenced at first principally by Akkadian, then from the 5th cent. B.C. by Persian and from the 3rd cent. B.C. onwards by Greek, as well as by Hebrew, especially in Palestine.

**Word Pairs in Aramaic**

We have seen how parallelism persisted in spoken and written Aramaic well into the Common Era. I am of the opinion that we will find word pairs - the very same word pairs that we have already seen persist from Ugaritic into classical Hebrew - continue into the Aramaic written by Jews. After all, the tradition had already remained in Palestine for as much as a millenium. The new language was cognate, it exhibited parallelism, and was spoken by people whose thought and writing patterns were heavily influenced by the word pairs found in scripture. It is difficult to believe that they did not persist.

The first place to look for word pairs is the most obvious - namely, the portions of the Hebrew Bible which are in Aramaic. Dahood notes that RSP I 028 "ktqts 'to eat'/ 'to gnaw' is found twice in the Aramaic of Daniel (3:8 and 6:25)." "Accordingly, at this time certain Chaldeans came forward and denounced the Jews" (Daniel 3:8 NRSV). The phrase here translated "denounced" is נָאַלַף הָֽקָטָשׁ. It "incorporates the two verbs of the word pair, and is an ancient Akkadian expression having the idiomatic meaning 'to bring an accusation'".

---

9 "From the 8th cent. B.C. on, Aramaic, thanks to its simplicity and flexibility, increasingly superceded Akkadian and Canaanite - a development which was further accelerated by Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian imperial policy and the use of transportation as part of that policy in the 9th - 6th cent. B.C. In the time of Jesus Aramaic was spoken throughout the Semitic area apart from where Punic (until the 5th cent. A.D.) and Arabic were used. In the 7th - 10th cent. A.D. Aramaic was extensively replaced by Arabic in conjunction with the spread of Islam. It still survives today, however, in a few places." Beyer, 1986, pp. 9-10

10 Beyer, 1986, pp. 13-4

11 RSP I, p. 108

12 Lacocque, 1979, p. 61
The same expression with the same idiomatic meaning occurs again in Daniel 6:25. These two verses constitute the only occurrence of a word pair from RSP found in the Aramaic portions of the Hebrew Bible.

**Extra-Biblical Sources**

The next place to look is in extra-biblical works that are found in about the right place and time. Of necessity, many of these must be from Qumran texts and from rabbinic authors. The pieces I have chosen for analysis were picked at random from amongst those to which I had access, and which included both a text in square Hebrew characters and an English translation. In fact, only one of these is in Aramaic. The others are in a Late Hebrew which is very like the language of the Hebrew Bible. Some scholars working on the Qumran texts are of the opinion that the spoken language of that community was Late Hebrew rather than Aramaic, because it has been noted that there are no aramaicising mistakes in the Hebrew texts.¹³ The word pairs for which I have searched are those found in RSP. To the best of my knowledge, no attempt other than this has been made to check extant texts in Aramaic and Late Hebrew for them.

Reference to exegetical and compositional habits of the rabbis pushes the argument forward into the Common Era. Valid it may be, but as extrapolation it remains subject to the constraints of any extrapolation. There is, however, a traceable history of Hebrew/Aramaic between the composition of classical Hebrew poetry and what the rabbis have left us.

The heightening characteristics of biblical style, and parallelism in particular, were clearly not lost on the remnant of Israel that lived at the close of the biblical period. Prayers and songs going back to this period, like indeed later Hebrew, Aramaic, and even Greek compositions of various genres, show themselves to be the true heirs of biblical style, not only in their penchant for familiar forms of "seconding" but in their use of traditional pair-words, differentiation, repetition, verbal alternations, and ellipses -- features that, as we have seen, accompany parallel style in much of the Bible. Nor ought one to see here an antiquarian revival. For the ways in which these compositions differ from, for example, their Psalter prototypes, precisely in the matter of parallelism, argue that they are a development rather than an imitation of biblical stylistics, one that observed some of the conventions of the latter and yet underwent an overall loosening of constraints and formulae, a phenomenon that in fact probably began in the latest stratum of biblical texts.¹⁴

¹³ Comment in a lecture delivered by Carol Newsom at the University of Otago, May 1994.
¹⁴ Kugel, 1981, p. 96
Composition is a pre-eminent way to determine the mentality of the composer. But this century perhaps more than any other has recognised how opaque composition is. And we must add the insights of Parry and Lord (confirmed by many others) that oral poets are fully capable of skill equal to that of writing poets. Promoters of the Parry-Lord theory emphasise the importance of formulae and of variation in performance composition. Parry and Lord's suggestion that these characteristics are coextensive with the practice of oral poetry must be modified in the light of experience in other predominantly oral cultures. For instance, "Andrzejewski reports that Somali poets memorize long poems, build huge repertoires, 'can learn a poem by heart after hearing it only once', and have illiterate audiences arguing later over the purity of textual readings...."15 The experience in India with the transmission of sacred texts also reflects minute attention to detail, a feature scarcely recognised by the original formulation of the Parry-Lord theory, though Lord agreed that the Vedas constitute an important exception to the theory.16

Aramaic seems to have retained the use of word pairs in its spoken and compositional forms, though their importance gradually ceased to be recognised when the language was used as a translation (for instance in the Targums) under the influence of rabbinic exegesis. Dahood has examined some Qumran texts for RSP word pairs, but appears largely to have confined his efforts to manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible. His research has been fruitful in that it has turned up readings that support the presence of word pairs cognate to Ugaritic in the Hebrew Bible, when later Masoretes (through alternative pointing or division of words) overlooked them.

The words upon which I wish to focus are the Ugaritic/Hebrew word pairs collected in Ras Shamra Parallels. These words are significant for several reasons: First, as we have seen, word pairs appear to be an integral part of the structure of parallel language. Later we will observe how the Seventy handled them in translation, which serves to illuminate their self-consciousness as translators. Second, these particular word pairs provide a continuity of expression and therefore, we can deduce, of thought in Canaanite/Israelite circles from the second half of the second millennium BCE into the Common Era. It is critical that we establish the boundaries of the usage of these particular word pairs as

15 Fry, 1975, p. 45
16 "It should be clear...that sacred texts which must be preserved word for word, if there be such, could not be oral in any but the most literal sense." Lord, 1960, p. 280, fn 9
clearly as possible. Only then will we be able to position the Seventy in their
correct relation to the practice of word pairing, insofar as it is possible to know.
Toward the close of the Old Testament era, we have a unique way of testing the
understanding of those who read and used those very word pairs. It is the
translation of the Septuagint.

First, however, we must establish the trajectory from Ugaritic/Hebrew
through Late Hebrew and Aramaic into the Common Era. That from Ugaritic into
classical Hebrew has already been established. How much further can we take it?
That is the subject of this chapter.

The importance of establishing a trajectory for parallel language and the
existence of word pairs can scarcely be overestimated. That these word pairs were
part of the living tradition and its attendant literature in Ugaritic/Hebrew/
Canaanite traditions has been sufficiently well established. But as the spoken
language changed to Aramaic, did the same tradition continue? Kugel maintains that the tradition of parallelism continued and cites examples from
Qumran to Saadiah Gaon (882-942 CE). Evidence of word pairs is not so clear-cut
as that for parallelism, though it seems that where we have parallelism we also
have word pairs. Dahood gives examples of the use of a few word pairs in
Qumran texts not biblical in origin. The number is negligible. It is not however
my purpose to quantify the number of word pairs used in Late Hebrew or
Aramaic. I wish only to establish a trajectory for their use amongst Jews at a time
which post-dates the translation of the LXX, the better to establish their presence
as a living tradition among those very translators.

A Prayer from Qumran
Kugel gives an example of a hodayah found at Qumran. He notes its late
characteristics and makes much of the parallelism. I have examined it for the
word pairs found at Ras Shamra, and found a not insignificant number. The
language is not Aramaic but a Late Hebrew, written by the pious men of Qumran
somewhat in the style of prayers found in the Hebrew Bible. That the style is not
slavishly imitative is seen by Kugel as evidence that parallelism (and, we would
say, word pairs) was a living tradition.

Prayers and songs going back to this period, like indeed later Hebrew,
Aramaic, and even Greek compositions of various genres, show
themselves to be true heirs of biblical style, not only in their penchant
for familiar forms of “seconding” but in their use of traditional pair-
words, differentiation, repetition, verbal alterations, and ellipses--
features that, as we have seen, accompany parallel style in much of the Bible. Nor ought one to see here an antiquarian revival. For the ways in which these compositions differ from, for example, their Psalter prototypes, precisely in the matter of parallelism, argue that they are a development rather than an imitation of biblical stylistics, one that preserved some of the conventions of the latter and yet underwent an overall loosening of constraints and formulae, a phenomenon that in fact probably began in the latest stratum of biblical texts.  

It contains proportionately as high a number of word pairs as does Psalm 29, the psalm generally agreed to be of North Canaanite provenance which we analysed in the previous chapter. If the high number of word pairs cognate with Ugaritic is evidence of that provenance, as is often alleged, what does that say about this little prayer? It seems to me that it says one of two things: 1) The scribes of Qumran were so steeped in biblical language that they reproduced it right down to the word pairs, though the latter had long since fallen out of “ordinary” language. This situation is similar to the way “thee” and “thou” remained in the language of Christian prayer and liturgy long after they fell into disuse in everyday speech. 2) (Some) word pairs remained in the tradition so strongly that they were a natural part of the way everyone spoke and wrote no matter what kind of style of language they were speaking or writing. This situation is similar to the way some obsolete words remain in common usage, like “fro” in “to-and-fro”. Naturally, these two possibilities are not exclusive; they could and probably did occur together, each reinforcing the other. The likelihood is greater that tradition, in the form of option 1 or 2 above or both, takes a prominent role, when we note that the pairs are not just any pairs, but are cognate with the very same traditional pairs that we have already seen in Ugaritic and in the Hebrew Bible. In this prayer, indeed, we find seven different examples of those pairs, one occurring twice and one an uncertain number of times.  

It is hardly surprising that RSP I 032 (“God”:: “God”) appears in verses 1 and 4; this is a prayer after all, and these verses show the studied repetition described in Chapter III How Word Pairs Mean. Similarly the conjunctions in verses 1 and 2 (RSP 1 275) fail to raise eyebrows.

The marked parallelism of verses 1 and 3 is rather different:

1....you....have sheltered me against [the sons of] men....

2....you have saved a poor man’s soul in the lions’ den....

---

18 Kugel, 1981, p. 96
19 The texts discussed and the word pairs in them appear in an appendix at the end of this chapter.
The pair (RSP III 059) is present, infrequently, in the Hebrew Bible, though never in the strict parallelism of this prayer.

Judah is a lion's whelp;
from the prey, my son, you have gone up.²⁰

As regards classification, what would we call this? It is scarcely a merismus or even a collocation. It is probably best to regard it as a word pair one member of which is a literal term and the other a metaphor for the same thing, making it a kind of kenning. That interpretation is credible for both the texts just mentioned.

There are several examples of the word pair "שֵׁם: שֵׁם" (RSP I 391). Though its common translation is "soul", commentators agree that שֵׁם in classical Hebrew should not be interpreted as Western thinkers under the influence of Greek philosophy tend to regard it. In fact, the meaning approximates "what makes something alive as opposed to dead". For this reason the שֵׁם was associated with blood (Leviticus 17:11), and the word is sometimes translated "life" in modern versions. How later Jews, those who wrote the texts we are examining in this chapter, regarded the concept is another matter.

2. For in my soul's trouble you have not abandoned me/
you have heard my crying in my soul's distress....
3. So that you saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den....
4. But you my God shut up their teeth/
lest they savage the soul of one poor and needy/ /
5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard/
leaving unharmed your servant's soul....

Verse 2 is a clear case of parallelism, though of what sort may be a matter for dispute. Synonymous or staircase parallelism seem the most likely contenders. But there is another way of viewing the use of שֵׁם in the whole prayer which is less clear-cut and less satisfying to tidy minds. On the other hand, it explains all the pairings the same way. There could be a system of interlocking pairs so that the one just quoted stands as the first pair, followed by the second pair that takes the second occurrence of שֵׁם as its first member, and so on. This way the second pair would be

2. For in my soul's trouble you have not abandoned me...
3. So that you saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den....
and the third pair,
3. So that you saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den...
4. ...lest they savage the soul of one poor and needy....

with the final pair

²⁰ Genesis 49:9 NRSV
4. ...lest they savage the soul of one poor and needy....
5. ...leaving unharmed your servant's soul....

If this analysis is correct, the use of pairing is traditional as are the words chosen, but the stylistics of the prayer shows the kind of development Kugel noted in its loosening, and the pairs are interlocked to provide continuity.

Verses 3 and 5 both have phrases which contain a striking word pair.

3. ...whose tongues are as sharp as a sword....

5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard....

This pair (יִשָּׁרִי רְפֵּאָךְ RSP III 113) is not one that would spring immediately to mind, as do "father" :: "mother" or "heaven" :: "earth". However, given the shape of the ancient sword and the image of Death as one who devours, the association becomes understandable. This is a good example of the way it is possible to rationalise the pairing of words without being able to predict it.

The pair "tongue" :: "sword" (RSP III 113), two very concrete words, is juxtaposed in an interesting way with the pair previously discussed (RSP I 391), which we think of as very much less concrete.

3. So that you saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den/
   whose tongues are as sharp as a sword /....

5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard/
   leaving unharmed your servant's soul....

Two examples of the pair "tongue" :: "sword" fit inside the pair "soul" :: "soul". There is nothing to say that the Qumran sectarians regarded the images as more concrete surrounded by less concrete, though that is probably the way we would see them.

There is another word pair in this part of the prayer. It is יִשָּׁרִי :: יַעֲנֵי, "sharp" :: "teeth" (RSP III 316), where the same word is used once as an adjective and once in the plural as a substantive. Thus the Hebrew forms a reduplicative, but the translation does not.

3. So that you saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den/
   whose tongues are as sharp as a sword /.

4. But you my God shut up their teeth /
   lest they savage the soul of one poor and needy.

And the final word pair in verse 5 (RSP I 196) is a clear case of collocation, where two words of weaponry are associated.

5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard....

A Fragment of Narrative from Qumran
Alexander Rofe has published an interpretation of a fragment from a cave at Qumran, based on the translation by F.M. Cross. It is in Hebrew and could possibly be a piece from an early version of 1 Samuel which fell out of the MT in the course of transmission. It is included here for examination because it represents one of the few narrative examples in extra-biblical Late Hebrew. This we will examine next for the presence of RSP word pairs, though Rofe sounds a cautionary note regarding the style.

We would suggest that linguistic criteria are inadequate for such short passages. Late authors knew the classical texts almost by heart and were sometimes able to imitate perfectly the classical style in writing a few verses.\textsuperscript{21}

I wholeheartedly endorse Rofe's remarks. Indeed, I would go further than that and say that what seems at first glance to be a cautionary note, on closer examination provides support for my contention that the RSP word pairs persisted in Late Hebrew and Aramaic into the Common Era.

The Qumran sectarians, like many another band focussed on imminent eschatology, were a closed group. The interests, pursuits and goals of the individuals in the community were largely the same. From this we may fairly conclude that their turns of phrase came over time to be very similar, whatever their initial background. We may see the same thing happening in schools, army units, and religious communities. In addition, the sectarians spent a great deal of time in liturgical exercises, in reading and copying scripture, and in various sorts of godly discussion. They were preoccupied with scripture and its interpretation; inevitably their speech patterns must have reflected the patterns found in scripture, especially since their common language was one very close to the language of scripture.

Thus it is hardly surprising that texts composed at Qumran in Late Hebrew are very much \textit{in the style of}. It would be strange indeed if they were not. Even so, the piece of narrative prose published by Rofe contains five separate examples of RSP word pairs. Three of the five are reduplicatives and none appear in parallel structure, a fact that may be due to its narrative style. The three reduplicatives "all" :: "all" (RSP I 283), "son" :: "son" (RSP I 112), and "eye" :: "eye" (RSP I 433) produce no surprises, and the same is true of the other two pairs "king" :: "servant" (RSP I 362, II 036) and "right" :: "face" (RSP I 461).

The Prayer of Nabonidus

\textsuperscript{21}Rofe, 1982, p. 131
The reconstruction of fragments from this prayer was published by Frank Moore Cross. It is from Qumran and in Aramaic, the only one of the texts in this chapter which is. Nevertheless, the word pairs found in it are no different in either number or type from the others. For technical reasons, I am addressing only the first eight verses.

This prayer, like the one translated by Kugel, contains nine RSP word pairs, three of which are reduplicatives. One is used three times. There is also one pair which does not occur in Ugaritic but which is nevertheless recognised for what it is. The head of that statue was of fine gold, its chest and arms of silver, its middle and thighs of bronze, its legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly of clay. This is the Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew word, thought to be from the South Canaanite dialect. This pair is far more common in the Hebrew Bible than is the pair cognate with Ugaritic, which may reflect North Canaanite usage. This represents the only case in these texts where the continuity of cognate word pairs from Ugaritic to Hebrew to Aramaic has been broken. There remains, however, a point at which the two traditions of word pairs cross over. The Hebrew Bible contains both the North Canaanite tradition and the South Canaanite one, with Aramaic to back up the latter, while Ugaritic backs up the former.

The reduplicatives are "he" :: "he", "year" :: "year", and "God" :: "god". The classification in each case is studied repetition, though none of them is in parallel structure. And the reduplicatives are often several verses apart. While this tends to make them less immediately noticeable, it also encourages a subliminal sense of familiarity with wording, which heightens its effectiveness.

Several of the other word pairs are adjectives + nouns, the noun in each case being and the adjectives being epithets of God. The classification is therefore of the kenning type. "Most High" occurs three times, in vss. 2 and 3, 5, and 6. In vss. 2 and 3, one member of the pair occurs in the former verse and the other in the latter.

1. [...] when he was stricken
2. with an evil disease by the decree of Gold in Teman.
3. [...] and I prayed to the Most High

---

22 Cross, 1984
23 Daniel 2:32-3 NRSV
A Prayer from Qumran

1. For you my God have sheltered me against men/ your Torah have you hidden
   in me till the end of your salvation’s unfolding to me/ /
   בִּכְיָאָהּ אֶלֶף מַרְאָהָאָנָי נֶגֶד בְּנֵי אָדָם/ וְתִוְרָהָ תְּבוֹרָה

2. For in my soul’s trouble you have not abandoned me/ you have heard my
   crying in my soul’s distress/ and taken stock of my pains, recognized my
   suffering/ /
   בִּכְיָבְרָה נֶפֶשׁ לָא תְוַבֵּרָה/ וְשָׁמַעְתָּה בְּנֻקּוֹר נֶפֶשׁ/ וְרֹדְחֵית גַּנָּגִי תְּבוֹרָה

3. So that you saved a poor man’s soul in the lions’ den/ whose tongues are as
   sharp as a sword/ /
   וּרְצֵל נֶפֶשׁ גָּיוֹן בְּאֵרֹת הוֹרָה/ אַשֶּר שַׁבָּכָה

4. But you my God shut up their teeth/ lest the savage the soul of one poor and
   needy/ /
   וְאֶלֶף בָּלָא תְוַבֵּרָה בָּכרָה שִׁנְיָם/ וְכָהְרֵב לָשׁוֹנָם

5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard/ leaving unharmed
   your servant’s soul/ and so as to show your power in the sight of men/ /
   וְרֹדְחֵית לָשׁוֹנָם בָּכוֹרָה אֶל תְּבוֹרָה/ בְּלָא נֶפֶשׁ/ וְאֶלֶף בָּלָא תְוַבֵּרָה

vv. 1 :: 4

1 Kugel, 1981, p. 306
1. For you my God...
2. For in my soul's trouble....

vv. 1 :: 3

דניר יבר נני "sons (of man)" :: "lion"
RSP III 059

1. you...have sheltered me against [the sons of ] men....
3. you have saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den....

v. 2

גנש נני "soul" :: "soul"
RSP I 391

2. For in my soul's trouble you have not abandoned me,
you have heard my crying in my soul's distress....

v. 2 :: 3

גנש נני "soul" :: "soul"
RSP I 391

2. For in my soul's trouble you have not abandoned me...
3. So that you saved a poor man's soul in the lions' den....

v. 3

רקרב נני "tongue" :: "sword"
RSP III 113

3. whose tongues are as sharp as a sword ...

vv. 3 :: 4

שษ סף "sharp" :: "teeth"
RSP III 316

3. ...whose tongues are as sharp as a sword/
4. but you my God shut up their teeth....

v. 3 :: 4

גנש נני "soul" :: "soul"
RSP I 391

3. ... So that you saved a poor man's soul ...
4. ...lest they savage the soul of one poor and needy.

v. 5

רקרב נני "tongue" :: "sword"
RSP III 113

5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard....

v. 5

_epi לאר "sword" :: "scabbard"
RSP I 196

5. So you returned their tongues like a sword to its scabbard....
A Fragment of a Narrative from Qumran

6. [And Na]hash, king of the Ammonites, sorely oppressed the Gadites and the Reubenites, and he gouged out a[lll] their right eyes and struck terror and dread in Israel. There was not left one among the Israelites in Trans-

7. [Jordan whose right eye was not gouged out by Naha]sh king of the [A]mmonites; only seven thousand men fled from the Ammonites and entered [Jabesh Gilead. About a month later Nahash the Ammonite went up and besieged Jabesh [Gilead] and all the men of Jabesh said to Nahash the Ammonite: Make with [us a covenant and we shall become your subjects.] Nahash [the Ammonite said t]o [th]em: [On this condition will] I make [a covenant with you].

vv. 6 :: 9

v. 6

6. ... and he gouged out a[lll] their right eyes...
7. ... and all the men of Jabesh ....

RSP I 1283

RSP I 112

2 Rofe, 1982
6. ... sorely oppressed the Gadites [lit. sons of Gad] and the Reubenites [lit. sons of Reuben] ....

vv. 6 :: 10  לֹא הָעִבּוֹד, “king” :: “servant”  
RSP I 361, II 036

6. [And Na]hash, king of the Ammonites, sorely oppressed the Gadites and the Reubenites...
10. ... we shall become your subjects  [Heb root עבד = “servant”]

vv. 7 :: 8  בָּרִית, “eye” :: “eye”  
RSP I 433

6. ... and he gouged out a[ll] their
7. right eyes and struck ter[ror] and dread in Israel. There was not left one among the Israelites in Tr[ans-]
8. [jordan who]se right eye was not gouged out by Naha[sh king] of the [A]mmonites;

vv. 8 :: 9  יָפָה, “right” :: “face”  
RSP I 461

8. [... who]se right eye was no[t go]uged out by Naha[sh king] of the [A]mmonites; only seven thousand men
9. fled from [the face of] the Ammonites ....
1. The words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of Babylon, the great king, prayed when he was stricken

2. with an evil disease by the decree of God in Teman. [I Nabonidus] was stricken with [an evil disease]

3. for seven years, and from [that] (time) I was like [unto a beast and I prayed to the Most High]

4. and, as for my sin, he forgave it (or: my sin he forgave). A diviner - who was a Jew of the Exiles - came to me and said:

5. “Recount and record (these things) in order to give honour and great(ness) to the name of the God Most High.” And thus I wrote: I

6. was stricken with an evil disease in Teman [by the decree of the Most High God, and, as for me

7. seven years was I praying to gods of silver and gold, bronze, iron,]

8. wood, stone (and) clay, because [I was of the opinion that they were gods ....]

vv. 1: 4

RSP I 161

1. The words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of Babylon, the great king, prayed when he was stricken....

3 Cross, 1984
4. and, as for my sin, he forgave it (or: my sin he forgave)....

v. 7 נַעֲמָה, "silver" :: "gold"
not found in RSP4

7. seven years I was praying [to] gods of silver and gold....

vv. 3 :: 7 שִׁנָּה, "years" :: "years"
RSP I 574

2. ... was stricken with [an evil disease]
3. for seven years, ....
7. seven years I was praying....

vv. 2 :: 3 נַעֲמָה, "God" :: "Most High"
RSP III 023

2. ... by the decree of Gold in Teman.
3. ...[...and I prayed to the Most High]

v. 5 נַעֲמָה, "God" :: "Most High"
RSP III 023

5. ... give honour and great(ness) to the name of Gold Most High....

v. 6 נַעֲמָה, "God" :: "Most High"
RSP III 023

6. ... was stricken with an evil disease in Teman [by decree of the Most High God.

vv. 1 :: 5 שִׁגְלָה, "king" :: "name"
RSP III 200

1. The words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of [Ba]bylon....
5. ... give honour and great(ness) to the name of Gold Most High....

vv. 5 :: 6 נַעֲמָה, "God" :: "God"
RSP I 032

5. "Recount and record (these things) in order to give honour and great(ness) to the name of the God Most High." And thus I wrote: 1]
6. was stricken with an evil disease in Teman [by decree of the Most High God, ...]

vv. 7 :: 8 נַעֲמָה, "god" :: "god"
RSP I 032

---

4 See text of Chapter V.
7. seven years I was praying [to] gods of silver and gold, [bronze, iron,]
8. wood, stone (and) clay, because [I was of the opinion that they] were gods [...].

vv. 1 :: 2  אֲשֶׁר, “great” :: “God”
RSP I 038
1. The words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of [Ba]bylon, the great king, pray[ed when he was stricken]
2. with an evil disease by the decree of G[d] in Teman.
Psalm 154 from Qumran\(^5\)

16. Behold the eyes of the Lord are compassionate on the good ones

17. And upon those who glorify him he increases his kindness[;] from an evil time will the redeemer deliver [their] soul[.]

18. [Bless] the Lord who redeems the humble from the hand of adversaries [and deliver]ers [the pure from the hand of the wicked,]

19. Who established a horn out of Jacob and a judge of people out of Israel;

20. for his habitation [he desires] Zion ... ch[oo]oses Jerusalem forefer [sic]

vv. 16: 17  לע עיניי הוא לע טובים החוזרים, "good" :: "kindness"

not found in RSP\(^6\)

16. Behold the eyes of the Lord are compassionate on the good ones

17. And upon those who glorify him he increases his kindness....

v. 18  יְבָרֵךְ הוא, "to bless" :: "hand"

RSP I 214

18. Bless the Lord who redeems the humble from the hand of adversaries and delivers the pure from the hand of the wicked.

vv. 16 :: 18  לע עיניי הוא, "eye" :: "hand"

RSP III 240

16. Behold the eyes of the Lord are compassionate on the good ones....

18. Bless the Lord who redeems the humble from the hand of adversaries and delivers the pure from the hand of the wicked.

v. 18  יְבָרֵךְ הוא, "hand" :: "hand"

---

\(^5\) Eschel et al., 1992

\(^6\) See text of Chapter V.
RSP I 217
18. Bless the Lord who redeems the humble from the hand of adversaries and delivers the pure from the hand of the wicked.
A Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice

Column I:

1. [...] wondrous new works. All this He has done wondrously in His eternally hidden ways (or: in His Hidden ways). And not

2. [...] all the words of knowledge. «For from the God of knowledge» came into being everything which exists forever. And from His knowledge

3. [and from] His [purposes] have come into existence all things which were eternally appointed. He makes the former things

4. in] their [seasons] and the latter things in their due time. And there are none among those who have knowledge

5. who can discern [His wondrous] revelations before He makes them. And when He acts all [those who do righteous] ness cannot comprehend that

6. which He purposes. For they are part of His glorious works; before even they existed

7. [they were part of] His [plan].

8. By [For the maskil. Son]g of the sacrifice of the sixth Sabbath on the ninth of the [second] month.

9. [Praise the God] of the angelic elim, O you inhabitants of the height of heights!

---

Newsom and Yadin, 1984
10. [...] most holy. And exalt His glory

11. [...] knowledge of the eternal angelic elim

12. [...] the dignitaries of the height of heights

13. [...] with all holiness

vv. 1 :: 2 :: 3 :: 5 בול בוכל "all" "all"
RSP I 283
1. [...] wondrous new works. All this He has done wondrously in His eternally hidden ways (or: in His hidden ways). And not
2. [...] all the words of knowledge. "For from the God of knowledge" came into being everything which exists forever. And from His knowledge
3. [and from] His [purposes] have come into existence all things which were eternally appointed. He makes the former things
5. ... And when He acts all [those who do righteousness cannot comprehend...]

vv. 4 :: 5 קא אשר "there is not" "not"
RSP I 310
4. ... And there are none among those who have knowledge
5. who can discern [His wondrous] revelations before He makes them. And when He acts all [those who do righteousness cannot comprehend....

vv. 5 :: 6 לפניי, "before" "before"
RSP I 338
5. who can discern [His wondrous] revelations before He makes them....
6. ... For they are part of His glorious works: before even they existed
7. [they were part of His [pla]n.

vv. 2 :: 3 עד "until" "forever"
RSP I 411
2. [...] all the words of knowledge. "For from the God of knowledge" came into being everything which exists (until) [forever]. And from His knowledge
3. [and from] His [purposes] have come into existence all things which were eternally appointed.

v. 2  רֵֽעַת, “word” :: “knowledge”

RSP III 032

2. [...all the words of knowledge....]

Column II:

1. ...

] ] נָל (1)

2. ...

] נ (2)

3. words of [...]  דְּבָרִים (3)

4. truth and [...]  אֶמֶת (4)

5. all the angelic elim...]

] בְּנֵאל (5)

6. great [...

] גָּדוֹל (6)

7. chief [...the third of the chief princes]  רְשָׁי: (7)

8. will exalt[the God of lofty angels seven times with seven words of]  רְוֹרִים לָאֲלָלוֹת מַלְאָאךְ רֹם שְׁבֵּעָה שְׁבֵּעָה דְּבָרִים רְמִים (8)

9. wondrous [exaltations. Psalm of praise by the tongue of the fourth to the Warrior who is above all the]

] בַּלָּאָל חָדָל שָׁשׁ שְׁבֵּעָה דְּבָרִים שְׁבֵּעָה שְׁבֵּעָה בֵּּרְשִׁים (9)

10. angelic elohim [with its seven wondrous powers; and he will praise the God of powers]

] אָלֶּלְיוֹת (10)
11. seven times with [seven words of wondrous praise. Praise of thanksgiving]  

12. by the tongue of the fifth to [the king of glory with its seven wondrous thanksgivings;]  

13. they will give thanks to the God of glory seven times with seven words of wondrous thanksgivings  

14. [Ps]alm of rejoicing by the tongue of the sixth to [the God of goodness with its seven wondrous songs of joy;]  

15. [and he will cry joyously] to the king of goodness seven [times with seven words of wondrous rejoicings.]  

16. [Psalm of praisesong by the tongue of the seventh of the chief princes.]  

17. a praisesong of strength to the God of holiness with [its] seven wondrous praisesongs;  

18. and he will sing praise to the king of holiness seven times with seven words of wondrous praisesong.  

19. Seven psalms of His blessings; seven psalms of the magnification of His ...;]  

20. seven psalms of the exaltation of His kingdom; seven psalms of the praise of His ...;]  

21. seven psalms of thanksgiving for His wonders; seven psalms of rejoicing in His strength;]
22. [seven psalms of praise of His holiness, the twldwt...]

23. [seven times with seven wondrous words, wor[ds of...The first]

24. [of the chief princes will bless in the name of the glory of God all the...]

25. [with seven wondrous words, to bless all [their] councils [in the sanctuary of]

26. [with seven wondrous words andwith them (he will bless) those who have eternal knowledge...]

vv. 8 :: 10

vv. 10 :: 13

vv. 14 :: 17
v. 17  "God" :: "holiness"
RSP I 033
17. a praisesong of strength to the God of holiness with [its] seven wondrous praisesongs;

vv. 12 :: 13  "God" :: "king"
RSP I 036
11. ...Psalm of thanksgiving]
12. by the fifth to [the king of glory with its seven wondrous thanksgivings;]
13. they will give thanks to the God of glory seven times with seven words of wondrous thanksgivings.

vv. 8 :: 11  "with" :: "with"
RSP I 092
8. will exalt the God of lofty angels seven times with seven words....]
10. .... and he will praise the God of powers]
11. seven times with [seven words of wondrous praise....]

vv. 24 :: 25  "bless" :: "bless"
RSP I 122
23. [....The first]
24. [of the chief princes will bless in the name of the glory of God all the ...]
25. [.... with seven] wondrous [words, to bless all [their] councils [in the sanctuary ...]

vv. 12 :: 14  "fifth" :: "sixth"
RSP I 200
11. ... Psalm of thanksgiving]
12. by the fifth to [the king of glory with its seven wondrous thanksgivings;]
14. [Ps]alm of rejoicing by the tongue of the sixth to [the God of goodness with its seven wondrous songs of joy;]

vv. 14 :: 15  "goodness" :: "goodness"
RSP I 203
14. [Ps]alm of rejoicing by the tongue of the sixth to [the God of goodness with its seven wondrous songs of joy;]
15. [and he will cry joyously] to the king of goodness seven times [times with seven words of wondrous rejoicings.]
vv. 5 :: 9

all ḥol, “all” :: “all”

RSP I 283

5. all the an[gelic elohim...]
9. ...who is above all the]
10. angelic elohim

vv. 24 :: 25

all ḥol, “all” :: “all”

RSP I 283

23. [...]The first]
24. [of the chief princes will bles]s in the name of the glory of God all the ...]
25. [...]with seven] wondrous [wor]ds, to bless all [their] councils [in the sanctuary ...]

vv. 9 :: 12

all ḥol, “to” :: “to”

RSP I 316

9. ... Psalm of praise by the tongue of the fourth to the Warrior who is above all...]
11. ... Psalm of thanksgiving]
12. by the tongue of the fifth to [the king of glory with its seven wondrous thanksgivings;]

vv. 13 :: 15

all ḥol, “to” :: “to”

RSP I 316

13. they will give thanks to the God of glory seven times with seven words of wondrous thanksgivings.
15. [and he will cry joyously] to the king of goodness seven times with seven words of wondrous rejoicings.

vv. 14 :: 17 :: 18

all ḥol, “to” :: “to”

RSP I 316

14. [Ps]alm of rejoicing by the tongue of the sixth to [the God of goodness with its seven wondrous songs of joy;...]
17. a praisesong of strength to the God of holiness with its seven wondrous praisesongs;
18. and he will sing praise to the king of holiness seven times with seven words of wondrous praisesongs.

vv. 17 :: 18

all ḥol, “strength”, “sing praise”

RSP I 414

17. a praisesong of strength to the God of holiness with [its] seven wondrous praisesongs;]
18. and he will sing praise to the king of holiness seven times with seven words of wondrous praisesongs.

vv. 7 :: 9

דְּבִּיטִיךְ :: שְׁלֹֽאִים, “third” :: “fourth”
RSP I 602

7. ... [...the third of the chief princes]

9. ... Psalm of praise by the tongue of the fourth to the Warrior who is above....]

vv. 14 :: 16

שְׁבָכוֹצֶר :: שֶׁשֶׁ, “sixth” :: “seventh”
RSP I 609

14. [Ps]alm of rejoicing by the tongue of the sixth to [the God of goodness....]

16. [Psalm of praisesong by the tongue of the seventh of the chief princes,]

vv. 18 :: 24

מִלָּה :: שֹוָם, “king” :: “name”
RSP III 200

18. and he will sing praise to the king of holiness seven times with seven words of wondrous praisesongs.

23. ... The first]

24. [of the chief princes will bless in the name of the glory of God....]

v. 18

מִלָּה :: קְרָדָשׁ, “king” :: “holiness”
RSP III 271

18. and he will sing praise to the king of holiness....]
WHICH WORD PAIRS?

We have seen that word pairs are a significant feature of parallel language in Ugaritic, in classical Hebrew and in Late Hebrew, and presumably Aramaic. The widespread presence of this type of speaking in one sort of language caused it to become pervasive throughout, so that it found its way from poetic and ritual language into "ordinary" speech. In much the same way rhyme, which is a feature of English poetry, has become pervasive throughout the English language, and most especially in the popular spoken form of English. (Just listen to the lyrics of popular songs.) For some reason, the ear of the English speaker is so pleased by a feature of poetics that it has appeared in "ordinary" speech in the form of rhyme reduplicatives, rhyming doggerel such as limericks, and rhyming slang. Similarly, the ear of many speakers of non-IndoEuropean languages, Ugaritic and Hebrew amongst them, is pleased by a feature of parallel language and has incorporated it into "ordinary" language in the form of pairs of words that recur regularly.

For this reason, as well as the practical one of searching for occurrences, I have not confined my selection of data to those places in the Hebrew Bible where word pairs occur in parallel language. The phenomenon of pairing is much wider, as was demonstrated in Chapter III How Word Pairs Mean. In fact, like rhyme, it appears in every language style and under every circumstance. Therefore, I looked for proximity of words, not for the circumstances under which they appeared.

Word pairs are, then, a feature of the language of the Hebrew Bible. In previous chapters we have indicated some ways that it is possible to identify them. They are culturally conditioned, as is every other aspect of language, so that the pairing of some words seems self-evident while it is difficult to imagine how others came about. In general terms, it seems as though those which "feel" self-evident are those which fall into the categories described by Gurevic, namely tautological, complementary and opposite. These are pairs like רֶסַּר ("cedar" :: "tree")2, רֶסַּר וּגְוֶד ("shower" :: "dew")3 and רֶסַּר וּגְוֶד ("earth" :: "heaven")4. There is another group of pairs which are less immediately obvious (to our eyes) as pairs. Nevertheless, it is possible to imagine how they may have

1 Gurevic, 1986
2 RSP I 442
3 RSP I 205
4 RSP I 071, I 554
come about, by association of ideas or the application of the concrete to the abstract. Among these are יִנְגָּה : פָּרָה (“sea” :: “ship”)⁵ and יַשֵּׁר :: יָרָב (“tongue” :: “sword”). Finally, there remains a group of pairs which just defy imagination as to what could possible have produced them. These are few in number, but remain very noticeable. Among them are יִבְהַל : הָלָל (“God, god” :: “this”)⁷ and יִבְהַל :: פָּרָה (“earth” :: “hook”)⁸. Yet both these latter word pairs are attested not only in Ugaritic but in the Hebrew Bible.

In trying to explain how word pairs came about, or even just identifying them, we need to keep firmly in the forefront of our minds the vast cultural differences which separate us from the people who used these pairs. Chief amongst those differences is the basically oral nature of their language in contrast to our more literary orientation. For this, the work of A.R. Luria in documenting the psychodynamics of orality is relevant:

Subjects were presented with drawings of four objects, three belonging to one category and the fourth to another, and were asked to group together those that were similar or could be placed in one group or designated by one word. One series consisted of drawings of the objects hammer, saw, log, hatchet. Illiterate subjects consistently thought of the group not in categorical terms (three tools, the log not a tool) but in terms of practical situations - ‘situational thinking’ - without adverting at all to the classification ‘tool’ as applying to all but the log. If you are a workman with tools and see a log, you think of applying the tool to it, not of keeping the tool away from what it was made for - in some weird intellectual game. A 25-year-old illiterate peasant: ‘They’re all alike. The saw will saw the log and the hatchet will chop it into small pieces. If one of these has to go, I’d throw out the hatchet. It doesn’t do as good a job as a saw.’ (1976, p. 56). Told that the hammer, saw, and hatchet are all tools, he discounts the categorical class and persists in situational thinking: ‘Yes, but even if we have tools, we still need wood - otherwise we can’t build anything.’ (ibid.).⁹

Where situational thinking predominates, it is necessary to know the situation in order to understand. Even where we know a good deal about context, there is still much we don’t know. For example, there is a great deal of argument over the origin of the expression “O.K.” Here the situation lies in a dead culture, which is very much less known to us. Hence it is probably more remarkable the amount we do know, rather than what we don’t.

---

⁵ RSP I 053
⁶ RSP III 113
⁷ RSP III 018
⁸ RSP III 116
⁹ Ong, 1982, p. 51
The Nature of RSP Word Pairs

Presenting an argument for the definition of any specific word pairs within the technical meaning of the term is not the purpose of this study. And yet we have seen in the work of Watters, for example, how lack of precision about what a word pair is can lead one into finding word pairs anywhere one wishes to find them, and to a subjectivity which renders research of dubious value. In order to avoid this problem, I have confined my choice of word pairs to those accepted by an independent authority. The 1019 word pairs identified by Dahood and his associates in the three volumes of Ras Shamra Parallels are, in Adele Berlin's words, "one of the major achievements of modern biblical research".10

It is worthwhile to consider the nature of Dahood's collection of word pairs in general terms. And let me emphasise once again that RSP does not contain all the word pairs in existence, not even all those in Ugaritic/Hebrew. Merely, for convenience, they are deemed to be the corpus from which I work.

So, what are they like? First, they are all words cognate in Ugaritic and Hebrew, and in most cases the meanings of words are the same in the two languages. Occasionally there is a transfer of meaning, as when Tannin in Ugaritic (a proper noun) comes to mean in classical Hebrew a "sea-serpent" or "monster". Further, in the great majority of cases (about 80%), both members of the pair are words at least potentially the same part of speech. It is not however, in spite of Watson, invariable. Anyway, nearly half the total are pairs where a noun is paired with a noun, while just under a quarter are verbs similarly paired with verbs.

A significant number are reduplicatives (pairs that consist of the same word root twice), and these represent 13.84% of the total. Because that percentage constitutes a statistically significant number, it is necessary to address them as a group. Unfortunately, they also present difficulties of analysis. These problems, as well as others that arose in the course of the study, will be discussed later in the chapter.

There are only fourteen triplets (1.37%) in the total, a number that falls short of being statistically significant, with the result that that group need not be addressed as a separate entity.

Many prepositions in Hebrew are attached to their objects, which makes their identification difficult since AnyText scans for complete words only. However, only 4.91% of the total are prepositions of any sort, and none of those which are attached are found in the group I analysed. There is one preposition

---

10 Berlin, 1985, p. 65
(not attached) found in the group; I will discuss later in this chapter my reasons for not including it among the words I analysed.

Upon further examination of RSP, I began to feel most strongly that segholate nouns\footnote{Segholate nouns are those in which both the vowels are seghols, like סב or דב or מ. They all form constructs and add suffixes and prefixes in the same way.} formed a very large portion of nouns in the word pairs. In fact, the pairs where both words are segholate nouns are only sixteen in number, or 1.57% of the total. Also my efforts to discover if my impression was true were hampered by not being able to find out what proportion of the total number of nouns in classical Hebrew are segholate. A suggestion which may resolve the problem appears in Chapter IX Some Conclusions.

A complete analysis of parts of speech in RSP may be found in the first of the two appendices at the end of this chapter.

Developing a Methodology

I recognised early in the project that a careful analysis of all 1019 word pairs was impossible. The scope was simply too large. I had to narrow it down somehow. Finding a way to do that which did not lay me open to charges of subjectivity and which included enough pairs to be significant but still manageable, presented a considerable challenge to my ingenuity.

In the chapter on parallelism I included a survey of more than a dozen works that discuss word pairs. Some of them, like Whallon (1969), foundered on methodology: he assumed rather than proved that the word pair was a formula that functioned in Old Testament poetry in the same way that Parry and Lord postulated the formula functioned in Homeric verse. Others, like Kugel (1981) and Watson (1984), are so concerned to convince that they have failed to note points that discredit their arguments. Both make generalities about word pairs that argue a startling unfamiliarity with those identified by Dahood. O'Connor (1981) unfortunately reserves judgement, though he refers to the “astonishing vitality”\footnote{O'Connor, 1981, p. 108} betokened by the research of Dahood and others. Pardee (1988) simply concentrates on a very small (and different) aspect of parallelism. None of them consider what a study of the translation of word pairs in the LXX may tell us.

Having concluded that my projected study was worthwhile and that the word pairs on which I focussed would be some of those in RSP vols. I-III, it only remained to decide which. I felt that whatever approach I took it was necessary to move from the Ugaritic/Hebrew word pairs to the Greek translation instead of
the other way about, since that was the way the Seventy did it. They had in their minds, and most likely in writing as well, a specific Hebrew text or texts, their Vorlage. It was this (or these) that they sought to render into Greek. (In some cases, like Judges, parts of Joshua and Daniel, we have more than one rendering.) Therefore it was necessary to approach my research in the same way. With the Ugaritic/Hebrew word pairs before me, I would then discover how they were rendered into Greek, making the text from which I started the MT. It is probably the closest we have to the Vorlage from which the Seventy worked. And, from the evidence of the Qumran literature, such textual corruption as has occurred in the intervening millennia is remarkably slight.

There were several possible ways to approach the translations. I could sift a single book minutely for every word pair and discover how each was translated. However, it is believed that various books (and parts of books) were translated at different times, perhaps in different places and certainly by different people. That means that the translation of one book could be idiosyncratic. Therefore the only way to avoid what may have been idiosyncratic is to use as many books as possible, thus as it were levelling out the differences and concentrating on commonalities of language. I determined to select some word pairs and to pursue them through the whole of the BHS, since that is not only the standard critical edition but also the one provided with AnyText. Such an approach would also reveal if some word pairs were concentrated in certain books. For example, if particular word pairs were dear to the Deuteronomistic Historian, my method of data collection would reveal it.

Now, it is possible that certain pairs of words were idiosyncratically translated, especially if they occur only a very few times. Therefore I felt that it was necessary to achieve a statistically significant spread of specific word pairs, some with a higher degree of frequency and others with lower. In order to provide a statistician with the necessary information (and far from incidentally to learn how to use the concordance programme AnyText), I recorded the number of occurrences of both members of all the word pairs in RSP, as well as all the occurrences of the two words together within the maximum proximity allowed by the programme (ninety-six bytes). Several discussions with Brian Niven of the Centre for Applied Statistics and Mathematics at the University of Otago indicated that the most promising approach was to pursue a random selection within each size grouping. Whilst preparing the information to achieve that, I began to feel that, as well as having a statistically significant spread in high-to-low frequency word pairs, I should also have numbers of parts of speech that reflect
the numbers in the total corpus of word pairs. Thus, if 30% of RSP word pairs were nouns, then 30% of my sample should be nouns as well..., and so on. 

I studied RSP in greater detail than before and, as I did, an interesting pattern began to emerge. I was struck by the number of words that kept recurring, and not only words (like God) that we biblicists tend to expect. In fact, I was reminded of nothing so much as a spirograph, where lines radiate out and then converge again to form geometric patterns. Word A paired with word B, which paired with word C. But A and C also paired, as B did with E and F. And so it went. I determined to unravel the puzzle, at least for some words. And that was the point at which I jettisoned any thought of statistically significant numbers of words. And yet, interestingly, it did come to pass in the end. But more of that later. On with the story.

One Word Which Is A Focus

One word turned up over and over; it was one I did not expect, though upon further reflection I wondered why I had not. It was also a segholate noun, a class of nouns that seemed to appear in disproportionate numbers in word pairs. Further, it is a word of deep significance to the earliest Israelites as it remains to Jews today, and to indigenous peoples everywhere. It is of course יָמָן ("earth", "land").

The words that pair with יָמָן are thirty in number (thirty-one if we count itself — יָמָן, RSP I 062): "WILDERNESS" (RSP I 063), "SEA" (RSP I 064), "ALL" (RSP I 065), "DUST" (RSP I 067), "TREE" (RSP I 068), "ROCK" (RSP I 069), "FIELD" (RSP I 070), "HEAVEN" (RSP I 071, I 554), "HOUSE" (RSP I 127, III 069), "THRONE" (RSP I 297), "KING/TO REIGN" (RSP I 358), "NORTH" (RSP I 479), "ROOT/TO UPROOT" (RSP I 584), "WAY/TO TREAD" (RSP II 006), "GOD" (RSP III 030, III 036), "INHERIT/ANCE" (RSP III 044), "FRUIT" (RSP III 045), "SHOWER" (RSP III 046), "DEW" (RSP III 122), "TO SIT" (RSP III 151), "UNDER/NEATH" (RSP III 328) and "FOOTSTOOL." (RSP I 160). Several pair with no words other than יָמָן: "BED" (RSP I 066), "MOUNTAIN" (RSP I 169), "CLOUD" (RSP I 447), "MIRY BOG" (RSP III 099), "HOOK" (RSP III 116), "TO DENY/TO SUBMIT/DECEPTION" (RSP III 161), "TO PLANT/PLANTATION" (RSP III 212). Finally, there is one triplet, made up of "STONE" (ירדנ) and "TREE" (ֶלֶשׁ) with יָמָן (RSP III 245). יָמָן, a noun, pairs with twenty other nouns, with three words that may be either verbs or nouns, with one adjective, with one word that may be either a common or a proper noun, with two verbs and with one

13 Tables of the parts of speech of words in RSP, and the proportions of each are found in the first of the two appendices at the end of this chapter.
preposition. The triplet consists of all nouns. Two words ("MIRY BOG" and "CLOUD") are *hapax legomena*. A glance at the first appendix at the end of this chapter indicates that percentages here are roughly similar to those in RSP overall. This group of words I have called the first shell, like the shell of electrons that surrounds the nucleus of an atom.\(^\text{14}\)

The second shell consists, not of more words that pair with יָּהָ, but of the words that pair with the words in the first shell. But some of these are also words that pair with יָּהָ. "WILDERNESS", for example, is a word in the first shell. Words that pair with it (that is, words in the second shell) are "wasteland" (RSP I 344), "seed" (RSP III 182), "devastation" (RSP III 183), "dunes" (RSP III 184), and "corner/side" (RSP III 257). Also pairing with it, but still in the first shell, is "FIELD" (RSP I 536). In noting these relationships we may observe psycholinguistics at work. The word "WILDERNESS" sets up the expectation of any of the six words that may be paired with it. And if "FIELD" is the pair of choice, then an expectation arises that may involve any of the words that can pair with it. For instance, "FIELD" pairs with "to hunt/hunting" (RSP II 062), which pairs with "bread" (RSP I 475), which forms a triplet with "oil" and "wine" (RSP I 333), and "oil" pairs with "DEW" (RSP I 206), which brings us back to the first shell. This is what I mean by the pattern being like a spirograph.

The words that surround יָּהָ particularly show how the associations of the pairs build a richness far beyond any immediate word. And this richness permeates the language of the Hebrew Bible. For example, consider Deuteronomy 26:5-10 (NRSV):

[Y]ou shall make this response before the Lord your GOD: "A wandering Aramaean was my ancestor [lit. father]; he went down into Egypt and lived there as an alien, few in number, and there he became a great nation, mighty and populous [lit. many]. When the Egyptians treated us harshly and afflicted us, by imposing hard labour [from יְּדִיב "servant"] on us, we cried to the Lord, the GOD of our ancestors [lit. fathers]; the Lord heard our voice and saw our affliction, our toil, and our oppression. The Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, with a terrifying [lit. great] display of power, with signs and wonders; and he brought us to this place and he gave us this LAND, a LAND flowing with milk and honey.

Such a relatively short passage still demonstrates the kind of richness that word pairing promotes. The words indicated here are by no means all the pairs present,\(^\text{14}\) The translation of words in the first shell is in capital letters; words in the second shell are underlined; words in the third shell are in lower case letters. They are enclosed within quotation marks and this convention is maintained in the rest of the chapters wherever the words analysed appear in the body of the text.
but only those from RSP that I have chosen to analyse, approximately 20% of the total. There is no doubt that RSP does not encompass all pairs even in the Ugaritic/Hebrew corpus, let alone those which have another provenance.\textsuperscript{15}

The Major Complex\textsuperscript{16}

There is a particular way that some words group, a constellation as it were, that appears over and over again in this collection. It is a largely self-contained grouping into which entry may be gained by a number of routes. I noticed it in the course of determining which words pair with which other words, to see if I could find for words that pair with מִלָה the kind of matrix Fox describes for some words in Rotinese.\textsuperscript{17} The project, which arose from the detailed examination of RSP described above, proved too complex to achieve for all words pairing with מִלָה. But as I struggled with the many combinations these words form, I found myself meeting again and again the same group of these words, which I have called the Major Complex. In order to illustrate the complexity of the matrix which would surround מִלָה (if it could be carried out using a computer modelling system, for example), I have described the Major Complex in some detail and have included it in the second of the two appendices at the end of this chapter.

This grouping consists of a number of interlinking concatenations like "bread" :: "to serve/servant" (RSP III 228), "to serve/servant" :: "son" (RSP I 404), "son" :: "name" (RSP I 547), "name" :: "hand" (RSP I 219), etc. All the words in the Major Complex pair either with "KING/TO REIGN" ("to serve/servant" - RSP I 362 and "name" - RSP III 200) or with "GOD" ("son" - RSP III 017 and "hand" - RSP III 124), except for "bread" which pairs with both מִלָה "TO SIT" (RSP III 154) and with בֵּית "HOUSE". We shall see later that the words which pair with both מִלָה and בֵּית are particularly significant in terms of how they are translated and what may be implied by those translations.

As I have already said, entry may be made into this grouping, which I have called the Major Complex, by means of several different routes. The entry points are numerous: מִלָה, מֵאָבָה "bread", מִלָה "oil", מַר "servant/to serve", מֵאָבָה מַר "star", מֵאָב "water", מֵאָב "son", מַר "Baal/master/to own", מֵאָב מַר מַר מַר "star", מֵאָב מַר מַر מַר מַr
“father”, and כְּלִי “eternity”

and no doubt many others which do not appear in this (unashamedly contrived) scheme.

If one considers the Major Complex from the point of view of the entry word son “sun”, which pairs with בָּאָל “SEA” (RSP I 235), the former also pairs with Baal/master/to own “Baal/master/to own” (RSP III 319), which itself pairs with הָרְאָא “GOD” (RSP I 034) and, more immediately relevant to the point at hand, with בָּאָל “son” (RSP I 116). בָּאָל in its turn pairs with שָׁלֹשׁ אִדְמָּט “ROOT/TO UPROOT” (RSP I 116) and with כְּלִי “star” (RSP I 117).

“Star” is a little different from other words in the Major Complex because, instead of pairing with a number of third shell words and two or three from the first and second shells, it pairs with several words in the first and second shells - כְּלִי “HEAVEN” (RSP I 282) and בָּאָל “son” (RSP I 116), as we saw, among them, but only one in the third shell, הָרְאָא “moon” (RSP II 023), which is so common a pairing in this and other languages that it would be surprising if it did not occur. But “star” does not only form pairs; it also forms part of the only quadruplet in the Ras Shamra Parallels, “star” :: “GOD” :: “HEAVEN” :: “water” (RSP III 190). A related triplet “HEAVEN” :: “GOD” :: “star” also occurs (RSP III 031), but it is impossible to tell whether one derived from the other, and if so, which. An interesting point to note is that while both “star” and “water” pair with “HEAVEN”, neither pairs with “GOD”. It appears that the latter words can associate in a triplet or quadruplet, but not in a pair. However, the quadruplet brings כְּלִי “water” into the picture, though “water” also gains an entry point through “DEW” (RSP I 352), “FIELD” (RSP III 298), and “oil” (RSP I 354, III 191).

“oil” is a particularly significant word in this context. It, together with כְּלִי “bread” and the words with which both pair, forms a significant portion of the Major Complex. Most of the words with which “oil” pairs are third shell words, but through its triplet with כְּלִי “bread” and יָשָׁב “wine” (RSP I 333), it provides another point of entry. It also forms a rather unexpected triplet with “DEW” and SHOWER (RSP I 207), which in its turn provides the basis for a pairing of phrases which evokes the heart of Israelite thinking about כְּלִי. Given the Ancient Near Eastern setting, what could be more poignant than Isaac’s words when he blessed Jacob whilst under the impression that he was Esau.

Ah, the smell of my son

is like the smell of a FIELD that the Lord has blessed.

May GOD give you of the DEW of HEAVEN,

and of the fatness [oil] of the EARTH,
and plenty of grain and wine. (Genesis 27:27-8 NRSV)

The same pairing of phrases occurs in Genesis 27:39, where Isaac confirmed that the blessing for the first-born had irrevocably gone to Jacob rather than Esau.

"Son" בֵּית, which we noted above as pairing with "Baal/master/to own" (RSP I 113) and "ROOT/TO UPROOT" (RSP I 116), also pairs with מְשָׁנָה "name" (RSP I 547), and that provides yet another point of entry in its most notable pairing with מִלֶּה תְמוּנָה "KING/TO REIGN" (RSP III 200). The other significant word with which "name" pairs is הַיָּד "hand" (RSP I 219). And "hand" pairs with "GOD" (RSP III 124), providing a last point of entry into the Major Complex.

Words That Pair With בֵּית
Several of the words that pair with בֵּית do not pair with any other words in the RSP corpus. Most however do pair with at least some other words. Fewer pair with many other words, like מָלֶכֶת ("KING" / "TO REIGN") and יִשְׁלַךְ ("GOD"). So much chimes well with traditional expectations for the Hebrew Bible. Even the many pairs with עָסָה ("TO SIT") are not unexpected, given that the word carries shades of meaning ranging from "TO SIT" through "TO BE ENTHRONED" on to "TO DWELL" and "TO BE INHABITED". Its implications, as well as its forms, are affected by an intermittent confusion with עָסָה ("to return", "to go back"). The same sort of thing happens with the two English verbs "to lie" and "to lay". The many words which pair with יָם ("SEA") also have their logic, at least in hindsight, for often they are associated with water in its many manifestations - "SHOWER", "rain", "river", "DEW", etc.

The extraordinarily rich associations of בית ("HOUSE") are far more complex. On one level it is entirely clear why we should find words pairing with it again and again: shelter is a major preoccupation of humans. But so is food, and הָעֵד ("FIELD") and יְפֻלָּה ("FRUIT") between them only amount to two-thirds the volume of pairings that בית does. However, the social implications of בית resonate through many things. Order and civilisation, domesticity and comfort, domination through familial ties are only some of what the word implies. Further, and most importantly, none of these concepts preclude the others, but all overlap and form a powerful complex of implications which emerge wherever any word is used. And this, it must be noted, is true of the way word associations open up ideas in all these pairings.

Why Some Words Are Missing

19 Note the number of words from the group we are analysing; for ease of recognition they are printed in bold type.
Some word pairs should, according to the criteria above, have been analysed. However, for a variety of reasons, that has not been possible. Probably the largest class is what we may (somewhat inaccurately) call reduplicatives. These are words that pair with themselves, like above. I have not been able to search for these because it is not possible using AnyText. Where there is a cognate verb and noun, simply searching for one and then the other overcomes the problem to some degree. ("KING") and ("TO REIGN") provide a suitable example. The words in the first shell that form reduplicative pairs are "ALL" (RSP I 283), "TREE" (RSP I 443), "SEA" (RSP I 231), "HEAVEN" (RSP I 559), "HOUSE" (RSP I 129), "FIELD" (RSP I 537), "KING" / "TO REIGN" (RSP I 361), "GOD" (RSP I 033), "TO SIT" (RSP I 271) and "UNDER/NEATH" (RSP I 590). Of these it has been possible to search for pairings only for "KING" / "TO REIGN" ( and ( ). Whether analysis was achieved and what the results were is indicated in the complete listing of data at the end of this study.

Two words in the first shell were excluded for technical reasons. "ALL" presented insuperable difficulties in the handling of computer files, simply because the number of occurrences was so large that the files were impossibly bulky. "UNDER/NEATH", a noun, a preposition, and even at times an adverb, also presented the AnyText programme with insuperable difficulties. However, since my intention in this study was principally to analyse a sufficient number of words to be statistically significant, I did not feel that a lack of those when there so many left constituted a major fault.

Another type of word pair that presented a challenge was the paired phrase. An example is "son of GOD" :: "star of morning" (RSP I 117), where "GOD" is a word in the first shell and both "son" and "star" are in the second shell. This situation presents a challenge because AnyText searches for words rather than for phrases. However, as in the case of reduplicatives, it has been possible to get around the problem to some degree. I have searched for one word in each of the phrases and then checked the references the programme generates in order to determine where the phrase (as opposed to the word) occurs. Luckily there are not many of these.

Another challenge, but of a different sort, was found in the words modified or retranslated in RSP to fall into line with the editors' understanding. Since it is no part of my study to argue these issues, I have settled any questions by appealing to BDB and KB. Where the RSP translation agrees with both of them, it is deemed to be accurate. Otherwise the word pair is simply not analysed. In the case of repointing or redivision of words, the BHS is always followed because AnyText uses it. In each case where a word pair should have been analysed but
was not for one of the reasons cited above, it has been included in the appendix at the end of this study and the reason stated for its exclusion from analysis.

Some word pairs present still another challenge. These are actually not pairs as such but rather triplets; it is possible that they have developed from concatenations of pairs. For example, מִּזְמֹרָה :: יִרְמָיָּה :: יָם (“bread” :: “wine” :: “oil”, RSP I 333) may have arisen from the word pairs מִּזְמֹרָה :: יִרְמָיָּה ("bread" :: "wine", RSP I 332) and יִרְמָיָּה :: יָם ("wine" :: “oil”, RSP I 249). Interestingly, מִּזְמֹרָה :: יָם ("bread" :: “oil”) does not appear. The argument may be put forward that the pairs מִּזְמֹרָה :: יִרְמָיָּה and יִרְמָיָּה :: יָם are in fact derived from the triplet instead of the other way about. This may be so. However, since word pairs in RSP outnumber triplets by a massive 996 to twenty-three, so that triplets form only 2.2% of the total, the balance of likelihood tips in favour of the pairs being primary and triplets secondary. The same situation as that outlined above occurs with the triplet מִּזְמֹרָה :: יִרְמָיָּה :: לֹא (“DEW” :: “oil” :: “SHOWER”, RSP I 207), which may consist of the pairs מִּזְמֹרָה :: לֹא (“DEW” :: “SHOWER”, RSP I 205) and יִרְמָיָּה :: לֹא (“DEW” :: “oil”, RSP I 206). Again, as with the triplet מִּזְמֹרָה :: יִרְמָיָּה :: לֹא above, one of the possible combinations is missing in RSP. מִּזְמֹרָה :: לֹא (“oil” :: “SHOWER”) may be lurking as yet undiscovered in the vast library of Ugaritic documents. An alternative explanation for the apparent lack of one possible combination of word pairs in the concatenation that makes up a triplet is that the third word can only be paired with the other two when they are both also present. If this is the correct explanation, then מִּזְמֹרָה can pair with לֹא only when יִרְמָיָּה is present as a sort of intermediary. It is probably not significant that מִּזְמֹרָה and יִרְמָיָּה are both words from the second shell while לֹא is from the third, or that the first two words are segholate nouns. The classification which produces shells is entirely arbitrary, intentionally developed to display certain relationships. Viewed from a different perspective, the pairs would exhibit different relationships. Nevertheless if יִרְמָיָּה acts as an intermediary in the triplet מִּזְמֹרָה :: לֹא and מִּזְמֹרָה, the same may be true of the triplet יִרְמָיָּה :: לֹא (“DEW” :: “oil” :: “SHOWER”), where מִּזְמֹרָה would be able to pair with מִּזְמֹרָה only where מִּזְמֹרָה also occurs.

How *AnyText* Works
The time has come to explain how I used *AnyText*. For this I rely heavily on the manual provided with the programme. *AnyText* is a concordance programme prepared by Linguists’ Software Inc. that searches for specific words in any text. The copy of the programme I have used is supplied with a copy of the BHS and one of the LXX. For my purposes, I have used only the BHS. It was compiled and
then indexed in its grammatically tagged form so that words in whatever grammatical construction that appears can be identified.

There are two indices for simultaneous use. One member of the word pair was placed in each index so that they would display a word count. The proximity size was set; I used the largest possible, ninety-six bytes. Then the proximity search was initiated. It took only a few seconds. The result was displayed, and the references were written to a file which was printed at the completion of each search. The printout formed the basis of my research because, while I might misread something on a screen or write down incorrectly a figure I have seen, the computer itself will print what it finds in a file. And it has no preconceived ideas.

Mention has already been made above of two characteristics of *AnyText* which presented a challenge to my ingenuity, and which I managed to overcome to some degree. *AnyText* also throws up multiple identical entries from time to time, depending upon the relative positioning in a verse (or verses) of the words in question.

Two occurrences of a word can overlap the same proximity word, thus resulting in one listing for two words. Example: "...the Lord, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth,...." If your proximity search is based on the word "Lord," there will be one listing, since there is only one occurrence of "Lord" that can be listed for this verse. If you use "God" as the basis, there will be two listings, since there are two occurrences of "God" that can be listed for this verse. Even though you would have different numbers of occurrences in the two searches, all of the occurrences will have been found either way.20

It means that the figure given for the number of occurrences of a word pair is likely to be several more than the actual number because, scanning down the list of references, one often sees the same entry more than once. However, while the number may be a little larger than the actual references warrant, it is never smaller. This idiosyncrasy of *AnyText* does not present a problem to one who is familiar with it, but it may seem strange to a person meeting it for the first time.

Where The Data Came From
This then is how I obtained my primary data. First the word pairs are those in RSP; since they proved to be too numerous, I chose those which pair with הָיוֹנָן and the ones that pair with those. This makes a total of about twenty percent of the word pairs in RSP, a significant number for statistical purposes. Further, those word pairs encompass some which appear very frequently, such as הָיוֹנָן ("GOD"), which together occur 4785 times, and some infrequent such as חָיוָנָן.

---

20 Payne, Stringham and Saia, 1991, p. 21
("BED") occurring thirteen times. There are even two *hapax legomena* ("MIRY BOG" and "CLOUD").

These have the advantage of being words chosen by a system. They are not simply words that for one reason or another appeal to me or, still worse, ones that I think are found in word pairs. Rather, they are already accepted by biblical scholars as word pairs, and the way I have identified those for analysis is easily verified by anyone. Thus I am able to avoid charges of subjectivity in my selection.

In the appendix at the end of this study, each word pair is listed in succession by its RSP number. Each word is given in Hebrew and in English translation. Greek translations are also given, with the number of times each translation is used. Every effort is made to insure that English translations are not duplicated, though this is not always possible. A check with the Hebrew should settle any queries.

It will be noted that in some cases the number of word pairs found is indicated by zero (0). This does not mean that there are no examples of those word pairs in the BHS, because Dahood's work is a listing of those Ugaritic word pairs the cognates of which are also found as word pairs in the Hebrew Bible. A zero result simply means that the two words in question do not occur within ninety-six bytes of each other. If recourse is made to the some of the references that Dahood gives but which have not been generated by *AnyText*, it is found that the relevant words are lurking just outside the proximity limits.
**FIRST APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VI**

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduplicatives</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplets</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palindromes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words x 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs containing Construct Phrases</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs containing Attached Parts of Speech</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs containing Noun + Adjective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs containing Preposition + Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs Both Members of Which are the Same Part of Speech</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Pairs Which May contain More than One Part of Speech</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Noun</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>46.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Noun in Construct + Noun</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun in Construct :: Noun in Construct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Noun + Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + Adjective :: Noun in Construct + Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Noun :: Noun :: Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Noun, where both Nouns are Segholate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Noun, where both Nouns are Proper</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Not Noun</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Verb</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Adjective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Pronoun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun :: Preposition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition + Noun :: Adverb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb :: Verb</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>23.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb :: Non-Verb</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb :: Adjective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb :: Preposition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb :: Adverb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb :: Adverb</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb :: Verb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb :: Preposition + Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition :: Preposition</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition :: Enclitic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition :: Verb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition + Noun :: Adverb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition :: Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun :: Pronoun</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun :: Noun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective :: Adjective</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective :: Verb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective :: Noun</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction:: Conjunction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECOND APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VI

The Major Complex

\textit{servant/to serve} :: prisoner -- I 403

\textit{servant/to serve} :: \textit{son} of a handmaid - I 404

\textit{son} :: \textit{son} - I 112

\textit{son} :: beloved - II 013

\textit{son} of \textit{GOD} :: \textit{star} of morning - I 117 $\Longrightarrow$ \textit{GOD}

\textit{star} :: \textit{moon} - II 026

\textit{son} :: \textit{assembly} - II 014

\textit{assembly} :: \textit{GOD} - III 022 $\Longrightarrow$ \textit{GOD}

\textit{son} :: \textit{GOD} - III 017 $\Longrightarrow$ \textit{GOD}

\textit{son} :: lion - III 059

\textit{son} :: scion - I 115

\textit{son} :: \textit{ROOT}/TO \textit{UPROOT} - I 116 $\Longrightarrow$ \textit{ROOT}

\textit{son} :: \textit{to give birth} - I 226

\textit{son} :: \textit{wife} - I 085

\textit{son} :: \textit{daughter} - I 114

\textit{son} :: \textit{band} - III 061

\textit{son} :: \textit{generation} - III 093
son :: youth - I 386

son :: name - I 547

name :: name - I 548

name :: KING/TO REIGN - III 200 ==> KING

name :: shame - III 308

name :: hand - I 219

hand :: hand - I 217

hand :: arrow - I 180

arrow :: arrow - I 179

arrow :: quiver - I 084

arrow :: STONE - I 178 ==> STONE

arrow :: bow - I 505

hand :: arm - I 213

hand :: knee - I 214

hand :: flesh - I 215

hand :: sword - I 216

hand :: right hand - I 218

hand :: soul - I 389

hand :: GOD - III 124 ==> GOD
son :: Baal/master/to own - I 113

Baal/master/to own :: death/to die/dead - I 371

dead/to die/dead :: death/to die/dead - I 374

dead/to die/dead :: to live - I 372

dead/to die/dead :: soul - I 374a

dead/to die/dead :: to fall - I 387

dead/to die/dead :: plague - III 084

dead/to die/dead :: to gather - III 205

dead/to die/dead :: to break forth - III 206

dead/to die/dead :: sword - III 207

dead/to die/dead :: to descend - III 208

to descend :: to ascend - I 421

to ascend :: to go/walk - III 237

to go/walk :: to go/walk - I 165

to go/walk :: WAY/TO TREAD - III 098 => WAY/TO TREAD

to go/walk :: to come - I 081

to go/walk :: to return - I 596

to go/walk :: step/foot/to march - II 008

to go/walk :: to hasten - III 096
to go/walk :: to dance - III 097

to go/walk :: to make to dwell - III 302

to go/walk :: hunting/to hunt - I 166, I 474

hunting/to hunt :: FIELD - II 062 ==> FIELD

hunting/to hunt :: to eat - I 473

hunting/to hunt :: bread - I 475

bread:: grain - I 151

bread :: wine - I 332

bread :: wine :: oil - I 333

oil :: DEW - I 206 ==> DEW

oil :: DEW :: SHOWER - I 207 ==> DEW

===> SHOWER

oil :: wine - I 249

oil :: honey - I 376

oil :: balsam - I 561

oil :: meal - I 562

oil :: perfume - I 563

oil :: water - III 191, I 354

water :: FIELD - III 298 ==> FIELD
**water** :: soul - III 189

**water** :: GOD :: HEAVEN :: **star** - III 190 ==> GOD

==> HEAVEN

**star** :: HEAVEN - I 282 ==> HEAVEN

**star** :: HEAVEN :: GOD - III 032 ==> GOD

==> HEAVEN

**star** :: moon - II 026

**star** of morning :: **son** of GOD - I 117 ==> GOD

**oil** tree :: cypress - I 564

**oil** :: blood - III 088

**oil** :: olive tree - III 104

**oil** :: drink-offering - III 311

**oil** :: bone - III 315

**bread** :: drink - I 334

**to eat (bread)** :: to drink - I 335

**bread** :: **table** - I 336

**table** :: HOUSE - I 136 ==> HOUSE

**table** :: THRONE - I 300 ==> THRONE

**table** :: wine - I 600

**table** :: cup - I 601
bread :: soul - I 390

bread :: to refresh - II 032

bread :: lamb - III 034

bread :: meat - III 068, III 294

bread :: HOUSE - III 072 ==> HOUSE

bread :: sweat - III 072

bread :: TO SIT - III 154 ==> TO SIT

bread :: offering - III 175

dead :: to smite - III 209

dead :: to consume - III 226

dead :: bones :: Pit - III 246

dead :: Pit - III 300

dead :: afterlife - II 001

dead :: KING/TO REIGN - II 034, III 171 ==> KING

Baal :: to own :: to love - III 063

Baal :: master :: Lord - I 120

Lord :: suzerain - I 013

Lord :: mother - I 012

Lord :: GOD - I 011 ==> GOD
Lord :: father - III 001

father :: father - I 001

father :: mother - I 047

father :: GOD - I 030 => GOD

father :: to be - I 003

father :: generation - I 002

father :: ROCK - I 004 => ROCK

Baal/master/to own :: great - I 512¹

great :: great - I 517

great :: arm - III 285

great :: mighty - I 516

great :: to pound - I 513

Baal/master/to own :: Asherah - III 064

Baal/master/to own :: guard/to guard - III 065

guard/to guard :: GOD - III 025 => GOD

Baal/master/to own :: shame - I 076

Baal/master/to own :: sun - III 319

sun :: sun - I 578

¹ "Great" here is the Hebrew word בָּל. There is another "great" in Hebrew ולֹא.
sun :: moon - I 577

sun :: SEA - I 235 ==> SEA

servant/to serve :: eternity - I 405

eternity :: until - I 411

eternity :: until death (?) - I 413

eternity :: generation after generation - I 425

eternity :: living - III 239

eternity :: KING/TO REIGN - I 363 ==> KING

eternity :: day :: year - I 234

servant/to serve :: lad - I 406

servant/to serve :: messenger - II 036

servant/to serve :: personal possession - II 044

servant/to serve :: KING/TO REIGN - I 362 ==> KING

servant/to serve :: to bring - III 227

servant/to serve :: bread - III 228

bread :: grain - I 151

bread :: wine - I 332

bread :: wine :: oil - I 333

oil :: DEW - I 206 ==> DEW
oil :: DEW :: SHOWER - I 207 ==> DEW
  ==> SHOWER

oil :: wine - I 249

oil :: honey - I 376

oil :: balsam - I 561

oil :: meal - I 562

oil :: perfume - I 563

oil tree :: cypress - I 564

oil :: blood - III 088

oil :: olive tree - III 104

oil :: water - III 191, I 354

  water :: FIELD - III 298 ==> FIELD

water :: soul - III 189

  water :: GOD :: HEAVEN :: star - III 190 ==> GOD
      ==> HEAVEN

  star :: HEAVEN - I 282 ==> HEAVEN

  star :: HEAVEN :: GOD - III 032 ==> GOD
      ==> HEAVEN

star :: moon - II 026

star of morning :: son of GOD - I 117 ==> GOD

oil :: drink-offering - III 311
oil :: bone - III 315

bread :: drink - I 334

to eat (bread) :: to drink - I 335

bread :: table - I 336

table :: HOUSE - I 136 ==> HOUSE

table :: THRONE - I 300 ==> THRONE

table :: wine - I 600

table :: cup - I 601

bread :: soul - I 390

bread :: to refresh - II 032

bread :: lamb - III 034

bread :: meat - III 068, III 294

bread :: HOUSE - III 072 ==> HOUSE

bread :: sweat - III 072

bread :: TO SIT - III 154 ==> TO SIT

bread :: offering - III 175

bread :: hunting/to hunt - I 475

hunting/to hunt :: FIELD - II 062 ==> FIELD

hunting/to hunt :: to eat - I 473
hunting/to hunt :: to go/walk - I 166, I 474

to go/walk :: to go/walk - I 165

to go/walk :: WAY/TO TREAD - III 098 => WAY/TO TREAD

to go/walk :: to come - I 081

to go/walk :: to return - I 596

to go/walk :: step/foot/to march - II 008

to go/walk :: to hasten - III 096

to go/walk :: to dance - III 097

to go/walk :: to make to dwell - III 302

servant/to serve :: female servant - III 317
THE SEVENTY AS TRANSLATORS

We have seen in previous chapters that certain words are regularly paired in all sorts of written composition, most especially in ritual language. In some Germanic languages, such as Icelandic and Old English, whose antecedents were forerunners of English, those pairings were found most often as two words of the same grammatical class or in kennings. In Ugaritic and in classical Hebrew, word pairs often occur in contiguous parallel lines. But in those languages, they are found as well juxtaposed in composite phrases like a noun and its attendant construct (בְּנֵי בְרֵי) and in figures of speech like hendiadys (ֶַָּנּוֹשֹׁק). The fact is that they do, in Quirk’s happy phrase, set up a “reciprocal expectancy” of each other wherever they are found. And they are found everywhere, in every style of speech and composition. They are in classic constructions of synonymous parallelism and they are in texts where one member of the word pair is in a phrase which concludes a train of thought and the other is in a phrase which begins another — and everything in between. In each case, the expectation has been set up that the other member of the word pair will follow.

Numerous examples have been given in previous chapters of word pairs in parallel language and in “ordinary” language. We have also shown how some of the same cognate word pairs persisted into the Common Era in Late Hebrew and in Aramaic compositions from post-biblical sources. We have thereby established them as traditional cognate pairings that were sustained for approximately 1500 years.

A Way To See How Some Jews Viewed Their Language

It is possible to open a window (albeit small, clouded, and ill-lit) on the internal workings of some Jewish minds in the last few centuries before the Christian era. Composition uses one set of reflective equipment, and by examining it one may gain insight into the mind of the author. But it does not make its methods transparent. Since the discovery of the subconscious, twentieth century literary criticism has been made aware how very opaque the process of composition is. Even modern self-reflective analysis of living authors takes us only a limited distance into the consciousness of writers. We have far less chance of understanding what went on in the minds of those who put together compositions using a now dead language in a now dead culture so very different from our own, and before widespread literacy and industrialisation.

1 Quirk, 1963, p. 151
There is, however, another linguistic activity related to composition but using a somewhat different set of reflective equipment. It is not entirely transparent either, but it does provide an alternative route by which to examine the problem of how Jews of the last few centuries before the Common Era understood the language of their scripture. And, we have a sustained example of that form of linguistic activity dating from the period.

Some decades after the spoken language of the Jewish people in Palestine became Aramaic, in the new social and intellectual climate that followed Alexander’s conquest, Jews of Alexandria undertook to translate their scripture into Greek. The cultural impact of this translation is incalculable; its effect on subsequent Western civilisation is unimaginably huge because it established that revelation can be translated, leading eventually to centuries of linguistic effort on the part of missionaries who learned the languages of their intended converts in order to translate scripture for them. We are not concerned, however, with the subsequent impact. Its importance to us lies in the unique insight it gives into the linguistic processes of a particular group of people who struggled to render their sacred writings into a language unrelated to its original. Further, this had not been done before on a systematic basis (as far as we know), so there was no precedent and no pattern from which to work.

It is not possible for me to analyse the whole of the LXX. Such a mammoth task is not within the capacity of a single individual. Anyway, the subject of this study is a particular type of formulaic language and how it performs in the face of translation. Through a study of the way the Seventy translated word pairs, we may learn something of the way they perceived their own language. Did the Seventy recognise implicitly or explicitly the strength of the bond between pairs of words? If so, had the tradition remained sufficiently strong to allow the bonding between the members of the word pairs to persist through translation? Or had the tradition of the (later rabbinic) exegesis that “failed” to recognise parallelism\(^2\) (and maybe word pairs as well) developed sufficiently by the time of the Septuagint translation to affect it? We are unlikely to get a simple answer to these questions, given the difficulties of finding these things out and given the differences in practice and belief through space and time that we now recognise in Judaism.\(^3\)

The question of how the Seventy perceived the language of scripture and how that perception may have affected their translation of word pairs is further complicated by the question of their mother tongue. They may not have been

---

\( ^2 \) Kugel, 1981, p. 97
\( ^3 \) Neusner, 1983
native speakers of Greek and their experience of it may have been largely confined to literature and commerce. The Jewish community may well have spoken Aramaic or Late Hebrew in their homes and amongst themselves, just as there are areas of New York City where Yiddish is still the language of choice. Nevertheless, these suppositions must also reckon with the undeniable truth that the Septuagint is not a translation made by people who only half understood Greek. And bilinguality or even trilinguality is frequent in urban commercial centres where several languages are in common use.

The Jewish Scholars of Alexandria

We could postulate a situation in Alexandria in the second century before the Common Era not unlike that in, say, Babylon several centuries later. It might be suggested that “proto-rabbis” laboured to read, translate and comment on their Scripture, using in their speech and writing the very parallelisms they interpreted differently when they encountered them in Scripture.

[T]his [tradition of reading and writing] is laterally connected to the rabbinic conception of the Bible’s sanctity, and most notably to the principle of biblical “omnisignificance.” For the basic assumption underlying all of rabbinic exegesis is that the slightest details of the biblical text have a meaning that is both comprehensible and significant. Nothing in the Bible, in other words, ought to be explained as the product of chance, or, for that matter, as an emphatic or rhetorical form, or anything similar, nor ought its reasons to be assigned to the realm of Divine unknowables. Every detail is put there to teach something new and important, and it is capable of being discovered by careful analysis....

It turned for them upon the fact that this was Scripture, no ordinary literature for them to read:

Now in this principle of biblical omnisignificance there is certainly a theological element. The words of the Pentateuch are, after all, instructions given to a prophet with whom God had spoken “mouth to mouth” (Num. 12:8). It is inconceivable that any of those words should owe their existence solely to chance, rhetorical, or for that matter some mechanical principle of parallelism. The purpose of the Torah is to teach; if a statement is parallelistic in form, that statement must be examined to reveal its full meaning -- everything must be read, in other words, as potentially “sharp.”

An assessment of the situation that parallels that which Kugel describes for early rabbis may well be substantially correct, but it was complicated in Alexandria by the involvement of the authorities in the life of the Jewish community there.

4 Kugel, 1981, p. 104
5 Kugel, 1981, p. 104
That the initiative for the translation itself came from the monarch is argued persuasively by Barthélemy.

Qu'elle ait été ou non suggérée par des conseillers juifs, l'initiative royale instituant une commission de traduction est tellement vraisemblable et tellement largement attestée qu'on peut le considérer comme historiquement certaine... Le résultat fut une version dont le standing de fidélité était ultrasatisfaisant si on la comparait aux targums liturgiques fragmentaires qui avaient pu la précéder.6

That initiative explains why the LXX differs in kind from contemporary targums:

Il s'est passé quelque chose qui a empêché le processus de se dérouler de la même façon qu'il le fit pour les targums samaritains ou palestiniens, ou encore pour la Vieille Latine. Or nous possédons une tradition externe ancienne et largement diffusée sur cette initiative toute puissante extérieure à Israël qui, triomphant de certains scrupules juifs, rompit le cours normal des choses.7

How, then, did this situation affect them when they came to translate the Scripture into Greek? If Barthélemy is right, the Seventy were politically aware, but to what extent and how this may have affected the specifics of their translation remains debatable.

The question of the nature of LXX Greek is of course a complex one, involving many factors. There is an extensive literature on it and on matters that have a bearing on it, and there are many differing shades of opinion. It seems to me, however, that the central issue involved is as I have outlined above. Essentially the question that faces us is: in order to account for the undoubted peculiarities of LXX Greek, is it sufficient to refer to the fact that the LXX is a translation, or is it necessary to assume the existence of a living 'Jewish-Greek' dialect?8

Space prevents me entering fully into all sides of this question. In any case, at our present state of knowledge we probably cannot make a definitive answer. Therefore, the best we can do is to draw up a hypothesis which seems to fit the facts as we know them, always remembering the likelihood that the picture will change.

The position I take for the purpose of this study is closer to the first of the two outlined by Lee above. It is like one advocated by Deissmann:

Over the Hebrew, with its grave and stately step, they have, so to speak, thrown their light native garb, without being able to conceal the alien's peculiar gait beneath its folds. So arose a written "Semitic-Greek" which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after.9

---

6 Barthélemy, 1974, p. 32
7 Barthélemy, 1974, p. 32
8 Lee, 1983, pp. 13-4
While noting the speculation in Deissmann’s comment (“which no one ever spoke...either before or after”), there is undeniably a written Semitic-Greek, found in the LXX. This fact we can firmly base our study on, while notions of a living Semitic dialect of Greek remain in the domain of hypothesis.

It is a truism that all translation is interpretation (traduttore traditore); it is also a truism (a position pioneered by these same Seventy) that Scripture must be translated with the most careful attention to its profoundest meaning. We therefore conclude that to the best of their ability and understanding, the Seventy translated the Hebrew Bible into the Greek (either literary or spoken) of their day. The Letter of Aristeas fosters this view and should accepted as correctly reflecting the general situation in spite of its questionable status as a forgery.

La lettre du Pseudo-Aristée sera sans doute remplie de nombreux détails fictifs, mais ces détails fictifs sont brodés sur une tradition déjà familière aux lecteurs du faussaire et considérée par eux comme solide.  

In spite of sometimes fanciful details, then, the impression left by Aristeas remains valid:

When the work was concluded Demetrius assembled the community of the Jews at the place where the translation was executed, and read it out to the entire gathering, the translators too being present; these received a great ovation from the community also, in recognition of the great service for which they were responsible.

And they accorded Demetrius a similar reception, and requested him to have a transcription of the entire Law made and to present it to their rulers. When the rolls had been read the priests and the elders of the translators and some of the corporate body and the leaders of the people rose up and said, “Inasmuch as the translation has been well and piously made and is in every respect accurate, it is right that it should remain in its present form and that no revision of any sort should take place.” When all had assented to what had been said, they bade that an imprecation be pronounced, according to their custom, upon any who should revise the text by adding or transposing anything whatever in what had been written down, or by making any excision; and in this they did well, so that the work might be preserved imperishable and unchanged always.

When these proceedings were reported to the king he rejoiced greatly, for he thought that the purpose he cherished had been securely carried out. The whole work was read out to him also, and he marvelled exceedingly at the intellect of the lawgiver. To Demetrius he said, “How has it not occurred to any of the historians or poets to make mention of such enormous achievements.” And he said, “Because the Law is holy and has come into being through God; some of those to whom the thought did occur were smitten by God and desisted from

---

10 Barthélemy, 1974, p. 25
the attempt.” Indeed, he said, he had heard Theopompus say that when he was on the point of introducing into his history certain matter which had previously been translated from the Law, too rashly, he suffered a derangement of the mind for more than thirty days.\textsuperscript{11}

In its rather florid style, the Letter makes several important points, all to do with the way contemporary Jews perceived the translation: it was done with their knowledge and approval, it was regarded as divinely inspired and its lack of recognition by non-Jews was seen as part of God’s plan. These add up to a conclusion that the most committed efforts of contemporary Jews were brought to bear upon the translation.

Jerome As A Biblical Translator

Unfortunately, the Letter of Aristeas does not give us even as detailed information about principles of translation as do the letters and prefaces of Jerome half a millenium later. In fact, Jerome (331-420) offers an excellent translator to study, because, much closer in time than we are to the Seventy, he too wrestled with the relationship between the MT and the LXX. And he left a great deal of material in addition to the translation itself.

It was around 390 that Jerome at last took the plunge (‘with my eyes open I thrust my hand into the flame’), and embarked on an entirely fresh translation of the Old Testament based directly on the Hebrew. His intensive Biblical studies over the past decade had finally convinced him that, however revolutionary it might seem and whatever hostility it might provoke, the only ultimately satisfying Bible for Christians was one which reproduced the Hebrew original. In principle, of course, he was entirely right, even allowing for the fact (which he could not possibly know) that, being older, the Septuagint in many passages preserves a more ancient reading than the currently accepted Hebrew text (substantially the same as our ‘Massoretic’ text).\textsuperscript{12}

But as with the LXX, we can only get so far into the translator’s mind by reading his translation. Hence the enormous value of his own comments about what he was doing:

Although in 395 he was to inform Pammachius that Scripture ought to be translated word for word, his guiding principle in practice was that a good translation should express the meaning, not the actual words, of the original. Since the idioms of one language could not be reproduced in another, he felt justified in preserving the characteristic elegance of Latin so long as he did not alter the sense. Hence in the interests of ‘grace’ and ‘euphony’ he consistently rearranges in more complex groupings the paratactic sentences favoured in Hebrew, and goes to

\textsuperscript{11} Hadas, 1951, pp. 221-3
\textsuperscript{12} Kelly, 1975, pp. 159-60
every length to eliminate, by the substitution of synonyms, the
monotonous but distinctively Hebrew repetition of words and phrases.

What surprises us, however, is that, with these principles and
with his reverence for the classical models, he never dreamed,
apparently, of translating the Bible into the cultivated literary prose of
which he was a master without rival among his contemporaries. For
all the corrections and embellishments he introduced, the Latin of his
new version was essentially that special 'Christian Latin', with its
strong Hebrew colouring, which as a young man in the desert had
repelled him (as it repelled many an educated Christian) as barbarous
and uncouth. The explanation of this paradox was in large measure
practical: he had no wish that his Old Testament should deviate more
than absolutely necessary from the style and general tone, indeed from
the actual wording, of the familiar version hallowed by centuries of
usage. At a more theoretical level he, like other Christian intellectuals,
was persuaded, first, that what mattered in Scripture was the content,
not the literary form; and, secondly, that, being intended for ordinary
folk, it was appropriate that it should be expressed in the simple, even
crude language which most of them appreciated. Later generations
have good reason to be grateful for Jerome's decision, for in spite of
inequalities (stylistically, for example, his Pentateuch stands out as
supreme, while Job is about the least satisfactory of the books), his Old
Testament raised the vulgar Latinity of Christians to the heights of
great literature.¹³

It would seem therefore that while the translation of the Seventy may have
retained the significance of word pairs, Jerome's did not and indeed by his
recasting of characteristic Hebraic turns of phrase may have effectively removed
them from the language of the Vulgate.

Universal Principles Of Translation?
Sidney Jellicoe provides a masterly summary of the issues faced by translators,
those of Scripture and of the LXX in particular.

For what are we looking in a translation? Is it to be literal or
paraphrastic? Or is its purpose to consist in a portrayal of the original to
men of strange lips and another tongue? If the last, it might justifiably
be denied the term 'translation'. No doubt such questions are of more
vital moment to a 'translation-conscious' age such as our own than
they were to those who gave us the LXX.¹⁴

Nevertheless, the vexed question of how to translate Scripture is one pioneered
by the Seventy. Not much later the translators of the Peshitta had to come to
terms with it, and they seem to have followed more nearly the tradition of the
Targum. Jerome also faced it, and answered it to some degree with his concept of

---
¹³ Kelly, 1975, pp. 162-3
¹⁴ Jellicoe, 1968, p. 318
Hebrew veritas. Every other translator has had to come to her/his own conclusion.

So what is the theory of translation that lies behind what happened to word pairs? Just as sometimes (as we have noted) the pairing did not persist into Greek, so sometimes a pairing appeared in later translations that was not present in the original. In short, word pairs in a translation do not always reflect word pairs in the Hebrew original. They can also occur as an answer to a translation problem: Ernst Hansack (1979) has shown in his study on Exarch John, a prolific translator and writer active in Preslav around 900, that the prelate's frequent use of double translations, two Slavic words for a single Greek one, is not a stylistic or rhetorical device but derives from the theory he followed in his translation. The foreword to one of John's translations refers to this theory as it was most clearly expressed by Dionysios the Areopagite (Pseudo-Dionysios), one of the most prominent Greek Neo-Platonists. It stipulates that a translation \textit{[sic]} render the "etymologically" correct meaning as well as the contextually determined "semantic" one; in other words both the "form" and the "content" of the original must be conveyed. If the target language lacked a single word that could perform both functions, the translation \textit{[sic]} would have to use two words.\textsuperscript{15}

We will see later in this chapter the way Emmanuel Tov's demonstration of "sterotypical translation" in the LXX reflects a remarkably similar theory of translation. That the theory was almost certainly unwritten and almost as certainly unarticulated in no way detracts from its importance as a principle of biblical translation. The methods that different individuals use to resolve the difficulties of translating from a source language to a target language remain remarkably alike. This study observes what was done by the Seventy, not principally in order to deduce principles of translation, but in order to draw conclusions about their understanding of a particular linguistic phenomenon.

There is no doubt that certain writers of the Hebrew Bible were enamoured of some words. This applies to word pairs as well. For instance, the pair \textit{[sic]} occurs nineteen times, of which fourteen appear in Jeremiah and Zechariah. Likewise, the Seventy favour some words for translation. For instance, \textit{[sic]} ("to walk") in the pair with \textit{[sic]} ("WAY" - RSP III - 098) is almost without exception translated by \textit{[sic]}, while \textit{[sic]} occurs only once, at Ecclesiastes 11:9.

Why should such favouritism occur? This study sets aside sociological factors which, though of vital importance, are for us unknowable or difficult of access. An example of the kind of sociological factor of which we are only dimly

\textsuperscript{15} Sjöberg, 1987, p. 148
aware is the translation βασιλεὺς for θεός. The only probable alternative available to the Seventy was τυραννος, which has the same kind of negative connotations as the Latin rex. Basileus, on the other hand, lay in the same positive realm as θεός, and so was chosen by the Seventy.¹⁶

And So To ... Word Pairs

We come at last to the central question of this study: did the Seventy recognise some words as paired in a special way? If so, were those the ones that have been identified as word pairs in Ugaritic/Hebrew? Specifically, how did they view the words we have selected from RSP? We have already seen some examples of the way in which the Seventy failed to appreciate parallelism in general and word pairs in particular. But was this consistent? Could the examples cited by Dahood be aberrations?

It seemed to me that the most realistic way to answer these questions (and some of the others raised by this issue) was to check the LXX for consistency in the translation of the word pairs. At a distance of time which is rather more than two thousand years, little remains by which we may acquire the information which is relatively achievable with living cultures. The comparative studies in earlier chapters were one means of illumination. But they, as I have already pointed out, go only some distance toward answering the questions. We are not able, by asking practitioners of parallel language in Rotinese for example, to know how ancient Israelites viewed their parallelism. Thus ultimately we must look at the Hebrew itself and at what the Seventy did with it.

The study of Biblical translators offers a... fruitful path toward understanding the process by which a text is rendered from one language into another. In fact, such a comparative study may be shown to constitute a neglected, but potentially valuable means for evaluating the work of those responsible, for example, for the early Greek translations of the Bible that we commonly refer to as the Septuagint.¹⁷

Because the Seventy left (as far as we know) no notes about their techniques of translation, we must reconstruct their mental processes by indirect methods. And the clues by which this is done frequently look to be minor, insignificant or even irrelevant.

For example, בֶּן הָאָדָם, in Genesis 1, 2, which might signify nothing more than ‘a great Wind’ or, with Onkelos and his later followers, ‘a wind from before [or, sent by] the Lord’, is rendered quite literally and ambiguously πνεῦμα θεοῦ. Narrative again is literally rendered even to the retention of characteristic Hebraisms, as, for example, the use of

¹⁶ For this insight I am indebted to Ian Cairns.
¹⁷ Greenspoon, 1989, p. 91
cognate accusative; προστίθημι with infinitive to indicate repetition of an action; parataxis; phrases such as 'in the eyes of' and 'the face of'.

Thus do biblical scholars build up a picture of the Hebrew Vorlage used by the Seventy and of what they thought they were about when they translated it. The underlying principle of Hebrew poetics was enunciated more than two centuries ago by Lowth. Evidence gleaned from numerous discoveries of how the Seventy (and other translators) accomplished their aim is examined critically to determine how it fits into the overall picture, or if indeed that picture must be redrawn.

From Jerome onwards Aquila has been ridiculed for his supposed grammatical absurdity in rendering the Hebrew sign of the definite accusative by the 'preposition' σύν. Contrary, however, to what is often stated or implied this is not his universal practice....Of late, Barthelemy has sought to acquit Aquila of grammatical absurdity on the grounds that πάντα is to be construed not as a preposition, but as an adverb, a usage found mainly in Homer, though not confined to him.

Another piece was added to the puzzle when, in the 1930's, a considerable body of poetic texts was recovered from the ruins of ancient Ugarit. Their decipherment gave new impetus to the study of Old Testament and related literature.

The poetic texts, in their extant form dating to the fourteenth century B.C.E., were found to have been composed in a language closely related -- from a lexical point of view at least -- to biblical Hebrew....More importantly in the present context, it was found that the parallelistic structures evident in the Ugaritic poems were in all significant respects virtually identical with those known from Old Testament poetry. Still more central to the concerns of the present work was the recognition of a poetic diction common to the two literatures. Specific "pairs" of words in fixed parallel relationship were found to occur in both Ugaritic and Hebrew literature with such frequency and regularity as to preclude the possibility of coincidence, while the differences in age and locale excluded the possibility of direct borrowing.

It is to Professor H.L. Ginsberg that we owe this second major discovery, namely that the poets of ancient Syria and Palestine had at their command a body of conventionally fixed pairs of words upon which they might freely draw in the construction of their literary compositions.

The way word pairs were actually used in composition remains unclear; evidence points to their use having been learned through implicit understanding. The Seventy were faced with the translation of those words.

---

18 Kellicoe, 1968, p. 316
19 Kellicoe, 1968, p. 81
20 Gevirtz, 1973, pp. 2-3
Greek is not cognate with Hebrew and is developed on different principles. Therefore, a use of word pairs which was like that used in the targums and in Late Hebrew (as we saw in Chapter V Did Word Pairs Persist?) was out of the question.

Moreover, and this is particularly important in the current context, Hebrew is triliteral, which in theory limits the number of words available. There are certainly far fewer word roots in classical Hebrew than in Hellenistic Greek, though there may be reasons for this other than triliterality. Potentially several words were available to the Seventy for the translation of any particular Hebrew word. So, as regards word pairs, did they take advantage of the broader vocabulary that Greek offered? In order to answer that question, we need to examine some of the results of this study.

Observations On Translation Techniques Of The Seventy

At least as early as Origen (185?-254?), people have been interested in and have studied LXX Greek. (It is no accident that he was an Alexandrian.) There exists a large body of literature which seeks to identify the differences between the MT and the LXX. Often such differences as are found are subsumed under one all-embracing point:

That the translators of the Septuagint could theoretically have been subjected to influences of a Hellenistic nature is surely true, for the impact of Hellenism upon the Ancient Near East was widespread. In the realm of religion, reactions to Hellenism were disparate. Broadly speaking, three positions can be defined. In some instances, Hellenistic ideas were rejected. The Jewish sect whose writings were discovered in the Judean desert (Qumran) is a suitable example, though even their writings do exhibit some Greek influence. In other instances, such ideas were only partly accepted. And third, Hellenistic ideas were absorbed totally, with syncretism as a result. Philo of Alexandria, the graecized Jew whose treatise on the creation (De opificio mundi) for example is interspersed with Greek philosophical ideas, belongs to this grouping.

One of the significant results of this encompassing hellenizing process was actually the creation of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, but just where it should be placed within the three groupings above is a matter of dispute. The question consequently remains: “Is this document only, primarily a Hellenistic writing, [as is suggested inter alia by Gerleman (1950)], or is the Jewishness of its authors indeed a factor to be reckoned with?”

---

21 Another reason may be the very much smaller corpus of works we have for classical Hebrew as compared to classical Greek.

22 Cook, 1987, p. 31
Because the LXX is not, everyone is agreed, a monolithic work, there is no single answer to Cook's question. The extent to which the LXX reflects directly reflects the MT varies widely from book to book. For instance, the LXX book of Jeremiah is rather shorter than its Hebrew counterpart and in many places seems to reflect a very different source from the MT. The LXX book of Proverbs is different from that of Jeremiah in that

the text of Proverbs...(LXX) differs considerably from the MT. The reasons for these deviations should be searched for in three directions. On the one hand, the translator could have had another Vorlage at his disposal. On the other hand, these deviations could have been brought about by the translator. A third possibility -- the question of inner Greek corruptions -- has a bearing upon the intricate tradition history of the Septuagint.23

Cook concentrates on the second direction, but follows a very different line from that of the main scholar he criticises:

I am of the opinion that Gerleman made a methodological mistake by endeavouring to analyse the Septuagint only thematically. In the process, words/concepts were taken out of their contexts, opening the way for misinterpretation.24

Cook, then, focuses on specific words and phrases found in Proverbs 2 (with a sidelong at chapter 7). Are the word pairs we have chosen to be found among them? Alas, no. But then our word pairs are not much found in the MT Proverbs anyway. It is perhaps just as well, considering the complications that exist between the Hebrew Vorlage and the Greek translation.

It is not possible to describe all the characteristics of the LXX that have been identified, so we will confine those mentioned to the ones which directly affect this study of the translation of word pairs.

Many translators rendered all occurrences of a given Hebrew word, element (e.g. preposition), root or construction as far as possible by the same Greek equivalent, often disregarding the effect of this type of translation upon its quality. Although this system of consistent representation, usually called stereotyping, needs to be studied in greater detail, it is probably true to say that from the outset a tendency towards stereotyping was the rule rather than the exception. The system of stereotyping was an integral part of the translation technique and it originated from a certain approach to the OT, viz. that the words of the Bible should be rendered consistently in order to remain as faithful as possible to the source language. This type of translation created a consistent representation of whole Hebrew word-groups (roots) with Greek words also belonging to one word-group. While this root-linked system had its origin in a certain conception of translation

23 Cook, 1987, p. 35
24 Cook, 1987, p. 35
technique, it was also used in connection with difficult words. If such a
difficult word has a recognizable Hebrew root, it was sometimes
rendered by a Greek word which belonged to a Greek stem that
elsewhere rendered other Hebrew words which, together with the
"difficult" word, also belonged to the one group (root). The Greek word
does not necessarily carry the same meaning as the Hebrew word, but
other words close to that Greek word are used elsewhere as renderings
of Hebrew words close to the Hebrew word under review.25

We shall see this tendency from time to time in the translation of specific words.
It appears in a particularly marked manner in the translation of בושי, “to sit”; we
will examine this word in detail in the next chapter.

Modern commentators must be willing, when assessing the translation of
the LXX, to accept that the Seventy had serious reasons for their choice of words
and syntax. If we analyse the “mistakes” as either textual or semantic, they fall
into one of two categories:

1) either the translators were faced with a reading that could not be
deciphered,
2) or the word or phrase in question was legible but not
understandable.

Dahood cites examples of each. RSP I 374 - רמות/_sur “to die, Death”/ “to die,
Death”:

This well-documented repetition safeguards the second רמות “they
shall die,” in Jer 11:22 against emendation to רמות suggested by the LXX
teleutesousin, “they shall come to an end.” Or is this merely an
instance of “elegant variation” on the part of the LXX which renders
the first רמות by apothanountai, “they shall die,” and the second רמות by teleutesousin ?26

We cannot at this distance enter fully into the minds of the Seventy, but,
Dahood’s suggestion of “elegant variation” notwithstanding, the likelihood is
that they found the double רמות in Jeremiah 11:22 inappropriate and assumed the
second רמות occurred by scribal error for a similar word:

therefore thus says the LORD of hosts: I am going to punish them; the
young men shall die by the sword; their sons and daughters shall die
by famine;27

This sort of emendation, as well as those more numerous where the Seventy left
out phrases which secure the parallelism, argues for an unfamiliarity (conscious
or unconscious) with parallelism as a language device. It also argues for

25 Tov, 1984, pp. 67-8
26 RSP I, pp. 271
27 NRSV
unfamiliarity with specific word pairs. For instance, RSP I 127 is the pair "house" :: "earth," to which Dahood appends the comment "In Isa 23:1 the LXX omits 'from the house,' but the apparent parallelism with 'from the land,' tells against the LXX reading. What is more, 1QIsa supports MT." The other sort of "mistake" involves, not the belief that their confusion was caused by scribal error, but that the meaning had been wrongly conveyed. As well as RSP I 329, mentioned in a previous chapter, where the pair "silver" :: "gold," we have RSP II 049 "holy" :: "just") in I Sam 2:2. Dahood points out in connection with this word pair that

[i]he Ugaritic collation bears text-critically on I Sam 2:2, where for "mountain [rock]," the LXX and Vet Lat read "just." To these versions, the pairing of "holy" and "mountain ["rock"] may have seemed odd, but the MT is now sustained by the Ugaritic text. Jellicoe has identified several types of differences between the LXX and the Vorlage of the Seventy. The differences fall roughly into two categories: those which were deliberate because the Hebrew was thought to be wrong or corrupt, and those which have occurred because

the meaning of a Hebrew word was known to the Greek translators and preserved in their version but subsequently lost. Hence it was thought, mistakenly, that the translators were using a text different from our own, whereas the explanation is that the meaning had undergone a long period of hibernation which modern philology has brought to reawakening.

The first category, which corresponds in some respects to the two types of "mistakes" described above, may be further subdivided, according to Jellicoe, into alterations which he describes as 'Haggadic':

Some changes from the Hebrew made by the LXX translators are quite clearly interpretative. Genesis ii.2 will serve as an example. In this passage MT reads: 'And on the seventh day God ended his work, etc.' LXX renders 'sixth day,' which some have accordingly adjudged the true reading. That 'sixth' has the support of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Syriac (both based on the Hebrew) would seem to make it almost certainly so. Nevertheless, there are grounds for pause. G.J. Spurrell...regards 'sixth' as an intentional alteration on the part of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the LXX, the Peshitta, and the Midrashic

28 RSP I, p. 152
29 RSP II, p. 27
30 Jellicoe, 1968, p. 324
Bereshith Rabba ‘to avoid the idea that God created anything on the seventh day’.31

There are also changes which Jellicoe describes as “rubrical directions”: [Psalm 84: 5-7] which has baffled a succession of translators and commentators, can only be construed with any measure of intelligibility as a processional direction specifying the route from the assembly point on the western hill southwards via the Tyropeon Valley to the Pool of Siloam, and thence northwards to the Temple. The LXX, as most moderns, has attempted to extract some sense from the passage by paraphrase involving figurative interpretation....32

Most differences between the MT and the LXX fall into one of these major categories.

And where does the translation of word pairs fit into this discussion? Are they invariably translated with the utmost sensitivity to the nuances found in Ugaritic/Hebrew? Or did the Seventy not recognise at all what they had in hand, and translated them (like everything else) according to one of the three philosophies Jellicoe offers as possible in a translation?33 This is one of the questions which we must keep in mind as we pursue our study of translations. The answer may be one or the other, but it is more likely that, given the individual differences from book to book in the LXX, that we will find that there is every possible variation within the extreme positions we have outlined.

31 Jellicoe, 1968, p. 321
32 Jellicoe, 1968, p. 323
33 Jellicoe, 1968, p. 318
How Were Word Pairs Translated?

From Hebrew to Greek

Before we consider this last and most crucial question, it is necessary to understand how I used the basic data the collection of which was described in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs. As explained there, AnyText generates, as well as the number of occurrences of the two words within the proximity chosen (ninety-six bytes), a complete concordance listing for those words. I then looked up each of the references in the LXX to determine which Greek words had translated the Hebrew. It may be suggested that I should have used AnyText to find the Greek; that was certainly the way I intended to conduct the study, until I actually tried to do it. For instance, when I tried to find the Greek of the word pair יִשְׂרָאֵל ("TREE" :: "STONE", RSP I 009, I 441), I looked for ἸΔΕΑΡΙΟΝ :: ΠΕΤΡΟΣ. I soon found that these words were inappropriate, as the references where they occurred did not correlate with those I had for יִשְׂרָאֵל. Therefore I checked the LXX at the references generated by AnyText and found that the words chosen by the Seventy were not ἸΔΕΑΡΙΟΝ :: ΠΕΤΡΟΣ but rather ξύλος :: λίθος. After this experience, I concluded it was more rational simply to look at the evidence, rather than to conjure out of my imagination what words the Seventy might have chosen. Thus I used AnyText as a basic tool and worked forward from it to find the Greek, emulating the work of the Seventy in constructing the LXX from the Hebrew text they knew. From time to time I referred to HR. It provided separate documentation of links in the LXX between specific Hebrew and Greek words. HR, being entirely independent of what I found in the course of my study, proved a valuable crosscheck.

Does יִשְׂרָאֵל Become יִשְׂרָאֵל?

Before beginning to discuss the word pairs that I have analysed, it is necessary to set out the conventions I have used to describe the study:

1) Transliterations are, for the most part, avoided. Where they are used, they are in italics.
2) Translations are enclosed in quotation marks.
3) Translations of all words in the first shell are in capital letters wherever they occur.
4) Translations of all words in the second shell are underlined wherever they occur.
5) "In close proximity" means within ninety-six bytes, the closest proximity that AnyText can accommodate.
6) “Occurrence” means the number of times the word appears in the BHS according to *Any Text*. As explained in Chapter VI, *Which Word Pairs*, this number may be a few more than the actual references indicates. The discrepancy for each word pair is noted in the appendix at the end of this study.

In Chapter VI, it was noted that the word pairs chosen for analysis were those which surrounded γῆς (“EARTH, LAND”), itself occurring 3311 times in the BHS. The total number of γῆς :: X, where X is any one of the thirty potential words discussed in the previous chapter, comes to 2220. My first duty then was to discover how γῆς was translated when paired. LS describes γῆ as “EARTH” as opposed to “HEAVEN” and therefore including both land and sea, or as “LAND” as opposed to “SEA”, or as “NATIVE LAND”. It is therefore a logical translation of γῆ when γῆ is paired with מַעְלָה (“HEAVEN”)², when it is paired with מָי, and in those places where the implication is “NATIVE LAND”. Now, LS as well lists ἐπιεύρος as meaning “land” as opposed to “sea”, which makes it an alternative translation to γῆ when paired with מָי. The fact is though that ἐπιεύρος is not used in these situations. For γῆ :: מַעְלָה we have γῆ :: οὐρανός, just as for γῆ :: מָי we have γῆ :: θαλάσσα. But ἐπιεύρος also has implications of “plain” as opposed to “mountain”, which suggests that it may be a translation alternative to γῆ where γῆ is paired with מַע (“MOUNTAIN”). And that is not so either. מַע is customarily translated by ὀρός, while here as in the other pairings cited, γῆ is translated by γῆ.

HR does not even list ἐπιεύρος, though it does list χώρα, which LS defines as “land” or, better, “country” as opposed to “town”. In fact, χώρα is a serious contender for an alternative to γῆ as a translation for γῆ, because LS points out that it was used specifically as a way of distinguishing “country” from “city” in Alexandria in the 3rd century BCE. χώρα does occur as a translation for γῆ in the LXX, but only sixty-five times as opposed to the 2220 of γῆ for the same word⁵. Josephus, writing several centuries later, does not use ἐπιεύρος any more than the LXX does, but the proportion of times he uses γῆ rather than χώρα is

---

¹ Further information may be gained about any word pairs mentioned by consulting the appendix at the end of this study. All pairs are listed in order under their RSP numbers, with all the information collected in the course of the study.
² RSP I 071, I 554
³ RSP I 064
⁴ RSP I 169
⁵ These figures are taken from HR.
very different - 418 to 618. The parallel is not exact: Josephus was not translating as such, nor was he an Alexandrian. On the other hand, he was a Jew writing post-classical Greek, and his subject had a religious orientation, even when he was not recounting the history of the Jewish people.

With the exception of the handful of instances described below, in the 2220 occurrences that I examined of \( \gamma \eta \) pairing with another word, the translation for \( \gamma \eta \) was \( \chi \omicron \upsilon \rho \alpha \). This suggests a very strong bias to the translation of \( \gamma \eta \) by \( \chi \omicron \upsilon \rho \alpha \). It should be noted, moreover, that HR does not even list \( \varepsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omicron \sigma \varsigma \). This raises the possibility of an explanation. It may be that the word had simply dropped out of current use and therefore did not occur to the Seventy as an alternative translation for \( \gamma \eta \). That possibility is strengthened by the fact that Josephus does not use it either. But the same is not true of \( \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \), which is not only present in the LXX, but is also known from secular sources at about the same time and place. Further, as we saw above, not only does Josephus use \( \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \) but he uses it rather more frequently than he does \( \gamma \eta \). We do not know what Aramaic word Josephus may have been translating, and his Greek may well have been so good that he thought as well as wrote it, but he certainly preferred \( \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \) to \( \gamma \eta \).

The same type of comparison can be made with the Christian scriptures. Again, comparison is not exact, but again the writers were Jews writing on religious themes using post-classical Greek. Like Josephus they were acquainted with the LXX. The results of the analysis are rather different for the Christian scriptures: \( \gamma \eta \) is used 250 times while \( \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \) is used twenty-eight times. \( \varepsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omicron \sigma \varsigma \) is, as we should expect by now, not used at all. It is possible that the great preponderance of \( \gamma \eta \) has appeared under the influence of LXX Greek. One way to discover if this is so is to find the context in which the instances appear. While it may not be significant that only one instance of the twenty-eight occurrences of \( \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \) occurs in a quotation from the LXX, surely it is significant that more than half (sixteen) of those occurrences are in Luke-Acts and none at all in the Pauline corpus. It indicates at the very least that the \( \gamma \eta / \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \) choice is one susceptible of idiosyncratic usage.

As mentioned above, \( \chi \omicron \omega \rho \alpha \) is used in the LXX as a translation for \( \gamma \eta \) sixty-five times. Twenty-two of those occurrences appear in text where \( \gamma \eta \) was found with one or more of the thirty words with which it is potentially paired. These show the same sort of idiosyncratic usage as found in NT texts. The Pentateuch

---

6 These figures are taken from Rengstorff, 1983.
7 cited in LS
8 These figures are taken from CC.
does not appear, nor do the historical books, except for one example in 2 Kings\(^9\) and two in 2 Chronicles\(^{10}\). Likewise, the sapiential books and the minor prophets are little represented\(^{11}\). Otherwise, all occurrences are in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and First Isaiah. The only instance in Jeremiah appears in Jer 3:18-9, which the LXX translates like this:

\[
\text{ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις σύνελευσόταi οἶκος Ἰουδα ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἤγουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ γῆς βορρᾶ καὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν χωρῶν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἢν κατεκληρονομήσα τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐγὼ εἴπα γενοίτο, κύριe· ὅτι τάξω σε εἰς τέκνα καὶ δώσω σοι γῆν ἐκλεκτήν κατηγορομένην θεοῦ παντοκράτορος ἔθνων}
\]

Ezekiel contains χωρα at 20:41 and 29:12, while the translator of First Isaiah uses it most, at 8:8, 18:2-3, 21:14, and 36:10. Thus, while χωρα is not entirely missing from the LXX as a translation for γῆ, as ἐπετριφός is, it is not common, and it appears in only a few books. We cannot be certain of the reason, but we can be certain that, especially where γῆ was used with one of its pairs, γῆ came very much more readily to the minds of the Seventy as a translation than did χωρα.

Words In The First Shell
Having discussed γῆ, its translation and pairing, at length, it is now necessary to go on and address the words that pair with it, i.e. those in the first shell. How these words were chosen was discussed in the previous chapter. To recapitulate, those in the first shell are the ones that themselves pair with γῆ, with the exception of “ALL” (RSP I 065) and “UNDERNEATH” (RSP III 328) for the reasons described in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs? They are, as well as “EARTH” itself (RSP I 062), “WILDERNESS” (RSP I 063), “SEA” (RSP I 064), “BED” (RSP I 066), “DUST” (RSP I 067), “TREE” (RSP I 068), “ROCK” (RSP I 069), “FIELD” (RSP I 070), “HEAVEN” (RSP I 071, I 554), “HOUSE” (RSP I 127, III 069), “MOUNTAIN” (RSP I 169), “THRONE” (RSP I 297), “KING/TO REIGN” (RSP I

---

\(^9\) 2 Kgs 18:33 (LXX 32-3), where γῆ appears four times, βασιλεύς once, χωρα once, θεος once, and χείρος once.

\(^{10}\) 2 Chron 15:5, which contains ἐκπορευομαι, εἰσπορευομαι, κυριος, κατοικω, and χωρα, each once. 2 Chron 32:13 has πάτηρ, θεος, γη, χειρος, and χωρα each once. λαος occurs twice.

\(^{11}\) Prov 8: 26-7 (where the Hebrew is in any case unclear) and Prov 29: 4, also Amos 3:9, which is particularly interesting as χωρα occurs twice, once in close association with Αὐγυπτός, a word pair which, when it occurs in the Pentateuch has γῆς translated by γῆ.

**Hapax Legomena**

The **hapax legomena** are הָרַע, “CLOUD”, (RSP I 447), found only at Isaiah 5:30, and מִרְי מָבָג, “MIRY BOG”, (RSP III 099), at Psalms 140:11-12. The meaning of the former word, even though a **hapax legomenon**, does not seem to be under dispute. The LXX translates the verse in question as

καὶ βοήσει δυ' αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὡς φωνῇ
θαλάσσης κυματούσης· καὶ ἐμβλέψωσιν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ
ιδοὺ σκότος σκηνρόν ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ αὐτῶν.

The Greek ἀπορία does not exactly translate הָרַע because it means something more like “shade” than it does “cloud”. A more literal translation might have been ὀμβρος, which is used elsewhere as a translation for מַגָיב “SHOWER” when it pairs with מַגָא “rainfall” (RSP I 519), itself **hapax legomenon**.

מִרְי מָבָג, which derives from מָבָג, means according to BDB “to pour out” and KB “it is pouring rain”. While “MIRY BOG” satisfactorily conveys the meaning of the noun, BDB translates it as “FLOOD”, or “WATERY PIT”, and KB as “PITS FILLED WITH RAIN”. The LXX (at Ps 139:11-2) translates it

11. πεσοῦνται ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἄνθρακες
ἐν πυρὶ καταβαλεῖς αὐτοὺς,

12. ἀνὴρ γλωσσώδης οὐ κατευθυνθησεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
ἄνδρα διδικον κακὰ θηρεύσει εἰς διαφθορὰν.

Since these are the only occurrences of both those words, it is not possible to make any comparisons about the way they were translated in different places.

**Words That Pair Only With הָרַע**

The next group to consider are those words which pair with nothing other than הָרַע. They are הָר, “BED” (RSP I 066); מִר, “MOUNTAIN” (RSP I 169); מִרְי.
"HOOK" (RSP III 116); סָמַךְ, "TO SUBMIT/DECEPTION" (RSP III 161);
נָשָׁן, "PLANTATION/TO PLANT" (RSP III 212).

 nipples occurs in the BHS thirty-two times, but it occurs only once within the
ninety-six bytes that AnyText searches. That is at 1 Sam 28:24, where the LXX
translates it as διφρον.

καί οὔκ ἑρουλήθη φαγεῖν· καὶ παρεβιάζοντο αὐτὸν οἱ
παῖδες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἢ γυνὴ, καὶ ἦκουσεν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν καὶ
ἀνέστη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τὸν διφρόν.

πιτ; is similar. It does not occur as often as nipples (only nine times), but the
pairing also appears in only one place - Ezekiel 19:4, which is translated
καὶ ἦκουσαν κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἐθνή, ἐν τῇ διαφορά αὐτῶν
συνελήμφησιν, καὶ γῆγαγον αὐτὸν ἐν κημῷ εἰς γῆν Αἰγύπτου.

Like ἀπορία above, κημός does not exactly translate πιτ, but since hooks and
thorns were used in the ancient world like bridles for directing domestic animals,
the reason for the Seventy’s choice is clear.

τι is rather different. It occurs in the BHS 793 times, and sixty of those times
it is in close proximity with γῆ. Every one of those sixty times it is translated by
ὁρος. And every time γῆ appears as one member of this word pair, it is
translated by γῆ; when τι occurs, it is translated by ὁρος.

שֵׁם שֵׁם, "TO SUBMIT/DECEPTION" (RSP III 161); Dahood translates the
verb in RSP as "TO CRINGE". He appends a note:

S. Rin, BZ, XI (1967), 182-183, sees in שֵׁם ("to worship") the root found
in הֶנַּק (a connection that is phonetically and semantically acceptable.13

This suggestion brings it closer to the BDB and KB translation of "TO SUBMIT"
or "TO DENY". The verb occurs in the BHS twenty-two times, and with γῆ only
three, where it is translated in each case by the root ψευδο-. There is another
possibility for this root. The noun meaning "LIE, DECEPTION" and also
"LEANNESS", שֶׁבַּר, is agreed by BDB and KB to be cognate. Though it occurs
eight times in the BHS, it never appears in close proximity with γῆ and
therefore lies outside the scope of this study.

משלשני appears, like its predecessor, as both a noun and a verb from the
same root. The noun, which means "PLANTATION", occurs only twelve times
and pairs four; the verb "TO PLANT" is found more often, fifty-nine times, but
still pairs only five times. In each of the translations the Greek root φυο- occurs.

This completes all the words of the first shell that do not pair with any words
other than γῆ.

13 RSP III, p. 90
Words That Pair With One Word Other Than יִסְכָּה

The next group to consider are those which pair with one word other than יִסְכָּה. “DUST”, “NORTH” and “FOOTSTOOL” each fall into this category.

“DUST”, pairs of course with יִסְכָּה (RSP I 067), but apart from that, pairs only with יִסְכָּה (“head” RSP III 284), which pairs with ten other words, of which only one is a word not in the third shell. יִסְכָּה allows entry into the complex of prepositions in RSP, such as “in” (RSP I 100, I 417), “between” (RSP III 060), and “behind” (RSP III 062). But these are largely separate from the word here under analysis. Prepositions in RSP seem mainly to group together and to pair with each other. The words with which יִסְכָּה pairs are similar, and this means that יִסְכָּה is effectively outside the interlinking which characterises the group of words surrounding יִסְכָּה. I suggest that this isolation is reflected in the variety of translations which the LXX gives for it: יִסְכָּה, “SAND”, (Gen 13:16), χόμα, “DUST”, (Exod 8:12-3), πηλος, “CLAY”, (2 Sam 22:43), ἔδαφος, “SOIL” (Isaiah 29:4), ποσσα, “PITCH, TAR” (Isaiah 34:9), χόον, “DUST”, (Psalm 44:26 - LXX Psalm 46: 26) and even κοπριος, “DUNG”, (Psalm 113:7 - LXX Psalm 112:7). As the investigation proceeds it may be that a pattern will emerge in the way the words under analysis are translated. The next chapter will attempt some tentative explanations of the results that appear.

“FOOTSTOOL”, appears in the BHS only twelve times. Four of those times it pairs with יִסְכָּה (RSP I 160) and twice it pairs with יִסְכָּה “THRONE” (RSP I 298). In each case the Greek is ΥΠΟΠΟΘΙΟΝ. “FOOTSTOOL”, like “DUST”, does not directly enter the complex of words currently under analysis. However, unlike “DUST”, it does enter this complex indirectly, through its association in word pairing, as in Ancient Near Eastern iconography, with “THRONE”, and “THRONE” with “KING/TO REIGN” (RSP I 299), which is another first-shell word. “THRONE” will be dealt with a little later because it pairs with many words other than יִסְכָּה; suffice to say here that it conjures not only regal associations but also those of order and civilisation, like “table” (RSP I 300) and “city” (RSP III 279).

“NORTH”, is in rather a different situation from either of the two previous words. Although like those it pairs with only one word other than יִסְכָּה, it is both a proper noun and a common noun. It seems to have come from Ugaritic as a proper noun, and was retained in Hebrew as the name of a mountain as well as meaning “NORTH”. It is translated in the LXX with great consistency as βόρρᾱ. The place name, used in Ps 89:13 MT, Job 26:7 and Ezek 32:30, is not transliterated, unlike most proper names. At Psalm 88:13 LXX, we have τὸν βόρρᾶν καὶ θαλάσσας οὐ έκτισας,
and this in spite of the presence of other place-names in this text that might have alerted the Seventy to γῆς as a proper noun. In Job 26:7,

\[ \text{ekteίνων } \text{ βορέαν } \text{ ἐπ' οὐδὲν} \]

κρεμάζων γῆν ἐπὶ οὐδενός.

appears, in which the parallelism could scarcely be clearer. Finally, Ezekiel 32:30 has

\[ \text{ἐκεῖ ὁ ἄρχωντες τοῦ βορρᾶ πάντες στρατηγοὶ Ἀσσουρ} \]

Did the Seventy not know that γῆς could be a proper noun? The number of examples, thirty-four, is hardly enough to let us make a definitive answer, but there is enough information to make us wonder if that might be the case.

γῆς, as we pointed out earlier, is one of those words which pairs with one word other than γῆς. In this case the other word is ὅρις, "to bind" (RSP III 266). It occurs sixty-one times in the BHS but never appears within ninety-six bytes of γῆς.

We have now considered, of the words which pair with γῆς, those which are hapax legomena (two), those which pair with no words other than γῆς (five), and those which pair with only one other word (three). That totals ten, which is more than one-third of the entire number of words that pair with γῆς.

Words Which Pair With Between Two And Five Words

The next group of words we shall consider are those which pair with two words and up to five other than γῆς.

σωσθήσεται, "ROOT/TO UPROOT" (RSP I 584) is one of those words which may be (when unpointed) either a noun or a verb. The noun only occurs in close proximity three times, and each time it is translated by ἄνωθεν. The verb, also occurring only three times and once with σωσθήσεται as a cognate accusative, is translated by the verb ἄνωθεν, which preserves the internal cognate at Isaiah 40:24. In the other places where σωσθήσεται appears the Seventy translate it in a more complex way:

Psalm 52:7 (LXX 51:7)

καὶ τὸ ἄνωθεν σου ἐκ γῆς ζωντῶν

Psalm 80:10 (79:10)

καὶ κατεφύτευσας τὰς ἄνεις αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ.

"ROOT" pairs with one other first-shell word, ἡ γῆ, "HOUSE" (RSP III 074). "HOUSE", it transpires, forms pairs of many types; it seems probable that its association with "ROOT" comes through the derived meaning of "ROOT" as "OFFSPRING"). The translation of "ROOT" in this pairing is exactly the same as it
is when it pairs with γυνή, φίλα, probably because the Greek φίλα has the same derived meaning. (The verb has no examples in close proximity with “HOUSE”.) We assume that the same rationale lies behind the way “ROOT” joins with its only other paired word, ἡ δικαιοσύνη, “son” (RSP I 116). Through “son” as through “HOUSE”, we enter the Major Complex of word pair relations already described, and indeed demonstrated, in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs? That it was extraordinarily rich was very clear there; here we see the way several words that are only peripherally involved enter the Complex through a seemingly minor association. ἡ δικαιοσύνη, “son”, like οἶκος, “HOUSE”, and μύριον, “bread”, will be discussed later in detail. Here we only note that ἡ δικαιοσύνη pairs with fifteen words other than itself and “ROOT”, including only one first shell word, “GOD”, which will be discussed at length in its turn. Of the other words that ἡ δικαιοσύνη pairs with, only ἱλάσαι, “star” (RSP I 117), ἡ, “name” (RSP I 547), and ἑταροί, “Baal/master/to own” (RSP I 113) are second shell words. The rest are all third shell.

Ὑάτον, “STONE”, appears in the next group of words we are considering in association with ὄξους as a triplet. Therefore it only appears in this context with θῦμος (“TREE”) as well (RSP III 245). The possible phonetic relationship of the three words has already been discussed in the previous chapter. Be that as it may, the occasions where the three occur in close proximity are few, Exod 7:19; Deut 8:9, Jer 3:9, and Ezek 20:33 (LXX 32-33). In each case the relevant words are translated γαία, λειβατος, and ξυλος. “TREE”, when paired with θῦμος, is once translated δεσνδρον (Deut 22:6) and once βοτανή (Gen 1:11), with one occasion where both δεσνδρον and ξυλος appear (Exod 9:25-6). The only first shell word in RSP with which “STONE” pairs (as opposed to appearing in a triplet) is ἄδειος, “TREE” (RSP I 009, I 441). That pair occurs fifty-four times, and with one exception at 1 Kings 18:38 ἄδειος is translated by ξυλος, while ὄξους is always translated by λειβατος or twice by one of its cognates. A second shell word with which “STONE” pairs is δοξάζειν, “balances” (RSP I 008), which though it occurs in the BHS forty-two times never appears in close proximity with ὄξους. It pairs with nothing else. Another second shell word falling into this category is ἄγω, “arrow” (RSP I 178). It pairs with ὄξους only three times; the Greek words are ῥοξος and λειβατος. “Arrow”, as so many words do, pairs with itself (RSP I 179), but also with ἄγω, “hand” (RSP I 180), “bow” (RSP I 505), and “quiver” (RSP I 084). As the other two words are third shell, ἄγω is the only one that concerns us further. Also, it is through ἄγω and its pair with ἄγω that we enter the Major Complex which includes words like ἡ δίκαιος, “son”, ἡ, “name”, ἰσχύς, “KING/TO REIGN”, and λειβατος, “GOD”. Each of those will be analysed in its turn. ἄγω “arrow” and ὄξους “hand” (RSP I 180) pair seven times and while ἄγω; is, as might be expected, translated χειροσ, ὄξους is on all but one
occasion translated ἴην θεοί rather than τὸ χρήμα, as it was when paired with Ἰερ χρήμα "STONE" above. As often before, the number of occasions where the words occur is too small to be able to draw any firm conclusions. In any case, such conclusions as seem possible will be considered in the next chapter.

In this context, this is a good place to discuss ἱππος "TREE". While it does appear in the triplet, unlike Ἰερ χρήμα "STONE" it pairs with itself (RSP I 443) and with one other first shell word apart from the other two in the triplet. This word is, logically enough, ἱππος, "FRUIT" (RSP III 260). Second shell words are nearly as sparse. They are "Lebanon" (RSP I 327), "juniper" (RSP I 446), "cedar" (RSP I 442). "Juniper" forms no other pairs, and none of its occurrences with "TREE" are in close proximity. "Cedar" and "Lebanon" pair with each other twenty-six times, but form no other pairs with first or second shell words. The translation for "TREE" is consistently ἴην θεοί, while that for "FRUIT" is καρπίς two times out of three. "Cedar" is κεδρός or κεδρίνος, and "Lebanon" is without exception simply transliterated, the common fate of proper names.

ἱππος, "FRUIT", pairs with three words, one of which is also in the first shell (ἱππος, "TREE", RSP III 265). "TREE", as was mentioned above, is consistently translated ἴην θεοί. One of the other words with which ἱππος pairs is ἰππος, "produce" (RSP I 211). However, it does not occur in close proximity to ἱππος in the BHS and does not pair with any other words. The third is ἰππος, "olive tree" (RSP III 103). ἱππος is like ἱππος ("FOOTSTOOL") mentioned above. Through one of the words with which it pairs, ἰππος, it enters the huge Major Complex which includes "oil", "bread", "to serve/servant", etc. The translation of that Complex will be discussed at length in the appropriate place. Suffice to say here that the word through which ἱππος enters, ἰππος, "olive tree", is translated by ἐλαλεῖ, which is cognate with and very similar to ἐλαπλεῖν, "oil", the word that customarily translates Ἰο. ἱππος does not pair directly with Ἰο "oil", though ἰππος does (RSP III 103). Note that though the Hebrew words ἰππος "olive tree" and Ἰο "oil", a word pair (RSP III 104), are not cognate, nonetheless at every occasion on which the two are paired the Seventy translated the words by cognate words. There is only one occasion (Jer 11:16) of the pairing ἱππος :: ἰππος but many more of the pair ἰππος :: Ἰο. At first glance this would seem to be a reversal of the phenomenon of stereotypical translation noted by Emmanuel Tov above. However, as that principle is enunciated, it states that cognate Hebrew words tend to be translated by cognate Greek words; this is a case of Hebrew words (not cognate, but within the same semantic field) being translated by cognate Greek words.
The last word that pairs with three words other than יִשְׂרָאֵל is יָרוֹד “ROCK”. When it pairs with יִשְׂרָאֵל, and this only happens four times, the translation is πετρόω. Otherwise, “ROCK” pairs with two first shell words - “GOD” (RSP I 448) and “HEAVEN” (RSP I 453). It also pairs with one second shell word - “father” (RSP I 004). In each case the translation is the same as when יִשְׂרָאֵל pairs with יָרוֹד. יָרוֹד enters only tangentially into the Major Complex. Through “GOD” and “HEAVEN”, it certainly does, but a more direct entry, which might be achieved through “father”, carries on through “Lord” (RSP III 001), “Baal/master/to own” (RSP I 120), and “sun” (RSP III 319) but peters out there. Like entry through either of the two first shell words, involvement in the Major Complex can come indirectly through any of those words, but there is no direct route.

The Sole Verb

The next word in the first shell that we will consider is the only one under analysis which is a verb only and not a noun as well. For this reason it may have been handled by the Seventy rather differently from, say, יִשְׂרָאֵל, (“KING” / “TO REIGN”).

And let me say immediately that, with only a handful of exceptions, יִשְׂרָאֵל is translated by a verb that derives from the Greek noun οἶκος, “HOUSE”. Most often that verb is θῆκος, but the simple verb appears as well, along with other compounds. This verb shows to a marked degree the stereotypical translation described by Tov and discussed in the previous chapter. יִשְׂרָאֵל, “TO SIT”, pairs, as so many of these words in the first and second shells do, with itself (RSP I 271). It also pairs with several other first-shell words - “TO INHERIT” / “INHERITANCE” (RSP I 272), “TO REIGN” / “KING” (RSP I 360), “WAY” / “TO TREAD” (RSP II 152), and “ROCK” (RSP I 155).

“TO INHERIT” / “INHERITANCE”, יִשְׂרָאֵל/תָּרָם (RSP I 272), appears in close proximity with יִשְׂרָאֵל only a few times. While יִשְׂרָאֵל appears, as explained above, it is not invariably the verb of choice for translation. That is shared by both verbs and nouns based on the Greek root θῆκος. However, the numbers are insufficient to be able draw definite conclusions from them.

“KING” / “TO REIGN”, יִשְׂרָאֵל (RSP I 360), is one of the pairs that shows the most frequent number of pairings in this study. While the number of

---

14 Dahood, in RSP, customarily translates יִשְׂרָאֵל as “MOUNTAIN” rather than “ROCK”, as local geography tends to make the two synonymous. I have confined the translation of יִשְׂרָאֵל to “ROCK” in order to allow יָרוֹד to be translated “MOUNTAIN”.
occurrences of both בָּשִׁים and דַּמִּים is high (1088 for the former and 4086 for the latter), that, as a glance at the appendix at the end of this study shows, is not a guarantee of a high instance of pairing. In fact, the total number of pairs, of בָּשִׁים with both דַּמִּים and דַּלִּים, is 105. דָּל ו and its compounds as always predominate in the translation; in fact, where בָּשִׁים pairs with דַּמִּים, there are no exceptions. Where it pairs with דַּל ו, the only exception is 1 Kings 1:13:

Go in at once to King David, and say to him, 'Did you not, my lord the king, swear to your servant, saying: Your son Solomon shall succeed me as king, and he shall sit on my throne? Why then is Adonijah king?' (NRSV)

which the LXX renders

Clearly, the exceptional use of a Greek verb not cognate with דָּל ו was influenced by four successive uses of the word דַּמִּים in that verse, three of which precede it while one follows. Thus, on a subconscious if not a conscious level, here the Seventy exercised an alternative to stereotypical translation. In the instance, the Hebrew used the noun דַּמִּים with the customary though not cognate verb בָּשִׁים, while the Greek used βασιλέως, the cognate verb βασιλεύω, and another Greek verb not cognate. The implications of דַּמִּים and the way it is translated will be taken up when we get to that first shell word.

"WAY/TO TREAD", דָּמִים (RSP III 152, II 024), is another very important first shell that pairs with בָּשִׁים. Like דַּמִּים above, it is a segholate noun with a cognate verb. The noun is found in close proximity with "TO SIT" twenty-six times, and the only verb once. (This pairing, at Jeremiah 25:30, is missing from the LXX.) "WAY" and "TO SIT" appear in the BHS approximately a thousand times each, but are within ninety-six bytes of each other only about 2.5% of the time. This is hardly significant, and could well be regarded as a chance selection, were it not for the cognate word pair in Ugaritic. If the Seventy did not recognise (either consciously or subconsciously) these two words as a pair, that could account for the uncharacteristic presence of דָּמִים and דַּל ו as translations for בָּשִׁים, as well as the more usual דָּל ו and its compounds.

Finally, among first shell pairings, "TO SIT" pairs with כָּר, "ROCK" (RSP III 155). The number of occurrences is minimal, only four, and the LXX translates it equivocally, using neither λίθος nor πέτρος, one of which we would have
expected. However, יָּשָׁר, the focus of this section, does behave in the expected manner, being translated with any of several compounds of וְיָשָׁר.

“TO SIT” pairs with a number of second shell words, among them שָׁם, “bread” (RSP III 154). Each of the second shell words will be discussed in turn, but here is a convenient place to discuss at length the translation of the Major Complex which I described in detail in the previous chapter and have mentioned since. It is appropriate to look at the way the LXX translates word pairs that juxtapose concepts central to Israelite culture, like “bread” :: “oil” :: “wine” (RSP I 333).

Translation Of The Major Complex
Because this section is devoted to the translation of the Major Complex in general, not to the way that words within it pair with first shell words, I shall confine my discussion to second shell words that pair together. First shell words are covered elsewhere in this chapter and third shell words, as explained in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs?, are not analysed but only recorded to provide context.

In the Major Complex, we see the same kind of consistency of translation we have found elsewhere in this study. It is not perfect - that would be so unlikely as to arouse suspicion - but it is remarkable, given the belief common in some quarters that the Seventy had little unanimity of design.

“Servant/to serve” is translated in a very interesting way. יָּשָׁר is almost evenly divided between the nouns פָּדִישׁ and דָּוִלָּס. The verb דָּוַלַח is more often recorded than פָּדִישׁ is as a translation for the verb, but both are present. The reasons for which noun is chosen seem to be based on nuances drawn out of the social circumstances of the culture. These are elaborated in the conclusions chapter. In the pair “servant” :: “son of a handmaid” (RSP I 404), יָּשָׁר is always translated דָּוַלַח, but פָּדִישׁ is evenly divided between פָּדִישׁ (and, rarely, its cognates) and דָּוִלָּס, with a few transliterations of the proper name as אֶבֶד. In the case of יָּשָׁר pairing with פָּדִישׁ, the verb is translated דָּוַלַח or קָּדַדְוַלַח. The same pattern of using both פָּדִישׁ and דָּוִלָּס appears throughout the translation in pairings between the noun “servant” and the other second shell nouns, “eternity” וְקָדַדְוַלַח (RSP I 405) and “bread” וְקָדַדְוַלָּס (RSP III 228). דָּוִלָּס outnumbers פָּדִישׁ in both these cases, but where יָּשָׁר “to serve” is a member of the pair, the verb is דָּוַלַח when paired with פָּדִישׁ and, somewhat surprisingly,
When paired with מַעֲשַׁהוּ 15. But “eternity” is always translated מַעֲשַׁהוּ and “bread” is always אָרֵרָס.

“Son” יָהֲעַג as far as I can tell is very consistent. It is almost always מָעַהוּ, one exception being a few cases of תֹּאכַו “child”, where יָהֲעַג pairs with מַעֲשַׁהוּ (RSP III 117), מִשְׁמָה “name” (RSP I 147), מִשְׁמָה לְבֵל “Baal/master/to own” (RSP I 113). The other exception is posed by three instances in the book of Job where it is translated מֵעֲשַׁהוּ.

"star" is always translated אֶסְתַּנְר. This applies whether it pairs with "son" (RSP I 117), or “water” (RSP III 190), or is in the triplet or quadruplet which will be discussed under “HEAVEN”. The same consistency is true of “water” whether it is in the pair with “star” or it occurs in the aforementioned triplet/quadruplet or in a pair with “oil” (RSP III 191, I 354). It is invariably מְדָוְר.

"name" is just as consistent. Its second shell words are only "son" (RSP I 547) and מִשְׁמָה "hand" (RSP I 219), but מַעֲשַׁהוּ appears without any exceptions.

"Hand" מִשְׁמָה, apart from the pair just mentioned, pairs only with itself (RSP I 217) and with מַעֲשַׁהוּ “arrow” (RSP I 179). "Hand" is always translated מֵעֲשַׁהוּ, but “arrow” is not quite as remarkably consistent as we have seen with this set of nouns. It is sometimes translated מֵעֲשַׁהוּ and other times seems to be מֵעֲשַׁהוּ; the former is strictly an arrow (or at least a cast missile) while the latter is a bow, but they may appear as alternatives through merismus.

“Baal/master/to own” is potentially one of the most revealing words in the Major Complex because it has several meanings and therefore contexts, because it is sometimes a noun and sometimes a verb, and because it pairs with an unusually large number of second shell words. Those five words are יָהֲעַג "son" (RSP I 113), מִשְׁמָה "death/to die/dead" (RSP I 371), מִשְׁמָה "Lord" (RSP I 120), מִשְׁמָה "great" (RSP I 512), and מִשְׁמָה "sun" (RSP III 319). These offer as well as nouns, a verb and an adjective. Unfortunately, of the pairs, the second and fourth have no occurrences in close proximity, and the third has only one, Isaiah 26: 13, translated in the LXX

κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς· κύριε, ἔκτος σοῦ ἄλλον οὐκ οὐδεμεν, τὸ ὄνομα σου ὄνομάζομεν.

The fifth, "sun" is more promising with five occurrences and, though "sun" is reliably מַעֲשַׁהוּ, מִשְׁמָה proves disappointing because it is transliterated, as is customary with proper names. The same is true of RSP I 113, the pair with יָהֲעַג, which seems to confine itself to proper names and place names. There is however

15 Two out of the three instances are in Proverbs (12:11 and 28:19) and the third is in Ezekiel (48:18).
16 Job 1: 6, 2: 1, 38: 8 (LXX 7)
one notable exception, Proverbs 31:28, which in the LXX pairs ἡμᾶς and ἄνθρωπος. So much for a promising example; the reality is sometimes disappointing.

"Death/to die/dead" offers the possibility of more revealing information except that it too proved a disappointment, but not for the same reason as בֵּית. In the pairing of the latter with the former (RSP I 371), there are, as we saw, no occurrences in close proximity. And the only other second shell word with which בֵּית/מת pairs is רָדַּשׁ "to descend" (RSP III 208). Thus we actually gain very little information about translation from this word too.

But "to descend" also pairs with "to ascend" (RSP I 421), and hardly surprisingly this pair is translated καταβαίνω and ἀναβαίνω. The latter member of this pair also pairs with ἀνάβει which means "to go, walk" (RSP III 237). It might be supposed by the uninitiated that the most likely translation for ἀνάβει would be περιπατέω, but this occurs in only one place - Ecclesiastes 11:9. No, the verb of choice is πορευομαι, or one of its compounds, and that with great consistency. Πορευομαι, or one of its compounds, is the customary translation for ἀνάβει across the board.

ἀνάβει also pairs with ἀνάξιον "hunting/to hunt " (RSP I 166, I 474), and this is translated by the noun θηρία or the cognate verb θηρεύω whether it is in that pair or with "FIELD" (RSP II 062) or with ἄρτος "bread" (RSP I 475).

This latter word "bread", which as we saw above, pairs with "hunting/to hunt ", also forms a triplet with one other second shell word, "oil" and "wine" (RSP I 333). "Oil" here and in its other pairings is consistently translated ἐλαιὸν and in the pair ἀνάβει "oil" :: ὕδωρ "water" (RSP I 354, III 191) the translation is ἐλαιὸν :: ὕδωρ. (Note that we have already covered "water" through its appearance in the quadruplet "star" :: "GOD" :: "HEAVEN" :: "water" (RSP III 190); one of the ways these words reinforce the universe of discourse they describe is by this kind of multiple pairing.) ἄρτος "bread" finally pairs with ἄρης "table" (RSP I 336), and the latter word is consistently translated τραπέζηα.

I have discussed the translation of the Major Complex at some length because I have occasion to refer to it many times. Most of the first shell words analysed connect with it, particularly if they pair with a total of several words. Increasingly as this chapter progresses we will be considering words of that kind.

With "SEA", as we saw above, the way into the Major Complex was through its pairing with "sun". In the case of בֵּית, the point of entry is the pair with בֵּית ה "bread" (RSP III 154). "Bread", as we already know, forms a triplet with "oil" and "wine" (RSP I 333), and so on. Once entry has been made into the Major Complex, that Complex is exactly the same as when we discussed it in connection with "SEA". It is the sameness that is so powerful; the Complex resonates with
powerful semantic forces, which may be accessed through any of a large number of pairings. And as soon as any member of the Complex is used, the aura of the entire thing begins to pervade the composition. The Major Complex appears again and again in the constellation of words that surround נְשָׁך, and we shall note each of those occasions when it arises.

Once Again בֵּית

בֵּית pairs with two further second shell nouns, "gate" (RSP III 156) and "family" (RSP III 339). The former pairs with only two other words, one of which is a first shell word ("HOUSE" - RSP I 137), and the other a third shell word and therefore not analysed. The translation of this pair is a little different from some others we have seen. The overwhelming majority of occurrences of נְשָׁך "gate" is translated by פֹעַל, but while several times בֵּית is translated by אָמַף or כָּתוּב (as we would expect), almost as often it is translated by כָּתוּב and once by עִיָּב. As we will see in detail later, "HOUSE" is a very interesting word with a wide variety of pairings which suggest a breadth of implication far beyond the immediate notion of shelter. It may be, given the pairing of בֵּית with נְשָׁך and נְשָׁך with הָעִבְּרִית (RSP I 137), that the nuances from הָעִבְּרִית flow over into בֵּית. This supposition would be strengthened if נְשָׁך paired with הָעִבְּרִית. In fact it does not, and we have already seen how בֵּית when paired with נְשָׁך is sometimes translated by a cognate verb of אָמַף but almost as often by a word which has no etymological association with it.

The pairing of בֵּית with "family" (RSP III 339) is another of those instances where the noun נְשָׁך pairs with nothing else. In the only place (1 Chronicles 2:55) where the two pair, בֵּית is translated entirely predictably, just as we have seen so often before. רַבִּים, an entirely different word, is sometimes translated "family" and it is this word which pairs with בֵּית (RSP I 002) and with נְשָׁך "eternity" (RSP I 425). I have translated רַבִּים as "generation" in order to avoid confusion with נְשָׁך. As a third shell word, the pairs that form with רַבִּים were not analysed.

בֵּית's final collection of pairs is a group of verbs. רָעָה "to raise" (RSP III 222) pairs with itself (RSP I 394) as well as with ten third shell words. There is also a triplet consisting of בֵּית with "to ascend" רוּחַ and "to descend" רוּחַ (RSP III 238), and these pair with each other (RSP I 421), as they both do with נְשָׁך (RSP I 422 and I 256 respectively). "To ascend" also pairs with six miscellaneous third shell words and "to descend" with itself (RSP I 255) as well as two other third shell verbs. In all these cases, נְשָׁך is translated by כָּתוּב, while the translations of choice for "to ascend" and "to descend" are הרָפָא and
The rest of the verbs pairing with יָשָׁב are "to overturn" (RSP III 337), which pairs also with two third shell verbs, שָׁרָה, "to possess" (RSP III 338), which pairs also with one third shell verb, and יָשָׁר, "to shepherd" (RSP I 274), which pairs with nothing else. In all these cases, the translation of choice for יָשָׁב is קָדָם with only an occasional exception.

Words That Can Be Either A Noun Or A Verb

Words that fall into this category number five. They are שֶׁרֶשֶׁר, "ROOT/TO UPROOT" (RSP I 584), גֶּפֶל/גֶּפֶל, "PLANTATION/TO PLANT" (RSP III 212), both of which have already been discussed, and יָשָׁר/יָשָׁר, "KING/TO REIGN", יָשָׁר/יָשָׁר, "WAY/TO TREAD" (RSP II 006), and יָשָׁר/יָשָׁר, "INHERITANCE/TO INHERIT" (RSP III 044). Because all these words can be more than one part of speech, in each case the noun and verb is pointed differently. That fact has enabled me to check to some degree for reduplicatives. As explained in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs? AnyText does not allow testing for the proximity of two identical words. But technically (taking into account the pointing) the noun and the verb are not identical, and so I was able to do proximity checks on those word pairs which exhibit this characteristic. יָשָׁר "KING" and יָשָׁר "TO REIGN" (RSP I 361) appear in close proximity eighty-three times. Without exception, the noun is translated בָּשָׂר and the verb בָּשָׂר, as we would expect from the principle of stereotypical translation put forward by Emmanuel Tov and discussed in Chapter VII The Seventy as Translators. יָשָׁר/יָשָׁר ("KING/TO REIGN") pairs with יָשָׁר (RSP I 358) 202 times as a noun and twenty-one times as a verb; it may be thought that because of the unique situation of these words, the noun and the verb should really be discussed separately. In fact, we have here a classic example of Tov's stereotypical translation - every time the Greek word has the root βασιλεύω, just as the Hebrew always has the root -בָּשָׂר. Therefore the noun/verb distinction is not necessary. An important first shell word with which "KING/TO REIGN" pairs is בָּלָה/בָּלָה, "GOD" (RSP 1 036); this is another of those pairings which is a little complicated by the translation of words for "GOD". The entire issue of the translation of words for God is discussed later in this chapter. In this section I am focussing on the member "KING/TO REIGN", and that follows the principle of stereotypical translation with one exception - Προέδρους instead of בָּשָׂר at Numbers 23:21. Another, almost equally important, word is יָשָׁר/יָשָׁר which, in pairs with יָשָׁר/יָשָׁר (RSP I 359), provides four possible combinations. "KING" :: "WAY" appears thirty-two times, and is just as consistent as the others. "TO REIGN" :: "WAY" occurs in close proximity only once, at Psalm 146:9 (LXX 145:9-10), and
there “WAY” is מֵלָה/מֵלָה while “TO REIGN” is, of course, βασιλέως. מֵלָה does not appear in close proximity. “KING/TO REIGN” paired with “TO SIT” (RSP I 360) exhibits the same translation consistency we have already seen. “TO SIT” has already been discussed, and מֵלָה does not pair with any other first shell words. Among second shell words, there are a number that may be expected, like “Lord” (RSP I 357), “servant/to serve ” (RSP I 362), “to judge/ruler/justice” (RSP I 365), “to establish” (RSP III 199). All these are entirely consistent regarding the translation we have seen already. Second shell words, probably less expected or even entirely unexpected, are מֵלָה/מֵלָה: “death/to die/dead” (RSP II 034, III 171), מֵלָה/מֵלָה “to build” (RSP III 197), מֵלָה/מֵלָה “to fortify” (RSP III 198), מֵלָה/מֵלָה “name” (RSP III 200), מֵלָה/מֵלָה “to be sated/satiety” (RSP I 364). The translation of מֵלָה/מֵלָה is, throughout all these pairs, consistent, although in many cases there are so few occurrences that it is not really possible to be sure that apparent consistency is the same as actual consistency. Through the second shell words we have seen before - “Lord”, “servant/to serve ”, “death/to die/dead”, and “name” - entry can be achieved from several directions into the Major Complex.

“INHERIT/ANCE” pairs with מֵלָה/מֵלָה (RSP III 044) a total of seventy-five times. “INHERIT/ANCE” is always translated by a Greek cognate of κληρονομια. Setting aside מֵלָה/מֵלָה, “INHERIT/ANCE” does not pair with itself as so many of the nouns do, but it does pair with the first shell word, “TO SIT” (RSP I 272), and there it is translated just as it is when paired with מֵלָה/מֵלָה. Of second shell words, there is only “dominion ” (RSP I 380) and “holiness ” (RSP I 484) and these are again consistently translated. None of these words form a point of entry into the Major Complex in any direct way; through “TO SIT” there is indirect entry, but the lack of a direct point (or, as in the case of מֵלָה/מֵלָה several points) to some degree isolates this word from the constellation of words here analysed. The same phenomenon can be seen to a greater degree with another first shell word, “DUST”.

“WAY/TO TREAD” is the final word among those that may be either a noun or a verb. It pairs with מֵלָה, of course, (RSP II 006) and here the distinction between noun and verb becomes important. When מֵלָה pairs with מֵלָה, the latter is translated as מֵלָה, and this occurs fifty-seven times. When, however, it is paired with מֵלָה, only eight times, the translation is not the verb cognate with מֵלָה, but rather מֵלָה.

Other first shell words with which מֵלָה/מֵלָה pairs are מֵלָה, “HEAVEN” (RSP III 094), and the pairing we have already seen with מֵלָה/מֵלָה. Second shell

17 BDB and KB do not agree with this translation. Therefore it was not analysed.
words are “path” (RSP III 225) and “to submit/deny” (RSP II 027), and neither of these pair with anything else. Out of the possible pairings with both these words, there is only one example - Psalm 119:35 (LXX 118:35) - and the translation there is indirect.

οδηγησον με ἐν τρίβω τὰν ἔτολμην σου, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἠθέλησα.

The direct path of entry into the Major Complex from ἑλκύτωρ, however, is through its pairing with the second shell word ὁδός “to go/walk” (RSP III 098). At first glance, that pair is interesting in the same way that the pairing with ἀπέρχομαι is. However, when ἑλκύτωρ “WAY” pairs with “to go/walk”, as it does 177 times, ἑλκύτωρ is always translated ὁδὸς. ἑλκύτωρ, “to go/walk”, turns out though to be πορευόμαι or one of its compounds, but there are also six examples of ἀπέρχομαι, all in 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings, a clear case of idiosyncratic translation.

περιπατέω appears only once, perhaps significantly, at Ecclesiastes 11:9 and even there ἑλκύτωρ is ὁδός. The pair ἑλκύτωρ :: ἑλκύτωρ is much the same, though there are only three pairs to analyse. “To go/walk” pairs with “hunting/to hunt” (RSP I 166, 1474), which pairs with “bread” (RSP I 475), and thus we have entered decisively into the Major Complex.

Words Which Pair With More Than Five Words
The remaining words in the group we are analysing are those which pair with more than five words other than ἑλκύτωρ. They are all nouns, seven of them: “DEW” (RSP III 122), “FIELD” (RSP I 070), “HEAVEN” (RSP I 071, I 554), “HOUSE” (RSP I 127, III 069), “SHOWER” (RSP III 046), “THRONE” (RSP I 297), and “WILDERNESS” (RSP I 063).

The last of these words, ἐρήμος “WILDERNESS” (RSP I 063), is the least typical of the group. It pairs with a total of seven words. When it pairs with ἑλκύτωρ, it is translated either by ἐρημηθησα or ἐρημηθησας. The same is true when it pairs with ἑλκύτωρ “FIELD” (RSP I 536), the only first shell word. It also pairs with four words that pair with no words other than ἐρήμος, “wasteland” (RSP I 344), “seed” (RSP III 182), “devastation” (RSP III 183), and “dunes” (RSP III 184). These four words together elicit only three examples of pairs so the sample is not large, but in every case the LXX has ἐρημηθησα for ἐρήμος. The final pairing of ἐρήμος is with ἔρημος “corner/side” (RSP III 257), which pairs with only one other word, “face”, which is third shell. ἐρήμος in the ἐρήμος :: ἔρημος pair is translated with the same consistency we have seen in its other pairings.

“SHOWER”, μεταβίβασις, (RSP III 046), pairs with six words other than ἑλκύτωρ. Since “SHOWER” appears in the whole of the BHS only ten times, it is difficult to
make any generalities about the way it was translated by the Seventy. However, when it pairs with \( \text{γὰτα} \) (only once), the LXX has \( \text{σφαγὸνες} \). The only first shell word with which it pairs is \( \text{ἔλεγος} \) "DEW" (RSP I 205), and there it is \( \text{πίπτωσα} \). It does, however, form a triplet with "DEW" and "oil" (RSP I 207), as described in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs? The triplet only occurs once in the Hebrew (at Genesis 27:28). The LXX understands \( \text{ζῷο} \) here as the noun meaning "abundance" rather than the singular of the noun \( \text{δόξαντα} \) "SHOWER" and translates the verse

\[
\text{καὶ ἔδρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ θεοῦ}
\text{καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πιστητος τῆς γῆς}
\text{καὶ πλήθος σιτου καὶ οίνου.}
\]

The Seventy may well have been right; they were closer in time and thought patterns to the writers of the Hebrew Bible than we are. Modern translations like NRSV follow the LXX:

May God give you of the DEW of heaven, and of the fatness of the earth, and PLENTY of grain and wine.

All the other words with which "SHOWER" pairs are in the second shell. Two are (different) words for "rain" (RSP I 519 and RSP II 056) and the others are "light/to shine" (RSP I 060) and "fire" (RSP I 518). There is only one occurrence among all these pairs, which makes it impossible to determine if there is any consistency in translation. At Deuteronomy 32:2, the only example of RSP I 519, "SHOWER" is translated \( \text{δυσμός} \), while III 056 was not analysed because BDB and KB do not agree the translation of "rain". The pairing of "SHOWER" with \( \text{χοάν/χοάρις} \) (RSP I 060) produces no pairs in close proximity. "Fire" when paired with "SHOWER" (RSP I 518) is equally disappointing for the same reason.

"THRONE" also pairs with six words other than \( \text{γὰτα} \). In that pairing (RSP I 297), as in all the others with "THRONE", we find complete consistency, the Greek invariably being \( \text{θρόνος} \). \( \text{蹈} \) pairs with only two first shell words, "FOOTSTOOL" - RSP I 298 and "KING/TO REIGN" - RSP I 299, neither of which offer any surprises. But "THRONE" also pairs with "table" (RSP I 300), through which it enters the Major Complex, with "seat" (RSP I 409), "city" (RSP III 279), and "holiness" (RSP III 270). As explained before, in all these cases, "THRONE" is translated by \( \text{θρόνος} \).

We note again a curious circumstance concerned with \( \text{ἡσσίς} \) "holiness", which I have already discussed as a part of the Major Complex. It pairs with nine words, of which two are third shell words (and they pair with nothing else), but all the rest are first shell words. Further, these first shell words are not only the
expected ones, like “KING”, “HEAVEN”, and “GOD”, but others less obvious -
“ROCK”, “HOUSE” and “INHERIT/ANCE”.

Another noun, very like “SHOWER” in several respects both semantic and
lexical, pairs with half again the number of words. דבש “DEW” shows the kind of
consistency of translation that we have come to expect. From its pairing with ינש
(RSP III 122) to the paired phrases “DEW of HEAVEN” :: “oil of EARTH” (RSP I
208) and everything in between, we find absolute consistency in its translation as
דָּבָשׁ. Its first shell pairings are minimal, “SHOWER” (RSP I 205) plus a
triplet which includes “oil” (RSP I 207) and “HEAVEN”, as well as the latter in a
pair (RSP III 121). The second shell words are equally unsurprising: “to drip” (RSP
III 250); “rain” (RSP I 350), which in fact has no pairs in close proximity; “oil”
(RSP I 206), a pair independent of the triplet seen above; “water” (RSP I 352); and
“light/to shine” (RSP III 041). The LXX translation in all cases is דָּבָשׁ.

ניָּץ, “FIELD” pairs with eight words in all. The translation of its pairs with
ניָּץ (RSP I 070) shows some variation. Usually we find דָּבָשׁ, but several times
it is יֶּדֶּנֹּן instead. Unfortunately, we don’t know what happens when יָּניָּץ
pairs with itself (RSP I 537), but in the rest of the pairings, which are not
numerous, the proportion of דָּבָשׁ to יֶּדֶּנֹּן is about the same as it is in the
RSP I 070 pairing. There does not seem to be any pattern in the choice; maybe
both seemed equally possible. It is noticeable that “FIELD” leads quickly and
directly into the Major Complex, and those pairs that lie outside it are minimal.

The word pair “EARTH” :: “HEAVEN” יָּניָּץ :: יָּניָּץ (RSP I 071, I 554) exhibits
the classic pattern of word pair translation which this study has found in the LXX.
The number of occurrences is high by the standards we have seen, 185. יָּניָּץ is
always translated יִרְאָה, while יָּניָּץ is with equal consistency translated מְנַחַם.
“HEAVEN”, as we have already seen, forms a triplet with “star” and “GOD” (RSP
III 032) and a quadruplet with those same words plus “water” (RSP III 190). Entry
into the Major Complex could come through the first shell word, but is achieved
more directly through “star” which pairs with “water” (RSP III 190) or through
“water” itself which, since it pairs with “oil” (RSR III 191, I 354) leads into the
heart of that Complex. “HEAVEN” also pairs with itself, יָּניָּץ :: יָּניָּץ (RSP I
559), though it is not possible to find out if the translation in this case is
consistent with what we have seen already. Apart from that, the other first shell
words with which יָּניָּץ pairs are “WAY/TO TREAD” (RSP III 094), “DEW” (RSP
III 121), “SEA” (RSP I 555), and “ROCK” (RSP I 453). It can be seen straight away
that the pairings offer a much richer and wider scope than do those that pair with
“WILDERNESS”, for example. This is true not only in number (thirteen as
opposed to six), but in type: יָּניָּץ has four first shell words other than itself and
and one of those words is both a noun and a verb. It also pairs with six second shell words. Of these, two lead directly into the Major Complex, “hunting/to hunt” (RSP III 261), and the quadruplet which combines “HEAVEN” with “star”, “GOD” and “water” (RSP III 190). The remaining second shell words are a miscellaneous combination of some that lead nowhere, like “Rider of the Clouds” (RSP I 557)18 and “height” (RSP I 558), and others that develop a series of interesting pairings, like “holiness” (RSP III 310) mentioned above and “deep” (RSP I 560). Contrast this with “WILDERNESS”, which as described above pairs with only one first shell word (other than \(\heartsuit\)), four second shell words that pair with nothing else and one that pairs with one other word. And yet - this is the really interesting point - for both these words, both “HEAVEN” and “WILDERNESS”, the translation is utterly consistent. In the first case, it is \(\varepsilon\rho\eta\mu\eta\), \(\dot{\varepsilon}\rho\mu\nu\mu\sigma\), and in the second \(\sigma\upsilon\varphi\alpha\nu\sigma\). The only reason one might question the conclusions drawn is the small sample of words for “WILDERNESS” and the large one for “HEAVEN”, though it must be admitted that most of the latter are in the pair “HEAVEN” :: “EARTH” (RSP I 071, I 554).

The most interesting of the first shell words, because the richest and the most varied, has turned out to be \(\heartsuit\), “HOUSE”. It pairs, like so many of these words we have been studying, with itself (RSP I 129) and of course with \(\heartsuit\). It also shows the same kind of consistent translation patterns we have seen in other examples: \(\omicron\kappa\omicron\sigma\zeta\) is found throughout the LXX as the translation of choice for \(\heartsuit\). The first shell words with which “HOUSE” pairs, apart from those mentioned above, are few, only “ROCK” (RSP I 135) and “ROOT/T TO UPROOT” (RSP III 074), and both of those require a certain amount of lateral thinking to encompass them. Nevertheless, \(\omicron\kappa\omicron\sigma\zeta\) is found for \(\heartsuit\) everywhere. The second shell words are even more interesting and varied. There is one triplet, where “HOUSE” combines with both “palace, temple” and “courtyard” (RSP I 162), and it also pairs with both words as well (RSP I 130 and RSP I 131, respectively). Unfortunately the triplet occurs in close proximity in only one place (2 Chronicles 29:16), so it is difficult to tell if any of the words perform differently in a triplet setting from what they do in pairs. In any case, \(\omicron\kappa\omicron\sigma\zeta\) appears consistently and in fact appears twice in the translation of the triplet above. Other second shell words are much more curious; several of them don’t pair with any other words. These

18 “The disputed \(\heartsuit\) has finally been cleared up by means of the Ugaritic texts. Aliyan Baal has the attribute \(\text{\textit{rkb}} \text{'rpt} = \text{‘cloud rider’}. The mutation from \(p\) to \(\dot{b}\) can be documented otherwise too in a comparison of Ugaritic and Hebrew.” Kraus, 1989, p. 46
are “feed-trough” (RSP I 126a), “bed” (RSP I 134),19 “window” (RSP I 131a), “to enclose” (RSP I 132), “to prepare” (RSP I 133), “entrance” (RSP III 070),20 “hut” (RSP III 056), and “prison” (RSP III 073). For the most part, they are not, it must be admitted, words that immediately spring to mind as pairs with “HOUSE”, with the possible exception of “entrance”, the translation of which is disputed anyway. When רֵצֶה pairs with each of these words, it is consistently translated ὀίκος, and consistency is also a feature of the translation of the words with which it pairs. It is not however, true of שָׁכַר (“bed” RSP I 134), perhaps because there appears to be not only more than one Hebrew word for the same thing, but also more than one Greek word. What, if any, nuances existed between them remains unclear.

Second shell words that pair with several others are a little more obvious, and very familiar by now because they provide entry points into the Major Complex. “Table” (RSP I 136) and “bread” (RSP III 072) are too obvious to require comment, and they exhibit consistent translation. There are several words that pair with only a few words other than “HOUSE”, like “holiness” (RSP III 269) whose idiosyncracy has already been discussed. “Kotharot”, a word of Canaanite origin which will be discussed later in this chapter in the section on proper names, pairs only with “HOUSE” (RSP III 071) and “merry” (RSP III 170). “Length (of days)” (RSP III 043) similarly pairs with only one word other than “HOUSE”, “life” (RSP I 173) which is almost a foregone conclusion. There are three other second shell words that form a semantic cluster and form pairs freely with each other. These are “gate” (RSP I 137), “wall” (RSP I 494), and “city” (RSP I 499). The consistency we have already seen for ὀίκος is maintained throughout. The total number of words with which “HOUSE” pairs is twenty-three.

The Translation Of Proper Names

One type of word pair preserves even greater consistency than what we have already seen: those containing proper names. The pairs which fall within the group I have analysed are יְהוָה כֶּדֶר, “Lebanon” :: “cedar”, (RSP I 326); יְהוָה יָעָן, “God” :: “Egypt”, (RSP I 037); the triplet יְהוָה יָעָן יָעָן, “God” :: “Egypt” :: “Amon”, (RSP I 048); and יְהוָה כֶּדֶר כֶּדֶר, “tree” :: “Lebanon”, (RSP I 327).

---

19 This is שָׁכַר in Hebrew, not the same as “bed” in RSP I 066, which is רֵצֶה in Hebrew. The former is translated κλινή, and the latter δίφρος.

20 This word, רֶעֶס, is translated by Dahood “entrance”. Both BDB and KB translate it “produce” or “yield”. The only place it occurs in close proximity with “HOUSE” is Prov 15: 6, where it is translated as καρπός.
Another small group of words were proper names in Ugaritic. However, by the time the word was used in classical Hebrew, they had become common nouns, and as such were treated like any other. For example, the proper name Tannin in Ugaritic became a common noun in classical Hebrew meaning “sea serpent”, and was translated consistently as ὀρειχαλκός in Greek. The same thing may have happened with “Kotharot”, but its pairing with “HOUSE” (RSP III 071) was not analysed because Dahood's translation did not agree with BDB and KB, nor was its pairing with “merry” (RSP III 170) because “merry” is a third shell word.

The pairs containing “Baal/master” are a different matter. It is a proper name in its own right. In addition it is used in combination to form other proper names like Baal-zebub (2 Kings 1: 2,3,6,16). These are in the main simply transliterated. However, בְּרַע is also a common noun meaning “husband” and “master”. This nuance is not usually directly reflected in the translation of pairings, with a few notable exceptions like Proverbs 31:28 in which

becomes

In this connection, the comments of Peter Boodberg on the translation of parallel lines in Chinese poetry are interesting:

[The Japanese translators] would maintain that 1.1-2, being a proper name, cannot be // to 2.1-2, and that 1.3 is definitely a substantive. If so, they would have overlooked two important rules of parallelism: a) it is a function of the second line of a distich to give us the clue for the construction of the first; b) a common noun // to a proper name can subtly revive the concrete connotations of the latter.

We have already seen how the meaning of some Ugaritic words changed from proper to common nouns, and how the Seventy seem not always to have been aware that some words were proper nouns. As for Boodberg’s suggestion that a common noun lying parallel to a proper name “can revive the concrete connotations of the latter”, in Chapter IV Three Completely Diverse Languages?

---

21 Thackeray, 1909, p. 160
22 Boodberg, 1979, p. 173
we saw the exact opposite. The two common nouns that pair with Lebanon (cedar, RSP I 326, and wild oxen, RSP III 173) do not nuance the proper name, but the reverse.

The Translation Of Words For God

One persistent question in Septuagint studies surrounds the use of a substitute term for the Tetragrammaton. Pietersma gives a lucid summary of the question: When more than fifty years ago Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin wrote his massive work entitled *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* he arrived at the conclusion, on the basis of his extensive, detailed and at times belaboured investigation, that the ancient LXX read *kyrios* as a surrogate for *Yhwh*, and not a form of the Hebrew tetragram, as had been maintained as far back as Origen. Since his time, however, the claim for an original tetragram, either in Semitic guise or in Greek transliteration, is being asserted by an increasingly growing number of scholars. The reasons for the revival of a theory already espoused by antiquity’s great hebraizer are well known. Important early Greek texts have recently come to light on both Egyptian and Palestinian soil, which give us proof positive that the tetragram was indeed employed in pre-Christian biblical manuscripts. Hence Baudissin must be wrong and Origen must be right!23

Many centuries of uncertainty surrounds this issue. In the first years of the Christian era, even LXX texts sometimes contained a transliteration for the name of God, which is interesting in the light of what we said earlier about the tendency of the LXX to transliterate proper names.

Interestingly enough, as we indicated earlier, the originality of the tetragram in the LXX is not a modern theory. No less a textual critic than Origen put forth the same claim. Wrote he,

In the more accurate exemplars [of the LXX] the (divine) name is written in Hebrew characters; not, however, in the current script, but in the most ancient.

Similar statements are found in Jerome. Clearly in Origen’s estimation, Greek MSS with the tetragram written in *paleohebrew* were the best representatives of the LXX. There is, furthermore, evidence to suggest that Origen wrote the tetragram in his Hexapla. The Mercati palimpsest of Psalms has it in all its columns, including the LXX one, and the Cairo Geniza fragment of Ps 22 from the Hexapla has πτπτ. But it may well be asked what Origen’s statement about “the more accurate exemplars” or the possible evidence from his Hexapla proves about the originality of the tetragram. In our opinion, neither proves anything! Origen obviously knew what we now also know first-hand, namely that among the Jews there were Greek texts which sported the tetragram in Hebrew characters - and he seized on this as original LXX.

---

23 Pietersma, 1984, p. 85
But in the light of his allsurpassing regard for the *hebraica veritas* and his colossal undertaking to attain it, is not this precisely what one would have expected, and is it any wonder 1) that Origen fondly and wishfully judged the tetragram to be "more accurate" and hence presumably original, and 2) that he therefore incorporated it in his Hexapla? One should rely on Origen for an original tetragram no more than one should rely on his fifth column as a whole for original LXX.

The question is further complicated by the problematical nature of the word הוהי itself, by the coyness of rabbinic commentators on the subject, and by the paucity of our information, as described earlier in this chapter. Nevertheless, by examining the words that pair with the various Hebrew words for "GOD" and how the Seventy chose to translate them, we may be able to gain some insight into their thoughts on the subject.

Pietersma concluded, as I did independently, that certain more than a glimpse of what the LXX must have read can be obtained by examining transitional consistency....Proof that, of the translators of the Pentateuch, at least the translator of Exodus understood both adon and the tetragram as being equivalent to kyrios can be ascertained from two passages in which they occur together in the Hebrew. Both solutions which the translator forged are well known in the LXX outside of the Pentateuch....

As we shall see below, I reached the same conclusion whilst examining the translation of word pairs.

As mentioned, meaning of the Hebrew word הוהי is a well-known source of puzzlement to scholars. It is undeniably a form of the verb "to be" and the one place in scripture which throws light upon the meaning of the word is Exodus 3:16, that enigmatic remark of God's discussed in Chapter III How Word Pairs Mean as an example of the *idem per idem* construction.

"I Am that I Am," replies God. The verbs are first person common qal imperfects of the verb הוהי "to be," connoting continuing unfinished action. "I am being that I am being," or "I am the Is-ing One," that is, "the One Who Always Is." Not conceptual being, being in the abstract, but active being, is the intent....

והי was pointed in later manuscripts with the vowels of ייוי ("Lord"), indicating that the latter word was to be pronounced in its place. It is usually translated as Κυριως, as is ייוי, but absolute consistency simply does not occur. When it appears with מְצַמִּיךָ (מְצַמִּיךָ הוהי), it is almost always translated Κυριως Θεος, which is straight-forward enough. But, the issue is further complicated by the presence of אֱלֹהִים, a proper name for the high god in Ugaritic and

---

24 Pietersma, 1984, pp. 87-8
25 Pietersma, 1984, p. 95
26 Durham, 1987, p. 39
another name for הַמָּלָא in older portions of the Hebrew Bible. It appears in combinations like הַמָּלָא וַתִּלְבֹּשׁ ("GOD Most High" - itself a word pair, RSP III 023) and often functions like a proper name, which it also is in combination - like מַלְאָא (Elijah - "my God is מַלְאָא"). There is an added complication that מַלְאָא (unpointed) also means "not", "toward", and several other less common things. On occasion this may have presented a source of confusion to the Seventy. As a result of all these factors, not much consistency is apparent, though מַלְאָא is translated most often as θεός.
When students of biblical literature read modern translations, their attention is drawn in the notes to differences between the received text we have today and what is found in ancient versions. There is frequently an assumption in such notes that the Hebrew is necessarily "correct", and that ancient versions have little value apart from being all we have when the Hebrew is unintelligible. While ancient versions are indeed useful for clarifying disputed readings, to confine their value to that is to ignore the rich heritage they have transmitted to us. By study of the LXX, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate, we do not merely gain insight into the Vorlage to which the translators had access. We also are exposed to the writings they thought worthy of translation, to principles of translation they regarded as important, to what they thought needed explanation and what was obvious, and so on. These ideas are not ones they catalogued for the use of future generations (with the possible exception of Jerome), but rather must be carefully, painstakingly, and tentatively drawn out by a close scrutiny of the ancient translations.

I have engaged in a close scrutiny of one very small aspect of the LXX. In so doing, I have formed some impressions of what the translators thought about what they were doing. In some cases these impressions are only that, and require further investigation. Other cases have more foundation in fact, and are substantiated in the discussion. This chapter deals in generalities and tries to answer the question "So what?"....

Who Were The "Seventy"?
In the preceding chapters I have referred to "the Seventy" frequently, as though they were some six dozen minds with but a single thought. That is manifestly not true, and indeed, I have demonstrated it in several places, such as in the discussion in the previous chapter about how וְיָֽעַר was translated. The turn of phrase is one commonly used by students of the LXX and is not meant to imply that the Seventy translated in concert or necessarily at the same place and/or time. What it does mean is that I consider they were profoundly influenced, in Alexandria or wherever in the third, second or first century BCE, by the tradition they inherited. In the present context, I am particularly interested in the way that tradition urged certain words to appear together. It is in this sense that the Seventy are carriers of a tradition and it is in this sense that they are spoken of as a single unit.

The Value Of The Project
The data which this project has generated is far in excess of what was foreseen when it was initiated. As recently as a few months ago I still imagined that I could analyse a couple of hundred word pairs in exhaustive detail. I cannot; the amount of information this study has produced is too great. The previous chapter pointed to some suggestive trends; this chapter tries to pull those trends together into some coherence and point to areas for further study. Thus such comments as I make are divided into two groups:

1) those that are relevant for the study of word pairs and as such may have wider implications for linguistics and biblical studies, and

2) those which consist of ideas and suggestions for further research.

Whichever group each comment falls into, it must be regarded as tentative. The data is clear and plain for anyone to see. What I deduce from it is another matter, and that is susceptible to misunderstanding by me and to correction by others. The cultural baggage we carry with us (not to mention the cultural baggage of the Seventy, overlaid on the cultural baggage of ancient Israelites) makes it impossible to gain a transparent view of the translation of the LXX. That knowledge does not prevent me from trying to make what sense of it I can.

The Significance Of יָּ֧֫שׁ

In a previous chapter, I mentioned that יָ֧֫שׁ occurs 3311 times in the BHS. The pairings I have looked at with יָ֧֫שׁ and some other word number 2220, and that only includes those word pairs the two members of which lie within ninety-six bytes of each other. Put most simply, it means that in two-thirds of the instances where יָ֧֫שׁ appears it is in close proximity at least one of the Ugaritic/Hebrew word pairs recorded in *Ras Shamra Parallels*. Therefore, more often than not, the words we have been examining occur along with the concept of “earth”, “land”, bringing to bear upon the text in question all the richness of association this study has been concerned to uncover. The very appearance of the word יָ֧֫שׁ, or in the LXX יָ֧֫שׁ, is enough to begin to collect the sorts of associations that tradition has brought to bear upon it. These associations may be thought of as bringing together the two eyes of binocular vision. Thus we return to the image of stereoscopy with which we began this study.

To draw out some generalities about the word pairs we have seen, we may roughly divide them into groups corresponding with the kinds of words that surround יָ֧֫שׁ.

First, there are those that appear ready-made to be word pairs in connection with land - בֵּית, the verb used when speaking of “dwelling” in the “land”; עָֽנָ֧֫ו, “the heavens” that God made at the same time as he made “the earth”; מָֽלָ֧֫ך, the “king” who rules the “land”.


Second, there are words which have an indirect semantic association with יָּהּ. They are not in the Major Complex, but they do appear frequently and they may have influenced the way thinking developed. "God" forms a word pair with "he" in Ugaritic as in classical Hebrew (RSP III 095). The same two words appear in close proximity more than 300 times in the Hebrew Bible; is it not likely that in time an unreferenced "he" in liturgical and devotional literature came to mean "God"?

Third, there are those words we concentrated on in the Major Complex, words that may not directly pair with יָּהּ, but which provide shadings for the concepts lodged in the more directly pairing words. Words like "Lord" and "Baal/master/to own" provide nuances for "king" and "God", which in their turn associate back to "earth/land". "Bread" and "oil" develop ideas in "tree", "field", and "house", and "oil" less obviously with "dew". These are only examples, but they offer a way of looking at some of these words that may help to make sense of why יָּהּ appears so often in pairs.

The Importance of Many Pairings

In the course of this project, I formed the opinion that a critical factor for the stable translation of a word is the number of words with which it pairs. This hypothesis has significance not only for the study of word pairs in Ugaritic/Hebrew but also perhaps for the same sort of study in other languages. It emerges out of results rather different from the tentative hypothesis with which I began. I had thought that the power of oral tradition was such as to induce great consistency in the translation of word pairs in the LXX. So much seems to be true. I had thought further that the more frequently a word was used the more likely it was to be consistently translated, the idea being that a word heard (or read) over and over would induce the same sort of repetition in the translation. That does not seem to be demonstrable. It seems rather that the more words with which a given word pairs, the more likely it is to exhibit consistency in translation. If the given word is imagined as a tarpaulin on a trailer, the more places it is tied down the more likely it is to remain attached (= be consistent).

For example, בֹּשֶׁה pairs with more than a dozen words as well as with itself. This is not as many words as pair with יָּהּ, but it illustrates the same principle, that multiple pairings tend to encourage stability of translation. When the words used by the Seventy to translate בֹּשֶׁה are examined, there appear to be a number of different ones, but on closer examination it is apparent that virtually all the words are compounds with עוֹּקָה. "Dust", which is translated by seven different words, pairs with only one word other than יָּהּ. יָוָן, on the other hand, "mountain", which pairs only with יָּהּ, does not conform to this principle as it is completely consistent in being translated by όρος.
“servant” is a little different. It is a second shell word, one which has a very important part to play in the Major Complex. It also forms pairs with ten other words and exhibits great consistency of translation, but there are two words used, παῖς and δοῦλος. In Hebrew, the one word רָעָן conveys a meaning both of “servant” and of “child”, as does our English word “boy”. παῖς has the dominant meaning of “child”, whereas δοῦλος is more nearly “servant”, as shown by the predominance of the verb δοῦλα to translate רָעָן “to serve”. רָעָן, like παῖς, refers on the sociological level to a “servant” who is a member of the household - a “child” in fact. What then of δοῦλος, and why is it regarded as an acceptable translation for רָעָן? It appears that δοῦλος is used when the dominant meaning intended is “servant” and παῖς when the emphasis is on inclusion in the clan. For instance, where Joseph’s brothers wish to claim his kindness by emphasising that they are his servants (Genesis 42:13), the LXX uses παῖς.

οὶ δὲ εἶπαν Δώδεκά ἐσμὲν οἱ παῖδες σου ἄδελφοι ἐν γῇ Χανααν....

The translation is the same in Exodus 20:10 in the commandment to do no work on the Sabbath.

τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδομῇ σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου· οὐ ποιήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶν ἐργὸν, σὺ καὶ ὁ νύος σου καὶ ή θυγάτηρ σου, ὁ παῖς σου καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη....

On the other hand, Saul berated his entourage for not telling him that his son had made pact with David, “my servant” (1 Samuel 22:8). Saul is here emphasising David’s betrayal of his favoured status in Saul’s household and the LXX reflects that nuance in its translation.

... καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ποιήσῃ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀποκαλύπτων τὸ ὦτιόν μου ὅτι ἐπήγαγεν ὁ νύος μου τὸν δοῦλον μου ἐπ' ἐμὲ εἰς ἐχθρὸν ὃς ἢ ἡμέρα αὕτη.

παῖς τοῦ “the Servant of Yahweh” in Second Isaiah is translated consistently by παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, which would seem to confirm the impression that that Servant is emphatically a member of Yahweh’s clan. While this sort of consistency is based on interpretative factors as well as on multiplicity of pairings, still the information gained from this study leads me to feel comfortable with the hypothesis that many pairings are one determining factor in consistency of translation.

A Modification Of Stereotypical Translation?
As discussed in an earlier chapter, Emmanuel Tov has shown that one principle of translation used by the Seventy was that called stereotyping. In it the “translators rendered all occurrences of a given Hebrew word, element (e.g.
preposition), root or construction as far as possible by the same Greek equivalent". The data accumulated in the course of this project tend to confirm Tov's view, which he felt in 1984 needed to be studied in more detail.

In one respect however, I would wish to modify his opinion. We have seen already how בַּעַל is translated in its many meanings with στάρι or one of its compounds. We have also seen several Hebrew roots which may form either a noun or a verb, such as נְבֵלָה/נָבְלָה (“king”/ “to reign”, RSP I 358) and תְּבִט/תֶבָט (“plantation”/ “to plant”, RSP III 212). Just occasionally, these words do not exhibit stereotypical translation when the shift occurs from noun to verb. For instance, in the translation of the pair פְּלַס/פָּלָס, (RSP II 006) פָּלָס is without exception translated ὁδός, but פְּלַס is paired with the verb דַּרְשֵׁה, the case is different. The verb of choice is not ὁδός but rather ἔπταμεν. More work needs to be done on this problem to see if a pattern can be found which makes it possible to predict when translation is stereotypical and when it is not. At the moment, the most that can be said is that when the principle breaks down in instances of word pairing, the critical factor seems to be the grammatical shift from noun to verb.

Phonetics
Because of the volume of data, I have not been able to follow up some aspects of this study that look both interesting and promising. For instance, the whole issue of phonetics has deliberately been avoided, even though I recognise its primacy because it is the basis of orality. I have avoided it for the same reason that Lowth thought scansion impossible to discover for Hebrew. Lowth's argument against the likelihood of defining the meters of biblical Hebrew poetry has never adequately been refuted: namely that the correct pronunciation of ancient Hebrew, the syllabification of many words, and the quantity and accent of the syllables are all highly uncertain.

The fact is that phonetics must be a major factor in the rationale that creates word pairs. However, the problems presented by a study of phonetics in dead languages would cause hearts stouter than mine to fail. Further, it would I believe constitute a thesis on its own, and I have no acquaintance with modern Arabic, a language which seems likely to be a good starting point.

Having said that, I have not been able entirely to avoid noticing some points of phonetics. I was intrigued early on in my research to note what seemed to my inexperienced eye a disproportionately large number of segholate nouns among the word pairs. I wondered if segholates tended to pair together because ancient

---

1 Tov, 1984, p. 67
2 Gevirtz, 1973, p. 12
Israelites regarded יִבְשָׁם as more euphonious than יִבְשָׁמ as "king", as "servant" as "king" as more euphonious than יִבְשָׁמ as "water" as "dew", for instance. However, several attempts to follow up the question failed to achieve conclusive results. I have been unable to discover what proportion of nouns in classical Hebrew are segholate, and am therefore unable to determine if those amongst RSP constitute a higher than average count. What does seem to be the case, however, is that many of the nouns which occur with great frequency (such as יִבְשָׁם = 3311, יִבְשָׁמ = 3735, יִבְשָׁמ = 922, יִבְשָׁמ = 993) are segholate. This may account for my impression that pairs containing segholate nouns are unusually common.

As an adjunct to the idea that phonetics is a major factor in the development of systems of word pairing, word plays based on phonetics may well constitute an important part in the dynamics of performance composition. By using phonetics with skill a performer can work within a tradition but still remain innovative — the great challenge to practitioners of oral composition. To use an analogy previously discussed, a rap artist may end a line to rhyme with a previous word. A really skilled performer may make a rhyme with the first syllable of a word and finish the word in the next line. Thus the tradition is maintained by using rhyme to complete a line, but innovation is achieved through atypical use of enjambement.

In a similar vein, a composer using parallel language in Hebrew pairs יִבְשָׁמ “tree” with יִבְשָׁמ “stone”, fairly understandable to us because they are both features of the natural landscape and were in common use as building materials. יִבְשָׁמ is also paired with another word strikingly like יִבְשָׁמ in sound, but far less understandable (at least to us) in terms of associations. יִבְשָׁמ “arrow” pairs with יִבְשָׁמ occasionally, though nothing like as often as יִבְשָׁמ with יִבְשָׁמ. By what mental association could יִבְשָׁמ and יִבְשָׁמ pair? Is it a reflection of the Stone Age when an arrowhead was flint? If so, we are looking back to early days indeed. I suggest that for an answer we need look no

---

3 RSP I 358
4 RSP I 362
5 RSP I 352
6 The book to which I was advised to go (Sagarin, 1987) gave absolutely no information on that point.
7 RSP I 009, I 441
8 But see the work of A.R. Luria discussed in Chapter VI Which Word Pairs? Nevertheless, Ican plead that the Seventy thought along these lines because they consistently translated יִבְשָׁם by ζυλος rather than δενδρον, and יִבְשָׁם by λιθος rather than πετρος. Walter Ong would probably explain those translations by appealing to the literacy of the Seventy and their familiarity with abstract patterns of thinking developed by the Greeks.
9 RSP I 178
further than phonetics: γν sounds very like γν which pairs with γν. Therefore it is a logical alternative to γν when an innovative artist wanted another member to pair with γν. *γν : γν is a pair that present an obvious relationship of sound and γν pairs with itself. Further, the words are related by metonymy in that γν is a material used in the manufacture of γν. But the fact remains that that pair does not occur in RSP. However, we must not forget that this corpus does not contain all possible word pairs, and that there are certain to be more in the literature only awaiting careful examination to be found.

As already explained, phonetic considerations do not form a part of this study. Nevertheless, it is clear that much remains to be done in the study of this corpus of word pairs.

The Seventy's Awareness Of The Nature Of Word Pairs

In this context there is a related issue which needs discussion even if there is no way to reach an ultimate conclusion about it. One thing about word pairs I have been addressing is whether the Seventy were aware of them. But, if my research indicates that they were aware, it still leaves open the question of whether that awareness was implicit or explicit. In other words, were the Seventy consciously aware that certain words which appeared in contiguous lines of parallel verse, and by extension in other contexts as well, fitted together in a special way? Or was the awareness on a subconscious level, the kind of thing that leads one to think that it sounds right? We cannot, of course, at this distance in time answer the question in any definitive way. But the LXX arose from a group of people who were particularly interested to render classical Hebrew into Greek as accurately as possible. They presumably talked to each other about matters of translation; we do not know if the subject of word pairs came up.

While, as I said, we can't ultimately know the answer, we can approach the understanding of the Seventy in indirect ways. It seems to me likely that if their consciousness of word pairs was of the explicit kind, the translation would be extremely consistent and correct to the point of rigidity. That is to say that a certain mechanical influence would have crept into the translation owing to an awareness of the Seventy concerning what was the "correct" translation. If, on the other hand, their awareness was of the implicit sort, there would be consistency, but it would be modified by a feel which might well go beyond immediate correctness. If I may make the distinction, the Seventy used the "right" translation rather than the "correct" one.

From the examples I have shown in this study, I think it is beyond question that the Seventy were aware of word pairs, but that this awareness was of an...
implicit sort. It was the kind of awareness which knows what’s “right” but doesn’t know why. They wished by their labour to reflect nuances in their translation and in this they succeeded with word pairs, as they did in other aspects of their translation to a greater or lesser degree.

The Implications of Pairings
One of the main ways the ambience which is associated with a word pair or a group of them is through the use of particular words. We have already seen the way the meaning of יושב varies with context. In some cases this variation is attributable to (or at least reflected by) the word with which ישב pairs. An example of this is the pairing of ישב with<::>

תלוי (RSP I 360). The primary meaning of “to sit” is made more specific and at the same time metaphorical as it develops meaning into “to reign” when ::תלוי is the noun and ישב is the verb.

But that is not the whole story; words do not simply take on the colouring of the other member of the pair. They also maintain their own colouring at the same time. We return once again in this context to the image of stereoscopy with which we began this study. The quality of being “three dimensional” emerges creatively not only when the words are used in hendiadys or in merismus but also when they are found in parallelism, as in Ezekiel 27:35:

All the inhabitants of the coastlands
are appalled at you;
and their kings are horribly afraid,
their faces are convulsed.

ישב, which is here the root word lying behind “inhabitants”, retains the implications of its primary meaning “to dwell”. But at the same time the awareness that ישב also means “to reign” suffuses the parallel structure. The “inhabitants” react in a particular way; their overlords, their representatives and mediators, their “kings”, react similarly but in more detail. The people respond in a general way; the person on whom specifics about them focus responds in a detailed way. The pairing of the two words creates a three-dimensional picture that superimposes the image of the frightened kings upon that of the appalled inhabitants. The representatives stand in the foreground while their people fill the background. In this way, the members of the pair serve to nuance each other.

The Greek words used by the Seventy to translate these words do not of themselves convey this kind of nuance. But then neither do the Hebrew words by themselves. The stereoscopy provided by parallelism, of which word pairs are a feature, enables the words to carry added dimensions. And the implications inherent in the stereoscopy are retained by the traditional word pairs even when they are not being used in parallel language.
Sometimes the same thing that is true of the Hebrew words happens also when they are translated into Greek. It is true when בָּשֵׁם is consistently translated by οἶκῶ, but it is not so true when דָּבָר is sometimes translated by παῦς and other times by δοῦλος. The implications of παῦς include the commitment and obligations of the patriarchal clan to its dependents. Δοῦλος conveys a sense of unremitting toil and a measure of the alienation felt by one who spends her/his life for another. This richness is conveyed by the Hebrew with overlapping meanings in a single word, but is lost when those meanings are split if they are translated by two different words. Thus, παῦς δοῦλος not only confirms emphatically the familial relationship existing between the “Suffering Servant” of Second Isaiah and his God, it also nuances Jesus’ cry of dereliction from the cross. So too does Saul’s characterisation of David as his δοῦλος confirm David’s status while describing Saul’s sense of loss, even while it emphasises David’s disillusionment and his risk-taking on Saul’s behalf. All this is blurred if not lost when the one word is translated by two different words.

If this sort of dichotomy can occur in the translation of specific words, how much more is this so when we are dealing with the subtle nuances and stereoscopic overlay of word pairs.

Changes In The Use Of Word Pairs
We have seen in previous chapters, especially in Chapter V Did Word Pairs Persist?, the way parallelism and word pairs are both found in Late Hebrew texts. However, we also saw that differences in stylistics appeared as well. These appeared under three headings:

First, word pairs in parallel positions have become very much less common. It is not that parallelism has disappeared, but that its classic use with word pairs in exactly parallel positions in contiguous lines has largely disappeared. Instead, we find an increased use of merimus, collocation, and hendiadys. Even where word pairs are used in grammatically parallel positions, increasingly the tendency is to use them with different referents, so that the parallelism has become a little skewed.

Second, word pairs appear, not so much in strict twos, but in long strings or concatenations that act as a cohesive element throughout the composition. They may appear in a chiastic structure or in an extended merismus. This development, which like the one above appears to be an example of the kind of “loosening” Kugel\textsuperscript{11} describes, deserves more study.

Third, some kinds of meaning lying behind the pairs appear to me to have undergone a subtle shift in the later texts from that found in the Hebrew Bible.

\textsuperscript{11} 1981, p. 96
The words are the same -- as we have already demonstrated; but the way the words are used is more metaphorical, or better, more figurative.

Fourth, word pairs seem to appear more frequently in prose in later texts. It may be that word pairs in prose are a kind of fossilised remnant of the poetic compositions that lie behind some prose texts we have, like those found in the parallel stories in prose and poetry of Judges 4 and 5. It may be that we have more later prose and less later poetry, just as we have more earlier poetry and less earlier prose. Certainly, our sense of which is which is changing. These matters need more study.

I have not been able to gain any sense of whether developments in the use of word pairs affected translation by the Seventy. However, since my impression is that their understanding of word pairs was implicit and since they were translation from a Vorlage which lay before them, my inclination is to say that there was no effect, except where, as Kugel says\textsuperscript{12}, the development had already occurred in the later strata of the Hebrew Bible.

My feelings upon completion of this study are neatly summed up in a few words of Jerome:

I am well aware that there will be many who, with their customary fondness for universal detraction (from which the only escape is by writing nothing at all), will drive their fangs into this volume. They will cavil at the dates, change the order, impugn the accuracy of events, [and] winnow the syllables.... I should be within my right if I were to rebut them by saying they need not read unless they choose; but I would rather send them away in a calm state of mind.... The truth is that I have partly discharged the office of a translator and partly that of a writer.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} 1981, p. 96
\textsuperscript{13} Fremantle, 1893, p. 484
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FULL APPENDIX

1 - 001
FATHER  FATHER

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

1 - 004
ROCK  FATHER

actural pairs: 4
number complete: 0
Greek:

πατηρ  3
πατρια  1
Σουρ  1
Βαιδσουρ  1
θεον  1
anos hmtvw  1

1 - 008
STONE  BALANCES

STONE  TO BALANCE
404 42 0

I - 009, I - 441

TREE  STONE

ןִּיטֶּר  נְבָשׁ

506 406 54

actual pairs: 36
number complete: 36
Greek:

ξυλος  35
σχιδικας  1
λιθος  34
λιθουργικα  1
λιθινας  1

I - 011

LORD  GOD

יְהֹוָה  אֱלֹהִים

367 1121 8

actual pairs: 6
number complete: 2
Greek:

κυριος  5
θεος  2
μη  1

יְהֹוָה  אֱלֹהִים

367 3664 43
actual pairs: 26
number complete: 24
Greek:

| Κυρίος | 27 |
| Ἑως | 23 |
| Ἀδώνας | 1 |

1 - 030

FATHER  GOD

1392  1121

actual pairs: 18
number complete: 15
Greek:

| πατήρ | 15 |
| Ἑως | 12 |
| οὐχ | 1 |
| οὐχι | 3 |
| μη | 1 |
| κυρίος | 2 |

1392  3664

actual pairs: 94
number complete: 92
Greek:

| πατήρ | 92 |
| Ἑως | 94 |

I - 033
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>HOLINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קדש</td>
<td>קדש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָגוֹיָס</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָגוֹיָסְמָה</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אלוהים</th>
<th>קדש</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָגוֹיָס</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָגוֹיָסְמָטָוס</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAAL/MASTER</th>
<th>GOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בֶּלַע</td>
<td>בְּלַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 16
number complete: 10
Greek:

εἷδωλον 1
θεος 13
placename 3
βασιλεία 9

TO OWN GOD

actual pairs: 1
Malachi 2:12 (LXX 11)
The translation is achieved by circumlocution.

TO OWN GOD

Isaiah 26:13
Greek:

κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, κτήσαι ἡμᾶς· κύριε, ἐκτὸς σοῦ ἄλλον οὐκ οἴδαμεν, τὸ δυνάμα σου ονομάζομεν.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LANG1</th>
<th>LANG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KING GOD</td>
<td>מֶלֶךְ</td>
<td>גָּדוֹל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual number:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευντός</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλησί</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυρίος</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LANG1</th>
<th>LANG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO REIGN GOD</td>
<td>מֶלֶךְ</td>
<td>גָּדוֹל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs:</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete:</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχοντός</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυρίος</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LANG1</th>
<th>LANG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO REIGN GOD</td>
<td>מֶלֶךְ</td>
<td>גָּדוֹל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>3664</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LANG1</th>
<th>LANG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO REIGN GOD</td>
<td>מֶלֶךְ</td>
<td>גָּדוֹל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>3664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 9
number complete: 8
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύω</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεὸς</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOD EGYPT

1121 1023 7

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 3
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αἴγυπτος</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεὸς</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3664 1023 82

actual pairs: 52
number complete: 46
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αἴγυπτος</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεὸς</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOD GREAT

1121 596 13
actual pairs: 8
number complete: 6
Greek:

(μακρο)θυμος 3
πολλος 3
θεος 3
κυριος 5

3664 596 20

actual pairs: 15
number complete: 8
Greek:

πολλος 7
μεγαλος 1
θεος 11
κυριος 3

I - 048, see also I - 037

GOD EGYPT AMON

אֱלֹהִים מצרים אמון

1121 1023 41 0
3664 1023 41 1

The only place where all three words occur in close proximity is Jeremiah 46:25; which is missing in the LXX.

I - 053
SEA  SHIP

481  35  13

actual pairs: 10
number complete: 8
Greek:

θαλασσα  8
πλοιον  8
ναυτικος  1

I - 058

LIGHT  LIGHT

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

LIGHT  TO SHINE

245  45  8

actual pairs: 6
number complete: 3
Greek:

φως  4
φωτιζω  2
φανω  1

TO SHINE  TO SHINE

זאור

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.
This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 060

SHOWER  LIGHT
רְבֹּר  אוֹר
288  245  0

SHOWER  TO SHINE
רְבֹּר  אוֹר
288  45  0

I - 062

EARTH  EARTH
יאהָר יאהָר

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 063

EARTH  WILDERNESS
יאהָר  בְּרָאָה
3311  301  42

actual pairs: 27
number complete: 23
Greek:
ερατη  19
ερατος  4
γη  23
actual pairs: 44
number complete: 39
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θαλάσσα</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποταμος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Samuel 28:23
Greek:
καὶ οὐκ ἔβουλήθη φαγεῖν· καὶ παρεβιάζοντο αὐτὸν οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ, καὶ ἤκουσεν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τὸν δίφρον.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 067

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 29
number complete: 13
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄμμος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χώμα</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηλος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐδαφος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πισσα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χοῦν</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοπριος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 068

EARTH           TREE

3311           506

actual pairs: 18
number complete: 15
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄμμος</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δένδρον</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βότανη</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 069

EARTH           ROCK

3311           149

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek:</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πετρα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γη</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I - 070**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARTH</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γη</td>
<td>נַּבְשֹׂ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3311 358 28

actual pairs: 26
number complete: 18

Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>άγρος</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χώρα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεδιον</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γη</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I - 071, I - 554**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARTH</th>
<th>HEAVEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γη</td>
<td>מַגְּבִישׁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3311 503 185

actual pairs: 141
number complete: 132

Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>γη</th>
<th>135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐρανος</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I - 075**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 1  
Zechariah 9:4  
Greek:  
\[\text{διὰ τὸ τοῦτο κύριος κληρονομήσει αὐτὴν καὶ πατάξει εἰς θύλασσαν δύναμιν αὐτῆς, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐν πυρί καταναλωθήσεται.}\]

I - 112  
SON  
SON  
\[\text{This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.}\]

I - 113  
BAAL/MASTER  
SON  
\[\text{placename 7, personal name 2}\]

actual pairs: 20  
number complete: 16  
Greek:  
\[\begin{align*}  
\text{ὢιος} & 18 \\  
\text{τεκνα} & 1 \\  
\text{placename} & 7 \\  
\text{βααλ} & 4 \\  
\text{βααλιμ} & 2 \\  
\text{ἀνηρ} & 1 \\  
\text{personal name} & 2 \\
\end{align*}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO OWN</th>
<th>SON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בָּנוֹ</td>
<td>בֵּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τέκνα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υἱός</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔξωμα νοικῷ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 116

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SON</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בֵּן</td>
<td>שָׁרֵשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5035</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 117

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SON (OF GOD)</th>
<th>STAR (OF MORNING)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בָּנוֹ</td>
<td>בָּנוֹ 'שׁבָּךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5035</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 0
Greek:
άστρα 2

I - 120

BAAL/HUSBAND  L ORD

בר  רוז
282  367  0

TO OWN  L ORD

עיל  רוז
16  367  1

Isaiah 26:13
κύριε  ο  θεός  ἡμῶν,  κτήσαι  ἡμᾶς·  κύριε,  ἐκτὸς  σοῦ  ἄλλων  οὐκ  οἴδαμεν,  τὸ  δυνόμα  σου  δυνομάξομεν.

I - 126a

HOUSE  FEEDTROUGH

шиб  שבט
2376  5  0

I - 127, III - 069

EARTH  HOUSE

ץן  חן
3311  2376  72
actual pairs: 64
number complete: 51
Greek:

\[ \gamma \dot{i} \]
\[ \delta \dot{ikos} \]

I - 129

HOUSE

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 130

HOUSE

PALACE/TEMPLE

\[ \text{2376} \]

actual pairs: 10
number complete: 8
Greek:

\[ \delta \dot{ikos} \]
\[ \nu\dot{a}\dot{d}os \]

I - 131

HOUSE

COURTYARD

\[ \text{2376} \]

actual pairs: 37
number complete: 20
Greek:

οἶκος 22
αύλη 23

I - 131a

HOUSE  WINDOW

טי  יריב

2376  47  6

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 3
Greek:

οἶκος  3
θυρίδος  4

I - 132

HOUSE  TO ENCLOSE

טי  ינר

2376  63  1

Job 27:19 (LXX 18 ?)
Greek:

ἀπέβη δὲ ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ ὅσπερ σήτες καὶ ὅσπερ ἀράχνη.

I - 133

HOUSE  TO PREPARE

טי  יר


This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

I - 134

HOUSE          BED

בֵּן            נַשׁ

2376          13          4

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 2
Greek:
oίκος          2
στῶμα          1 ?
kλίνη           1

I - 135

HOUSE          ROCK

בֵּן            צָה

2376          149          6

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 1
Greek:
oίκος          3
πετρα          1

I - 136

HOUSE          TABLE

בֵּן            שִׁלֹן
2376 | 94 | 7
---|---|---
actual pairs: 5  
number complete: 1  
Greek:
- σῶκος: 2  
- τράπεζα: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>GATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>กִּרְבּ</td>
<td>נֵבָע</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2376 | 531 | 58
---|---|---
actual pairs: 39  
number complete: 26  
Greek:
- σῶκος: 27  
- πυλή: 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO DECIDE</th>
<th>TO JUDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גִּרְבּ</td>
<td>שֹׁר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205 | 1 | 0
---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO DECIDE</th>
<th>JUDGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גִּרְבּ</td>
<td>שֹׁר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205 | 42 | 1
---|---|---

Psalm 9:5  
Greek:
δότι ἐποίησας τὴν κρίσιν μου καὶ τὴν δίκην μου,
ἐκάθισας ἐπὶ θρόνου, ὁ κρίνων δικαιοσύνην.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARTH</th>
<th>FOOTSTOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>θιὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3311</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑποποδιόν</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>PALACE</th>
<th>COURTYARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θῆς</td>
<td>ἱλικόη</td>
<td>ζῆν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2376</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The triplet occurs only at 2 Chronicles 29:16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εἰσῆλθον οἱ ἱερεῖς ἔσω εἰς τὸν οἴκον κυρίου ἁγνί</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέβαλον πᾶσαν τῇν ἀκαθαρσίαν τῇν εὑρεθέσαν ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν οἴκου κυρίου, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO GO/WALK</th>
<th>TO GO/WALK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πορεύομαι</td>
<td>πορεύομαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 166, I - 474

TO GO/WALK  TO HUNT

רָלִל       צָוָד

1560       17

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

πορευομαι  2
θηρευω      2

I - 169

EARTH       MOUNTAIN

ץֶזָע     רֵבָע

3311       793

actual pairs: 50
number complete: 45
Greek:

γῆ          46
ὁρὸς        47

I - 178

STONE       ARROW

גֶּזַע     רֵד

404        67

3
actual pairs: 3
number complete: 1
Greek:

τοξός 1
λίθος 1

I - 179

ARROW ARROW

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 180

HAND ARROW

2336  67  7

actual pairs: 5
number complete: 5
Greek:

χειρός 5
βελός 4
τοξευμάτα 1

I - 205

SHOWERS DEW

10 49 2
actual pairs: 1
Micah 5:6
Greek:
καὶ ἐσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς δρόσος παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα καὶ ὡς ἄρνες ἐπὶ ἄγρωστιν, ὡτε μὴ συναχώμη μηδὲ ὑποστῇ ἐν νόσις ἄνθρώπων.

I - 206

| OIL | DEW |  
| ָלך | יָל |  
| 269 | 49 | 1  

Numbers 11:9 (LXX 8-9)
Greek:
...καὶ ἐὰν ἡ ἔδοική αὐτοῦ ὠσεὶ γεῦμα ἐγκρίες ἐξ ἔλατου. 9 καὶ ὥσπερ κατέβη ὁ δρόσος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβόλην νυκτός κατέβασεν τὸ μαννα ἐπ' αὐτῆς.

I - 207, see also I - 206

| OIL | DEW | SHOWER |  
| ָלך | יָל | קָבָכֵי |  
| 269 | 49 | 1  
| 49 | 10 | 2  

Genesis 27:28
Greek:
καὶ διώκει σοι ὁ θεός ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ οὐράνου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πιστητοῦ τῆς γῆς καὶ πλήθους σιτοῦ καὶ οἴνου.
DEW OF HEAVEN    OIL OF EARTH

Genesis 27:28
Greek:
καὶ δύψη σοι ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ οὐράνου
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πιότητος τῆς γῆς
καὶ πλῆθος σιτου καὶ οἶνου.

Genesis 27:39
Greek:
Ἰδοὺ ἀπὸ τῆς πιότητος τῆς γῆς ἔσται ἡ κατοικησία σου
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀνωθεν.

FRUIT    PRODUCE

170    25   6

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 4

Greek:
καρπος    4
γενήματα    2
ἰσχὺν    1
σπορος    1

HAND    HAND

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.
I - 219

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>HAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יַשֵּׁי</td>
<td>תַּנֵּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>2336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 19
number complete: 13
Greek:

ὄνομα 18
χείρα 13

I - 229

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>SERPENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְשֵׁי</td>
<td>יַשֵּׁי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 1
Psalm 68:23 (LXX 67:23)
Greek:

ἐἶπεν κύριος ἐκ Βασαν ἐπιστρέψω, ἐπιστρέψω ἐν βυθοῖς θαλάσσης

I - 233

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>RIVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְשֵׁי</td>
<td>יְרֵם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 17
number complete: 16
Greek:

\begin{align*}
\text{θάλασσα} & : 16 \\
\text{ποταμός} & : 17
\end{align*}

I - 235

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{SEA} & \text{SUN} \\
481 & 197 \hfill 2
\end{tabular}

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

\begin{align*}
\text{θάλασσα} & : 2 \\
\text{ἥλιος} & : 2
\end{align*}

I - 236

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{SEA} & \text{DEEP} \\
481 & 55 \hfill 12
\end{tabular}

actual pairs: 8
number complete: 7
Greek:

\begin{align*}
\text{θάλασσα} & : 7 \\
\text{βυθος} & : 1 \\
\text{μεσος} & : 1 \\
\text{βαθή} & : 1 \\
\text{άρμοσος} & : 4
\end{align*}

I - 237
SEA  TANNIN

481  21  6

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 3
Greek:

\[θαλασσα\]  3
\[δρακος\]  4

I - 255

TO DESCEND  TO DESCEND

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 256

TO SIT  TO DESCEND

1088  383  14

actual pairs: 14
number complete: 6
Greek:

\[κατοικω\]  7
\[καταβαινω\]  11

I - 270

TO SIT  SHADE
This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 7 (Judges A + B)
number complete: 6

Greek:
- κληρονομια: 3
- κληρος: 2
- κατακληρονομο: 2
- κατοικω: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO SIT</td>
<td>RESTING PLACE</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ישב</td>
<td>ננה</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 0

Greek:
- ἀναπαύω: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO SIT</td>
<td>RESTING PLACE</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ישב</td>
<td>קנוני</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psalms 132:14 (LXX 131:14)
Greek:

Αὕτη ἡ κατάπαυσις μου εἰς αἰώνα αἰώνος,
καὶ κατοικήσω, ὅτι ἰδρυσάμην αὐτὴν.

I - 274

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO SIT</th>
<th>TO SHEPHERD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שָׁבָע</td>
<td>ῥἀνη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 1
Greek:

κατοικῶ 2
ποιμάνω 1

I - 275

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGEMENT</th>
<th>TO SIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שָׁבָע</td>
<td>ῥἀνη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ezekiel 28:26
Greek:

καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐν ἐλπίδι καὶ
οἰκοδομήσουσιν οἰκίας καὶ φυτεύσουσιν ἀμπελῶνας καὶ
κατοικήσουσιν ἐν ἐλπίδι, ὅταν ποιήσῃ κρίμα ἐν πᾶσι
τοῖς ἀτιμάσασιν αὐτούς ἐν τοῖς κύκλωι αὐτῶν.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO JUDGE</th>
<th>TO SIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שָׁבָע</td>
<td>ῥἀνη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 6  
number complete: 4  
Greek:  
κατοικῶ 2  
ἐνοικῶ 1  
συγκαθιζῶ 1  
καθιζῶ 1  
κρινῶ 4  

I - 282  

HEAVEN  
STAR  
הםירש  בכרב  
503  38  20  

actual pairs: 21 (Judges A + B)  
number complete: 20  
Greek:  
οὐρανός 20  
ἄστερος 20  

I - 297  

EARTH  
THRONE  
יבָּר  בְּרוּ  
3311  198  9  

actual pairs: 6  
number complete: 5  
Greek:  
γῆ 6  
θρόνος 5
THRONE  FOOTSTOOL

actual pairs: 1
Isaiah 66:1
Greek:

actual pairs: 36
number complete: 30
Greek:

actual pairs: 5
number complete: 5
Greek:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Pairs</th>
<th>Number Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THRONE</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σοφός</td>
<td>ἰδώρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Kings 4:10

ποιήσωμεν δὴ αὕτη ὑπέρφοιν τόπον μικρόν καὶ θῶμεν αὐτή ἐκεῖ κλίνην καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ δίφρον καὶ λυχνίαν, ...

I - 306

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VINEYARD</th>
<th>VINEYARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מועשׁ</td>
<td>מועשׁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 321, II - 031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מים</td>
<td>הָעִבְרִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2

number complete: 2

Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>θαλάσσα</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐθνος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I - 326

LEBANON  CEDAR

kład  שז.effect
91  93  26

actual pairs: 20
number complete: 19
Greek:
κεδρος  16
ξυλον  4
ξυλα κεδρινα  2
Διβανον  21

I - 327

TREE  LEBANON

זן  קלבון
506  91  12

actual pairs: 8
number complete: 7
Greek:
ξύλος  7
Διβανον  7

I - 333

BREAD  WINE  OIL

טה  שמן
542  269  8
None of the four references includes all members of the triplet.

1 - 336

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>BREAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 7
number complete: 4
Greek:
- ἀρτος 4
- τραπεζα 4

1 - 344

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILDERNESS</th>
<th>WASTELAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deuteronomy 32:10
Greek:
- σωτάρκησεν αὐτὸν ἐν γῇ ἑρημῷ, ἐν δίψει καύματος ἐν ἀνύδρῳ.

1 - 350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEW</th>
<th>RAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δροσος</td>
<td>DEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νεφός</td>
<td>TO RAIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>49</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 - 352

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>DEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נֶפֶר</td>
<td>הָנַךְ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 786 | 49 | 2 |

actual pairs: 3 (includes Judges A + B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נֶפֶר</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δροσος</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - 354

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OIL</th>
<th>WATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מְנַשֶּׁה</td>
<td>מִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 269 | 786 | 3 |

actual pairs: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מְנַשֶּׁה</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֶפֶר</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KING

יְהוָה

3735

actual pairs: 72
number complete: 67
Greek:

βασιλεύς 67
κύριος 67

LORD

יְהוָה

367

EARTH

יְהוָה

3311

actual pairs: 128
number complete: 98
Greek:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Pairs</th>
<th>Number Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek:***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μλ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Psalms 146: 9 (LXX 145: 9-10)**

**Greek:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλικος</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευς</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁδος</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TO REIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μλ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EARTH TO REIGN**
9. κύριος θυλάσσει τοὺς προσηλύτους, ὁρφανῶν καὶ χήραν ἀναλήμφεται καὶ ὅδων ἀμαρτωλῶν ἀφανεῖ. 
10. βασιλεύσει κύριος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KING</th>
<th>TO REIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>βασιλεύσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 87  
number complete: 34  

Greek:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεὺς</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατοικῶ</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετοικῶ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκῶ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνοικῶ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - 361

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KING</th>
<th>TO REIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 81
number complete: 69
Greek:
  βασιλεὺς  73
  βασιλεύω  77

KING

This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.

TO REIGN

This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 362

actual pairs: 109
number complete: 89
Greek:
  παῖς  51
  δοῦλος  38
  βασιλεὺς  89

SERVANT

TO REIGN
actual pairs: 4
number complete: 1
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παῖς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοῦλος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασίλευς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασίλευς</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO SERVE          KING

actual pairs: 31
number complete: 10
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασίλευς</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοῦλευς</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταδοῦλευς</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοῦλος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO SERVE          TO REIGN

actual pairs: 0
number complete: 0
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

KING          ETERNITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αἰώνα</td>
<td>ETERNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευὼν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TO REIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αἰὼνα</td>
<td>ETERNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευὼν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KING PLENTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευὼν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KING TO BE SATISFIED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευὼν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KING SATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευὼν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευωθ</td>
<td>KING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και έτελεύτησεν</td>
<td>TO JUDGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Chronicles 29:28

Greek:

καὶ ἔτελεύτησεν ἐν γῆρει καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν πλούτῳ καὶ δόξῃ, καὶ ἐβασιλεύσεν Σαλωμών υἱὸς αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ.
actual pairs: 14
number complete: 12
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασίλευς</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαζω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικασος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρινω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαίωμα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρινος</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO REIGN

TO JUDGE

351

2 Chronicles 1: 11

Greek:

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Σαλώμων Ἀνθ' ᾧν ἐγενετο τοῦτο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ οὐκ ἦτίσω πλοῦτον χρημάτων οὐδὲ δόξαν οὐδὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν ὑπεναντίων καὶ ἡμέρας πολλὰς οὐκ ἦτίσω καὶ ἦτισας σεαυτῷ σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν, ὡπως κρίνης τὸν λαὸν μου, ἐφ' ὅν ἐβασίλευσά

σε ἐπ' αὐτόν.

I - 371

DEATH/DEAD

BAAL/HUSBAND

חָזַר

112

DEATH/DEAD

TO OWN
actual pairs: 9
number complete: 9
Greek:

\[ \text{ἀποθανω} \quad 6 \\
\text{προσαποθανω} \quad 1 \\
\text{τετελευτηκος} \quad 1 \\
\text{ἀποκτενω} \quad 1 \\
\text{proper name} \quad 2 \\
\text{κυριος} \quad 3 \\
\text{ἀνδρος} \quad 1 \\
\text{baal} \quad 3 \\
\]

**TO DIE**

TO OWN

Deuteronomy 22: 22

Εὰν δὲ εὑρεθῇ ἀνθρωπος κοιμώμενος μετὰ γυναικὸς
συνψυκσμένος ἀνδρὶ, ἀποκτενεῖτε ἀμφοτέρους, τὸν
ἀνδρα τὸν κοιμώμενον μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τὴν
gυναίκα...

I - 374

DEATH/DEAD

DEATH/DEAD
This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.

DEATH/DEAD  TO DIE

TO DIE  TO DIE

This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.

RIVER  DEEP

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

This word pair has not been analysed because it is a reduplicative.
TO INHERIT        INHERITANCE

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

TO RAISE         TO RAISE

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

SERVANT          SON (OF A HANDMAID)

actual pairs: 72
number complete: 43
Greek:

υἱός 62
παῖς 23
παιδάριον 1
παιδισκή 2
dοῦλος 24
Εβεδ 4

TO SERVE        SON (OF A HANDMAID)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>SERVANT</th>
<th>ETERNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דב &lt;&lt;</td>
<td>ניס</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 24
number complete: 12
Greek:

| nɪoɔ | 24 |
| δουλῶ | 11 |
| καταδουλῶ | 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>SERVANT</th>
<th>ETERNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דב &lt;&lt;</td>
<td>αἴωνα</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 2
Greek:

| αἴωνα | 4 |
| δουλῶ | 2 |

I - 409
This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

I - 421

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO ASCEND</th>
<th>TO DESCEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>עלה</td>
<td>ירד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 21
number complete: 18
Greek:
- ἀναβαίνω 18
- καταβαίνω 18

I - 422

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO SIT</th>
<th>TO ASCEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ישב</td>
<td>עלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 25
number complete: 7
Greek:
- κατοικῶ 10
- ἀναβαίνω 13
- καταβαίνω 3

I - 441, see I - 009
I - 442

CEDAR TREE

(actual pairs: 19
number complete: 17
Greek:

κεδρίνος 15
κεδρός 5
ξυλος 17)

I - 443

TREE TREE

(First word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.)

I - 446

TREE JUNIPER

I - 447

EARTH CLOUD
Isaiah 5:30

Greek:

καὶ βοήσει δι' αὑτοῦς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνη ἡς φωνή
θαλάσσης κυμαινούσης· καὶ ἐμβλέψονται εἰς τὴν γῆν,
καὶ ἰδοὺ σκότος σκληρὸν ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ αὐτῶν.

I - 448

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCK</th>
<th>GOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>זוהי</td>
<td>ניב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149 1121 20

actual pairs: 8
number complete: 0
Greek:

θεὸς 2

ROCK GOD

זוהי נלעימ

149 3664 18

actual pairs: 11
number complete: 0
Greek:

Results inconclusive

I - 451

ROCK ROCK

זוהי זוהי
This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 453

**HEAVEN**  **ROCK**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>סֵבִּית</td>
<td>רֹאֶס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 1
Greek:
- οὐρανός 1
- πέτρα 2

I - 474, see I - 166

I - 475

**TO HUNT**  **BREAD**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דִּבֶּש</td>
<td>בֵּית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joshua 9:12 (LXX 11-2)
Greek:

...λαβεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ἑπιστείσιμον εἰς τὴν ὅδον καὶ πορεύθητε εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἔρειτε πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκέται σοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ νῦν διάθεσοι ἡμᾶς διαθήκην. οὗτοι οἱ ἄρτοι, θερμοὶ....

**HUNTING**  **BREAD**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דִּיבֶש</td>
<td>בֵית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 1
Joshua 9:5
Greek:

...καὶ ὁ ἄρτος αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐπίστισμον ἔρηδος καὶ εὐρωτίων καὶ βεβρωμένος.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARTH</th>
<th>ZAPHON (NORTH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>Τάφμιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3311</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 19
number complete: 12
Greek:

γῆ          13
βορρᾶ        12
βορρεαν      1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLINESS</th>
<th>MAJESTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שׁחָר</td>
<td>רַחַנָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLY</th>
<th>MAJESTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שׁוֹר</td>
<td>רַחַנָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psalm 16:3 (LXX 15:3)
Greek:

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοίς ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ
ἐθαυμάστωσεν πάντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

HOLY MAJESTIC

59 620 3

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

...οἱ δὲ αὐτεχόμενοι μου κτήσονται γῆν καὶ
κληρονομήσουσιν τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἁγιόν μου.

INHERITANCE HOLINESS

296 620 3

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

ἁγιός 2
κληρονομία 2

I - 484

TO INHERIT HOLINESS

297 1-484

I - 492

GOD TO CREATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>TO CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE</td>
<td>WALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Number Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קֹדֶם</td>
<td>קֹדֶם</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>number complete: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kτιζω</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Number Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קֹדֶם</td>
<td>קֹדֶם</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>number complete: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κταομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμβανω</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Number Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קֹדֶם</td>
<td>קֹדֶם</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual pairs: 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>number complete: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number complete: 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶκος</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοιχος</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τειχη</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I - 499

HOUSE

ณ์

2376

CITY

ทร.

76

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

οικος 2
πολις 2

I - 503

CITY

ทร.

CITY

ทร.

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 512

BAAL/MASTER

หญ.

282

GREAT

นคร

288

TO OWN

หญ.

16

GREAT

นคร

288

0

I - 517
This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 518
FIRE
SHOWERS

752 10 0

I - 519
SHOWERS
RAINFALL

10 1 1

Deuteronomy 32:2
Greek:
προσδοκάσκω ὡς ὑψιτὸς τὸ ἀπόφθεγμά μου,
kai kataphetw ὡς δροσος τὰ ὑματά μου,
ὡςει ὁμβρος ἐπὶ ἄγρωστιν
kai ὡςεὶ νιφετὸς ἐπὶ χάρτον.

I - 524
GOD
TO HEAL

1121 69 1
Numbers 12:13
Greek:

καὶ ἠβόησεν Ἰςωύς πρὸς κύριον λέγων ὁ θεὸς, δέομαι σου, ἵασαι αὐτὴν.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>TO HEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἰασάω</td>
<td>σάρα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3664 69 3

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 3
Greek:

θεὸς 3
ιάσομαι 3

I - 534, III - 132

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṣי</td>
<td>יָרָן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

481 358 4

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 4
Greek:

θαλάσσα 4
πεδίος 3
ἄγρος 1

I - 535

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>VINEYARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָרָן</td>
<td>עֵין</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 5
number complete: 4
Greek:

\[ \gamma\rho\sigma \quad 4 \]
\[ \alpha\mu\pi\varepsilon\lambda\sigma\quad 4 \]

I - 536

WILDERNESS  FIELD

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 537

FIELD  FIELD

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 547

SON  NAME
This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.
Psalm 68:5 (LXX 67:5)

"The disputed רָּבָּכָבָּרָה has finally been cleared up by means of the Ugaritic texts. Aliyan Baal has the attribute rkb `rpt = `cloud rider`. The mutation from p to ב can be documented otherwise too in a comparison of Ugaritic and Hebrew." 1

Greek:

ξύσατε τῷ θεῷ, πράλατε τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ·
ἀδοποιήσατε τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, κύριος
ὁνόμα αὐτή,
καὶ ἀγγαλλίασθε ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.

I - 558

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAVEN</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 5
number complete: 4
Greek:

οὐρανός  4
ψῶς  2
ψιστός  2

I - 559

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAVEN</th>
<th>HEAVEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Kraus, 1989, p. 46
This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 560

HEAVEN DEEP

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 578

SUN SUN

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.

I - 584

EARTH ROOT

This word pair was not analysed because it is a reduplicative.
EARTH

TO UPROOT

.actual pairs: 3

Isaiah 40:24
Greek:
...οὐδὲ μη ῥίζωθη εἰς τὴν γῆν ἢ ῥίζα αὐτῶν...

Psalm 52:7 (LXX 51:7)
Greek:
...καὶ τὸ ῥίζωμα σου ἐκ γῆς ζώντων.

Psalm 80:10 (LXX 79:10)
Greek:
...καὶ κατεφύτευσας τὰς ῥίζας αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ.

I - 607

BULL

GOD

.actual pairs: 2
number complete: 0

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 1
Greek:
II - 006

EARTH WAY

.actual pairs: 35
.number complete: 31
.Greek:

γῆ

3311 993 57

actual pairs: 7
.number complete: 6
.Greek:

γῆ

3311 63 8

II - 007

FLAME FIRE

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood’s translation does not agree with BDB and KB.
SON ASSEMBLY

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

WAY TO SIT


tןיו
tש

993 1088 26

actual pairs: 18
number complete: 7
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁδὸς</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παροδὸς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναβαίνω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῖκω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατοικῶ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπερχομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO TREAD TO SIT

דר

63 1088 1

The only occurrence, Jeremiah 25:30, is missing from the LXX.

II - 025
TO SIT

כָּשָׁב

1088

actual pairs: 9
number complete: 1
Greek:

κατορκῶ 1
tυνῦ 5

II - 027

WAY

נָּחַל קֶר

993

TO TREAD

דָּרֶךְ קֶר

63

II - 031, see I - 321

II - 034

KING

מֹאָת DEATH/DEAD

3735

actual pairs: 8
number complete: 7
Greek:

βασιλεὺς  8
ἀποθνῄσκω  7
θανάτος  3

TO REIGN  DEATH/DEAD

351  112  0

KING  TO DIE

3735  845  56

actual pairs: 50
number complete: 37
Greek:

βασιλεὺς  43
tελευτάω  1
ἀπεκτάω  1
ἀποθανῶ  18
θανάτω  17

TO REIGN  TO DIE

351  845  26

actual pairs: 23
number complete: 23
Greek:

ἀποθανῶ  19
θανάτω  3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευω</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II - 056**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English (1)</th>
<th>English (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOWER</td>
<td>RAIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

**II - 061, III - 297**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English (1)</th>
<th>English (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td>CAIRN?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Micah 3:12
Greek:
διὰ τούτο δι' ὑμᾶς Σιων ὡς ἄγρος ἀροτριαθήσεται, καὶ Ιερουσαλημ ὡς ὁπωροφυλάκιον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ σῶκου ὡς ἀλσος δρυμοῦ.

**II - 062**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English (1)</th>
<th>English (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td>HUNTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 3
Greek:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀγρόικος</td>
<td>FIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυνηγεῖν</td>
<td>TO HUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεδίον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θηρευσόν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θηραν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Genesis 27:5
Greek:

Βεσσεκα δὲ ἐκουσεν λαλούντως Ισαακ πρὸς Ἰσαυ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. ἔπορεύθη δὲ Ἰσαυ εἰς τὸ πεδίον θηρεύσαι θηραν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.

actual pairs: 16
number complete: 15
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πατὴρ</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυρίος</td>
<td>VICTOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 001

LORD  FATHER

367  1392  21
This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

### III - 017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5035</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**actual pairs: 17**

**number complete: 14**

**Greek:**

- ὄνος: 13
- θεός: 7
- κυρίος: 2
- οὐχί: 1
- placenames: 4
- proper name Emmanuel: 1
- pair=οἶκος τοῦ Ισραηλ: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5035</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**actual pairs: 130**

**number complete: 113**

**Greek:**

- ὄνος: 110
- τεκνον: 3
- ἀγγελος: 3
- θεός: 107
- κυρίος: 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>THIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְהוָה</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אלוהים</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2  
number complete: 2  
Greek:  

tοῦτο  2  
Θεός   2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>WISE/WISDOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְהוָה</td>
<td>נבון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2  
number complete: 1  
Greek:  

σοφία   2  
κυρίος  1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>SKILLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְהוָה</td>
<td>נבון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BE WISE</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BE WISE</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psalm 58:7 (LXX 57:6-7)

Greek:

6. ἄτις οὐκ εἰσακούσεται φωνῆν ἐπαδόντων φαρμάκου τε
φαρμακευομένου παρὰ σοφὸς.
7. ὁ θεός συνέτισεν τοὺς ὀδόντας αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ στόματι
αὐτῶν,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 3

Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σοφὸς</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεὸς</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISDOM</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actual pairs: 12  
number complete: 11  
Greek:

σοφία 7  
σοφος 1  
φοινησις 3  
θεος 9  
κυριος 3

III - 021

GOD  EVERLASTING  
 áll  הָעַל  
1121 2655 45

*Anytext* cannot distinguish between the adjective here and the preposition דּּ meaning "until". This renders the results inconclusive.

נִצְלֶ                                    הָעַל  
3664 2655 131

*Anytext* cannot distinguish between the adjective here and the preposition דּּ meaning "until". This renders the results inconclusive.

III - 023

GOD  MOST HIGH  
אל  נֵצְלֶ  
1121 105 20

actual pairs: 10  
number complete: 10  
Greek:
actual pairs: 8
number complete: 8
Greek:

GOD MOST HIGH

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.
GOD DISTANT

.actual pairs: 5
.number complete: 0
Greek:
Results inconclusive

GOD TO BE DISTANT

Psalm 22:2 (LXX 21:2)
Greek:
οθεόςοθεόςμου,πρόσχεσμοi.ἲνατιἐγκατέληπτες
με;...

GOD DISTANCE/DISTANT PLACE

Jeremiah 23:24
Greek:
θεὸς ἐγγίζων ἐγώ εἰμι, λέγει κύριος, καὶ οὐχὶ θεὸς πῷρπῳεν.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>TO BE DISTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בַּלָּהֶה</td>
<td>רוחק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 3  
number complete: 3  
Greek:  
θεὸς | 3  
πορευομαι μακρὰν | 1  
ἐκαταλίπω | 1  
μακρυνῶ | 1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>DISTANCE/DISTANT PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בַּלָּהֶה</td>
<td>נּוֹרוֹק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 027

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>TO INHERIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בַּלָּהֶה</td>
<td>נדָּח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>TO INHERIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בַּלָּהֶה</td>
<td>נדָּח</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κατακληρονομῶ 3</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός 4</td>
<td>INHERITANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρος 8</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονομία 7</td>
<td>TO DECIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονομῶ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυρίος 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 19
number complete: 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נִוהֵל נָוהֵל 8</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121 296 3</td>
<td>GOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 0
Greek: Results inconclusive

III - 028
actual pairs: 7
number complete: 5
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιθαλ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυριος</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρινω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακρινω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαιω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαιου</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOD TO DECIDE

3664 205 18

actual pairs: 17
number complete: 13
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κρινω</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεος</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 029

GOD BEGETTER

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

III - 030

GOD EARTH
actual pairs: 27
number complete: 13
Greek:

\[ \gamma \theta \varepsilon \sigma \]
\[ \text{ou } \mu \theta \]
\[ \kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \sigma \]

actual pairs: 206
number complete: 191
Greek:

\[ \gamma \theta \varepsilon \sigma \]
\[ \kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \sigma \]
\[ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \beta \theta \gamma \]

actual pairs: 16
number complete: 14
Greek:

\[ \text{o} \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \sigma \]
\[ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \]

HEAVEN
GOD

\[ \gamma \theta \varepsilon \sigma \]
\[ \kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \sigma \]
\[ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \beta \theta \gamma \]

\[ \text{o} \upsilon \rho \alpha \nu \sigma \]
\[ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \]

322
actual pairs: 46
number complete: 46
Greek:

| οὐρανός | 46 |
| θεός   | 46 |

HEAVEN  STAR  GOD

Deuteronomy 10:22
Greek:

ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα ψυχαῖς κατέβησαν οἱ πατέρες σου εἰς Ἀἰγυπτόν, νυνὶ δὲ ἐποίησαν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὡσεὶ ἡ ἀστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλῆθει.

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 3
Greek:

| θεός   | 3 |
| ἀστερός | 4 |
DEW LIGHT

actual pairs: 1
Isaiah 18:4
Greek:

Διδάσκειν μεκότιον Ἁσφάλεια ἐσται ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ

ΗΣΟΣ λόγος καύματος μεσημβρίας, καὶ ἡ νεφέλη

δρόσου ἡμέρας ἀμητοῦ ἐσται.

DEW TO BE LIGHT

actual pairs: 0

Greek:

οἶκος 7
μῆκος 5

III - 043

HOUSE LENGTH (OF DAYS)

actual pairs: 8
number complete: 7
Greek:

οἶκος 7
μῆκος 5

III - 044
### Earth: Inheritance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονομία</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονομεῖν</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρος</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατακληρονομεῖν</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Greek:

- Actual pairs: 30
- Number complete: 29

### Earth: To Inherit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονομῶ</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονομία</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατακληρονομῶ</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Greek:

- Actual pairs: 24
- Number complete: 22

### Earth: Fruit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Greek:

- Actual pairs: 24
- Number complete: 22
actual pairs: 18
number complete: 17
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρπος</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκφορία</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρποφορος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 046

EARTH                  SHOWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גֵּינָה</td>
<td>SHOWERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3311   10   2

actual pairs: 1
Psalm 72: 6 (LXX 71: 6)
Greek:

καὶ καταβήσεται ὡς ὑπετος ἐπὶ πόκον
καὶ ὦσει οταγόνες οτάξουσαι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν γῆν.

III - 056

HOUSE                  HUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>צֶור</td>
<td>HUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood’s translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

III - 065

BAAL/MASTER            GUARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קֶנִים</td>
<td>GUARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

TO OWN GUARD

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

III - 069, see I - 127

III - 070

HOUSE ENTRANCE

BDB and KB give the definition "produce, yield", which is confirmed by the only LXX translation of this word pair.

Proverbs 15:6
Greek: 
οἶκοις δικαίων ἱσχὺς πολλή,  
καρποὶ δὲ ἀοβεῖν ἀπολούνται.

III - 071

HOUSE KOTHAROT

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.
This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

III - 072

BREAD    HOUSE

םַחְל    חַנָב

542   2376  29

actual pairs: 24
number complete: 12
Greek:

οἶκος  17
οἰκογενεῖς  1
ἄρτος  16

III - 073

HOUSE    PRISON

הַבָּתֵר    רַשָּׁב

2376  8  1

Isaiah 42:7
Greek:

ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν, ἔξαγαγείν ἐκ δεσμῶν
dedeménous kai eis oikou phulakês kathmenous en skotei.

III - 074

HOUSE    ROOT

הַבָּתֵר    שֶׁפֶשׁ

2376  45  5
actual pairs: 3
number complete: 1
Greek:

οἶκος 1
διζα 2

HOUSE  TO UPROOT

נֵבֶן  שִׁרְיָן

2376  8  0

III - 094

WAY  HEAVEN

דר  סִפְי

993  503  3

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 1
Greek:

οὐρανός 1
δῶδος 2

TO TREAD  HEAVEN

רו  סֶפִי

63  503  2

actual pairs: 1
Job 9:8
Greek:

ὁ ταύτης τὸν οὐρανὸν μόνος
καὶ περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπὶ ἑδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης.
III - 095

GOD       HE

1121  2826  59

actual pairs: 20
number complete: 6
Greek:
   Results inconclusive

GOD       HE

3664  2826  280

actual pairs: 134
number complete: minimal
Greek:
   Results inconclusive

III - 098

WAY       TO WALK

993  1560  177

actual pairs: 175
number complete: 145
Greek:
   περιπατεῖ 1
   δόξα  162
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Verb</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πορευομαι</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραλευσομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπέρχομαι</td>
<td>6 - all in 1 - 4 Reg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκπορευομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προπορευομαι</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαπορευομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταπορευομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TO TREAD** | **TO WALK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἠρα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 3  
number complete: 3  
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὄδος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξουθενόν</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πορευομαι</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαπορευομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III - 099**

**EARTH** | **MIRY BOG**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מים</td>
<td>מים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3311</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psalm 140:11-2 (LXX Ps 139:11-2)  
Greek:

11. ἐπὶ αὐτῶς ἄνθρακες  
12. ἀνὴρ γλωσσώδης οὗ κατευθυνθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἄνδρα ἄδικον κακὰ θηρεύσει εἰς διαφθοράν.

**III - 103**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit</th>
<th>Olive Tree</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRUIT</td>
<td>OLIVE TREE</td>
<td>Jeremiah 11:16: $\text{ἐλαίαν} , \text{ὑράιαν} , \text{εὐσκιον} , \text{τῇ} , \text{εἴδει} , \text{ἐκάλεσεν} , \text{κύριος} , \text{τὸ} , \text{ὄνομά} , \text{σου}...$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BEAR FRUIT</td>
<td>OLIVE TREE</td>
<td>III - 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIL</td>
<td>OLIVE TREE</td>
<td>III - 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTH</td>
<td>HOOK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ezekiel 19:4
Greek:
καὶ ἤκουσαν κατ’ αὐτὸν ἤθη, ἐν τῇ διαφορᾷ αὐτῶν συνελήμφθη, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐν κημῷ εἰς γῆν Αἰγύπτου.

III - 121

HEAVEN DEW

III - 122

EARTH DEW
III - 124

GOD       HAND

יֶֽעָן       יִֽתְנָא

1121       2336       53

actual pairs: 26
number complete: 23
Greek:

χειρος       23
ὑποχειριος   17
θεος         12
κυριος       11

.actual pairs: 121
number complete: 96
Greek:

θεος         91
κυριος       48
χειρος       95

III - 132, see I - 534

III - 140

GOD       PRECIOUS

יֶֽעָן       יִֽתְנָא

1121       45

ןֵֽיָּחִים    יִֽתְנָא

III - 132, see I - 534
actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρησσος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιληθεύνας</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOD          PRECIOUS THING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִמְלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִמְלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3364</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOD          TO BE PRECIOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִמְלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psalm 139:17 (LXX 138:17)
Greek:

ἐμοὶ δὲ λίαν ἐπιληθεύσαν οἱ φίλοι σου, ὁ θεος,
λίαν ἕκραται ὑπερήπεσαν αἱ ἀρχαὶ αὐτῶν.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִמְלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3664</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεος</td>
<td>ישיב</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐντιμωθητῶ</td>
<td>ישיב</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιμη</td>
<td>ישיב</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III - 151**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARTH</th>
<th>TO SIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ישיב</td>
<td>ישיב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual number: 184  
number complete: 136  
Greek:  
οἰκῶ 10  
κατοικῶ 117  
παροικῶ 2  
ζοικῶ 7  
γῆ 164

**III - 152, see II - 024**

**III - 153**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO SIT</th>
<th>TO INSTRUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ישיב</td>
<td>ישיב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1088 44 0

**III - 154**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREAD</th>
<th>TO SIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ישיב</td>
<td>ישיב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

542 1088 14
actual pairs: 13
number complete: 3
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀρτος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατοικῶ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνοικῶ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶκῳ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 155

TO SIT         ROCK

 Heb         יישב

1088         149

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 1
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μεγας</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνοικῶ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατοικῶ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 156

TO SIT         GATE

 Heb         ישב

1088         531

actual pairs: 22
number complete: 11
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πυλη</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐλη</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκῳ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
κατοικῶ 3
eἰσερχομαι 1
καθήμαι 4

III - 161

EARTH

γῆ 3
ψευδός 1
ψευδῆ 2

actual pairs: 3
number complete: 3
Greek:

γῆ 3
ψευδός 1
ψευδῆ 2

EARTH

TO SUBMIT

III - 182

WILDERNESS

SEED

Psalm 106:27 (LXX 105: 26-7)
Greek:

26. καὶ ἐπήρεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ αὐτοῖς τοῦ καταβαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
27. καὶ τοῦ καταβάλειν τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς ἑθέσειν
kai διασκορπίσαι αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς χώραις.

### III - 183

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilderness</th>
<th>Devastation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מָרָך</td>
<td>כָּנָשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III - 184

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilderness</th>
<th>Tracks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מָרָך</td>
<td>כָּנָשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeremiah 4:11
Greek:

ἐν τῇ καιρῇ ἐκείνῃ ἐροῦσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ τῇ
Ierousalēm Πνεῦμα πλανήσεις ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ, ὅτι τῆς
θυγατρὸς τοῦ λαοῦ μου οὐκ εἰς καθαρὸν οὐδ' εἰς ἁγιον.

### III - 190

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Heaven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כוכב</td>
<td>נחל</td>
<td>יָל</td>
<td>שָבָע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only place where all four members of the quadruplet occur is Psalm 148:3-5.
Greek:

3...αἰνεῖτε αὐτῶν, πάντα τὰ άστρα καὶ τὸ φῶς.
4. αἰνεῖτε αὐτῶν, οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὸ ὄντα τὸ ύπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν.
5. αἰνεσάτοσαν τὸ ὅνομα κυρίου, ...

III - 191, see I - 354

III - 192

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO SIT</th>
<th>TO BE ESTABLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יושב</td>
<td>בור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 9
number complete: 0
Greek:
Results inconclusive

III - 195

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>AGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ים</td>
<td>ישע</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

III - 197

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KING</th>
<th>TO BUILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מלך</td>
<td>בני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actual pairs: 17
number complete: 15
TO REIGN

TO FORTIFY

This word pair was not analysed because Dahood’s translation does not agree with BDB and KB.
This word pair was not analysed because Dahood's translation does not agree with BDB and KB.

III - 199

KING               TO ESTABLISH

3735               220       11

actual pairs: 10
number complete: 7
Greek:

βασιλευς        7
βασιλεια          1
βασιλειν           1
ἐτοιμαζω           8

TO REIGN             TO ESTABLISH

351               220       2

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 1
Greek:

βασιλευω              2
ἐτοιμαζω            1

III - 200

KING               NAME
actual pairs: 24  
number complete: 14  
Greek:

όνομα 15  
βασιλεὺς 16  
βασιλεα 1

TO REIGN  
NAME

actual pairs: 29  
number complete: 29  
Greek:

όνομα 29  
βασιλευσ 29

DEAD/DEATH  
TO DESCEND

actual pairs: 4  
number complete: 4  
Greek:

θανατος 3  
ἀποθανω 1  
καταβαινω 3  
συγκαταβαινω 1

III - 208
TO DIE

 tamil

845

actual pairs: 12
number complete: 10
Greek:

ἀποθανώ 6
τελευτάω 2
θανάτος 3
καταβαίνω 1
καταγώ 8

 III - 212

EARTH

3311

actual pairs: 1
Isaiah 60:21
Greek:

καὶ ὁ λαὸς σου πᾶς δίκαιος, καὶ δι' αἰῶνος
kληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν, φυλάσσων τὸ φυτεύμα,
ἐργα χειρῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς δόξαν.

EARTH

3311

actual pairs: 5
TO PLANT

3311
actual pairs: 5
number complete: 2
Greek:
\begin{align*}
\gamma' \& \ 3 \\
\phiu'teukw & \ 1 \\
\kata'phiu'teukw & \ 1
\end{align*}

III - 221

GOD \quad \text{LAMP}

\begin{align*}
\text{'el} & \ 93 \\
1121 & \ 93 \quad 0 \\
\text{el} & \ 93
\end{align*}

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 2
Greek:
\begin{align*}
\lambdauxuos & \ 2 \\
\theos & \ 2
\end{align*}

III - 222

TO SIT \quad \text{TO RAISE}

\begin{align*}
\text{lish} & \ 662 \\
1088 & \ 662 \quad 17
\end{align*}

actual pairs: 16
number complete: 1
Greek:
\begin{align*}
\kata'oiukw & \ 3 \\
\iota'oiukw & \ 1
\end{align*}
χωρῶ 1

III - 225

WAY PATH

צֵרֶה בְּרֵיחֲנָה

993 9 0

TO TREAD PATH

זָדוֹב בְּרֵיחֲנָה

63 9 1

Psalm 119:35 (LXX 118:35)
Greek:

ὁδηγησόν με ἐν τρίβῳ τῶν ἐντολῶν σου, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἡθέλησα.

III - 228

BREAD TO SERVE

םְחָרָב עֶבֶד

542 317 4

actual pairs: 4
number complete: 3
Greek:

ἀρτος 3
ἐργαζόμαι 3

BREAD SERVANT

םְחָרָב עֶבֶד
actual pairs: 3
number complete: 3
Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀρτός</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παῖς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοῦλος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III - 238

TO SIT  TO ASCEND  TO DESCEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יושב</td>
<td>עליה</td>
<td>יורד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only place where the triplet occurs is Amos 9:5.
Greek:

καὶ κύριος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἐφαπτόμενος τῆς γῆς καὶ σαλέυνα αὐτήν, καὶ πενθήσουσιν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν, καὶ ἀναβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς συντέλεια αὐτῆς καὶ καταβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς Αἰγύπτου.

III - 250

DEW  TO DRIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יין</td>
<td>יריחו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deuteronomy 33:28
Greek:
καὶ κατασκηνώσει Ἰσραήλ πεποιθώς
μόνος ἐπὶ γῆς Ιακωβ
ἐπὶ σίτῳ καὶ ὕδατι
καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς αὕτη συννεφῆς δρόσῳ.

III - 257

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILDERNESS</th>
<th>CORNER/SIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γνήσις</td>
<td>γνήσι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

301 | 87 | 2

actual pairs: 2
number complete: 0
Greek:
Results inconclusive

III - 260

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE</th>
<th>FRUIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γάτα</td>
<td>γάνατα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

506 | 170 | 36

actual pairs: 22
number complete: 22
Greek:

εὐλογ 19
εὐλογον 2
dενδρον 1
cαρπον 19
cαρποφόρα 1
gενήματα 2
HEAVEN  HUNTING
שֵׁם  צְדִיק
503  26  0

HEAVEN  TO HUNT
שֵׁם  צְד
503  1  0

NORTH  TO BIND
חֶנֶר  צֶרֶך
233  61  0

HOUSE  HOLINESS
בֵּית  קַשּׁי
2376  620  66

actual pairs: 42
number complete: 37
Greek:
οἶκος  39
ἀγίος  37
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOLINESS</td>
<td>ἡγεῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual pairs: 2
Number complete: 2

Greek:

- θρόνος: 2
- ἔγιος: 2

---

HOLINESS

III - 279

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>ἡγεῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proverbs 9:15

Greek:

προσκαλομένη τοὺς παριόντας
καὶ κατευθύνοντας ἐν ταῖς ὁθοῖς αὐτῶν

---

HEAD

III - 284

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUST</td>
<td>ἱμία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual pairs: 4
Number complete: 3

Greek:

- χοῦν: 2
- στοδον: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Actual Pairs</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEEP SHOWERS</td>
<td>κεφαλή</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD WATER</td>
<td>נֵבֵיבָא</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVEN HOLINESS</td>
<td>קַרְמֶשׁ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek:
- κεφαλή: 3
- נֵבֵיבָא: 4
- קַרְמֶשׁ: 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐρανός</td>
<td>Heaven</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἅγιος</td>
<td>Holy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֵּם</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כַּדֶּשׁ</td>
<td>Plead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III - 319**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>BAAL/MASTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָאָל</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָנָלָס</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>TO OWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָנָל</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III - 322, see I - 016**

**III - 337**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO SIT</td>
<td>TO OVERTURN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁב</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָּמָך</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Genesis 19:29*
Greek:
καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἐκτρήψαι κύριον πάσας τὰς πόλεις
tῆς περιοικῆς ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Αβραὰμ καὶ
ἐξαπεστείλεν τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς ἐν τῇ
καταστρέψαι κύριον τὰς πόλεις, ἐν αἷς κατέκει ἐν
αὐταῖς Ἀβραὰμ.

III - 338

TO SIT TO POSSESS

שי ישיב

1088 233 28

actual pairs: 35 (includes Judges A + B)
number complete: 22
Greek:
κατοίκω 49
ἀπόλλυμι 7
κληρονομαί 6
κληρονομια 1
ξηραίνω 3
dύναμαι 2
ὲξολοθρεύω 1

III - 339

TO SIT FAMILY

שי ישיב

1088 309 1

1 Chronicles 2:55
Greek:
πατριαὶ γραμματέων κατοικουντες Ἰαβες, ἑραμμηνευμ, ...

...
GATE | WALL
---|---
763 | 193
531 | 193

actual pairs: 21
number complete: 18

Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὀχυρα</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πυλη</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τεῖχος</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τεῖχη</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>