Translation technique and the translation of verbal forms in the Masoretic Text by the Peshitta Psalms 73-89

LH Moretsi

orcid.org 0000-0002-3095-1777

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree *Doctor of Philosophy* in *Semitic Languages* at the North-West University

Promoter: Prof HF Van Rooy

Graduation ceremony: May 2019

Student number: 10706046

Acknowledgement/Dedication

Glory to God Almighty in the Highest, who enabled me to embark on this research and blessed me with good health along this journey! All starts and ends with God – glory and honour be to Him at all times.

To my wife Virginia, a special word of gratitude for your love, endurance, patience, support and encouragement throughout this study: 'Kemo nokeng ya gago, bopelotelele, kutlwisiso, botswerere le bothakga di kgontshitse phitlhelelo eno.' To our three daughters, Tsholofelo, Tshegofatso, Tebogo and son Oretlametse, thank you for your support, patience, encouragement and prayers. I cannot thank you enough as I mostly was not there for you fully, though always present in my mind. I thank God for you at all times and love you all so much. Mr RD and Mrs NJ Moretsi, Ms MFB Mmami Tselapedi and Mrs A Mogotsi, thank you so much, for you were there when we needed you. Thank you and stay blessed.

To my promoter and mentor Prof Herrie Van Rooy, a renowned scholar in Peshitta research nationally and internationally, thank you for your fatherly advice and valuable inputs I received at all times, as well as your guidance in this investigative work. Thank you for your academic advice and excellence! Your interest in Semitic Languages and the Old Testament inspired me greatly. This study is the end product of your guidance, expert advice and critical remarks. Mrs Jacoba van Rooy, thank you for your hospitality at all times and for all your encouraging words. Thank you, Prof Herrie and Dr Jacoba for allowing me some of your valuable time in your retirement, especially the last two years up to now.

To the librarians, Mrs Hester Lombard, Mrs. Berna Bradley and Mr Sydney Vos, thank you for all your help throughout this study. I could knock at your door at any time and you always made sure I found the materials I needed. Even when it was absent in our library (FP or TSP), you always went an extra mile. You searched for articles and books that helped me. Mrs Hester Lombard, thank you for editing the first four pages of the bibliography. Words are not sufficient to express my thankfulness.

Colleagues at the Faculty, ministers in GKSA and friends, thank you all for your support and encouragements at all times. Prof Hans van Deventer, your contribution is highly appreciated.

Prof Fika van Rensburg, that call in November 2006 was the beginning of this. Thank you for the motivation I constantly received from you and all your valuable fatherly advice. May God bless you!

Nonkosana and Mhlabeni family, thank you for being there for us, may you be blessed! To the Reformed Church Diepkloof, thank you for your prayers throughout this journey. To rev Thomas Dreyer, Dr Jacob Pretorius and GK Linden, thank you very much. To the curators (GKSA), thank you for affording me this opportunity and may God bless you as we continue serving in his kingdom as servants.

Dr Chrissie Reinecke, thank you for your profound and outstanding editing work and all your valuable inputs and suggestions. May God Almighty bless you!

Lastly to my mother, brothers, sister and your families, the Moretsi family at large and my mother-in-law, my two sisters-in-law and their families, thank you all for your valuable support and understanding throughout this journey: ‘Motswana fa a bua sentle a re "ga e nke e ntsha boloko jotlhe" lotlhe lo lebogilwe’. Shalom (שָׁלֹם)!

Motswana fa a opela a ikutlwa sentle a re:

Morena thuso tsa Gago
Fa ke di gopola tsotlhe;
O molemo, le tlotlego,
O ntsamaisitse sentle.

Ecclesiastes/Qohelet (קהלת) 12:13-14

(13) סוֹף דָּבָר הַכֹּל נִשְׁמָע | **אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים יְרָא**
וְאֶת מִצְוֹתָיו שְׁמוֹר כִּי זֶה כָּל הָאָדָם׃

(14) כִּי אֶת כָּל מַעֲשֶׂה הָאֱלֹהִים יָבִא בְמִשְׁפָּט
עַל כָּל נֶעְלָם | אִם טוֹב וְאִם רָע׃

ESV: 13-14

[13]The end of the matter; all has been heard.
Fear God and keep his commandments, (for this is) the whole (duty) of man.

[14]For God will bring every deed into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil.

Summary

The theoretical assumption was stated that the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew source (*Vorlage*) that was used by the Peshitta translator reflect a similar tradition. The objectives of the study were: (1) to make a comparative study to determine the agreements and differences between the verbal systems of Hebrew and Syriac; (2) to determine the translation technique of the Peshitta Psalms; (3) to make an analytical study to determine the way in which verbal forms in the Peshitta Psalms were translated; (4) to determine through comparison with the Septuagint and the Targum the originality of the translation of the Peshitta; and (5) to make deductions from the translation about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta Psalms. The comparative text-critical method was used as it is the most appropriate and relevant method.

The verbal systems of Biblical Hebrew and classical Syriac were compared, with special attention to the verbs taking into account the contributions of various scholars. Attention was paid to translation technique in general and to matters related to the translation technique of the Peshitta Psalms. A comparative study was made of the verbs in Psalms 73-89 in the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta, with reference to the other ancient versions as well.

In some instances, the differences in the translation can be ascribed to translation technique. Other differences are the result of different interpretations of the very same unvocalised Hebrew word but the same consonants. In some instances, the Peshitta reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic Text. The clarity of the translation has been confirmed by the psalms treated. When confronted by difficult, rare words or *hapax legomena*, the Peshitta opts to simplify or omit them or rather render the translation according to sense or context. During the investigation it became clear that the possibility of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is minimal, for example in Psalms 73:24a and 78:28.

Characterised by freedom of the translation means the Peshitta remained faithful to the meaning of the source text but expressed and rendered it faithfully to the Syriac structure. The following techniques characterise the Peshitta in general: specification, accommodation, omissions, additions, changes in word order and harmonisation (maintaining agreement). In the psalms treated, two new techniques were discovered, namely softening and generalisation. The Hebrew

verb is softened when rendered by the Peshitta, for example, in Psalm 74:10, the Hebrew verb ‘to reject’ is rendered by the Syriac verb ‘to forget’ in the Peshitta. This is also seen in Psalm 78:10b, where the Hebrew verb in the Masoretic Text ‘they refuse to go’ is rendered in the Peshitta by ‘they did not want to go’. The other technique that occurred in psalms treated is generalisation going hand in hand with specification. At times, a general verb in the Masoretic Text is rendered in the Peshitta by a specific verb or vice versa, e.g. Psalms 78:43, 88:5a and 88:6b.

In conclusion, the Peshitta Psalms used a proto-Masoretic text. The evidence for a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is minimal. Deviations are mostly the result of a different interpretation of the same Hebrew consonants, or not understanding the Hebrew, or can be attributed to translation technique. The Peshitta Psalms contribute to the textual criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament, but it requires careful and critical approach or implementation.

Keywords

Peshitta Psalms

Translation technique

Textual criticism

Verbal forms

Word order

Variants

Hebrew *Vorlage*

Rare words

hapax legomena

Opsomming

Die teoretiese aanname van hierdie studie is dat die Masoretiese Teks en die Hebreeuse bronteks (*Vorlage*) van die vertaler van die Peshitta uit dieselfde tradisie kom. Die doelstellings van die studie was: (1) om deur ’n vergelykende studie die ooreenkomste en verskille tussen die werkwoordsisteme van Hebreeus en Siries te omskryf; (2) om die vertaaltegniek van die Peshitta Psalms te bepaal; (3) om te bepaal hoe die Hebreeuse werkwoorde in die Siriese Psalms vertaal is; (4) om deur ’n vergelyking met die Septuagint en die Targum te bepaal of die Peshitta ’n oorspronklike vertaling is; en (5) om afleidings te maak oor die Hebreeuse *Vorlage* van die Peshitta Psalms. Die vergelykende tekskritiese metode is gebruik as die mees geskikte en relevante metode.

Die werkwoordsisteme van Bybelse Hebreeuse en Klassieke Siries is met mekaar vergelyk, met aandag aan die bydraes van verskillende geleerdes in hierdie verband. Aandag is ook gegee aan vertaaltegniek in die algemeen en aan die vertaaltegniek van die Peshitta Psalms in die besonder. ’n Vergelykende studie is gemaak van die werkwoorde in Psalms 73–89 in die Masoretiese Teks en die Peshitta, met verwysing na die ander ou vertalings.

In sommige gevalle kan die verskille in die vertaling aan vertaaltegniek toegeskryf word. Ander verskille kan aan verskillende interpretasies van dieselfde ongevokaliseerde Hebreeuse woord met dieselfde konsonante toegeskryf word. In enkele gevalle berus die Peshitta op ’n Hebreeuse *Vorlage* wat verskil van die *Vorlage* van die Masoretiese teks. Die duidelikheid van die Peshitta as vertaling is bevestig deur die psalms wat bestudeer is. Wanneer die vertaler met skaars woorde te doen gekry het, soos *hapax legomena*, het hy hulle óf uitgelaat óf in die konteks vertaal. Die studie het gewys dat die gevalle wat aan ’n ander Hebreeuse *Vorlage* toegeskryf kan word, beperk is, soos in Psalm 73:24a en 78:28.

Alhoewel die Peshitta soms relatief vry vertaal is, het dit getrou gebly aan die betekenis van die bronteks, maar dit in ooreenstemming met Siriese styl vertaal. Die volgende tegnieke kan in die Peshitta onderskei word: spesifikasie, akkommodasie, weglatings, byvoegings, verandering van die woordorde en harmonisasie. In die psalms wat bestudeer is, het twee nuwe tegnieke na vore gekom, naamlik versagting en veralgemening. Die Hebreeuse werkwoord is soms versag soos in Psalm 74:10. Die Hebreeuse werkwoord “om te verwerp” is versag na “om te vergeet”. In Psalm

78:10b dui die Hebreeuse werkwoord op “om te weier om te gaan”. Die Peshitta vertaal dit met “om nie te wil gaan nie”. Veralgemening hou wel verband met spesifikasie. ’n Algemene werkwoord word met ’n meer spesifieke werkwoord weergegee, of die omgekeerde vind plaas, soos in Psalms 78:43, 88:5a en 88:6b.

Die Peshitta Psalms het ’n proto-Masoretiese teks gebruik. Daar is min aanduidings van ’n ander Hebreeuse *Vorlage*. Verskille is gewoonlik die gevolg van ’n ander interpretasie van dieselfde Hebreeuse konsonante, ’n gebrek aan die verstaan van die Hebreeus of dit kan toegeskryf word aan vertaaltegniek. Die Peshitta Psalms kan ’n bydrae lewer tot die tekskritiek van die Hebreeuse Ou Testament, maar dit vereis ’n versigtige, kritiese benadering.

Trefwoorde

Peshitta Psalms

Vertaaltegniek

Tekskritiek

Werkwoordvorme

Woordorde

Variante

Hebreeuse *Vorlage*

Skaars woorde

hapax legomena

Contents

Acknowledgement/Dedication i

Summary iii

Keywords iv

Opsomming v

Trefwoorde vi

Contents vii

List of tables xix

Abbreviations xxiii

Chapter 1 Orientation and problem statement 1

Introduction 1

1.1 Origin and history of the Peshitta Book of Psalms 1

1.2 Previous contributions by various authors on the research of Peshitta psalms 4

1.2.1 Baethgen, F. (1878, 1882) 4

1.2.2 Oppenheim, B. (1891) 5

1.2.3 Berg, J.F. (1895) 5

1.2.4 Rowlands, E. R. (1939) 6

1.2.5 Vogel, A. (1951) 7

1.2.6 Lund, J. A. (1988) 8

1.2.7 Eriksson, J. E. (1989) 8

1.2.8 Carbajosa, I. (2008) 8

1.2.9 Various short articles 12

1.3 Actuality 12

1.4 Scope of research 13

1.5 Problem Statement 13

1.6 Basic hypothesis/Central theory 14

1.7 Research aims and objectives 14

1.7.1 Research aims 14

1.7.2 Research objectives 15

1.8 Methodology 15

1.8.1 The Masoretic Text as the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the translation of the Peshitta Psalter 15

1.8.2 Comparative text-critical method 15
1.8.3 Translation technique 16
1.8.4 The value of the text 17
1.9 Chapter division 18
Chapter 2 A comparison of the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal systems 21
Introduction 21
2.1 Hebrew and Syriac verbs in Psalms 73–89 21
2.2 Hebrew and Syriac as Semitic languages 22
2.3 Previous contributions to studies of the Hebrew and Syriac verbal systems 24
2.4 Hebrew verbal system 24
2.4.1 Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley (abbreviation GKC), 1910:309–362 25
2.4.1.1 The perfect (GKC, 1910:309–313) 25
2.4.1.2 The imperfect (GKC, 1910:313–319) 25
2.4.1.3 The cohortative (GKC, 1910:319–321) 25
2.4.1.4 The jussive (GKC, 1910:321–323) 25
2.4.1.5 The imperative (GKC, 1910:324–326) 25
2.4.1.6 The imperfect with waw consecutive (GKC, 1910:326–330) 26
2.4.1.7 The perfect with waw consecutive (GKC, 1910:330–339) 26
2.4.2 Driver (1936:85–97) 26
2.4.2.1 Description of the waw consecutive 26
2.4.3 Moscati (1964:122–170) 27
2.4.3.1. ‘Tenses’ (Moscati, 1964:131–134) 27
2.4.3.2 Moods (Moscati, 1964:134–137) 27
2.4.4 McFall (1982:17–20, 176–177) 29
2.4.4.1 Waw consecutive theory (McFall, 1982:17–20, 176–177) 29
2.4.4.2 Relative tense solution (McFall, 1982:21–24, 177–179) 29
2.4.4.3 Waw inductive solution (McFall, 1982:24–26, 179) 30
2.4.4.4 Aspectual solution (McFall, 1982:180–181) 31
2.4.4.5 Factual-descriptive solution: William Turner’s theory (McFall, 1982:181–182) 32
2.4.4.6 Historical-comparative solution (McFall, 1982:182–184) 32
2.4.5 Waltke and O’Connor (1990:343–350) 33
2.4.5.1 The perfect (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990:479–495) 34
2.4.5.2 The imperfect (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990:496–518) 34
2.4.5.3 The waw consecutive 34
2.4.5.4 The jussive, imperative and cohortative (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990:564–579) 35
2.4.5.5 The infinitive 35
2.4.5.6 The participle (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990:612–631) 36

2.4.6 Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:67–173) 37
2.4.6.1 The verbs 37
2.4.6.2 Morphology of the basic paradigm (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:68–73; Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:309–313) 38
2.4.6.3 A tense or time system 40
2.4.6.4 The aspect system 40
2.4.6.5 The perfect form and waw 41
2.4.6.6 The imperfect form and waw 41
2.4.6.7 The infinitive construct and infinitive absolute 41
2.4.6.8 The participle 41
2.5 Syriac verbal system 41
2.5.1 Nöldeke (1966:100–142) 42
2.5.1.1 The perfect 42
2.5.1.2 The imperfect 42
2.5.1.3 The imperative 43
2.5.1.4 The infinitive 43
2.5.1.5 The infinitive absolute 43
2.5.1.6 The participle 43
2.5.2 Muraoka (1987:26–39) 44
2.5.2.1 The perfect and imperfect in Syriac 44
2.5.2.2 Participles (Nöldeke, 1966:202–207; Muraoka, 1987:43–45, 1997:66) 45
2.5.2.3 The infinitive 46
2.5.2.4 The perfect (Nöldeke, 1966:193–198; Muraoka, 1987:42, 1997:65) 47
2.5.2.5 The imperfect (Nöldeke, 1966:198–201; Muraoka, 1987:43, 1997:65) 47
2.6 Syntactic function of the verb in Biblical Hebrew 47
2.6.1 Meaning and use of the perfect or suffix conjugation (*qatal*) 47
2.6.2 The waw consecutive with the perfect (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:168–172) 47
2.6.3 The waw copulative + directives (jussive, imperative and cohortative forms) (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:171–172) 48
2.6.4 Meaning and use of the imperfect form or prefix conjugation (*yiqtol*) 49
2.6.5 The Imperfect and the waw consecutive (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:165–168; Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:326–330) 50
2.6.6 The imperative and cohortative and jussive forms 50
2.6.7 Syntax of the non-finite verb forms 51
2.6.8 The infinitive construct (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:153–157) 51
2.6.9 The infinitive absolute (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:154–162) 51
2.6.10 The participle (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:162–163; Davidson, 1962:43; Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:613–631) 51

2.7 Syntactic functions of the verb in Syriac (Nöldeke, 1966:193–198; Muraoka, 1987:42–44, 1997:65) 52
2.7.1 Perfect tense 52
2.7.2 Imperfect tense (Nöldeke, 1966: 198–201; Muraoka, 1987:43, 1997:65–66) 52
2.7.3 The participle (Nöldeke, 1966: 202–209; Muraoka, 1987:43–44, 1997:66–67) 52
2.7.4 The passive participle (Nöldeke, 1966: 209–211; Muraoka, 1987:44–45, 1997:67–68) 52
2.7.5 The cohortative and the jussive 53
2.7.6 The imperative 53
2.7.7 The infinitive absolute (Muraoka, 1987:55–57) 53
2.8 Comparison of the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal system 53
2.9 Conclusions 54
2.9.1 The waw consecutive 54
2.9.2 Compound tense in Syriac (Muraoka, 1987:46–47; Nöldeke, 1966:197, refer par 263; p. 196, refer pars 260–261; p. 200, refer par 268; p. 229, refer par 300) 54
2.9.2.1 Compound tense: □□□ □□□ 54
2.9.2.2 Compound tense: □□□ □□□ 55
2.9.2.3 Compound tense: □□□ □□□ 55
2.9.2.4 Compound tense: □□□ □□□□□□ 55
2.9 2.5 Compound tense: □□□ □□□□ 55
2.9.3 The jussive and cohortative 56
2.9.4 The perfect and the imperfect 56
Chapter 3 Translation technique employed by the Peshitta Psalter 57
Introduction 57
3.1 Translation technique 58
3.1.1 A few opinions in literature 58
3.1.2 Value of translation technique analysis 60
3.2 Textual criticism of the Old Testament 61
3.2.1 What is textual criticism? 61
3.2.2 Textual criticism and text-critical analysis 63
3.2.3 Function and value of textual criticism 64
3.2.4 Errors in copying and transmitting 65
3.2.5 Textual apparatus: Biblica Hebraic Stuttgartensia 66
3.3 Literary analysis and literary criticism 67
3.4 Relationship: Translation technique, textual criticism and literary criticism 68
3.4.1 The relationship between translation technique and textual criticism 69
3.4.2 The relationship between translation technique and literary analysis 71

3.5 The ancient translations 72
3.5.1 Value of the ancient translations before and after Qumran in textual criticism 72
3.5.2 Identification with or deviation from the Masoretic Text 74
3.5.3 Textual criticism of the ancient translations 74
3.6 Septuagint, Aramaic Targums, Vulgate and Peshitta 75
3.6.1 Septuagint (LXX) 75
3.6.1.1 Kaige-Theodotion 77
3.6.1.2 Aquila 78
3.6.1.3 Symmachus 78
3.6.1.4 The Hexapla 79
3.6.2 The Aramaic Targum/Targumim 79
3.6.2.1 Targum Onkelos 80
3.6.2.2 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, also known as Jerusalem Targum 1 81
3.6.2.3 The Targum Psalms 81
3.6.2.4 Character of the Targum Psalms 81
3.6.3 The Vulgate 82
3.6.4 The Syriac version (Peshitta) 83
3.6.4.1 Translation technique of the Peshitta 84
3.6.4.2 Relationship of the Peshitta to the other major ancient versions 85
3.6.4.3 Study of variants 87
3.6.4.4 The Peshitta and the textual criticism of the Old Testament 88
3.7 Value of the ancient translations in textual criticism 89
3.8 Conclusion 89
Chapter 4 Rendering of the verbal forms in the Peshitta Psalms 90
Introduction 90
4.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 91
4.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text 91
4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw 92
4.1.1.2 Perfect without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw 114
4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle 122
4.1.1.4 Perfect verb without waw rendered as no verb 125
4.1.1.5 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw 127
4.1.1.6 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative 129
4.1.1.7 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a participle 130
4.1.1.8 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw 132
4.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic text 135
4.1.2.1 Perfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw 135

4.1.2.2 Perfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a participle with waw 137
4.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic text 138
4.1.3.1 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb with waw 139
4.1.3.2 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw 140
4.1.3.3 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb with waw 140

4.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 145
4.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text 145
4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw 145
4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw 158
4.2.1.3 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle 161
4.2.1.4 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw 169
4.2.1.5 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw 176
4.2.1.6 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect of hwy plus participle 181
4.2.1.7 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a no verb construct 183
4.2.1.8 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative 184
4.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text 188
4.2.2.1 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw .. 188
4.2.2.2 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as perfect verb with waw 191
4.2.2.3 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw 197
4.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text 198
4.2.3.1 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb with waw ... 198
4.2.3.2 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb without waw 200
4.2.3.3 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw 202
4.2.3.4 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as □ plus imperfect verb 204

4.3 Verbs in the imperative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 207
4.3.1 Imperative rendered as an imperative 208
4.3.2 Imperative rendered without verb 216

4.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 220
4.4.1 Jussive rendered as an imperfect verb 220
4.4.2 Jussive rendered as an imperfect verb plus *d* 223
4.4.3 Jussive rendered as a perfect verb 224

4.5. Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 226
4.5.1 Cohortative rendered as an imperfect verb 226
4.5.2 Cohortative rendered as a perfect verb 231
4.5.3 Cohortative rendered as no verb 233

4.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text and their rendering into the Peshitta 234

4.6.1 Participle rendered as a participle 235
4.6.2 Participle rendered as a participle in a relative construction with □ 240
4.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun 244
4.6.4 Participle rendered as an imperfect verb in a relative construction with □ 249
4.6.5 Participle rendered as perfect verb 250
4.6.6 Participle rendered as an imperfect verb 255

4.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 258
4.7.1 Infinitive construct rendered as an infinitive 258
4.7.2 Infinitive construct rendered as a construct with □ (relative or otherwise) 261
4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun 265
4.7.4 Infinitive construct rendered as □□ plus perfect verb 269

4.8 Constructs without verb in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 270
4.8.1 No verb rendered as a finite verb 271
4.8.2 No verb rendered as a participle 274
4.8.3 No verb rendered as an infinitive 278
4.8.4 No verb rendered as an imperfect verb 279
4.8.5 No verb rendered as a perfect verb 280

4.9 Summary and conclusions regarding the trends discovered in 4.1–4.8 282
4.9.1 Number of occurrences of the Hebrew verbal forms found in the Masoretic Text 282
4.9.2 Word order 292
4.9.3 Rendering of particles, prepositions 293
4.9.4 Rendering of rare words 295

Chapter 5 Comparison of the Masoretic Text, Peshitta, Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum 297

Introduction 297

5.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text 298
5.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions 298
5.1.1.1 Perfect without waw as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 298
5.1.1.2 Perfect verb without waw as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 298
5.1.1.3 Perfect without waw as a perfect of □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 299
5.1.1.4 Perfect without waw as no verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 300

5.1.1.5 Perfect without waw as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 301
5.1.1.6 Perfect without waw as an imperative in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 302
5.1.1.7 Perfect without waw as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 303
5.1.1.8 Perfect without waw as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 304
5.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and other ancient versions 305
5.1.2.1 Perfect with waw copulative as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 305
5.1.2.2 Perfect with waw copulative as a participle with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 306
5.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and other ancient versions 307
5.1.3.1 Perfect with waw consecutive as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 307
5.1.3.2 Perfect with waw consecutive as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 307
5.1.3.3 Perfect with waw as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 308
5.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text 309
5.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw and their rendering in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions 309
5.2.1.1 Imperfect without waw as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 309
5.2.1.2 Imperfect without waw as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 310
5.2.1.3 Imperfect without waw as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other ancient versions 310
5.2.1.4 Imperfect without waw as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other ancient versions 311
5.2.1.5 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 312
5.2.1.6 Imperfect without waw as a perfect of □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 313
5.2.1.7 Imperfect without waw as no verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 314

5.2.1.8 Imperfect without waw as an imperative in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 315
5.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions 316
5.2.2.1 Imperfect with waw consecutive as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 316
5.2.2.2 Imperfect with waw consecutive as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 317
5.2.2.3 Imperfect with waw consecutive as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 318
5.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the other ancient versions 319
5.2.3.1 Imperfect with waw copulative as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 319
5.2.3.2 Imperfect with waw copulative as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 319
5.2.3.3 Imperfect with waw copulative as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 321
5.2.3.4 Imperfect with waw copulative as □ plus imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 322
5.3. Imperatives in the Masoretic Text 323
5.3.1 Imperative as an imperative in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 323
5.3.2 Imperative as no verb and its rendering in the other versions 323
5.4. Jussives in the Masoretic Text 324
5.4.1 Jussive as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 324
5.4.2 Jussive as an imperfect plus *d* in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 326
5.4.3 Jussive as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 326
5.5 Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text 327
5.5.1 Cohortative as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 327
5.5.2 Cohortative as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 328
5.5.3 Cohortative as no verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 329
5.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text 329
5.6.1 A participle as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 329
5.6.2 A participle as a participle in a relative construction with □ in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 330
5.6.3 A participle as a noun in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 331
5.6.4 A participle as an imperfect in a relative construction with □ in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 332

5.6.5 A participle as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 333
5.6.6 A participle as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions ... 334

5.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text 335
5.7.1 Infinitive construct as an infinitive in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 335
5.7.2 Infinitive construct as a construction with □ (relative or otherwise) in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 336
5.7.3 Infinitive construct as a noun in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions . 337
5.7.4 Infinitive construct as □□ plus perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 339

5.8 No verb constructs in the Masoretic Text 340
5.8.1 No verb as a finite verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 340
5.8.2 No verb as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 341
5.8.3 No verb as an infinitive in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 342
5.8.4 No verb as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 343
5.8.5 No verb as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions 343

5.9 Texts with text-critical issues 344

5.10 Summary of text-critical matters 389
5.10.1 Texts related to Kethib-Qere features 389
5.10.2 Different readings of the consonantal text 389
5.10.3 Confusion of similar looking consonants 389
5.10.4 Possible examples of a different *Vorlage* 390

5.11 Groups 390
5.11.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 390
5.11.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 390
5.11.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text 391
5.11.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 391
5.11.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 391
5.11.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 391
5.11.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 392
5.11.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 393
5.11.3 Imperatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 393
5.11.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 393

5.11.5 Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 393
5.11.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 393
5.11.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 394
5.11.8 No verb constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta 394
5.12 New renderings not dealt with previously 394
5.12.1 Waw consecutive + an imperfect in the Masoretic Text rendered as a no verb construct or omitted in the Peshitta, e.g. Ps 81:13 394
5.12.2 Imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta, e.g. Ps 86:11 395
5.13 Degree of agreement and disagreement between verbs as rendered by the Peshitta and these verbs as rendered by the Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum 396
5.13.1 Perfect verbs in Masoretic Text 396
5.13.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions 396
5.13.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions 398
5.13.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions 398
5.13.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text 399
5.13.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions 399
5.13.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions 401
5.13.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 402
5.13.3 Imperatives in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 403
5.13.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 404
5.13.5 Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 404
5.13.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 405
5.13.7Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 406
5.13.8 No verb constructs in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions 407
5.14.6 Deductions about texts with critical issues 408

5.15 Conclusion 410

Chapter 6 The Peshitta Psalter and its Hebrew Vorlage 413

Introduction 413

6.1 Examples possibly exhibiting a different Vorlage 414

6.2 Translation technique 427

6.3 Specific translation techniques in the Peshitta Psalms 429
6.3.1 Harmonisation (Carbajosa, 2008:104–127, 224–232; Carbajosa, 2016:269–273) 429
6.3.2 Assimilation (Carbajosa, 2008:128–135, 233–235; Carbajosa, 2016:272–273) 430
6.3.3 Specification (Carbajosa, 2016:269, 272–273) 430
6.3.4 Omissions (Carbajosa, 2008:65–69) 431
6.3.5 Additions (Carbajosa, 2008:38–42) 432
6.3.6 Word order (Carbajosa, 2008:21–26) 432
6.3.7 Changing the subject (not mentioned by Carbajosa) 433
6.3.8 Rare or difficult words or *hapax legomena* (Carbajosa, 2008:73–86) 433
6.3.9 Rhetorical questions (Carbajosa, 2008:27–29) 434
6.3.10 The use of the relative particle (Carbajosa, 2008:39–42) 435
6.3.11 Rendering according to sense or context: accommodation (Carbajosa, 2008:86–101) 435
6.3.12 Free rendering 436
6.3.13 The waw (Carbajosa, 2008:38) 436
6.3.14 'Softening' of the Hebrew verbs (Carbajosa does not mention it) 437

6.4 Conclusion 437

Chapter 7 Conclusions and reflections 439

Introduction 439

7.1 Synopsis 439
7.1.1 Chapter 1 439
7.1.2 Chapter 2 440
7.1.3 Chapter 3 441
7.1.4 Chapter 4 442
7.1.5 Chapter 5 444
7.1.6 Chapter 6 446

7.2 Conclusion 447

7.3 Further research 447

Bibliography 448

List of tables

Table 1: Division of Semitic Languages – Johns (1972:1–2) and Lambdin (1973:XIII) 23

Table 2: Division of Semitic languages – Moscati (1964:1–15) and Van Der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:15–16) 23

Table 3: Three different approaches to tenses (Julius Bate, 1751) 30

Table 4: The seven different stem formations of the Hebrew verb 39

Table 5: Conjugations of the Syriac verb 44

Table 6: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta 113

Table 7: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta 121

Table 8: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta 125

Table 9: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in the Peshitta 127

Table 10: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta 129

Table 11: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta 132

Table 12: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta 133

Table 13: Distribution of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render perfect verbs without a waw as found in the Masoretic Text 134

Table 14: Number of occurrences of a perfect verb with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect verb with waw in the Peshitta 137

Table 15: Number of occurrences of a perfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw or participle with waw in the Peshitta 138

Table 16: Number of occurrences of a verb with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect verb without waw in the Peshitta 140

Table 17: Number of occurrences of a perfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta 141

Table 18: Categories of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render a perfect verb with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text 142

Table 19: Classification of the perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta ... 143

Table 20: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta 156
Table 21: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta 161
Table 22: Number of occurrences of an imperfect verb without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta 168
Table 23: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta 175
Table 24: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta 180
Table 25: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect of *hwy* plus participle in the Peshitta 183
Table 26: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in the Peshitta 184
Table 27: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperative in the Peshitta 186
Table 28: Categories of the different verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text 186
Table 29: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta 191
Table 30: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta 196
Table 31: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text 197
Table 32: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta 200
Table 33: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta 202
Table 34: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta 204
Table 35: Categories of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text 205
Table 36: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text 206
Table 37: Number of occurrences of an imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperative in the Peshitta 216

Table 38: Number of occurrences of an imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in the Peshitta 219
Table 39: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperatives found in the Masoretic Text 220
Table 40: Number of occurrences of a jussive in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta 223
Table 41: Number of occurrences of a jussive in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect plus □ in the Peshitta 224
Table 42: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render jussives in the Masoretic Text 226
Table 43: Number of occurrences of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect verb in the Peshitta 230
Table 44: Number of occurrences of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect in the Peshitta 233
Table 45: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render cohortatives found in the Masoretic Text 234
Table 46: Number of occurrences of a participle in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta 239
Table 47: Number of occurrences of a participle in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta 244
Table 48: Number of occurrences of a participle in the Masoretic Text rendered as a noun in the Peshitta 248
Table 49: Number of occurrences of rendering a participle in the Masoretic Text as a perfect in the Peshitta 255
Table 50: Classification of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render participles in the Masoretic Text 257
Table 51: Number of occurrences of an infinitive construct plus preposition לְ in the Masoretic Text rendered as an infinitive construct plus □ in the Peshitta 261
Table 52: Number of occurrences of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text rendered as a construct with □ (relative or otherwise) in the Peshitta 265
Table 53: Number of occurrences of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text rendered as a noun in the Peshitta 268
Table 54: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render an infinitive construct found in the Masoretic Text 270
Table 55: Number of occurrences of no verb in the Masoretic Text rendered as a finite verb in the Peshitta 274

Table 56: Number of occurrences of no verb in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta 277
Table 57: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render no verb constructs 281
Table 58: Analysis of the occurrences of Hebrew verbal forms In the Masoretic Text and how the verbal forms are rendered in the Peshitta..... 283

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations have been frequently used throughout the thesis.

act	active
adj	adjective
AD	After Christ
art	article
BC	Before Christ
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stutgartensia
c	common
cf	refer/see
conj	conjunction
constr	construct
Dan	Daniel
def	definite
def art	definite article
e.g.	for example
etc	and so on
f	following
ff	and the following pages
fem	feminine
gen	genitive
Gen	Genesis
GKC	Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley

HALOT	The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Edited by Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner and Johann J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill. 1994-1999
hiph	hiphil
imperf	imperfect
imptv	imperative
indic	indicative
inf	infinitive
i.e.	that is
LXX	Septuagint
masc	masculine
ms/mss	manuscript/ manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text
NEB	New English Standard Bible (© 1961, 1970; Cambridge University Press and Oxford University Press)
NET	New English Translation (© 1996-2006; Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C.)
niph	niphal
NIV	Holy Bible: New International Version (© 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011; Biblica, Inc.)
p.	page
par	paragraph
pars	paragraphs
part	participle
pass	passive
perf	perfect
P	Peshitta
pl	plural

pp.	pages
prep	preposition
pres	present
pron	pronoun
Ps/Pss	Psalm/Psalms
rel	relative
sing	singular
SVO	subject, verb, object
subj	subjunctive
suff	suffix
TgJob	Targumim Job
TgPs	Targumim Psalms
VSO	verb, subject, object
V(s) + O	verb (subject included) + object
wa	waw
waw cons	waw consecutive
waw cop	waw copulative

Chapter 1
Orientation and problem statement

Introduction

The psalms have played an important role in the lives of believers and the church through the ages. It is known that nearly 900 scrolls were discovered at Qumran and it has been determined that the psalms take up a larger part of the scrolls than any other book. This finding makes it clear that the Book of Psalms was of fundamental importance to the people of Qumran (cf Flint, 2007:157; Strawn, 2017b:5). The fact that the Peshitta Psalter or the Syriac version of the Book of Psalms has been preserved by the Syrian church for many centuries testifies to the enormous role that the Peshitta Psalter played in the history of the Syriac-speaking churches (Van Rooy, 2005:537). In truth, the Book of Psalms has played a major role in the lives of numerous communities in Jewish and Christian traditions.[1]

The text of the Book of Psalms did not come to us in its original version, that is, as a manuscript from the hands of the scribe who in some way brought this poetic book to a close (see Carbajosa, 2008:1). It has a long history of translation, in which several translation techniques surely have been employed. This study is mainly concerned with the technique of literal and non-literal translation, with the emphasis on the translation of verbs into Syriac.

1.1 Origin and history of the Peshitta Book of Psalms

Like the rest of the Bible text, the Book of Psalms has been handed down through the ages in several versions that are interwoven in a complex network of translations and influences. The versions of the Bible that are important for this study are a Hebrew archetype or original, the Peshitta, the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum. The main interest in this study is the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta, specifically the Book of Psalms in these two versions.

[1]The *Psalter* is the collection of the Psalms as a whole. The Psalter is a hymn book. The word 'Psalm' is derived from the Greek word Ψαλμος, which in classical times meant a 'song or chant' accompanied by a stringed instrument (cf Terrien, 2003:10).

Pre-Masoretic Text, Peshitta, Masoretic Text, Septuagint and Targum

The Old Testament of the Peshitta was translated from a Hebrew text into Syriac, probably in the second century AD (see Carbajosa, 2008:2; Weitzman, 1999:2).[2] The Old Testament Hebrew original, which served as the master copy for the translation of the Peshitta, does not exist anymore, but it is accepted that it must have been relatively similar to the Masoretic Text of medieval and modern Hebrew Bibles. The date of the origin of the Old Testament Peshitta is important as it supports the view that the Peshitta is an authoritative witness to a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text.

The Masoretic Text is the authoritative Hebrew text of the Old Testament and its origin is dated as the period between the seventh to tenth centuries AD (see Würthwein, 1995:12 ff; Sanders, 1993:500–501; Tov, 2012:24 ff). The Peshitta, and therefore the Peshitta Psalter, is accepted as a copy of a witness to an original manuscript, the Hebrew original, which would be older than the Masoretic Text. Maori (1995:103) argues that several studies that have been published in recent years concerning the relationship of Peshitta to the Masoretic Text as regards different books of the Hebrew Bible show that the Hebrew text upon which Peshitta is based generally reflects the state of the Hebrew text in the first century AD. It should be noted that the Hebrew manuscripts bear a direct witness to the original text, whereas an ancient version such as the Peshitta preserves an indirect witness to it.

Since its inception more than a century ago, research on the Peshitta psalms has been guided by the issue of the influence of other versions, especially the Septuagint and the Targum, on the Syriac translation (Carbajosa, 2008:3; see Lund, 1995:85). Although influences from the Septuagint may be found in some instances in the Peshitta Psalter, it is believed that the translation of the Peshitta psalms took place independently of the Septuagint. It is unfortunate that most of the studies focus their attention on the problem of the Peshitta being influenced by the Septuagint.

Lund (1995:85) argues that some scholars go to the extent of describing the Peshitta as a 'faithful daughter' version of the Septuagint or that it at least appears to be such (see Zimmerli, 1979:77). Dirksen (1992:379) contends that Lund is not the first to deal with the relation between the Peshitta and the Septuagint in Genesis. He further argues that J. Hänel, in his dissertation of 1911,

[2] The New Testament of the Peshitta was translated from the Greek.

finds that the translator of the Peshitta consulted the Septuagint in a number of instances, of which he provides ten specific cases. There are some scholars who argue that the Septuagint gives observable shape to our present Peshitta text. This type of approach has led to neglecting or avoiding the characteristics of the Peshitta version or its translation technique. The investigations all mainly concentrate on influences on the Peshitta.

Even though the Peshitta is partly of Jewish origin, the Jews did not accept it because of several reasons: first, its adoption by the Christian church; second, the evidence of the dating would admit both a Christian and Jewish origin; and third, no reference to the Peshitta is found in Jewish sources until the Middle Ages (see Van Rooy, 2005:538; Weitzman, 1999:261).

Textual criticism of the Masoretic Text and the characteristics of the Peshitta

As has been mentioned earlier, it is widely accepted that the Old Testament Peshitta is an authoritative witness to a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text. This theory implies that the Syriac was translated from a Hebrew that differs from the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text. As the pre-Masoretic Text is older than the Masoretic Text, the reverse translation of the Syriac Peshitta into Hebrew can be used to reconstruct the Hebrew text of the Hebrew archetype. By comparing this Hebrew translation of the Syriac with the Masoretic Hebrew text, characteristics of the Masoretic Text that vary from the Hebrew translation from the Syriac of the Peshitta text can be identified, analysed and evaluated. These findings can be used in textual criticism of the Masoretic Text. It has been found that the text the Peshitta used differs from the Masoretic Text, although it is in respect of minor details.

Characteristics of the Peshitta psalms: Translation technique and composition

Carbajosa (2008:2) nevertheless encourages studies of the translation technique of the Peshitta. He argues that for the Peshitta to be able to contribute fruitfully to textual criticism, it will be necessary to study its characteristics, that is, the translation technique used, as well as other factors that may have influenced the Syriac text that has come down to us. The study of the translation technique of the Peshitta Psalms will help to separate the differences caused by translation and the transmission process from differences that may indicate different *Vorlagen* of the Peshitta and the Masoretic Text. If such differences could be identified in the Peshitta Psalter, they would be valuable for the textual criticism of book three of the Book of Psalms.

The composition of the Peshitta also has to be reconsidered in the light of recent developments in textual criticism (see Cook, 1988:147).

In order to get a better insight into previous research on the Peshitta psalms, an overview will now be given of previous contributions in the field.

1.2 Previous contributions by various authors on the research of Peshitta psalms

The aim is to give a synopsis of investigations carried out to date into the Peshitta psalms and of the results yielded as discussed by Carbajosa (2008:3–12) and as found in a few other sources. These sources have been chosen as they lay down an important foundation for the present research work.

1.2.1 Baethgen, F. (1878, 1882)

Baethgen (1878) inaugurated the critical research into the translation of the Peshitta psalms with his work *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschita*. He (Baethgen, 1882) completed the study later by an investigation into the value of the ancient versions for textual criticism of the Psalter, i.e. Book of the Psalms. In his initial work on the Peshitta psalms, he deals with aspects like the Syriac titles of the psalms and their origin, the liturgical divisions of the Psalter in the Syriac Church and the printed editions of Syriac Psalter. He concludes this study by paying attention to instances in which the Peshitta psalms differ from the Masoretic Text, alone or coinciding with all or some of the ancient versions (e.g. the Septuagint, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Targum). In his second work, he presents, psalm by psalm, without any comments, some of the variants noted in the different ancient versions when comparing them to the Masoretic Text. He made a tremendous contribution in the first part of this work paying attention to the value of the Psalters of the Septuagint, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Targum for textual criticism. Of the 28 pages of this work about the Peshitta psalms, half of the work is devoted to the influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta psalms and only the last few pages are an attempt to outline the characteristic traits of the Syriac version of the psalms. He concludes that the translation was done from a Hebrew text and that the translator with his insufficient knowledge of Hebrew consulted the Septuagint whenever he was unable to translate the Hebrew.

Baethgen's investigation has led him to conclude that the Peshitta psalms have practically no value for textual criticism. He gives three reasons for his argument: the faulty knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the translator, the arbitrariness of a translation that frequently corrects its *Vorlage* and, finally, the influence of dogmatic prejudices (see Carbajosa, 2008:5). Considering his discussion, he could have added the influence of the Septuagint on Peshitta psalms. For his discussion, Baethgen used the editions of S. Lee.

1.2.2 Oppenheim, B. (1891)

The investigation of Oppenheim (1891) concentrates only on book five of Psalms (107–150). In his investigation, he presents, verse by verse, the variant readings of the Peshitta psalms and compares them with the Masoretic Text. He also points out the translation choices of the Septuagint and the Targum. He accepts that the Peshitta makes use of a *Vorlage* that differs from the Masoretic Text in some instances, frequently presenting the Hebrew, which in his opinion, is hidden behind the Syriac reading. The main part of this work deals with the influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta psalms. He does not classify the readings analysed, nor does he offer a conclusion; as a matter of fact, the value of this work is limited to the suggestions collected for each verse. Oppenheim does not reveal the edition of the Peshitta Psalter used in his work, although it seems to be that of S. Lee (see Carbajosa, 2008:6).

1.2.3 Berg, J.F. (1895)

In his study, *The Influence of the Septuagint upon the Peshitta Psalter*, Berg (1885) indicates his approach to his subject matter from the onset. His focus is mainly on the problem of the influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta Psalter. Despite the clear statement of intention, he devotes eight pages in his introduction to the characteristics of the Syriac version. In his opinion, the style of Peshitta Psalter is not uniform: in some respects, it is faithful to the original text, while in others, it is irreconcilable with the original (Berg, 1895:29; see Carbajosa, 2008:6). To him many of the deviations are to be attributed to the carelessness of the translator. With regard to omissions, the Peshitta Psalter frequently translates a series of Hebrew words by a single term. Finally, the Peshitta Psalter shows a predilection for long sentences, and it frequently combines two short sentences by means of a causal or final particle. He deduces three factors that could have affected

the translator or translators. First, with regard to the translators' knowledge of the Hebrew language, everything seems to indicate that it had been insufficient. Second, with regard to the purpose of the translation, the translators wanted to obtain an intelligible or accessible version rather than a critical one. Finally, with regard to the influence of other versions, the diversity of styles within the translation seems to suggest dependency on the Septuagint and the Targum (see Carbajosa, 2008:7). Berg also used the Peshitta Psalter edition of S. Lee.

1.2.4 Rowlands, E. R. (1939)

The study of Rowlands (1939) is limited to an analysis of the third and fourth books of the Psalter (Pss 73–106).[3] This work also devotes ample time to the relationship between the Peshitta Psalter and the Septuagint. Rowlands uses the Greek version to illustrate the characteristics of the Syriac translation, which is in fact the second object of his investigation. As a result, the summary of the characteristics of the Syriac version is followed by a summary of characteristics of the Greek translation. Psalm by psalm and verse by verse, he analyses the variant readings of the Peshitta in relation to Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and, on occasion, the Targum and the Vulgate. He uses eight different versions of the Psalter to conduct this intensive study.

In his conclusion, he also reflects on the problem of the influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta Psalter. He highlights the freedom of Peshitta Psalter regarding the translation of copulas, the number of nouns, choice of suffixes and word order. He sees the same freedom in the numerous additions of the Peshitta Psalter in relation to Masoretic Text and in the not so numerous omissions. Rowlands indicates the confusion the translator encounters in most instances due to the Hebrew lookalike prepositions ב and כ. He highlights the deficiency of vocabulary in the Peshitta Psalter in relation to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint (see Carbajosa, 2008:8). He arrives at a conclusion that is different from that of the authors discussed above by coming out in favour of the originality of some readings of the Syriac Psalter. The result is that, in his opinion, the Peshitta Psalter should be consulted for textual criticism. To his mind, the Syriac version attests to readings that could correct the Masoretic Text and therefore has to be approached independently

[3] This work with the title of *Critical study* was never published. In a note that precedes the work, the author himself states: 'This Dissertation is the result of my own independent investigation, except where stated to the contrary. It has not been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree' (see Carbajosa, 2008:7).

or, especially, in accordance with the Septuagint (see Carbajosa, 2008:8). It is unfortunate that his work, which deals with the analysis of the third and fourth books of the Psalter, was not published.

Like his predecessors, he devotes ample time to the relationship between the Psalter of the Peshitta and the Septuagint.

1.2.5 Vogel, A. (1951)

The investigation of Vogel (1951) is based on the W.E. Barnes edition of the Syriac Psalter, which is a reproduction, via E. Nestlé's edition in four languages, of the MS 7a1 or Codex Ambrosianus, which would later be the basis for the Leiden edition (see Carbajosa, 2008:9). This is a very important contribution to the studies of the Peshitta Psalter.

In his research about the value of the Peshitta Psalter for textual criticism, Vogel is more positive than Baethgen. The reason is that he reduces the number of cases in which the Syriac version has experienced the influence of Septuagint. He considers the possibility that the Peshitta-Septuagint readings generally reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is different from the Masoretic Text, though there are also readings that are in agreement with both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. The findings of Vogel could suggest the same *Vorlage* for the Peshitta, Masoretic Text and the Septuagint or a strong influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta. Vogel says the agreement between the Peshitta and the Septuagint should not be attributed exclusively to the influence of the Greek on the Syriac (see Carbajosa, 2008:9).

As a result, he divides his study into the Peshitta-Masoretic relationship and the Peshitta-Septuagint relationship. He further divides the Peshitta-Masoretic relationship into two main sections with regard to readings that differ from the Masoretic text: the first section deals with the Peshitta variants that go back to a different Hebrew *Vorlage;* the second treats the Peshitta variants that do not go back to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. In this last section, Vogel devotes twelve pages to the study of the characteristics of the Syriac translation.

Like Rowlands, he concludes that the Peshitta is to be consulted for textual criticism. In his view, the translator was faithful to his Hebrew *Vorlage* and showed himself independent of the Septuagint. He attributes the influence of the Greek version to sporadic corrections introduced in the process of the textual transmission of the Peshitta.

In the present study, a comparative analysis of the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum in relation to the Peshitta will also be given.

1.2.6 Lund, J. A. (1988)

In his doctoral dissertation, 'The Influence of the Septuagint', Lund (1988) devotes his entire research to refuting the theory that the Peshitta has experienced a major influence from the Septuagint. He confronts two authors who supported this theory, namely J. Hänel with regard to the book of Genesis and Vogel especially with regard to the transmission of the Psalter (see Carbajosa, 2008:10). He completely refutes the theory that the Septuagint had a major influence on the Peshitta. This view is in stark contrast with that of scholars who frequently characterise the Peshitta as being directly influenced by the Septuagint when they describe the ancient versions of the Old Testament (see Lund, 1995:85). His view is that the Septuagint gave no significant shape to the present Peshitta text and that the direct influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta has been grossly exaggerated in the past. He concludes by regarding the Peshitta as a direct and independent witness to the original Hebrew text.

Lund is the first author to whom the Leiden edition of the Syriac was available and he used it as the base for his research. He also had the Dead Sea MSS available, a new and important witness to the Hebrew text (see Carbajosa, 2008:11).

1.2.7 Eriksson, J. E. (1989)

The unpublished doctoral dissertation of Eriksson (1989), 'The Hymns of David', consists of a detailed, verse by verse study of the translation technique in the Peshitta version of the first book of the Psalter (Pss 1–41) (see Carbajosa, 2008:11). He bases his research on the Leiden edition. He employs J. Barr's method, which comprises identifying the literalness or freedom of a translation. This method, however, is not suitable since it is not possible to use it to form any general judgment about the literal or free character of the Syriac translation.

1.2.8 Carbajosa, I. (2008)

Carbajosa (2008) makes a very important contribution to the study of the character of the Peshitta Psalter with his study of the character of the Syriac version of the psalms as found in books four and five (Pss 90–150). He studied the Syriac variants in relation to the Masoretic Text in all of these

61 psalms. According to him, the quest of the Peshitta Psalter is to render a clear and a readable version and this is seen in the translation of the Peshitta Psalter of its Hebrew text. In most cases, it does not follow the Hebrew literally but rather translates it according to meaning by using Syriac syntax and structure. According to Carbajosa, this is a translation that adheres and respects the rules of Syriac syntax by producing a text in clear and correct Syriac (Carbajosa, 2008:381). Regarding the Hebrew verb forms, Carbajosa (p 381) argues that the Peshitta Psalter translates the Hebrew verb forms morphologically following the Syriac language standard, thus privileging those Syriac verb forms that are best adapted to the context. Nouns are translated freely by changing their number (singular to plural or vice versa), and it is done in line with the Syriac language structure (see p 381). According to Carbajosa (p 381), the Syriac translation at the semantic level is characterised by a lack of uniformity in lexical correspondences. The author continues that the Peshitta Psalter translation indicates that the translator had difficulty with instances of *hapax legomena*, difficult Hebrew terms and technical nouns; in cases where the translator seems not to have known the terms, he translated them (if not omitting them) according to their immediate context (p 381). On the issue relating to the influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta Psalter in the 61 psalms studied by Carbajosa, he identifies six more or less clear cases of Greek influence and two probable ones. Another vital aspect is how frequently the Peshitta Psalter deviates from the Masoretic Text in difficult readings (p 386). The agreement among the ancient translations is either the result of a common Hebrew *Vorlage*, a common translation technique and the fact that they share the same source language or the same interpretation of the unvocalised Hebrew text (p 386). Carbajosa (p 387) concludes that the cases of Peshitta Psalter-Septuagint-Targum agreements not found in the Masoretic Text mostly go back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* common of the other three versions.

In his findings, 44 cases in the Peshitta Psalter that deviate from the vocalised Masoretic Text can be attributed to a different interpretation of the same Hebrew *Vorlage*, while 42 cases have to be attributed to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (see Carbajosa, 2008:387). Carbajosa concludes that the origin of the Peshitta Psalter must be located in a Hebrew text before the Vulgate and Targum translations, since the *Vorlagen* of the last two versions attest to a text already much closer to Masoretic Text (see Carbajosa, 2008:387; see also Strawn, 2017b:13). According to Carbajosa, it is

therefore not unwarranted to suppose that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta Psalter was a pre-Masoretic text that was circulating around the second century AD. In as far as the use of the Peshitta Psalter in textual criticism is concerned, Carbajosa concludes that it must be applied with caution bearing in mind the freedom of the Peshitta Psalter when dealing with the original text, and also recalling that it is a version more interested in clarity than in the exact reproduction of each element as it appears in its source text (see Carbajosa, 2008:389; 2016:276).

The textual tradition of the Peshitta is Christian, according to Strawn (2017b:13), as it is accepted that the translators were Jewish converts; this explains why it reflects a Jewish origin favouring the Hebrew parent text (see Carbajosa, 2016:262–266; Strawn, 2017b:13). As one cannot make a general conclusion about the translation technique of the Peshitta, it is necessary to study each book in its own right, also since the Peshitta is not the product of a single author (see Carbajosa, 2016:271). On the other hand, it is also important to note that some common characteristics are found in the translation of many of the Bible books. In as far as the translation technique is concerned, Carbajosa attests the criterion as mentioned by Ter Haar Romeny, which is further emphasised by Van der Kooij, that the original reading of the Peshitta would be the one that corresponds with the translator's techniques, while the secondary reading is the one that deviates from the techniques (see Carbajosa, 2016:269; Ter Haar Romeny, 1995:183; Van der Kooij, 1988:183–199).

Carbajosa argues further that the textual transmission of the Peshitta may have contributed to the view that there is a general way of translating it. The technique of the translators and later scribes who did the corrections can be described as follows: specifying, omitting difficult words or terms (*hapax legomena*, for example), clarifying additions, changing the word order, simplifying and harmonising. Adapting to the context is a very frequent characteristic in the Syriac version.

Free but faithful to the original text

The Peshitta, according to Carbajosa, was the first translation that sought to be and remained faithful to the original text, while ensuring the production of a version that was completely user-friendly to the reader, that is, a version that was reader-orientated (see Carbajosa, 2016:272). The translators of the Peshitta thus wanted to ensure that the end product was in correct, clear and readable Syriac, an end product that was faithful to Syriac syntax. Carbajosa describes the

development of the freedom of the Peshitta translators in its early stages by referring to three periods. The first period lasted until the fifth century and was characterised by great freedom and an attempt to bring the text closer to the reader. The second period was the sixth century and presented a transition towards literalism. The third period, the seventh century, was dominated by literalism and coincided with the peak of the Greek language in the Syriac world. This is the period when the Greek language would have had an influence on the Peshitta.

According to Carbajosa, copyists committed errors of various kinds or corrected the text during the process of transmission (see Carbajosa, 2016:274). One of the common and frequent errors copyists made is confusing the Syriac consonants □ and □ , which look very similar. In other instances, the deviations from the Hebrew text are due to the result of inserting a marginal gloss into the Syriac text in the process of the manuscript transmission (see Carbajosa, 2016:274). Harmonisations and assimilations are also the result of textual transmission. The copyists also contributed to the influence exercised during the process of the textual transmission by other ancient versions of the Bible, in particular the Greek versions (see Carbajosa, 2016:274). The influence of Greek on the Peshitta is the result of the copyists consulting this version in the translation or transmission of the Peshitta, a practice that contributed substantially to the second phase of the development of Syriac translations.

In as far as the word order is concerned, apart from the fact that the Syriac syntax is flexible, the Peshitta frequently deviates from the Hebrew word order due to its quest to present a clearer translation. It would therefore opt for a clearer construct than the Hebrew. With regard to the psalms, the Peshitta follows this order: verb + subject + direct object + indirect object + adverbial modifier. It therefore has no problem rearranging the elements of the *Vorlage* (see Carbajosa, 2016:272). The Peshitta omits translating particles that are often present in Hebrew and are not found in Syriac.

In conclusion, a good knowledge of the character of the Syriac version of the Book of Psalms is necessary to be able to use this ancient version correctly for textual criticism. As one of the earliest versions witnessing to an original Hebrew text, the Peshitta can be used in textual criticism. However, when using the Peshitta in textual criticism, it must be done with great caution due to the freedom of the Peshitta translations and its quest for clarity and a readable final product. It

can be stated without reservation that the Peshitta is a witness to a proto-Masoretic Hebrew text of the second century and thus has preserved original readings or variants (see Carbajosa, 2016:276).

Where a specific book of the Old Testament is concerned, the researcher has to study that book on its own merit to be in a position to identify readings that are based on different Hebrew *Vorlagen.* The researcher is equally obliged to identify those readings that are translated from the same Hebrew *Vorlage* and that show a relationship to the Masoretic text or that can point back to the Masoretic Text.

1.2.9 Various short articles

Apart from the above investigations, only short articles that touch marginally on the characteristics of Peshitta Psalter have been found. They are just notes on textual problems or discussions about the relationship of the Peshitta Psalter with other versions (see Zimmermann, 1940:44; Barnes, 1901:186).

1.3 Actuality

In surveying the above studies of the Peshitta Psalter and the other short articles available,[4] shortcomings have been found in the investigations. It has been shown in the previous section that the main focus of these studies is on the relationship question between the Syriac version and other ancient versions such as the Septuagint and the Targum. Regarding the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta, scholars (Anderson, 1970; Sanders, 1981) are persuaded to regard the Masoretic Text as a close enough approximation to the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta to justify its use as a hypothetical *Vorlage* of the Peshitta translation (see Greenberg, 2002:8). However, the text that the Peshitta used differs from the Masoretic Text. Although they differ in respect of minor details, Tov (2001:123) argues that since these differences are often very significant, the analysis of ancient translations is a necessary part of textual criticism. Apart from research done on some books of the Old Testament, e.g. Psalms 90–150 (Carbajosa, 2008) and Jeremiah (Greenberg, 2002), a detailed and in-depth study of the characteristics of the Peshitta Psalter is lacking.

[4] Baethgen (1878, 1882); Oppenheim (1891); Berg (1895); Rowlands (1939); Vogel (1951); Lund (1988); Eriksson (1989).

Furthermore, the contribution by Mulder stating the Peshitta is a *literal* translation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* needs to be validated. All the differences between the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta and the Masoretic text have to be identified and analysed to determine their value for the text of Psalms.

1.4 Scope of research

This study will concentrate on the Peshitta and the Masoretic Text and not so much on the other translations.

Seeing that a detailed and in-depth study of the first book (Pss 1–41) already exists (Eriksson, 1989), as well as of the fourth and fifth books (Carbajosa, 2008), which is very detailed on the character of the Syriac Version of Psalms, book three (Pss 73–89) was chosen for this study. The focal point of this study will be on analysing and classifying the verbal forms according to their patterns as used by the Peshitta in comparison with the Masoretic Text in order to validate the characteristics of the Peshitta translation.

The present study is based on the Leiden edition of the Peshitta Psalter. A characteristic of the Leiden edition is that it does not include the Syriac titles of the psalms. It is not the intention here to discuss the issue of titles, as it is a different field of study altogether (see Van Rooy, 2005:542; Carbajosa, 2008:19). For purposes of this study, the division of psalms and the numbering of verses of the BHS will be followed; therefore, the titles as appearing in the BHS will be maintained in this study.

1.5 Problem Statement

It has been indicated that differences exist between the Peshitta and the Masoretic Text. These differences raise questions with regard to the Hebrew *Vorlage* that the Peshitta used. Is the problem of differences or deviations the result of a *Vorlage* that is different from that of the Masoretic Text or could it be ascribed to the translation technique employed? The main question of this study is: What is the case with regard to Peshitta Psalms compared to the Masoretic Text?

Other questions that will be addressed are:

1. How does the verbal system of the Hebrew and the Syriac compare to each other?
2. What translation technique is used in the Peshitta Psalms?

3. How were the verbal forms translated into the Peshitta?
4. How does the translation of the Peshitta compare with the Septuagint, the Targum and the Vulgate?
5. What can be deduced from the translation of the Peshitta about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta psalms?

1.6 Basic hypothesis/Central theory

The present study holds that the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew source (*Vorlage)* used by the translator of the Peshitta psalms reflect a similar tradition and that the Peshitta psalms used a Hebrew text close to the Masoretic Text as its source. The Peshitta psalms are a literal translation of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The Peshitta is a direct and independent witness to the Hebrew text of the Bible. It is primarily an ancient witness to the text of the Bible, in importance only second to the Septuagint. Consequently, it is an important tool in the textual criticism of the Old Testament and a major instrument in the textual criticism of the Book of Psalms.

1.7 Research aims and objectives

The aim of this study is to validate the hypothesis by comparing the translation of the verbal forms and their variants in book three of Psalms in the Masoretic Text with the verbal forms in book three of the Peshitta Psalter.

1.7.1 Research aims

The aims of this study are the following:

- to investigate the translation technique employed in translating the verbal forms of the Syriac text, as well as other factors that might have influenced the Syriac text that has come down to us;
- to define the difference between the Peshitta and the Masoretic Text and the extent of variations; and
- to evaluate the Peshitta Psalter and determine its value with a view to text-critical studies of the Book of Psalms.

1.7.2 Research objectives

To meet the above aims, the following objectives are formulated:

- to conduct a comparative study to determine the agreements and differences between the verbal systems of Hebrew and Syriac;
- to determine the translation technique in the Peshitta Psalter;
- to do an analytical study to determine the way in which verbal forms were translated into the Peshitta psalms;
- to determine through comparison with the Septuagint and the Targum what the archetype of the translated Peshitta could be;
- to make a deduction about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta Psalms from the translation.

1.8 Methodology

In the present study, the investigation will be conducted as described below.

1.8.1 The Masoretic Text as the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the translation of the Peshitta Psalter

We do not have the original Hebrew text or the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta. Internal evidence has shown that the Peshitta version was created from a Hebrew text (Weitzman, 1999:1). It has been mentioned that scholars[5] are persuaded to regard the Masoretic Text as a close enough approximation to the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta to justify its use as a hypothetical *Vorlage* of the Peshitta translation (see Greenberg, 2002:8). For this reason, the Masoretic Text will be taken as the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the translation of the Peshitta Psalter in this study. The Peshitta Psalter will be compared with the Masoretic Text.

1.8.2 Comparative text-critical method

The method that will be used in the present study is the comparative text-critical method. The comparison comprises the four categories explained in the next section (1.8.3 Translation technique) and it will be facilitated by the linear arrangement of the Hebrew and Syriac texts (see Greenberg, 2006:263). The linear arrangement refers to placing the Hebrew and the Syriac texts

[5] Sanders (1981); Anderson (1970).

alongside each other. A detailed and in-depth study in which the Hebrew and Syriac verbal forms in Psalms 73–89 are compared verse by verse will be carried out. All the verbal forms found in these Peshitta psalms will be evaluated, namely the expected normal forms, as well as the verbal forms that deviate from the Masoretic Text.

1.8.3 Translation technique

This investigation will employ linguistic and literary analysis. Cook (1988:148) argues that in order to determine the character of any translation it is imperative to determine the relative literalness of such a version. As a result, the translation technique as a characteristic of the Peshitta Psalter, as well as other variants of the Peshitta Psalter, needs to be studied. This will be achieved as described below.

Literal or free translation

In order to assess the value of variant readings by comparing the Masoretic Text with the Peshitta, it is significant to pay special attention to translation technique. Gordon (2006:255) argues that it is difficult to make a meaningful generalisation about such a large undertaking as the Peshitta translation of the Old Testament. He further states that the translators inevitably made mistakes, sometimes found their task too difficult and occasionally took liberties with the text. As a result, the text has to be thoroughly analysed to reconstruct a text close to the original text. Studies in the field of ancient translation generally make a distinction between two primary aims when describing the character of the translation technique: fidelity and intelligibility. The balance struck in a given translation is often indicated by describing it as either *literal* or *free* (Weitzman, 1999:22).

Literalism

Literalism has different categories and each one of them requires special attention. A translation may be literal in one of these categories and free in another. Weitzman (1999:22–26) classifies these categories as: (1) the segmentation of the text; (2) quantitative correspondence; (3) imitation of the form of the Hebrew; and (4) consistency of equivalences. Recently, Adair (1997:181, 187) suggests ‘a much more nuanced description of the translation technique’, which is aimed at producing a full quantitative description of the translation technique. Adair (1997:187) further proposes that a quantitative analysis of the four categories referred to by Weitzman above should

be made. A descriptive evaluation can then be based on the analysis. This statistical approach is instructive and could gain much acceptance in textual studies.

As mentioned above, the comparative text-critical method will be used to determine the translation technique used in the Peshitta Psalter 73–89. This investigation will use the interpretive description in the comparison of the Peshitta Psalter text with the Masoretic Text by employing critical and literary analysis as tools to achieve the goal of determining the translation technique.

It cannot be ignored that some scholars frequently characterise the Peshitta as being directly influenced by the Septuagint and that the influence is clearly visible in the psalms (see Barnes, 1901:187; Lund, 1995:85; Weitzman, 1999:68 ff). Because of this characterisation, a comparison of the Peshitta with the Septuagint will also be conducted, taking into consideration other versions that might shed light on instances where the Hebrew and the Syriac cannot lead to a convincing conclusion.

In the research, relevant contributions published in monographs, articles, papers and journals will be consulted and acknowledged by means of references.

1.8.4 The value of the text

Zimmermann (1940:44) mentions that regarding the Book of Psalms, the Peshitta is an important witness to the accuracy of the Masoretic text. This does not mean that the Peshitta does not suffer internal corruption as well. Koster (1993:254) argues that the study of the variant readings of the Peshitta, of the ancient manuscripts in particular, produces a wealth of evidence that has by no means been exhausted yet. The outcomes of the comparative text-critical studies as mentioned will lead to the evaluation of the text. The presence or absence of deviations/variations or the general closeness in wording and text of the Peshitta of the Old Testament (in particular the Psalms) in comparison to the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and the existence of numerous examples of translation that could be produced from a Hebrew *Vorlage*, have to be determined (see Williams, 2001:1). These deviations or variations will play a major role in determining the value of the Peshitta Psalter 73–89. The differences could attest to a *Vorlage* different from that of the Masoretic Text and may not be the result of translation, that is, translation technique or transmission.

The investigation will also pay attention to the value of the translation technique itself – the more literal the translation, the more valuable the text would be (see Mulder, 1988:180). The investigation will take into account the previous understanding or functions of the Peshitta in text-criticism, that is, its place among the textual witnesses to the Bible (Tov, 2001:121–154). It will consider its place in the history of the Biblical text[6] (Tov, 2001:187), which includes the history of copying and transmitting the Biblical text (Tov, 2001:199–201).

The methodology can be summed up as follows:

1. A comparison between the Hebrew and Syriac verbal forms, focusing on the differences, especially where the waw consecutive is found in Hebrew but not in the Peshitta. This will mainly be done by means of a literature study.
2. A study of the translation technique with special focus on the translation technique used in Peshitta Psalms, and a literature study.
3. Analysis of the verbal forms in the Peshitta Psalms in comparison with the Masoretic Text, classification of the verbal forms according to their patterns and determining how the conjunction waw is used in Hebrew poetry, followed by a comparative text-critical analysis.
4. A comparative text-critical study of the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta, the Septuagint, the Targum and the presumed Hebrew *Vorlage*.
5. A comparison of the Peshitta psalms with the presumed Hebrew *Vorlage.*

1.9 Chapter division

The chapter division of the study will be as follows:

1. Orientation and problem statement
2. A comparison of the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal systems
3. Translation technique employed by the Peshitta Psalter

   This chapter aims at studying and establishing the deviations of the Peshitta Psalter in relation to Masoretic Text and the place of translation technique in textual studies. Both non-verbal and verbal clauses with or without particles will be classified while marking deviations.

[6] In this investigation, the term *Biblical text* (BHS) is used with reference to the Old Testament text.

4. Rendering of the verbal forms in the Peshitta Psalms

   This chapter pays attention to the use of the waw consecutive that is found in the Hebrew but that is absent in Syriac; the use of wa by Syriac where there is no waw in the Hebrew will be investigated.

5. Comparison of the Masoretic Text, Peshitta, Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum

   Here attention is given to those instances where the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text, but the deviations are not related to the Septuagint or the Targum. Attention will also be given to the deviations of the Peshitta from the Septuagint and the Targum.

6. The Peshitta Psalter and its Hebrew Vorlage

   This chapter aims at studying and establishing the deviations of the Peshitta Psalter from the Masoretic Text, as well the place of translation technique in textual studies. Both non-verbal and verbal clauses with or without particles will be classified while marking deviations.

7. Conclusion

Bibliography

Chapter 2
A comparison of the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal systems

Introduction

The aim of Chapter 2 is to provide an overview of the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal systems with the focus on how the Peshitta translated the Hebrew verbs found in the Masoretic Text. It has to be kept in mind that in this study it is accepted that the Peshitta is not a direct translation of the Masoretic Text, but of some older original Hebrew text that does not exist anymore. At the same time, it is accepted that the Masoretic Text must be very close to the hypothetical original Hebrew text.

2.1 Hebrew and Syriac verbs in Psalms 73–89

In order to be able to determine what the agreements and the differences between the verbal systems of the Hebrew and the Syriac are, synopses of previous studies made of the verbal systems of both languages are provided. The aim is to establish the forms and functions of the verbal systems of both languages to be able to make a comparative and analytical study. The study is limited to Psalms 73–89 and therefore the Hebrew verbs in these psalms in the Masoretic Text and their Syriac version in the Syriac Peshitta Psalter 73–89 have been studied.

The waw is at the centre of this study, more specifically, the use of the waw conversive with the perfect and imperfect in Hebrew, a construct that does not appear in Syriac. Syriac further uses compound sentences, which is not the case in Hebrew. It is important to investigate such a clear difference in comparing two verbal systems. The word order of both the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal sentences is normally verb, subject and object (VSO) (the verb occurs at the end); or verb, with the subject already included in the verb, and object (V(s) + O), for example כָּתַבְתָּ. However, the Syriac verb may occur at the end of a sentence, thus differing totally from the Hebrew. As in the case of the waw conversive with regard to the structure of Hebrew and Syriac verbs, the total difference of the syntactical order of the Hebrew and Syriac verb calls for investigation. The Syriac word order is a bit more free and flexible as compared to the Hebrew word order, although Hebrew

deviates from the normal word order as well (i.e. VSO or SVO or OV), especially in poetry like the psalms. At times, Syriac uses the verb in a different tense or it repeats the verbal tense of the Hebrew as in Psalm 87:2. The Masoretic Text uses a verb derived from the root אהב, which is a qal active participle, while Syriac (Peshitta Psalm 87:2) suggests a translation of a Hebrew word with a different root, namely רחם, which is a peal perfect third person masculine singular. In Book 3 of Psalms, a number of such examples are found. The question is what the reasons for these differences would be.

2.2 Hebrew and Syriac as Semitic languages

It is important to mention beforehand that the Semitic languages are a cluster or group of related languages. Hebrew is one of the languages in the family of Semitic languages. The verbal system of Biblical Hebrew may be seen as the result of a conflation of different verbal systems and this complicates matters. The Hebrew verbal system has been debated by various scholars over a long time, and it is still the case to date, as the investigation has intensified during the twentieth century. One particular reason for the difference in opinion is that the verbal system has internal problems caused by different constructs in the different periods in which the Biblical writings originated or by the differences between genres (Beckam 2007:1). As a result, various theories have developed over decades with regard to the Hebrew verbal system, all of them suggesting various solutions.

In the light of these developments, the question is what the situation would be in the case of the other languages in this cluster of languages. According to Driver (1936:1), the problem of the Semitic tenses is their complexity, though they are not as complicated as some of the solutions that have been propounded. Driver continues that the complexity has been *prima facie* increased by the decipherment of the Akkadian language. If this would be true, the question is how it would influence other languages in this cluster.

The division of the Semitic languages by Johns (1972:1–2) and Lambdin (1973:XIII) is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Division of Semitic Languages – Johns (1972:1–2) and Lambdin (1973:XIII)

North-West Semitic	North-East Semitic	South-West Semitic	South-East Semitic
A. Aramaic (Syriac under Aramaic)	Akkadian	1. Arabic	A. South Arabic
B. Canaanite	1. Assyrian		B. Ethiopic [classical-Ge'ez]
1. Ugaritic	2. Babylonian		
2. Phoenician			
3. Hebrew			

A slightly different division of this cluster of languages is given by Moscati (1964:1–15) and Van Der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:15–16), as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Division of Semitic languages – Moscati (1964:1–15) and Van Der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:15–16)

East Semitic	North-West Semitic	South-West Semitic
• Old Akkadian (2400 BCE) • Babylonian in all its stages (1700 BCE) • Assyrian in all its stages (2000–600 BCE)	• Amorite (from about 2000 BCE) • Ugaritic (From about 1450–1200 BCE) Canaanite & Aramaic branches 1200 BCE: • Hebrew (1200 BCE) • Phoenician (1100 BCE) • Moabite (850 BCE) Syriac (800 BCE) is found in the Eastern Aramaic group, (also cf Johns, 1972:2)	• North Arabic • Ethiopian

It is clear that even though the divisions and groupings proposed may differ, Biblical Hebrew and Syriac are both part of the North-West Semitic languages, but that Hebrew is part of the Canaanite group while Syriac is part of the Aramaic group. These divisions demonstrate that Hebrew and Syriac are related Semitic Languages, but that one would expect some differences in the grammatical structures of the two languages.

2.3 Previous contributions to studies of the Hebrew and Syriac verbal systems

A study of a few contributions of authors has been made specifically with regard to their research on the verbal systems in Semitic languages. It is not the intention to develop a new theory; therefore, this chapter concentrates on theories and solutions that have been already suggested, and a brief evaluation of each is presented. This survey cannot be exhaustive, but provides the background for the analysis of the verbal forms in Book 3 of Psalms, which will be made in Chapter 4 (pp 90 ff) and Chapter 5 (pp 297 ff).

In the next two sections, the overview of previous research on the Hebrew verbal system (pp 24 ff) and the Syriac verbal system (pp 41 ff) is presented. Theories of the morphology of the two verbal systems are summarised and evaluated. The summaries of these two sections, the syntactic functions of the verb in Biblical Hebrew (pp 47 ff) and of the Syriac verb (pp 52 ff) are given respectively. A comparison of the two verbal systems follows in the next section (pp 53 ff). In comparing the Hebrew verbal system with the Syriac verbal system, the main focus is on the role and function of Hebrew verbs in the syntax and semantics, rather than on the morphology or development of the Hebrew verbal system.

2.4 Hebrew verbal system

In chronological order, the following authors will receive some attention with regard to the Hebrew verbal system:

2.4.1 Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley (abbreviation GKC), 1910:309–362 (p 25)

2.4.2 Driver (1936:85–97) (p 26)

2.4.3 Moscati (1964:122–170) (p 27)

2.4.4 McFall (1982:17–20, 176–177) (p 29)

2.4.5 Waltke and O'Connor (1990:343–350) (p 33)

2.4.6 Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:67–173) (p 37)[7]

[7] Nöldeke (1966) and Muraoka (1987) will be consulted for the Syriac verbal system.

2.4.1 Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley (abbreviation GKC), 1910:309–362

2.4.1.1 The perfect (GKC, 1910:309–313)

According to GKC (1910:309), the perfect indicates actions or events expressing completion as the point of view; thus the Hebrew perfect refers to events in the past time, or events extending into the present.

The perfect in Hebrew agrees with the perfect in Latin and English and is used in assertions, negations, confirmations and interrogations (GKC, par 106a). The perfect also expresses past events or repeated events in the past and actions already completed in the past (GKC, pars 106d & 106f). The perfect further expresses events that were completed in the past, but still have an influence in the present (GKC, 1910:311).

2.4.1.2 The imperfect (GKC, 1910:313–319)

The imperfect is used to express actions, events or conditions that are in the future, thus implying that they are still continuing, or that they are incomplete or determined modally (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:313a). The authors continue to say that the imperfect indicates actions that are continued for a shorter or longer period of time (p 314b). The imperfect is used to express events or actions that were repeated in the past.

2.4.1.3 The cohortative (GKC, 1910:319–321)

The cohortative is an indirect command to the first person and it is used to express a wish or a request for permission (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:319).

2.4.1.4 The jussive (GKC, 1910:321–323)

The jussive is found particularly in the second and third person in both singular and plural and it expresses a more or less definite desire that something should or should not happen (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:321). The jussive is mainly an indirect command to the third person but also expresses a wish.

2.4.1.5 The imperative (GKC, 1910:324–326)

The imperative expresses a direct command to the second person singular or plural. It expresses a direct command, permission and assurance (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:324)

2.4.1.6 The imperfect with waw consecutive (GKC, 1910:326–330)

The waw consecutive with imperfect functions as a prelude to the perfect in all its uses regarding events in the past, the present and the future (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:328–330; refer to Van Rooy, 1990:25), as indicated in par 4.1. It expresses a temporal and logical sequel of actions, events or states that have been named earlier (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:328). The imperfect with waw consecutive is used to express events that occurred in the past and represents present actions as well as future actions (pp 328–330).

2.4.1.7 The perfect with waw consecutive (GKC, 1910:330–339)

The consecutive perfect functions only as a prefix conjugation, while the time is usually determined by the preceding verb. A consecutive functions in one of the following three ways (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:331):

1. it depends on the previous tense or its equivalent;
2. it makes future events known in a loose connection with further announcements; and
3. the perfect consecutive occurs in the apodosis to conditional sentences.

2.4.2 Driver (1936:85–97)

2.4.2.1 Description of the waw consecutive

It is a well-known and accepted notion that a perfect in Hebrew refers to a complete action, while an imperfect refers to an incomplete action (Driver, 1936:86). The presence of a waw consecutive prefixed to the verb creates a unique problem in the Hebrew verbal system. According to Driver, the presence of a waw consecutive in a verb creates the possibility that the perfect might be continued by an imperfect that is introduced by the waw consecutive, and consequently, the imperfect might be continued by a waw consecutive introducing the perfect, in other words, it changes the mood (Driver, 1936:85; Joosten, 2012:23–26; Lambdin, 1973:38, 100). According to Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:168–173), the unique problem caused by the presence of the waw consecutive in a perfect verb needs careful analysis of the difference between the waw consecutive + perfect as analogous to the waw consecutive + imperfect. Also, in instances where the waw + perfect is simply used as a perfect with a conjunction, a waw copulative with a perfect is to be distinguished (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:168). Normally, if the waw

consecutive with the imperfect is wa plus doubling of the first consonant of the verb, it is prefixed too. The normal rules related to consonants that cannot be doubled, apply (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:164–172). Following Driver (1936:85), the waw consecutive is introduced by wa and generally requires doubling of the following prefix, or else the lengthening of its vowel in the imperfect tense, while the conjunction of the perfect tense is either *we* or *u*. One needs thus to distinguish between the waw copulative and the waw consecutive. The waw copulative is directly prefixed to the verb in the perfect, imperfect, imperative, jussive or cohortative form (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:163), while the waw consecutive can only occur with a perfect and with an imperfect (Driver, 1936:85–97).

2.4.3 Moscati (1964:122–170)

2.4.3.1. 'Tenses' (Moscati, 1964:131–134)

The 'tense' system produces one of the most complicated and disputed problems of Semitic linguistics. In the West Semitic area, Arabic and most other languages, as far as the traditional approach is concerned, exhibit two conjugations usually called tenses, namely the prefix (imperfect) and the suffix conjugations (perfect). The prefix conjugation indicates an incomplete action, while the suffix conjugation indicates a completed action (Driver, 1936:85; Moscati, 1964:131).

East Semitic (Akkadian) presents a system of several conjugations: one with prefixes for incomplete actions is described as the *present*; another, also with prefixes with a different vowel and syllable distribution, connotes completed action and is known as *preterite*; and a third one with suffixes is referred to as *stative*.

2.4.3.2 Moods (Moscati, 1964:134–137)

Arabic attests to a full range of moods in the imperfect tense by employing the use of various endings: the indicative *yaqbur-u*, the subjunctive *yaqbur-a*, the jussive *yaqbur* and the energic *yaqbur-an* (*na*). The modal system in Akkadian shows a remarkable divergence from West Semitic. In Akkadian, moods are expressed in all tenses and not only in the imperfect tense. The ending differs from those in other languages: the indicative has none, and the subjunctive has *-u*. Moscati (1964:135) writes the following: 'In North-West Semitic (leaving aside Ugarit) Amorite

presents *yaqbur* and *yaqburu*, but a modal distinction cannot be determined; in the Tell Amarna glosses we encounter a volitive in *-a* and an energic in *-na*.'

All Semitic languages have an imperative corresponding to that of the prefix conjugation without its prefix. Moscati (1964:121) only indicates what the conjunctions are but provides no discussion about their uses. All Semitic languages possess the imperative, which is derived from the imperfect without the prefix.

2.4.3.2.1 The imperative

Moscati affirms the well-known and accepted notion regarding the imperative that in the derived stems in West Semitic, which includes both Northern and Southern Semitic, it corresponds to the form of the imperfect without the prefix (Moscati, 1964:156). Moscati discusses the imperative and makes no mention of the indirect command to the first person (cohortative) and indirect command to the third person (jussive). For more information about the imperative, refer to Moscati, 1964:145, 156.

2.4.3.2.2 The participle

According to Moscati, the participle is characterised by the prefix *mu-* and vowel *i* following the second radical in the active, while the passive is characterised by the prefix *mu-* and vowel *a* in the second radical (Moscati, 1964:157). He further mentions that the participle structurally corresponds to the prefix conjugation (imperfect).

2.4.3.2.3 The infinitive (Moscati, 1964:158–159)

According to Moscati, the infinitive of a derived stem has a number of forms and therefore it is vital that instead of making a general conclusion, one should study it in each language, that is, the infinitive of each language in this cluster of languages – the West Semitic cluster – has to be studied in its own right (Moscati, 1964:158). He further makes mention of the fact that the infinitive in the Akkadian language coincides with the stative verb followed by the nominal morpheme (Moscati, 1964:158). The infinitive in Hebrew is derived from an imperfect without its prefixes and it coincides with an imperative. The infinitive of the derived stem in Biblical Aramaic is indicated by the ending *–ā* of the stative absolute feminine, while Syriac retains the prefix *m-* of the simple stem, with the vowel *ā* in the second radical and with the ending *ū* in the third radical (Moscati,

1964:146 & 159, i.e. pars 16.70 & 16.105 respectively). The infinitive in Arabic has a number of forms, namely those possessing similar schemes that can be grouped together, those having a doubled second radical with lengthened first vowel, and others.

2.4.4 McFall (1982:17–20, 176–177)

McFall evaluated six theories or approaches to the problem of the Hebrew verbal system.

2.4.4.1 Waw consecutive theory (McFall, 1982:17–20, 176–177)

The Jewish grammarians led the way in developing the waw conversive theory (McFall, 1982:17). They discovered that the קטל form, which occurred independently without a prefixed waw, was normally translated as the past tense ('he killed', which is a complete action in the past). Similarly, it was observed that the form יקטל without a waw was normally translated as the future tense ('he will kill', which is an incomplete action). However, when these forms occurred with a prefixed waw, they were translated by the opposite tense, e.g. *weqtl* was future and *wayyqtl* was past (McFall, 1982:17). The presence of the waw consecutive in the verb changed the tense of the particular verb. According to McFall, this led the grammarians to conclude that the prefix waw was the cause of the conversion. Consequently, the waw conversive theory was developed (McFall, 1982:17). According to Joosten (2012:288), the various functions of *weqatal* were traditionally attributed to the force of the waw hippuk*,* the conversive waw.

McFall (1982:176) is of the opinion that the waw conversive can be traced as far back as the tenth century, but it has been abandoned by Hebraists. It has failed as it tried to fit the Hebrew verbal system into the tense structure of another language and, as a result, the form and distinctiveness of the Hebrew verbal system has been lost to researchers.

2.4.4.2 Relative tense solution (McFall, 1982:21–24, 177–179)

The solution proposed by this theory in this instance is that Hebrew has two tenses, namely the present (including the past) and the future tense. The theory was founded in 1751 by Julius Bate, who had many followers (McFall, 1982:177). This approach did away with the need of converting the tenses, since the two forms, *qtl* and *yqtl*, were given tense significations that were used in both an absolute and a relative sense (McFall, 1982:178). Although the theory was accepted, it led to

disagreements amongst grammarians and resulted in the three different approaches set out in Table 3 (McFall, 1982:178).

Table 3: Three different approaches to tenses (Julius Bate, 1751)

	Yqtl	*Qtl*
Schroeder, etc	Future	Past
Weir	Future	Present
Lee, etc	Present	Past

The pitfall of all three views is that Biblical writers were credited with being able to write their accounts either from the absolute standpoint (i.e. to write from the viewpoint of the time in which they were living) or the relative standpoint (i.e. to write from the viewpoint of the time about which they were writing). The writer had the liberty to change or alternate his standpoint from verse to verse and even from sentence to sentence.

The difficulty with this theory is that there are a number of syntactical conditions and other factors that condition or dictate the form of the verb. At times, proponents of the theory face the difficulties of the conversive theory as the relative waw is often missing. However, the theory takes into consideration the big gap that exists between the Hebrew and the Indo-Germanic verbal systems and that the conversive theory has reduced it to a minimum or non-existent level (McFall, 1982:179). The result is that the gap has been addressed somewhat (McFall, 1982:179). In this regard, the theory has made a positive contribution by making clear that the Hebrew has two tenses: the present tense includes the past and the future tense (קטל and יקטל). This theory contributed to the understanding of the Hebrew verbal system of the translation of the Hebrew verbs.

2.4.4.3 Waw inductive solution (McFall, 1982:24–26, 179)

In 1818, both Philip Gell and John Bellamy agreed with each other about understanding the *wayyqtl* form to be made up of the future *wyqtl* form and a waw inductive prefixed to it (McFall, 1982:179). When the waw was prefixed to *yqtl***,** it was translated in the past tense.

Gell was of the opinion there were two tenses in Hebrew, namely a present-future tense (*yqtl*) and a past tense (*qtl*). This is an indication that he might not have been aware of the relative and absolute tenses (McFall, 1982:179). His suggestion was that the tense of the first verb was inducted into the following verb, which retained its own tense subordinately, although this principle was not applicable to *qtl* forms in the prophetic writings for future events. To him the consecutive *qtl* lost its individuality in such cases and assumed the meaning of the first or dominant verb. This view marks the weakness of the theory. Gell was convinced that his theory banished the 'barbarism of conversive' (McFall, 1982:16).

According to S.R. Driver, the theory or solution shows in what sense the retention of the former waw conversive can be justified, as a limitation is imposed by the prefixed waw on the meaning of *qtl*. This means that the waw inductive solution is a semantic refinement of the waw conversive theory. This theory narrows down the gap between Hebrew and Indo-Germanic verbal systems (McFall, 1982:180) and it is widely used in translating Hebrew texts.

2.4.4.4 Aspectual solution (McFall, 1982:180–181)

McFall (1982:180) states that the aspectual solution approach was taken over and promoted by the following scholars: John William Donaldson (1848), G.H.A. von Ewald (1827–1879) and S.R. Driver (1874). Donaldson established the aspectual opposition, which comprised single acts versus sets of acts and Lee (1827) thought of the Hebrew verbal system in terms of relative and absolute tenses, while Ewald thought of them in terms of the relative and absolute aspect of action categories.

Common ground between these two grammarians is the idea of transportation of the writer to the site of the actual event. Ewald compares the complete (*qtl*) with the incomplete (*yqtl*), and argues that it 'exactly answers to the Greek aorist' (McFall, 1982:52), while Driver compares the perfect (*qtl*) and nascent (*yqtl*) and argues that 'it is conceivable that it [*wayyqtl*] should have suggested anything else except the idea of a fact done' (McFall, 1982:73). They do not agree on the understanding of the perfect consecutive form.

2.4.4.5 Factual-descriptive solution: William Turner's theory (McFall, 1982:181–182)

McFall also discusses William Turner's theory as a solution to the Hebrew verbal system. In this theory, *qtl* is seen to express the action or state as the attribute of the person or a thing spoken of; and *yqtl* is seen to express the verbal action as in or of the subject. In this regard, the *qtl* represents the act or state of the verb as an independent thing and therefore it gives factual information, while *yqtl* represents the same act or state as a process and therefore it gives descriptive information. Turner thus argues that there is no difference in meaning between the forms in their simple and conversive appearances in the Old Testament. Prefixing or adding the waw conversive to the verb changes its mood or tense; therefore, there is no difference in the meaning of the verb with waw conversive and the meaning of its simple form.

2.4.4.6 Historical-comparative solution (McFall, 1982:182–184)

This approach is aimed at shedding some light on the development of the Semitic and Hebrew verbal system. It was founded and promoted by J.A. Knudtzon (1889–1892), Hans Bauer (1910), G.R Driver (1936) and T.W. Thacker (1954) (McFall, 1982:182). The theory gave attention to the investigation and analysis of the basic problem of the Hebrew verbal system as being one of duplicate functions inhering in the same verb. It was further accepted that in the historical languages, this situation was clearly anomalous, if not improbable; for that reason, a solution was to be sought in the historical development of these languages (McFall, 1982:182).

The problem of the Hebrew verbal system is so big that each solution has its pitfall. The shortfall of the theory is its tendency to align or to couple particular tenses with particular aspects, for example, incomplete with present-future, and complete with past (McFall, 1982:183). This refers to the fact that *yqtl* was employed to render present or future events or actions, thus indicating an incomplete action, while *qtl* was used to render past actions or events, thus indicating a complete action. In any case, such assumptions could not always be justified.

The above-mentioned three forerunners of this theory (Knudtzon, Bauer and Driver) accepted the *wayyqtl* form as a true preterite tense in historical Hebrew language (McFall, 1982:183). They perceived it as developing from the mode of action system as opposed to a tense-oriented system.

2.4.5 Waltke and O'Connor (1990:343–350)

According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:343–350), the verbal system of the Hebrew language is at the centre of the expression of predication. While Hebrew uses non-verbal clauses and interjections, and exclamations are found intermittently, the central role in the predication is played by various verbal stems (e.g. qal, niphal, piel, etc) and forms (e.g. perfectum, imperfectum, imperative etc) (p 343). They further argue that of all the word classes the verb is the most multifunctional and thus the one most likely to determine a variety of macro-functions. An example is the verb וַיַּכּוּהָ ('And they smote it'), which expresses the following (p. 344):

- the action of smiting (root *nky***);**
- the subject, here the actor (third person masculine plural);
- the object, here the patient (third person feminine singular);
- voice (the subject is an actor and so the voice is active, not passive; the subject and object are different and so the voice is active, not reflexive; etc);
- case frame (the verb is transitive, not intransitive);
- it is singly transitive (it has one object), rather than doubly transitive (when it would have more than one object);
- type of action (the verb is hiphil, though the relevance of the stem is not obvious in this case; compare with the English simple action, 'He raged against his audience', versus causative action, 'He enraged his audience');
- time of action relative to time of speaking ('the smiting people' precedes the reference to it; contrast with יַכְּכָה, 'he smites/will smite you', in which the time of action does not precede the speaking);
- the quality of action (the action, though cumulatively made up of smaller actions, has an end point, though not necessarily an end product); and
- mood or modality (the action is independent; though consequent on another predicate, the verb is not subordinate to it; further, the verb makes an assertion rather than, say, a request).

Waltke and O'Connor (1990:345) further argue that the form *yakku* **(**יַכּוּ**)** has four bound morphemes:

- the verbal root, signifying the state or action represented;
- the pronominal affix or affixes, showing the person, gender and number of the subject;
- the prefix and or lengthening of the medial consonant of the root indicating voice and causation, that is, the markers of the verbal stem; and
- the vocalic infix in the verb signifying tense and mode, that is, the verbal conjugation, here the prefixing form (used after waw).

Relating to the conjunctive morpheme, a waw prefixed to a verb may show the relationship in the situation. The Hebrew verbal system is derived from the morphology realising most of the above-mentioned categories. Categories that require little attention before investigating how the Hebrew verbal system works are features of person, number and gender, which are associated with the subject of the verb. According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:346), tense, modality, voice and the two types of aspect require adequate attention.

2.4.5.1 The perfect (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:479–495)

According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:483), the perfect refers to the past, present, or future state that is related to a preceding or previous situation or a past situation that is relevant to a continuing later event or state. It presents a contrast between the perfective, which indicates present time situations, and the perfect (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:486–495, par 30.3). The Hebrew perfective aspect uses can mainly be related to present-time reference in English, while different uses of the perspective pattern in relation to the perfect state clearly indicate the time-orientated character of the English verbal system (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:486–495, par 30.5).

2.4.5.2 The imperfect (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:496–518)

The prefix conjugation has a broader range of meanings and it is more complex in itself as well as in relation to the jussive and cohortative moods than is the case with the suffix conjugation (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:496). The prefix conjugation is used to indicate the present and the future aspects, in other words, it indicates an incomplete action.

2.4.5.3 The waw consecutive

Two waw conjugation constructs are found, namely a waw + suffix conjugation and a waw + prefix conjugation.

The waw + suffix conjugation (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:519–542)

When a waw precedes a suffix conjugation, the construction is similar to two semantically distinct constructions, namely one with relative force and one with coordinate force. These two semantic constructions are identical, since the waw is prefixed to the suffix conjugation. There are various environments, in which the relative waw occurs, but two are distinct, namely a temporal expression formed with the infinitives and it also points to the association with the existential verb (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:536–537, par 32.2.5c, examples 21–22). The relative *wəqtl* indicates one situation as subordinate to another, while the waw copulative indicates two situations as being coordinated with one another (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:540). These two constructs are differentiated by stress and semantics.

The waw + prefix conjugation (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:543–563)

It is still the case here that the relative waw plus a prefix pattern represents a situation that is usually successive and at all times subordinate to the previous statement. This succession is either absolute or subjective. According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:559), the suffix and prefix patterns that indicate the same time reference probably complement one another.

2.4.5.4 The jussive, imperative and cohortative (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:564–579)

In relation to the direct and indirect command, Waltke and O'Connor indicates that the jussive (indirect command to the third person), the imperative (direct command to the second person) and the cohortative (indirect command to the first person) patterns do not overlap extensively in their uses; consequently, the three forms together establish one unified system to express the speaker's wishes (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:564). The jussive can be used rhetorically to create a distinctive pragmatic force, while the cohortative presents more complexities than the jussive or the imperative.

2.4.5.5 The infinitive

The Semitic languages distinguish between the infinitive, which deals with the action or situation of the verb, and the participle, which is about the actor or patient of the verb.

The infinitive absolute (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:580–597)

According to Waltke and O'Connor, the infinitive absolute is used as a noun in two ways, namely, as an absolute complement to a clause and as an adverbial complement, that is, a complement to the verb (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:583; refer to par 35.3.1 and par 35.3.2 respectively). In others instances, according to Waltke and O'Connor (p. 597), the infinitive absolute may be used or stand as a participle, though it is not easy to differentiate it from an adverbial-accusative use.

The infinitive construct (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:598–611)

One of the most important uses of the infinitive construct is its use after prepositions in the place of a subordinate clause (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:603–610; refer to Jenni, 1968:74–77). According to Waltke and O'Connor (p. 598), the infinitive construct is a verbal noun that is used in the same manner as the English infinitive.

2.4.5.6 The participle (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:612–631)

The participle occurs in two states, that is, in an absolute state, which governs an accusative object, an adverbial accusative or a prepositional phrase; and in a construct state, which governs an object or some other specification in genitive (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:616).

The participle has various uses. According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:612–613), the uses of the participle in Hebrew corresponds directly to the use of the English (adverbial) participle, and the different uses of the two participles (nominal and verbal character) depend on semantic features and syntactic patterns. The participle occurs in two voices, namely the active and the passive voices. It is important that the active participle in Biblical Hebrew has four significant uses, namely as a substantive, an adjective, a relative and as a predicate (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:613, 614–631).

Conclusions: The Hebrew verbal system (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:350–361)

The Hebrew verbal system is a system derived from morphology and it realises most of the categories discussed by Waltke and O'Connor (1990:343–350). The derivational morphology consists of the modification of the root or consonantal skeleton by various vocalic or consonantal affixes. These consonantal affixes include the prefixed *n* and *h*, infixed *t*, and lengthening or doubling of the middle consonant/radical of the root. These stem formations are the *qal*, *niphal*,

piel, *pual*, *hithpael*, *hiphil* and *hophal*. The Hebrew grammarians named these verbal patterns בנינים (*binyanim*). According to Waltke and O'Connor, unlike the piel, pual, hithpael, hiphil and hophal, the qal and the niphal are semantically without an element of causation in their prediction (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:362).

The problem

In this regard, the researchers have previously identified three basic problems related to the stem system (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:352). They have been fully outlined and are mentioned here in chronological order. The first of these problems is formally seen as based on the qal stem. In the second place, the scholars describe the stems notionally in an atomistic way, i.e. assigning a meaning or set of meanings to each stem independently. The third problem is that they have neglected the very systemic character of the system (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:352–353).

Proposals to find a solution

Various approaches and attempts have been made in trying to solve the problem of the Hebrew verbal system. Traditional grammarians emphasise the qal-piel relation as key, but the piel-hiphil relation has recently been stressed by grammarians as well (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:354). Albrecht Goetze unlocked the verbal system in his survey of Akkadian D, and this study was taken further by Ernst Jenni in his work, *Das Hebräische Piʿel* (1968). Jenni's study demonstrates that the piel entails a notion related to the basic active: passive dichotomy of voice. Piel tends to signify causation with a patient nuance, and the hiphil causation with an agency nuance (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:355). The Hebrew structure differs from those of other languages such as English; thus, interpreting the Hebrew categories, one must be guided by Hebrew forms and usages. Hebrew has seven stem formations, namely: qal, niphal, piel, pual, hithpael, hiphil and hophal.

2.4.6 Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:67–173)

Apart from the above publication, Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley (1910:309–389) has also been consulted.

2.4.6.1 The verbs

Verbs can be divided into two syntactic functions or groups. There are transitive verbs, that is, verbs taking a direct object, for example 'to eat', and intransitive verbs, that is, verbs not taking a

direct object, for example ‘to sleep’. Verbs have the following characteristics (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:53):

1. Modality (actuality of a process)
2. Time (temporal feature of an action)
3. Aspect (complete or incomplete action)
4. Voice (relation of a verb to a subject)
5. Conjugations
6. Agreement markers
7. Finite verbs/non-finite verbs or infinitives

Biblical Hebrew verbs are triconsonantal. They are known as the roots of the verbs and have affixes, namely prefixes, infixes and or suffixes. An affix helps with the identification of the verb, which means it gives an indication of where it belongs. Hebrew has seven stem formations, namely the qal, niphal, piel, pual, hithpael, hiphil and hophal. The following conjugations are found in Biblical Hebrew: the perfect, imperfect, imperative, jussive, cohortative, infinitive construct, infinitive absolute and participles. In regular verbs, it is usually very easy to recognise the stem, stem formation and conjugation of a verb. The same cannot be said about irregular verbs, since a number of rules are applicable in forming an irregular verb. At times, only one consonant of the root remains. The verb also has the subject as part of it, for example, הָיָה (‘it was’ or ‘it happened’), but the verb can also have a pronominal suffix that refers to the object of the verb (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:68). It is of utmost importance to take note of this suffix, since it influences the vocalisation of the verb.

Certain verb chains and sequences related to the perfect, imperfect and imperative forms are also found in Biblical Hebrew. Biblical Hebrew roots or stems have affixes indicating a specific feature such as person, gender and number (singular or plural) where applicable in the conjugation.

2.4.6.2 Morphology of the basic paradigm (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:68–73; Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:309–313)

The qal conjugation is the simplest of all seven stem formations.

A. The perfect form or the suffix conjugation/*qatal* indicates a complete action and is often translated in the past tense, for example אמר as 'he said'. The perfect form is either preceded by a waw consecutive or waw copulative (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:163–165; refer par 21.1 and p. 171; refer par 21.4).
B. The imperfect form or the prefix conjugation/*yiqtol* form indicates an incomplete action or events often translated in the present or future tense. The imperfect form is either preceded by a waw consecutive or a waw copulative (pars. 21.2 and 21.4).
C. The imperative form can be described as a direct command to the second person. For an indirect command to the first person a cohortative is used, while the jussive is used for a command to the third person. It is important to note that the imperative form is the same as the imperfect second person without prefix.
D. The cohortative form is an indirect command to the first person. The cohortative is formed by adding a suffix 'ah' as in אָבִינָה to the imperfect of the first person. The final vowel before this suffix is then reduced.
E. The jussive form is an indirect command to the third person and it often appears as a shortened form of the imperfect. It is also used with אַל in negative commands to the second person.
F. The infinitive construct or declinable infinitive is a verbal noun expressing action without referring to the time or person (par 20.1).
G. The infinitive absolute or un-declinable infinitive does not decline and has in Æ ו Æ the final syllable.
H. The participle is a verbal adjective that functions as a verb, noun or adjective (par 20.3).

The verbs are derived from a stem or root that consists of three consonants. A verb occurs in seven different stem formations as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: The seven different stem formations of the Hebrew verb

Stem formations of the Hebrew verb		
qal	piel	hiphil
niphal	pual	hophal

	hithpael	

The discussion above has concentrated on the forms of Hebrew verbal system; the Syriac verbal system will receive attention in 2.5 Syriac verbal system (p. 41).

In Hebrew, a clear distinction is made regarding time. The perfect refers to the past time, while the imperfect refers to non-past time, as indicated by Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:143). Elsewhere, these authors discuss very important characteristics in relation to the syntax and semantics of the finite verb forms and of the non-finite verb forms (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:141–153, pars 19 and 153–173, par 20 respectively).

The Hebrew verbal system is very complex as it belongs to the cluster of languages, the Semitic languages, which have similar features (Joosten, 2012:39). The syntax and the semantics of the finite verbs, according to Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:141–153), will now be discussed.

Each verb has both syntactic (syntax) and semantic functions, which are at work in every language. The intention here is to look briefly at these functions in the Hebrew language.

2.4.6.3 A tense or time system

Each language has its own unique way of expressing time. Setswana like English has a past, present and future form of the verb. The complicated verbal system of Hebrew has amongst others forms expressing time, namely the perfect and imperfect (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:141).

2.4.6.4 The aspect system

Grammatically not all the languages have a noticed tense system; therefore, the verbs in some languages conjugate primarily to indicate whether the action is complete or incomplete. Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:141) point out that Hebrew is an example of such a language. They discuss time in Biblical Hebrew at length (pp. 142–144). They state that the perfect forms refer to events or actions completed in the past (pp. 144–146; see also Joosten, 2012:194–196). The imperfect forms refer to incomplete events either in the present or in the future (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:146–148; Joosten, 2012:180–191).

Also, the imperative, cohortative and jussive forms are discussed in detail by Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:150–153).

According to Joosten (2012:414), the syntax of poetry is more free and flexible than that of prose, a fact that is worth mentioning as psalms are under study in this research.

2.4.6.5 The perfect form and waw

Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:68; par 19.2) affirm the well-known and accepted notion that the perfect form refers to complete events or facts that are normally translated in the past tense. In instances where the perfect form is preceded by a waw, it may be either the waw consecutive or waw copulative (pars 21.1 and 21.3 respectively).

2.4.6.6 The imperfect form and waw

Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:70; refer to par 19.3) affirm the well-known and accepted notion that the imperfect form refers to incomplete events or facts that are often translated in either the present or future tense. In instances where the imperfect form is preceded by a waw, it may either be waw consecutive or waw copulative (refer to pars 21.2 and 21.4 respectively).

2.4.6.7 The infinitive construct and infinitive absolute

There are two types of infinitives, namely the infinitive construct or declinable infinitive and the absolute infinitive/indeclinable infinitive. According to Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:72; refer par 20.1), the infinitive construct is a verbal noun that expresses action without referring to time or person.

2.4.6.8 The participle

According to Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:72; refer par 20.3) the participle is seen as a verbal adjective that functions as a verb, noun or adjective.

2.5 Syriac verbal system

Syriac belongs to the group of languages generally known as Semitic languages, and it is part of the Aramaean group of the Northwest Semitic languages, as indicated above. The aim of this thesis is to conduct a comparative study of how the Peshitta translated the verbs in Psalms 73–89 from its

Hebrew text. It is therefore necessary to study what the Syriac verbal system was like. Here the approach of the following grammarians will be studied:

2.5.1 Nöldeke (1966:100–142) (p. 42) and

2.5.2 Muraoka (1987:26–39) (p. 44)

2.5.1 Nöldeke (1966:100–142)

The Syriac verbs contain features that mostly correspond exactly to those of the Hebrew verbs. According to Nöldeke (1966:100), Syriac verbs appear in two forms, that is, either with three or four radicals. Whether the verb is primitive or has been derived from a noun makes no difference at all in the inflection or conjugation. Just like in Hebrew, there are two tenses: the perfect and the imperfect. Nöldeke (1966:100) continues that in the perfect, the various persons, genders and numbers are indicated by means of affixes, while in the imperfect, they are indicated by prefixes or prefixes coupled with affixes. The imperative in Syriac resembles the Hebrew imperfect without prefixes. The Syriac imperative is conjugated (inflected) by affixes. The verbal nouns, namely the infinitive and the participles, are closely related to the finite verb.

2.5.1.1 The perfect

This section is a summary of the discussion by Nöldeke (1966:193–198) of the Syriac perfect. Like in other Semitic languages, the perfect denotes past events (p. 193); thus it is the narrative tense in Syriac. Nöldeke continues that the perfect furthermore indicates completed results (p. 193). In other instances, it is also possible that the action expressed or indicated by the perfect may occur before a previously told action, like a *plusquam perfectum* or a pluperfect and it can also be used like a future perfect (p. 194). It is also frequently used in conditional clauses (pp. 194–105). The perfect is frequently used with an adjective or the participle of □□□ to express a wish or command in other cases (p. 196). The perfect is also used in subordinate clauses to indicate past actions (p. 197). The past aspect is frequently emphasized by an enclitic □□□ (pp. 197–198).

2.5.1.2 The imperfect

Nöldeke (1966:198–201) also describes the Syriac imperfect. He says the imperfect stands in contrast to the perfect, since its use points to events or actions that are incomplete, as well as to present or future actions (p. 198). The imperfect is also extensively used in subordinate clauses, in

particular conditional clauses (p. 198), to indicate the future, or the future in relation to the time of the main clause (p. 199). The imperfect frequently occurs in the protasis of conditional sentences, with a participle in the apodosis (p. 198). The construction of the imperfect with the perfect of □ □ □ is often used to indicate a repeated action (p. 200) and it occurs frequently in subordinate clauses following a perfect (Nöldeke, 1966:201).

2.5.1.3 The imperative

The imperative is never used with negation (Nöldeke, 1966:215).

2.5.1.4 The infinitive

Nöldeke (1966:215–225) discusses the infinitive and mentions that where the infinitive is not an absolute object, it must always be preceded by □ (p. 215). He extensively explains the use of the infinitive with preposition □, including the idea of direction, purpose or obligation (pp. 215–217).

2.5.1.5 The infinitive absolute

When Nöldeke (1966:225–228) discusses the infinitive absolute, he says, as a general object, the infinitive absolute is not uncommon in both transitive and intransitive verbs, either as an active or passive verb (p. 225). It is used for emphasis (pp. 225–226). The emphasis is more pronounced when the infinitive follows the main verb.

2.5.1.6 The participle

From the description of Nöldeke (1966:202–215) of the Syriac participle, a few remarks are made here. In instances where the active participle acts as a predicate form, it does not make any direct reference to time, but it can be frequently used to indicate the present (p. 202). In this use, it can indicate continuous or repetitive action. It can also indicate the future (pp. 202–203). According to Nöldeke (1966:203), the participle very often occurs in conditional clauses, in the protasis and/or the apodosis. The participle plus □ □ □ expresses the situation is clearly placed in the past and it indicates duration or repetition in the past (p. 207). At times, the participle, instead of the imperfect, is also used in a broader sense for a future action in sentences (p. 204). With regard to the nominal use of the participle, the focus is on participles used as substantives. The participle active of the peal can be found in the construct state with possessive suffixes preceded by □, with

the object in the genitive construction (p. 212). Participles are also used substantively (pp. 211–215).

2.5.2 Muraoka (1987:26–39)

Muraoka (1987:26) argues that the inflection of the Syriac verb is, in its basic structure, virtually analogous to that of the Hebrew, the only noteworthy difference consisting of verb patterns, conjunctions, or *binyanim*, as shown in Table 5 (p. 44). From this table, it is clear that Syriac, compared to Hebrew, presents a much neater and more symmetrical scheme than Hebrew: each of the three non-prefixed patterns has a corresponding *eth* prefixed, the so-called reflexive pattern. The internal passive, pual and hufal of Hebrew, is only preserved in the participle of pael and aphel (Muraoka, 1987:26).

Table 5: Conjugations of the Syriac verb

Syriac	Hebrew
P'al Ethp'el	Qal
Pa''el Ethpa''al	Pi''el (Pu''al) Hithpa''el
Af'el Ettaf'al	Hif'il (-Huf'al) Nif'al

Syriac has three tenses, namely the perfect, imperfect and participle. In addition to the tenses, there are the imperative and the infinitive.

2.5.2.1 The perfect and imperfect in Syriac

The perfect is used with reference to the past and the imperfect with reference to the future. In comparison with Hebrew, the conjugation of the Syriac verb in the derived forms/patterns is simple, for the vowel sequence/pattern remains constant and unchanged throughout a given pattern. This is true for the perfect, imperfect, imperative and participles. Unlike Hebrew, Syriac has lost the jussive form (יָקֻם) and the cohortative form (אָקוּמָה); only traces of the primitive forms can be identified (Muraoka, 1987:29). The perfect refers to something that happened, has happened or had happened; thus it is essentially a preterite (Muraoka, 1987:42). The imperfect expresses the future (Muraoka, 1987:43).

2.5.2.2 Participles (Nöldeke, 1966:202–207; Muraoka, 1987:43–45, 1997:66)

A particle can be used to indicate what is taking place presently, or what happens often. Participles serve a dual purpose, as it is used to indicate the present tense and also habitual happenings (general present). Most importantly, it can express the future, intention or immediacy and certainty of fulfilment as in English. It is important to note that the participle indicates the future and also to realise the problem it causes. As the imperfect is also used to indicate the future, a fine line is drawn between the two. Participles are also used in conditional sentences. Participles are found in both active and passive forms. It is also important to note that the participle in Syriac, like its Hebrew counterpart, can be used as a noun signifying an actor, for example the verb 'to inhabit' or 'to dwell' could mean 'inhabitants' or 'dwellers'. According to Muraoka (1987:43), the most import function of the participle is expressing the idea of futurity, intention (prospective present) or immediacy, and certainty of fulfilment in the manner of the English construction 'be going to' + infinitive, for example in Genesis 1:20.

The particle with the different forms of the verb 'to be' (□□□) and the use of the verb □□□.

In this section, compound tenses in Syriac will be treated referring to Nöldeke (1966:196–197, 200 & 229) and Muraoka (1987:45–47, 1997:68). Attention will only be paid to the combination of the participle with the different forms of the verb 'to be' (□□□) and the use of the verb □□□.

The following uses of the enclitic □□□ in Syriac will be discussed:

1. Use of enclitic □□□ with the perfect
2. Use of enclitic □□□ with the participle
3. Use in which □□□ is not enclitic

Use of enclitic □□□ with the perfect

- Example of combination tense: □□□ □□□ or □□□ □□□ (Muraoka, 1987:45; Nöldeke, 1966:197, refer par 263)

In this combination the perfect + enclitic □□□ are combined. This combination corresponds exactly with the simple perfect and points to the same time reference as the simple perfect.

Use of enclitic □□□ with the participle

- Example of combination tense: □□□ □□□ □□□ □□□ (Muraoka, 1987:46; Nöldeke, 1966:197, refer par 263)

This example marks the combination of a participle + enclitic □□□. This combination indicates a continuing, repeated or habitual action in the past: □□□□ □□□ (‘I was weeping’ or ‘I kept weeping’ (Muraoka, 1997:68). This use is also found in hypothetical conditional sentences or clauses. It can also point to what was destined to take place.

Use in which □□□ is not enclitic

- Example of combination tense: □□□ □□□ or □□□ □□□ (Muraoka, 1987:46; Nöldeke, 1966:196, refer par 260–261)

In this combination, the verb □□□ is not enclitic; in truth, it is fully pronounced. This type of use expresses a wish, advice or an obligation of general and universal applicability, though not an instruction for instant action or execution for which the imperative is used. An adjective may be found in the place of a participle, for example □□□□ □□□□ (‘be healthy!’) (Muraoka, 1997:68).

- Combination tense: □□□ □□□□□ or □□□ □□□□□ (Muraoka, 1987:46; Nöldeke, 1966:200, refer par 268)

This combination is used in a past context, but also in subordinate clauses in the place of the simple imperfect tense. It is further used in conditional or associated (related) clauses.

- Combination tense: □□□ □□□□ or □□□ □□□□ (Muraoka, 1987:47; Nöldeke, 1966:229, refer par 300)

This combination is employed instead of the simple imperfect, for example ‘women should never enter (□□□□ □□□□□) their monasteries’.

2.5.2.3 The infinitive

Here it is important to note that unlike in Hebrew, the preposition □ is prefixed, except on rare occasions (Muraoka, 1987:28, 1997:43).

2.5.2.4 The perfect (Nöldeke, 1966:193–198; Muraoka, 1987:42, 1997:65)

The perfect points to an event that took place, thus indicating to the past (also, see Lambdin, 1973:38).

2.5.2.5 The imperfect (Nöldeke, 1966:198–201; Muraoka, 1987:43, 1997:65)

The imperfect indicates both the present and future tenses (also, see Lambdin, 1973:100). Much use of the imperfect is made in subordinate clauses, namely conditional clauses, in clauses complementing another verb, in clauses introduced by □ □□□ or □□ □□ or in purpose clauses introduced by □.

2.6 Syntactic function of the verb in Biblical Hebrew

The syntactic function of the verb in Biblical Hebrew will be discussed following Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:141–162) and Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley (1910:309–389)

2.6.1 Meaning and use of the perfect or suffix conjugation (*qatal*)

The *perfect* refers to a completed action and it is mainly translated into the past tense just as the English simple past tense, for example 'I kicked the ball' (Driver, 1936:1; Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:309; Lambdin, 1973:38; Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:145–146). It is also used as a general present perfect tense, for example 'I have kicked the ball'.

The perfect state can express a state of affairs or/and condition. It further expresses performative action and can indicate actions, events and/or facts that are not time-bound, that is, events that took place in the past but are still in force at present.

2.6.2 The waw consecutive with the perfect (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:168–172)

A clear distinction has to be drawn between the waw consecutive + perfect and waw consecutive + imperfect. This distinction needs to be made also in cases where the waw + perfect is just simply a perfect with a conjunction, namely a waw copulative with a perfect. A waw copulative + perfect can easily be distinguished from a waw consecutive + perfect, because the final/last syllable of the latter construction (waw consecutive + perfect) carries the Masoretic accent.

The waw consecutive + perfect does not necessarily follow a clause with an imperfect as the main verb. However, it can follow a clause with a perfect, a participle or an infinitive as the main verb. Sometimes, it succeeds a nominal clause.

The waw consecutive + perfect indicates same temporal spheres and aspects of the imperfect, the backbone of some discourse type, the backbone of a sequence of habitual actions in a descriptive section of a narrative and it also points to events/actions where no temporal sequence is involved.

2.6.3 The waw copulative + directives (jussive, imperative and cohortative forms) (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:171–172)

According to Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:171), a waw + a jussive, imperative or cohortative occurs in the following combinations:

1. cohortative + waw + cohortative/imperative/jussive
2. imperative + waw + cohortative/imperative/ jussive
3. jussive + waw + cohortative/imperative/jussive
4. question + waw + cohortative/imperative/jussive

It is important to note that a directive without a waw does also occur (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:171, refer par 21.5). These combinations express purpose, consequence, listing of urgent commands and are used after some verbs of movement.

The purpose of these combinations is to express or indicate the following uses (Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze, 1999:171–172):

1. Purpose (of preceding directive, mostly with a change in person):

   (i) after an imperative,

   (ii) after a cohortative,

   (iii) after a jussive and

   (iv) after an imperfect (in a question).

2. Consequence (of the preceding directive):

   (i) with waw + jussive and

   (ii) where the waw + imperative is quite unambiguously not a directive.

3. Listing of urgent commands that are found in instances where imperatives are combined with waw and both indicating *the same addressee*.
4. Lastly, after some verbs of movement (e.g. קוּם and הלַך).

2.6.4 Meaning and use of the imperfect form or prefix conjugation (*yiqtol*)

The imperfect is used as an incomplete action, which is a continuous action and can be translated as the present or future tense (Driver, 1936:2; Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:313; Lambdin, 1973:100; Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:146). Van Rooy (1990:22) argues that the imperfect is used to express actions, events or conditions to express what lies in the future, or what is incomplete, or what expresses a modality.

The imperfect is translated in the past tense under the following circumstances (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:314–31):

- The imperfect expresses actions and events in the past that continue for a shorter or a longer period. The imperfect is used in this sense especially after the following particles: אז (‘then’), טֶרֶם (‘not yet’), בְּטֶרֶם (‘before’), עַד־ (‘until’), for example in Job 38:21. An imperfect is also translated in the past tense when expressing actions repeated in the past either at fixed intervals or occasionally, for example Psalm 78:15, 40.

The imperfect is translated in the present tense in the following cases:

- It expresses actions, events or conditions that are continued for a shorter or longer time, for example Psalm 2:2.
- It expresses actions that may be repeated at any time, including the present.

The imperfect translated in the sphere of the future as follows:

- An imperfect usually indicates that events will occur in the future as definite events or as expectations.

2.6.5 The Imperfect and the waw consecutive (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:165–168; Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley, 1910:326–330)

The waw consecutive + imperfect succeeds a clause that contains a participle or imperfect as the main verb of such a clause. It may also follow a nominal clause or a clause containing or having an infinitive absolute in it. It introduces an independent narrative or a new section of the narrative. It carries reference to the same temporal spheres and aspects indicating progression. The waw consecutive + imperfect can be employed by the speaker to control the sequence and flow of his or her narratives.

2.6.6 The imperative and cohortative and jussive forms

- The suffix ־נָא may be added to all the directive forms indicating a polite request such as 'please'.
- The imperative is a direct and positive command to the second person either singular or plural. A conditional meaning can be expressed by two imperatives following one another and combined by a waw (Williams, 1976:35). It is of utmost importance to note that the imperative is never used in a negative command. Rather than expressing a negative command to the second person, the negative particle אַל is used with the jussive form of the second person (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:151).
- When an absolute prohibition to the second person is expressed, the negative לֹא with the imperfect is used.

The cohortative is an indirect instruction or command to the first person. Davidson (1962:94) argues that the cohortative, which is a command to the first person and very rare, is an extension of the imperative. Like the imperative, the cohortative uses the negative particle אַל to make the command negative. The cohortative expresses desire, exhortation, request, self-encouragement or declaration of intent (Davidson, 1962:94; Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:152).

The jussive, like the cohortative, is an extension, and not a derivative of the imperfect (Davidson, 1962:93). It is an indirect command to the third person. Sometimes, it is used as an indirect command to the second person as well. Similar to both the imperative and the cohortative, the jussive also uses the negative particle אַל for negative commands.

2.6.7 Syntax of the non-finite verb forms

These are forms that are not described in terms of person, for example participles, or in terms of person, gender and number, for example the infinitive (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:153)

2.6.8 The infinitive construct (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:153–157)

Van Rooy (1990:31) argues that the infinitive construct or verbal noun (*nomen verbale*) takes an intermediate position between the verb and the noun. It expresses action without making any reference to person, gender, number or tense. As a result, it cannot be used or seen as the main verb of the clause. Biblical Hebrew thus makes a clear distinction between the infinitive construct and the infinitive absolute. The infinitive construct as used in Biblical Hebrew is characterised by the fact that in some respects it acts syntactically like nouns (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:154)

2.6.9 The infinitive absolute (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:154–162)

The origin of the infinitive absolute is different from that of the infinitive construct; it takes neither the prefix or suffixes (Williams, 1976:37). With regard to form and function, it is utterly different from the infinitive construct. In Biblical Hebrew, unlike the infinitive construct, the infinitive absolute cannot be combined with any other grammatical or lexical morpheme. This means that the infinitive absolute can neither be governed by a preposition or take a pronominal suffix. Even if the infinitive absolute cannot take a preposition or pronominal suffix, it may occur in a nominal sentence as a subject (especially in poetry) or as an object and also reign an accusative (Lettinga, 1976:173, 'wel kan hij, evenals de inf. c., subject (alleen in poezie) of object in een zin zijn en ook zelf een accusativus regeren'). Waltke and O'Connor (1990:580–597) and Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999:157–162) expound fully on the infinitive absolute, with examples.

2.6.10 The participle (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:162–163; Davidson, 1962:43; Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:613–631)

By definition, the participle is a verbal adjective, which means it has both nominal and verbal characteristics. In Biblical Hebrew, it functions syntactically as a verb, noun or adjective. Davidson

(1962:43) argues that it represents an action or condition in its unbroken continuity, and in the present it corresponds to the English auxiliary verb ‘to be’.

2.7 Syntactic functions of the verb in Syriac (Nöldeke, 1966:193–198; Muraoka, 1987:42–44, 1997:65)

Here the syntax of the verb as a word of action is analysed.

2.7.1 Perfect tense

The perfect tense or form is perceived and accepted to describe something that happened, has happened or had happened, thus pointing to a past tense. Some perfect verbs, especially stative verbs, may have a translation value of the present. The perfect tense is commonly used in conditional sentences. It employs the use of □ □□ with reference to an event or action that will become a reality in future. It is seldom used referring to an action that is performed by stating or saying the verb, the so-called performative perfect.

2.7.2 Imperfect tense (Nöldeke, 1966: 198–201; Muraoka, 1987:43, 1997:65–66)

Muraoka (1987:43) argues that the use of the imperfect for pure future is rather uncommon. It is seldom used in independent clauses to indicate or to show a future state or action, but frequently used in dependent clauses complementing another verb. The imperfect is used mainly in subordinate clauses.

2.7.3 The participle (Nöldeke, 1966: 202–209; Muraoka, 1987:43–44, 1997:66–67)

The participle is used to show what takes place at present or what takes place often or habitually (general present tense). It also expresses the idea of the future, intention and certainty of fulfilment. The participle further indicates what has been happening for a while up and until the time of speaking (Luke 15:29, ‘behold, for some years I have been rendering you service’). It is often found in conditional clauses, in apodoses and also in protases.

2.7.4 The passive participle (Nöldeke, 1966: 209–211; Muraoka, 1987:44–45, 1997:67–68)

The passive participle expresses or emphasises the outcomes of some past actions.

2.7.5 The cohortative and the jussive

In Syriac, in contrast with the Hebrew language, neither the cohortative nor the jussive is found. Although traces of these uses can be found, it can be said that the cohortative and the jussive are almost completely lost in Syriac.

2.7.6 The imperative

As it is the case in Hebrew, the imperative is the direct and positive command to the second person. Since the imperative is only found in the second person, the imperfect forms of the first and third persons are used to compensate for first and third person indirect commands (Robinson, 1962:58).

2.7.7 The infinitive absolute (Muraoka, 1987:55–57)

An infinitive without □ is frequently used in the same sense as the Hebrew infinitive absolute. Muraoka (1987:55) states that where an infinitive absolute is to be expounded with the addition of an attributive adjective, numeral, relative clause and the like, a verbal noun of which the form varies is used instead.

2.8 Comparison of the Hebrew and the Syriac verbal system

Numerous studies have been made of the Hebrew verbal system. Various approaches have occurred in an attempt to address the tenses and different solutions have been suggested. Each of the theories and their solutions has its own shortcomings. The Syriac verbal system is not as complex as the Hebrew verbal system. Both the Biblical Hebrew and Syriac verbs have a specific strict structure. Hebrew has the following stems: qal, niphal, piel, pual, hithpael, hiphil and hophal, while Syriac has the following: p'al, pael, afeel, ethpeel, ethpaal and ettafaal. Both languages have two tenses, which are expressed by the perfect and imperfect forms. Syriac has completely lost the jussive and the cohortative that is found in Hebrew. Hebrew has both the infinitive construct and infinitive absolute; Syriac has the infinitive form to which the preposition *lamadh* is prefixed (except in very rare cases), and it is used for the Hebrew infinitive absolute (Muraoka, 1987:28). The use of the participle is the same except for the fact that for each pattern, Syriac possesses a category known as *nomen agentis* (actor noun or a noun signifying an actor). Other significant uses and differences of the participle in the two languages are that Syriac often uses a combination of

the enclitic □□□ plus the perfect or plus the imperfect or plus a participle, all of which are not found in Hebrew.

The Syriac word order is more free and flexible. The main difference between the two languages is the waw consecutive, which is found in Hebrew but absent in Syriac. Where Hebrew uses the waw consecutive, Syriac employs the use of prepositions + □ for conjunctions or just □. Hebrew uses the negative particles לֹא and אַל, while Syriac employs only the use of □□. Furthermore, Hebrew uses the infinitive with more prepositions than Syriac does. Syriac has the periphrastic construction with the verb 'to be' plus the participle. Some uses maintained in Hebrew are therefore not found in Syriac.

2.9 Conclusions

Regarding the verbal system of the Hebrew and the Syriac languages a few conclusions can be made.

2.9.1 The waw consecutive

As has been stated at the beginning of this chapter, the Hebrew language has a waw consecutive, which is not found in the Syriac language. In order to compensate for the waw consecutive used in the Hebrew language the Syriac language may use a waw or □ to translate the waw consecutive. The Hebrew language makes a clear distinction between the waw consecutive and the copulative waw, whereas Syriac only has a conjunction waw. Hebrew further distinguishes clearly between the use of the waw consecutive plus the perfect and that of the waw consecutive plus imperfect; in most cases, Syriac translations indicate that the translators understood the Hebrew syntax.

2.9.2 Compound tense in Syriac (Muraoka, 1987:46–47; Nöldeke, 1966:197, refer par 263; p. 196, refer pars 260–261; p. 200, refer par 268; p. 229, refer par 300)

2.9.2.1 Compound tense: □□□ □□□

Syriac uses various combinations to render certain aspects or phrases in Hebrew. With regard to compound sentences, Syriac employs a combination of the following: □□□ □□□ (Nöldeke, 1966:197, par 263; Muraoka, 1987:45, par 70). This is a combination of a perfect verb immediately followed by the enclitic of □□□. It renders the time range as a simple perfect, which means it

will be translated as past tense, for example □□□ □□□ ('he killed', 'has killed' or 'had killed').

2.9.2.2 Compound tense: □□□ □□□

According to Nöldeke and Muraoka a participle plus enclitic □□□ occurs frequently and it signifies an ongoing, continuous action, a repeated or habitual action in the past, for example in Mark 10:13 (Nöldeke, 1966:197, par 263; Muraoka, 1987:46, par 71). In Psalms 73–89, this use does not appear; it will be clarified in Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff).

2.9.2.3 Compound tense: □□□ □□□

This third kind of compound tense is used to indicate a wish, advice or obligation of general and universal applicability, but it is not an order for some instant action, for example Genesis 24:41 (Nöldeke, 1966:196, par 260–261; Muraoka, 1987:46, par 72)

2.9.2.4 Compound tense: □□□ □□□□□□

According to Nöldeke and Muraoka, the above-mentioned compound tense is at times used in a past context and in a subordinate clause, in the place of the simple imperfect (Nöldeke, 1966:200, par 268; Muraoka, 1987:46). This use is also applied in conditional or associate clauses. Muroaka (1987:46) provides examples.

2.9 2.5 Compound tense: □□□ □□□□

This is the last type of the compound tense in Syriac that is occasionally applied or used in the place of the simple imperfect (Nöldeke, 1966:229, par 300; Muraoka, 1987:47).

Some conclusions on the different ways of expressing tenses

The word order of both Hebrew and Syriac is normally verb, subject and object (VSO) or verb, with subject already included and the object (V(s) + O). The Syriac does not always keep this word order since the verb does occur at the end of the verse or sentence. The Syriac word order is a bit more free and flexible when compared with the Hebrew, although the Hebrew does deviate from this rule as well (i.e. VSO or SVO or OV), especially in poetry like the psalms. In other instances, the Syriac uses the verb in a different tense, or a completely different verb or it repeats the verbal tense as used by the Hebrew (e.g. Psalm 87:2).

2.9.3 The jussive and cohortative

Syriac has lost two forms for commands: for the indirect command to the first person known as the cohortative and the indirect command to the second (where the second person is jussive) or third person known as the jussive. Hebrew has both the jussive and the cohortative and in Chapter 4 it will be demonstrated how the Peshitta treated indirect commands (jussive and cohortative) found in the Masoretic Text.[8]

2.9.4 The perfect and the imperfect

The perfect and the imperfect are two tenses in Hebrew that are also frequently used in Syriac. Since Hebrew and Syriac are both North-West Semitic languages, one would expect that the Syriac would always render perfect for perfect and imperfect for imperfect, but this is not always the case. The Syriac tends to a tense system, while the Hebrew has a mixed system of tense and state.

The perfect renders the past tense, which is a complete action, while the imperfect renders the present or future tense, which is an incomplete action.[9]

[8] See 4.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 214) and 4.5. Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 220).
[9] See 4.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 92) and 4.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 143).

Chapter 3
Translation technique employed by the Peshitta Psalter

Introduction

The main focus of this research as a whole is on the translation technique that was used in translating the Syriac verbs in the Peshitta Psalter from an original Hebrew text. Such a study requires comparing the source text with the target text. However, as the source text does not exist anymore, the Masoretic has been accepted as the source text.[10] The aim of this chapter is to determine how translation technique can be used in textual criticism to contribute to the reconstruction of the Hebrew archetype of the Peshitta psalms.

To achieve this aim, the concepts of *translation technique*, *textual criticism* and the closely related concept of *literary criticism* will first be investigated. After that, the major ancient versions will be briefly introduced and evaluated as textual witnesses to a Hebrew archetype. In this overview, the emphasis will be on identifying and describing general translation techniques rather than on analysing the possible influence of the other ancient versions on the Peshitta. In this way, guidelines could be discovered to use a text in textual criticism in order to suggest the best original Hebrew text.

The chapter is divided into the following sections:

3.1 Translation technique (p. 58)

3.2 Textual criticism of the Old Testament (p. 61)

3.3 Literary analysis and literary criticism (p. 67)

3.4 Relationship: Translation technique, textual criticism and literary criticism (p. 68)

3.5 The ancient translations (p. 72)

3.6 Septuagint, Aramaic Targums, Vulgate and Peshitta (p. 75)

3.7 Value of the ancient translations in textual criticism (p. 89)

3.8 Conclusion (p. 89)

[10] See 1.8.1 The Masoretic Text as the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the translation of the Peshitta Psalter (p. 15).

3.1 Translation technique

The interest here is in how the source language is presented in the target language. One has to identify significant dissimilarities between the source text and the translated text and investigate why these differences occur.

Although it is important to bear in mind that a general conclusion should not be made about the translation technique of the whole of the Old Testament Peshitta by only using information gathered from one or a few Old Testament books, a study of the translation technique employed by the Peshitta has to start with an individual book.

3.1.1 A few opinions in literature

First, the views of a few authorities on translation technique in the context of a hypothetical source text and an ancient target text will be presented.

Aejmelaeus (1993, 2007: Different connotations, method of studying linguistic phenomena

According to Aejmelaeus (1993:65), scholars with different backgrounds attach different connotations to the concept of translation technique. As a result, their views on the attitudes and the aims of the translators may differ even more than the translations differ from each other. Aejmelaeus (1993:3) is of the opinion that if translation technique would be regarded as a question of the method that has to be followed in the study of linguistic phenomena in the translation, the results would be easier to interpret and more reliable. Aejmelaeus also emphasises the value of method in related studies, particularly in the textual criticism of both Greek and Hebrew texts.

Elsewhere, Aejmelaeus (2007:205) suggests that translation technique should be understood as simply designating the relationship between the text of the translation and its *Vorlage*. In this case, one has to study and compare how the source language was translated into the target language, e.g. how Hebrew was translated into Syriac. It is necessary to find out how the translators dealt with variants or constructs that are present in the source text but that are absent in the target text and *vice versa*.

Molina and Albir (2002): Importance of linguistic phenomena

Molina and Albir (2002:509) support the importance of method by their suggestion that translation technique is to be defined as procedures or principles that are used to analyse and to classify how translation equivalence works.

Tov (1999): Technical term denoting special technique

According to Tov (1999:239), the study of translation technique has received little attention, especially as regards its definition and demarcation. He (Tov, 1999:240) describes the term *translation technique* as a *terminus technicus* that denotes or points to the special technique used by translators when transferring the message of the source language to the target language. Translation technique includes the choice of equivalents, the amount of adherence to the Hebrew text, the equivalence of the Greek (for purposes of this study, 'Greek' would be replaced by 'Syriac') and Hebrew grammatical categories, and etymological exegesis.

Translation technique also refers to some of the conditions under which the translation came into being and about which information is included in the translation itself: the cooperation between translators and the use of earlier translations, according to Tov (1999:240).

Tov (1987): Definition of translation technique in terms of the translator

In an earlier publication, Tov (1987:339, see Greenberg, 2002:1), defines translation technique from the viewpoint of the translator. According to Tov, translation technique comprises the following:

1. firstly, the characteristic approach of the translator to his source text, for instance the choice of lexical equivalents, the degree of adherence to the source, and the equivalence of source and translated grammatical categories;
2. secondly, cooperation between translators and the use of earlier translations; and
3. thirdly, the work of later scribes on the original translation, that is, activity connected with revision.

To summarise this approach, one can define *translation technique* as a term that designates the particular translation features characteristic of any one translator. These take into account the following important aspects: the degree of consistency in the translation choices, the degree of

adherence to the word order, the degree of equivalence between elements in the source language and the target language, and lastly, variants between the source and target texts.

Tov (1997, 1999); Lemmelijn (2001): Literal or free

Tov (1997:17) states the most important aspect of translation technique is the overall character of a version that can be classified as literal, free or somewhere in between. Elsewhere he (Tov, 1997:19–29; Tov, 1999:240; see also Weitzman, 1999:22) explains that translation technique takes Hebrew as its point of departure and its primary objective is to categorise or classify the translation as 'free' or 'literal' in relation to the original Hebrew text.

From the literature, it seems that translations are generally either characterised as 'literal' or as 'free'. Lemmelijn (2001:43) states,

> A translation is called 'literal' when it renders its *Vorlage* very accurately, translating it in an almost mechanical way and often even word by word. In opposition to this, a translation is characterised 'free' when it does not proceed in this manner, in other words when it handles its *Vorlage*, linguistically as well as exegetically, more free.

Gordon (2006): Errors and translation technique

Gordon (2006:255) draws the attention to the evident fact that translators made mistakes. Sometimes, they might have found their task too difficult, and occasionally they took liberties with the text or omitted some words or clauses. As a result of these mistakes, the translated version deviates from the original. An insight into the translation technique used in such instances can help to rectify such mistakes; therefore, knowledge of translation technique is important.[11]

3.1.2 Value of translation technique analysis

From the description of the relation between translation technique and textual criticism by Aejmelaeus (1993:3), it is clear that these two processes are so closely connected that textual criticism should first be investigated before an evaluation of translation technique can be attempted:

[11] See also 3.2.4 Errors in copying and transmitting (p. 65) for a further discussion of errors.

Translation technique focuses on different renderings of the variants either omitted or added, simplification, harmonisations etc, while textual criticism can be summed up as an evaluation of the accuracy of the transmitted text from the source language to the target language in relation towards the Masoretic Text.

3.2 Textual criticism of the Old Testament

At the beginning of this discussion, it has to be emphasised again that the Masoretic text is the source text against which other ancient versions are measured; it is referred to as the *textus receptus* ('received text') of Hebrew Scripture (Tov, 2012:266). In this regard, the Masoretic text is the point of departure for describing and analysing the textual variations, as has been pointed out by Tov (2012:266). [12]

While practising textual criticism, it is essential to remember that original sources have been lost; therefore, one has to be very careful when making comparisons.

3.2.1 What is textual criticism?

In an early publication, Greenlee (1989:11) captures the essence of textual criticism, saying, 'Textual criticism is the study of copies of any written work of which the autograph (the original) is unknown, with the purpose of ascertaining the original'. Since textual witnesses differ from one another to a greater or lesser extent, the differences of all the witnesses have to be considered. It is important to note that when engaged in the study of textual criticism, the number and importance of variants is the centre of attention (Greenlee, 1989:16). Due to the plurality of Old Testament manuscripts and texts of which some are close to the Masoretic Text, it is difficult to arrive at the original text. Greenlee claims it is impossible.

Tov (1992:80, 1997:4, 2012:1) discusses textual criticism of the Biblical text in the context of the more general concept of *critical study*, which involves an investigation into its development, copying and transmission, and into the processes that have created different readings and texts over centuries. According to Tov (1992:1, 313, 1997:237), the critical study of the Old Testament includes the following: textual criticism, literary criticism and exegetical studies.

[12] See 1.8.1 The Masoretic Text as the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the translation of the Peshitta Psalter (p. 15) again.

Textual criticism is involved with the study of texts, how they have changed and how they have been transmitted from one generation to another is the definition of Tov (1992:1, 313; 1997:237). It deals with the nature and origin of all the witnesses to the composition or text, in this case the Masoretic text compared with the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Peshitta and the Targum (Tov, 2012:1). In the context of this chapter, the study of translation technique is a part of textual criticism.

Descriptive and practical aspects; two phases

Tov (1992:290) says the study of textual criticism is characterised by descriptive and practical aspects. The descriptive aspects of textual criticism deal with the copying process and the transmission of the Biblical text from one generation to the following; the study of practical features focuses on the differences between various texts and the way in which these differences are approached. These include all additions (pluses), omissions (minuses), differences in letters, words and in word order (the sequence of words), as well as differences in vocalisation and word division (Tov, 1992:291).

Later on, Tov (2012:265) more clearly distinguishes two phases in textual criticism: the first one involves *collecting and reconstructing* the data and the second *evaluating* them. The study of variants concerns all the Hebrew and reconstructed details that have been collected and differ from the accepted forms of the Masoretic text. Both the comparison and analysis of the textual differences of witnesses occupy a very significant place in textual criticism. It is therefore necessary to study the textual criticism of each version and its use for the textual criticism of the Old Testament.

Textual criticism and conjectural criticism

In textual criticism, two categories of variants are distinguished: the first deals with the Biblical text as found in the Hebrew manuscripts and how it is reflected in the ancient translations, while the second, conjectural criticism, is the conjectural emendation of the Biblical text, which is invoked when neither the Hebrew text nor the ancient versions have been transmitted in such a way that the text makes sense (Tov, 1992:290; 2012: 265). According to Tov (2012:65), the first category may be described as *textual criticism proper*, while the second may be described as *supplementary textual criticism*.

Identifying translation technique during analysis of the data

During analysis of the data, the translation technique is determined,[13] especially during the collection of variants found in the textual witness. When the data have been collected, a comparison is made between the textual witnesses and the Masoretic text.[14]

3.2.2 Textual criticism and text-critical analysis

It is also necessary to take note of the terms *textual criticism* and *text-critical analysis.*

Textual criticism as study of texts to ascertain which is original

Textual criticism is a very broad field of study, a scientific method through which the best readings are determined in instances where textual witnesses differ from one another, as has been indicated in the previous section. For purposes of making the distinction between textual criticism and text-critical analysis, it is sufficient to accept the brief definition of Tov (1992:1, 313, 1997:17, 2012:1, 2012:265; see also Fischer, 2014:168) that textual criticism is the study of texts and their transmission. Textual criticism as a science is concerned with data that are the result (end product) of textual transmission.

Text-critical analysis as establishing the text of a version

Text-critical analysis is employed also according to the above definition of Tov (1992:1; 287–290). Weitzman (1999:263) includes the reconstruction of the elements of a *Vorlage* from the extant manuscripts of a version in this definition. Further, according to Weitzman, text-critical analysis may be understood within the context of establishing the text of a version. Following Weitzman (1999:263), *text-critical analysis* may further be understood in the context of establishing the original text of a version (*Urtext*). Tov (1992:290) points out that the dominant factor in text-critical analysis is to make evaluations or judgements of variant readings that are the results of textual transmission in a specified text. The objective of the textual critic is to sort through the variants, removing those which are not part of the original text, thus creating a critical text. The purpose of text-critical analysis in this study is to isolate deviations or variants in a version that is presumably based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic Text (Tov, 1997:17). It further includes

[13] See 3.1 Translation technique (p. 58); also 3.4.1 The relationship between translation technique and textual criticism (p. 69).

[14] In Chapter 4 (pp. 91 ff), the variants of the verbal system of Peshitta psalms will be compared with the verbal system of the psalms in the Masoretic Text.

the reconstruction of elements in the same *Vorlage* under investigation (Weitzman, 1999:263). This process will be applied in Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff) in comparing variants of the verbal system of the Peshitta psalms with the verbal system of the Masoretic text.

Conclusion: Textual criticism and text-critical analysis

The broadness of the term textual criticism and related terms may cause confusion, especially in trying to determine or locate the place of translation technique analysis and its relationship to the other aspects of textual criticism. One may take note of the conclusion of Tov (1997:17) about the translation technique used in the Septuagint, namely that the translation technique of the Greek translators provides data for a better understanding of the translator's exegesis and for the text-critical evaluation of the Septuagint; in text-critical analysis, translation technique is employed in an attempt to reconstruct that *Vorlage*.

3.2.3 Function and value of textual criticism

The value of textual criticism is that it is a tool in reconstructing 'the best' original text and in exegesis.

Reconstructing the 'best text'

Textual criticism concerns itself with the original source; in other words, it aims at producing a text that is as close as possible to the original text (Tov, 2012:1). It helps in reconstructing the 'best' text. It is not easy to arrive at the original, as it is unknown. Textual criticism is therefore seen as a tool in striving to arrive at the best text.

Essential tool in exegesis

Textual criticism is a process that provides an essential tool in exegesis (Tov, 2012:283). When practising textual criticism, it is also important to have insight into the intricacies of the exegetical system and the translation technique of the translator. During the process of textual criticism, variants receive attention as they appear.

Textual criticism has become even more important since the Qumran discoveries in 1947, when Biblical texts were excavated of which some are close to the Masoretic Text and others are not.[15]

3.2.4 Errors in copying and transmitting

In textual criticism of a witness, it has to be kept in mind that some of the variants identified may point to errors that occurred during copying and transmitting the text, but they may also be ascribed to a different Vorlage.

The study of the Biblical text encompasses the research on its developmental stage, the manner in which it was copied and how it was transmitted, and also the processes that have created readings and texts over centuries (Tov, 1992:290). During copying and transmission a great variety of errors have been made and such errors need to be corrected. Textual criticism attends to the resultant textual variants. Through textual criticism, errors resulting from problems of hearing, writing or copying the text, reading, transmission, etc can be corrected. There are errors that are not only found in the Hebrew texts, but the variants in translations may also reflect either errors or a different Vorlage. Variants either indicating errors or suggesting a different Vorlage need to be differentiated from one another. According to Brotzman (1994:107), three types of scribal errors crept into the Old Testament throughout the lengthy period in which the text was copied by hand. These errors are:

1. a flaw of little significance caused by a physical defect in the scroll from which the scribe was copying;
2. a very important class of textual corruption that includes a whole series of unintentional errors introduced into ancient Old Testament manuscripts because of the human frailties of the scribes; and
3. a significant category of errors classified as intentional.

Unintentional errors are classified under four headings (Brotzman, 1994:108):

1. errors influenced by the text the scribe was working from;
2. errors that resulted from the scribe's carelessness or tiredness (fallibility);

[15] See 3.5.1 Value of the ancient translations before and after Qumran in textual criticism (p. 73) for a further discussion of the Qumran manuscripts.

3. errors that were caused by dictation and/or hearing; and
4. errors that originated in the scribe's mind or judgment.

Other scribal errors are intentional. These intentional changes made by the scribe are classed into four groups. Following Brotzman (1994:116), they are known as *tiqqune sopherim* ('emendations of the scribe'), *itture sopherim* ('omissions of the scribes'), explanatory glosses, and substitution by euphemisms for what were thought to be vulgar or indelicate expressions in the original text.

In view of the above, it can be concluded that errors found their way into the Old Testament because of the manner in which it was transmitted. These errors are accidental, unintentional and intentional (deliberate). For textual criticism both the unintentional and intentional changes are very significant, as they are to be solved to get to the best translation ever.

3.2.5 Textual apparatus: Biblica Hebraic Stuttgartensia

The textual critic's ultimate objective is the production of a 'critical edition'. This contains the text that the author thinks most closely approximates the original, and it is accompanied by a textual apparatus or an *apparatus criticus* (Waltke, 1989:100; Tov, 2012:1). In the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, the textual apparatus is placed at the bottom of the page. It is very significant in instances where there is a specific problem with a word or two or a phrase in the text. These textual notes are to be interpreted. According to Brotzman (1994:103), there are two major difficulties in reading a textual apparatus: first, a number of symbols refer to a variety of manuscripts and printed editions from which variants are cited; second, other symbols characterise the kind of variant information presented.

As has been indicated above, textual criticism is essential for the study of the Bible, since the original Hebrew and Aramaic have not been preserved. As a result, measures are to be put in place to determine the best text for the best interpretation. The textual apparatus found in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* at the bottom of the page is very important and aids with critical study or critical research of the Bible, especially with regard to the study of textual criticism and exegesis.

This textual apparatus lists selected readings that do not appear in the *Codex Leningradensis*, the text on which the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* edition is based. It is worth noting that the manuscripts referred to as textual witnesses vary according to the degree of their worth. The

textual apparatus helps in solving problems that might have occurred during the lengthy period of transmission and compilation of the Old Testament.

The footnotes do not contain all the important variants, so that one has to consult the ancient versions themselves. If the emphasis were on the Old Testament and the ancient versions, it would have been helpful in the quest of achieving the best text of the original Hebrew Book of Psalms.

3.3 Literary analysis and literary criticism

As stated in the introduction to this chapter (p. 57), the study of literary criticism (or literary analysis) is the third objective of this chapter.

Literary analysis or *literary criticism* is partly related to textual criticism. It is also built on a study of textual witnesses as it concerns itself with questions regarding the origin, date, authorship of Biblical books and can be described as a study of the development of Biblical books. Literary criticism handles all the different aspects relating to the literary composition in its entirety.

According to Lust (1986a:87), literary criticism has the following aim: analysis of variants in a translation specifically created by the scribe, editor or translator. Greenberg (2002:1–25), Mushayabasa (2008:16) and Tov (1992:313) refer to these literary variants as elements that are significant and always present in a translated text and they identify them as the origin, date, structure, authorship, authenticity and uniformity of the text, as well as the relationship of the text to the other versions.

In this regard, no witness to the Biblical text is preferred above another, but the literary character of each translation of a Biblical text is studied with a view to understand it in its own right. This viewpoint is supported by Lust (1986b:19), as it implies understanding each individual textual witness or version.

Literary criticism and textual criticism

Some critics differentiate literary criticism from textual criticism. According to Greenlee (1989:11), the differences between the two can be summed up as follows:

> While textual criticism seeks to determine the original wording of a document, *literary criticism* studies the original text and seeks to determine any sources which may underlie it (Fischer,

> 2014:168, 2014:163, respectively). Textual criticism primarily deals with manuscripts; literary criticism deals largely with elements such as style, vocabulary, and historical background.

The definitions as Greenlee provides them are confusing, since it is impossible to access the lost original text of the Old Testament.

I rather concur with Tov (2012:283) that *textual criticism* is involved with the study of textual witnesses and their transmission, and that *literary criticism* is concerned with the most important questions about the origin, date, structure, authorship, authenticity and literal layers of the Bible books, as well as the analysis of presumed early stages in their development.

Since original manuscripts have not been recovered, *textual criticism* helps us to resolve the question of variation. It helps us to identify and to determine the most reliable wording of the text and, by achieving this goal, to enable us to interpret the text validly.

It has been pointed out that during the process of development, copying and transmission over centuries, differences between the Hebrew and the translated texts may appear. It has also been noted that some of these differences have resulted from textual transmission while others may date from an earlier stage, indicating the *literary* development of a book, which would be of interest to literary critics.

Tov (1992:131–4) presents literary criticism as a field of study distinguished from textual criticism. In this study, it is regarded as part of or closely connected to textual criticism. As has been stated above, the two disciplines are closely related, as one builds on the other.

Having discussed translation technique, textual criticism and literary criticism, the question is what conclusions can be made about the translation technique employed in an ancient text in relation to textual criticism and literary criticism.

3.4 Relationship: Translation technique, textual criticism and literary criticism

The objective of this section is to determine how translation technique relates to both textual criticism and literary criticism. The question will be dealt with in two sub-divisions, namely translation technique and textual criticism in the first and translation technique and literary criticism in the second.

3.4.1 The relationship between translation technique and textual criticism

There is a thin line of differentiation between translation technique and textual criticism. The notion that textual criticism begins to operate at the point where translation technique ends is rather tenuous (Tov, 1997:5). Translation technique deals with the end product of a translator's work, while textual criticism deals with the transmission of the finished work (Aejmelaeus, 1993:69; Tov, 1997:5). This relationship indicates that the two are interrelated, as both has something to do with the final product: translation technique involves some evaluation of the text of a version and its *Vorlage*, while textual criticism investigates the translation produced in relation to the Masoretic Text. Naturally, text-criticism keeps itself busy with the study of texts and their transmission (Tov, 1992:313). It is during text-criticism where the study of translation technique occurs. It has been indicated earlier that Tov (1992:290) argues that textual criticism is divided into two phases: the first phase deals with collecting and reconstructing Hebrew variants, while the second phase concerns itself with evaluating them. The development of the translation technique is embedded in these two stages, but more particularly in the first stage of collecting the Hebrew variants.[16]

This implies that the critic who is investigating a variant that seems to be an addition in a translation has the responsibility to judge whether that 'non-literal' element is a conscious addition by the translator, and thus characterise the version at that particular point as 'free'; or, whether he should rather decide that the element indicates a variant text that lay in a *Vorlage* of the version and so characterises the translation as 'literal'. Making the aforementioned decision is rather complicated and complex (Lust, 1986b:14–15; Tov, 1997:39). According to Weitzman (1999:273), the relationship between textual criticism and translation technique can be described as a question of interlocking interests.

Textual criticism functions in the first place with reference to a Biblical text as found in the Hebrew manuscripts and presented in the ancient versions, and in the second place, the conjectural emendation of the Biblical text, which is employed when neither the Hebrew manuscripts nor the ancient versions transmit satisfactory evidence (Tov, 1997:5). Alternatively, to Tov's view of two

[16] See *Descriptive and practical aspects; two phases* (p. 62); *Identifying translation technique during analysis of the data* (p. 63).

consecutive phases in textual criticism, the relationship between translation technique and textual criticism can be employed in such a way that one is used to study the other. The study by Joosten (2005:217–223), which is based on the Minor Prophets, can shed more light on this relationship. Joosten (2005:218) concentrates on the reduction of repetitions, that is, a word occurring twice in the Masoretic text in the same clause or sentence is not repeated in the target language. He suggests, for example, that *repletion repetition* may be due to emphasis where the Masoretic text will repeat or have two identical words, whereas the Greek will translate only one. An example is found in Hosea 5:14:

MT: אֲנִי אֲנִי אֶטְרֹף	Greek: καὶ ἐγὼ ἁρπῶμαι
I, even I, will rend/tear	and I will seize/tear

The repetition of the first personal pronoun, 'I', indicates emphasis in this case: 'I myself' or 'I and no other'. There are a number of examples of deductions between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. Deliberating on these deductions, Joosten suggests that such deductions could have been in the *Vorlage* of the translator, or the translator's deliberate change, or could have resulted from the transmission to the Greek Text. Omissions and additions as found in the Minor Prophets are also found in the Book of Psalms. Joosten (2005:221–222) concludes that the elimination of verbal repetitions was a conscious technique employed by the Greek translator of the Minor Prophets. It is clear that the translation technique in this instance is characterised in terms of the manner in which the text was translated from the source text into the target text. It is an undeniable fact that translation technique involves textual judgement. It is also an undeniable fact that translation technique can be useful in textual criticism and that there is a need for it (Tov, 1997:18). Textual criticism evaluates and judges the readings. This is also the case when comparing the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta with each other.

One of the most significant characteristics of the macrostructure of a Hebrew poem is the patterns of verbal repetitions (Van der Lugt, 2006:81, 2010:4). Psalms are written in the form of Hebrew poetry and thus poetry rules apply. Parallelism is a common feature in Hebrew poetry. With regard to parallelism, the poet uses two lines of a text to bring his main point or statement across, that is,

in his first line, he makes his main point known and in the second, he makes an addition to the first statement. It is common to find verbal repetitions in the psalms.

Parallelism is not the only figure of speech found in the Book of Psalms. Double translation of Hebrew words or phrases is sometimes employed as technique by the Targum Psalms (see Stec, 2017:90–92). They are either expansive or explanatory, for example in Psalm 2:6, Psalm 89:46 and Psalm 119:119. At times, double translation or two different explanations for a word give an alternative in the Masoretic text.

3.4.2 The relationship between translation technique and literary analysis

According to Van Rooy (2007:2), the relationship between translation technique and literary analysis is apparent even at the broader level of textual studies. Literary analysis is essential and it is vital to have knowledge of literary elements that are significant and always present in a translated text. In this regard, even though the study conducted is based on translation technique, it is essential to have knowledge of literary signs or characteristics, according to Adair (2000:9). Greenberg (2002:4 ff) indicates an important aspect and need of the aforementioned, when she sees it befitting to discuss the date and place of the Peshitta translation in a study focussed on translation technique. The deliberation of Weitzman (1999; 2005) on the number of the Peshitta translators and the influence of other versions on the Peshitta are based on translation technique and literary criticism. All of these opinions indicate that there is a connection between translation technique and literary criticism. For this reason, literary criticism or analysis can be used as a vehicle to study translation technique, while at the same time, translation technique can also be used to study the literary nature of the text. There is therefore a strong connection existing between translation technique and literary criticism. One is very useful for the study of the other one.

Regarding the characteristics of the Peshitta psalms, Carbajosa (2008:12) mentions that over and above the fact that only short articles are found on the Peshitta psalms, these articles only touch marginally on the subject and there are only notes regarding the textual problems of the relationship of the Peshitta psalms with other versions. For this reason, the characteristics of the Peshitta or the translation techniques employed by the Peshitta, as well as other factors that may

have influenced the Syriac version or text that has come down to us, need careful and responsible investigation. Such an investigation may deliver results that would contribute to the value of the Peshitta in textual criticism. The contribution of Weitzman regarding the origin of the Peshitta Psalms and its *Vorlage* plays a major and significant role in this regard.

Conclusion: Relationship between translation technique, textual criticism and literary criticism

The close connection between translation technique, literary criticism and textual criticism can clearly be demonstrated by referring to the contribution of Lust (1986b:87). Lust argues that once textual criticism is done, one is in the position to ask whether the differences between the Greek version and the Hebrew version are intentional or unintentional, or whether such differences are present because of the scribe, an editor or a translator. Translation technique, literary criticism and textual criticism are all important, though each will place emphasis and focus on a different aspect contributing to a single role. This also applies where two versions concerned are a Syriac and Hebrew version, as in the present study.

3.5 The ancient translations

In the ancient world and in the Middle Ages, the Old Testament was translated into different languages, of which the most important ones were Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Latin and Arabic (Cox, 2017:177; Tov, 1992: 121). The four major translations are the Septuagint, the Aramaic Targums, the Vulgate and the Peshitta.

3.5.1 Value of the ancient translations before and after Qumran in textual criticism

All relevant and available material from the ancient times and the Middle Ages, also material derived from translated works, are collected for textual criticism. Although the ancient translations are of utmost importance in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the translations have to be measured and tested against the Hebrew at all times. In some instances, their possible Hebrew *Vorlagen* have to be reconstructed when they differ from the Masoretic text. The differences can occur in respect of a word, preposition, a verb and other elements of the text. Deviation is important; therefore, textual criticism pays attention to any significant difference between the source text and the target language.

There is overwhelming evidence that the ancient translations played a very significant role in the textual criticism of the Old Testament before 1947, which is the year in which the Qumran were made (Tov, 1992:122, Strawn 2017b:17). Before this discovery, the ancient manuscripts of the ancient translations were the earliest and most significant sources for providing knowledge of an original Hebrew text. Therefore, in the absence of ancient Hebrew sources, scholars attached much significance to the ancient translations.

A substantial amount of the documents excavated at Qumran contained Biblical materials (Van Rooy, 2005:537). This is another reason why textual criticism is important. Tov (1992:122) argues that the Qumran discoveries seemingly decreased the value of the ancient translations, since reliance on a Hebrew text is preferable to the use of ancient translations of an unknown Hebrew source. Even if this is the case, difference of opinion exists. Some ancient translations, especially the Septuagint, are still held in high regard as very important translations, since they reflect significant textual traditions (e.g. Palestinian/ Egyptian or Babylonian) that differ from both the Masoretic text and the Qumran texts (Tov, 1992:122). It is believed that the Torah translation was carried out in Egypt, while the books Esther, Qoheleth, sections of the Septuagint of Samuel and Kings, Canticles, Lamentations and Ruth were translated in Palestine (see Tov, 2012:131). For the characteristics of the Palestinian recension, the Egyptian recension and the Babylonian recension, see Tov (2012:173–174). Several such important readings are also found in other ancient translations.

The Biblical manuscripts discovered at Qumran from 1947 and onwards play an important role in scholarly research, since most of them do not differ much from the Masoretic text. However, the scarcity of other Hebrew witnesses is still felt. Not one of the books of the Old Testament has been preserved in its entirety at Qumran. For a complete text of the entire Old Testament in Hebrew, we are still dependent on the manuscripts of the tenth century AD and later (Würthwein, 1995:11). It is a well-known fact that the Jews destroyed defective manuscripts and that when the text of the vocalised Hebrew Bible was established in the tenth century, all the older manuscripts representing earlier stages of development were considered defective; consequently, they ultimately disappeared (Würthwein, 1995:11). According to Würthwein (1995:11), it is true that manuscripts were often destroyed during the medieval persecutions of the Jews, not only by their adversaries,

but also by the Jews themselves to prevent their sacred books from falling into the hands of infidels. Because of these acts, the ancient versions are more important for Old Testament textual criticism than for New Testament textual criticism.

3.5.2 Identification with or deviation from the Masoretic Text

It is a widely accepted view with regard to the ancient translations that if the content of an ancient translation is identical to that of the Masoretic Text, its *Vorlage* is taken to have been identical to the Masoretic text (Weitzman, 1999:269). The problem is that even though much of the translation is more or less equal to the Hebrew in many cases, there are differences as well, and these differences cannot be neglected. No translation of the Old Testament is in all respects equal to the Hebrew.

We cannot generalise when it comes to translation technique, since all books do not follow the same technique. As has been pointed out at the start of this chapter, when considering translation technique, it is very important to approach each book in its own right, even if different books show the same translation technique. Tov (1992:123) states that in both the Targum and the Peshitta, the consonantal framework is almost completely identical to that of the Masoretic Text. Consequently, the reconstruction of a source text is limited to a small number of words.

3.5.3 Textual criticism of the ancient translations

When practising textual criticism as a science, text-critical analysis of the ancient translations is essential. Textual criticism is very interested in cases where there is a difference between the Masoretic text and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the ancient translations. One of the objectives of textual criticism is to solve the differences by searching for the original word or clause used in a sentence, especially where deviation occurs from the Masoretic Text.

The research field of textual criticism is textual witnesses and their transmission. However, the study and analysis of these texts leads to other fields of study such as exegesis. According to Tov (2012:1), the analysis during textual criticism often involves an attempt to discover the original form of details in a complete text, or even of large stretches of text, although what exactly constitutes (an) 'original text(s)' is subject to much debate. As the original text is lost, it is difficult to determine the original text and therefore the aim is to reconstruct the best text possible. The

difference may be the result of translation technique or the result of a different *Hebrew Vorlage* or simply misunderstanding the Hebrew. The differences among the different textual witnesses, as well as textual differences of similar nature, require text-critical analysis (Tov, 2012:3).

3.6 Septuagint, Aramaic Targums, Vulgate and Peshitta

The Septuagint, the Aramaic Targums, the Peshitta and the Vulgate play a vital role in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, since they collectively contain all available relevant material from antiquity and the Middle Ages, including material derived from translated works (Tov, 2012:115). Brief attention is paid to these major versions, which were translated from a Hebrew text. It should be kept in mind that these translations had their own transmission history and as such they are also the object of textual criticism.

3.6.1 Septuagint (LXX)

The term *Septuagint* is derived from the Latin word *septuaginta*, which means 'seventy'; therefore, the roman figure LXX for 'seventy' (Aitken, 2015:1; Smith, 2017:82; Tov, 2012:128). The Septuagint originated in Alexandria, Egypt, and developed from the translation of the Torah from the third century BC (Fischer, 2014:100). The Septuagint is the Greek version that consists of all the Hebrew Scriptures (the Jewish Tanakh and the Christian Old Testament Scriptures) and a number of Greek apocryphal books. It is a witness to the text of the Old Testament and as such it is the text through which the Greek world first came into contact with the Old Testament revelation. According to Tov (2012:129), the collective name *Septuagint* denotes both the original translation of Hebrew-Aramaic Scriptures into Greek and a collection of sacred Greek writings in their present, canonical form. The early church accepted it simply as the standard form of the Old Testament. According to Dines (2004:27), by the time of the first complete manuscripts of the Bible in the fourth century, all the books of the Septuagint were established as Scripture in the Christian churches. Würthwein (1995:50) states Augustine demanded from Jerome to use this canonical form of the text (LXX), and not the Hebrew original, as the basis for his translation (Fischer, 2014:142–143). The Septuagint receives more attention with regard to textual criticism than the other versions. According to Fischer, not only was it valued highly in antiquity, but in the nineteenth century many scholars practically preferred it over the Masoretic text (Fischer, 2014:143; Smith, 2017:87). The

Septuagint can assist in the recovery of an earlier, pre-Masoretic text that would be closer to the original than the Masoretic text. The Septuagint is a very important witness to an early stage of the Bible and Greek is also one of the first languages into which the Hebrew Bible was translated (Aitken, 2015:2; Tov, 2012:132). Its significance is that it can help to reconstruct and to correct errors committed during transmission and help to find the most reliable text, although not the original.

As has been indicated above, the Septuagint consists of two types of books. First, there are the Greek version of the twenty-four canonical Hebrew-Aramaic books, which contribute significantly to Biblical studies, especially in understanding textual transmission and exegesis. Second, there are books not found in the Hebrew canon, the *Apocrypha* (the 'hidden' books) in Greek, and the *sefarim ḥiṣoniyyim* ('the outside books') in Hebrew (Tov, 2012:129). The Septuagint consists of the Pentateuch (Genesis to Deuteronomy), the historical books (Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms [Samuel–Kings], 1–2 Paraleipomenōn, 1 and 2 Esdras, Esther, Judith, Tobit, 1–4 Maccabees), the wisdom books (Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Job, Sirach (Ben Sira/Ecclesiasticus) and prophetic books (the minor prophets [Hosea–Malachi], Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel (Dines, 2004:11–25).

According to the Epistle of Aristeas, it is generally accepted that the Torah translation (Genesis–Deuteronomy) was carried out in Egypt at the beginning of the third century BC (Tov, 2012:131). This dating is compatible with the early date of several Greek papyri and leather fragments of the Torah found at Qumran and in Egypt, of which some date from the middle of the second century to the first century BC. According to Tov (2012:131), the remaining books were translated at different times. It is important to note that each book has its own history. There are various editions of the Septuagint.

Regarding the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint relating to the Torah, Tov (2012:136) is of the view or opinion that the reconstructed *Vorlage* of a Septuagint book only rarely reflects the textual features that characterise the book as a whole. The *Vorlage* of the Septuagint Torah is largely characterised by a large number of harmonising pluses.

According to Smith (2017:82), the exact date in which the Septuagint Psalms/Psalter was translated is not known, although the borrowed translation equivalents and literary allusions affirm the traditional approach that it postdates the Pentateuch. Smith (2017:87) further indicates consensus among scholars that the Septuagint Psalms is a translation of the formal equivalence type, though he defines features differently and accounts for them as such. In as far as its translation is concerned, it is accepted that it is translated from a Hebrew source that is close to the Masoretic text. The Septuagint Psalms is an important source or version for the text-critical study of the Masoretic psalms, but one has to take its translation technique into consideration and to treat its text as *sub iudice* pending the publication of a fully critical edition (Smith, 2017:87). The differences between the Septuagint and the Masoretic text resulting from the Hebrew variants in the translators' Hebrew *Vorlage* can be ascribed to the translators' exegesis and techniques or inner-translational development or a *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic text (Tov, 2016a:209). The agreements that exist between some Hebrew scrolls discovered at Qumran and the Septuagint contribute greatly to the credibility of the Septuagint in textual criticism studies of the Old Testament (Tov, 2016a:210).

Regarding the translation technique of the Septuagint Psalms, it is either characterised as 'literal' or 'free' (Smith 2017:85; Tov, 2016a:198–199). In as far as the text-critical value of the Septuagint Psalms is concerned, it is a very a valuable version for the textual criticism of the Masoretic Psalms.

Some of the revised editions of the Septuagint are the following: *Kaige-Theodotion*, Aquila (125 AD), Symmachus (end of second century or beginning of third century) and Hexapla (middle third century).

3.6.1.1 Kaige-Theodotion

Kaige is derived from the pervasive translation of the Hebrew גַּם and וְגַם by the Greek καί γε, all meaning 'even' or 'and even' (Brotzman and Tully, 2016:67, Fischer, 2014:107; Gentry 2016:217). This is the revision of the Old Greek (Septuagint) translation of the Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (Fischer, 2014:107; Tov, 2012:143). According to Würthwein (1995:55), this fragment, which may approximately be dated 50 AD, demonstrates that even prior to Jewish-Christian discussions there had been a trend to conform the Greek to the Hebrew text. This revision of the

Old Greek is linked to Theodotion, who was probably from Ephesus and apparently lived at the end of the second century. Following Tov (2012:143), the text-critical value of the *Kaige* of Theodotion is that it reflects the Masoretic Text.

3.6.1.2 Aquila

Aquila was a Greek-speaking Jew, who came from Pontus and was a disciple of Rabbi Akiba (Brotzman and Tully, 2016:68, Tov, 2012:144; Würthwein, 1995:55). He worked on his revision of the Septuagint in approximately 12 AD (Tov, 2012:144). In the revision, he presents two different editions for some books, but it is difficult to establish the relation between the two editions of a pair. He used a literal approach in his revision and created a version one would not understand without knowledge of the Hebrew source text. His approach to Scripture, which was the result of the influence of his mentor, Rabbi Akiba, was that every letter and word in Scripture is meaningful (Tov, 2012:144). He attempted to represent every word, particle and even morphological constituent found in the source text or language accurately in the target text or language. His translation technique was therefore characterised by the ideal of producing an accurate translation. Fischer (2014:108) is of the opinion that the Aquila translation confirms that the Greek-speaking Jews distanced themselves from the Septuagint, which was left to Christianity in its different forms. Its value is found in the fact that it reflects the Masoretic Text.

3.6.1.3 Symmachus

Würthwein (1995:56) states, 'Symmachus produced another new version ca. A.D. 170 designed not only for literal accuracy but also for good Greek idiom.' The aim of the Symmachus is best described by Salvesen (1998:178) as accurately reflecting the sense of the Hebrew original (source text) in clear Greek. This revision is usually dated towards the end of the second century or beginning of the third century AD (Tov, 2012:144). On the one hand, Epiphanius sees Symmachus as a Samaritan; while on the other hand, Eusebius and Jerome see him as a Jewish-Christian Ebionite (Tov, 2012:144; Würthwein, 1995:56). According to Fischer (2014:108), Jerome had a high regard for this translation, although only few of his quotations and Hexapla fragments have survived. One can agree with Tov (2012:145) that the Symmachus text reflects the Masoretic Text and thus it is important for text-critical evaluation.

3.6.1.4 The Hexapla

The Hexapla is a massive work that was compiled by the Alexandrian theologian Origen in approximately 230 to 240 AD in an attempt to achieve some clarification regarding the internal requirements of the church. This work has six columns, which include the Hebrew text, its transliteration in Greek characters and four Greek translations (Brotzman and Tully, 2016:69, Tov, 2012:145). Furthermore, regarding the text-critical value of the Hexapla, Tov (2012:146) argues that in spite of internal differences, sometimes reflecting different Hebrew readings, all the columns of the Hexapla, except for the fifth (the LXX), reflect the Masoretic text.

In summary, the Septuagint is a vital textual witness to the Hebrew Bible since it is the earliest (first) translation from the Hebrew Bible into Greek. It is a very significant textual witness and has to be studied as a potential source to help with the textual criticism of the Masoretic text. The Septuagint has its own textual value as a textual witness to the Masoretic text and makes a significant contribution in its own right. Without doubt, it is an important witness to the Old Testament and can offer help or solutions in the emendation of many corrupted passages (Würthwein, 1995:70). However, in using it as a textual witness to the Old Testament text, one has to be very careful (Würthwein, 1995:71).

3.6.2 The Aramaic Targum/Targumim

The Targum (plural Targumim) is the designation of the Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Bible. According to Tov (2012:148), the Targums were created in the Jewish communities as the official companion to the Hebrew Scriptures in rabbinic Judaism. It was prepared for the learned, not for the masses. Fischer (2014:131) sees the Targums as translations more deliberately orientated to an audience, an attempt to present the Biblical text as relevant and edifying. The Targums paved the way to some modernisation and exegesis in translations, but they did not affect the Hebrew text. The Targums have maintained a more special status in Jewish communities than any other translations throughout the centuries.

Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language in postexilic Judaism and was replaced by Aramaic, which was the official written language of the Western Persian Empire. During this period, Hebrew was still used in the synagogue, but later the documents were translated into Aramaic. The translation

was necessary, since the ordinary Jews spoke Aramaic. The main reason for the transcription was therefore to enable the lay Jew to understand the Bible. The Targums are characterised by the fact that they have more paraphrases than literal translations. Würthwein (1988:80) states the Targums in particular attempt to avoid anthropomorphic and anthropopathic statements about God. This approach occasionally almost ignores the meaning of the Hebrew text, reducing the value of the Targums as textual witnesses but making them important documents for the history of Old Testament exegesis. The two most important Targums that need to be differentiated are texts representing early Palestinian Targums and those revised in Babylon. Regarding the revisions, Onkelos was responsible for revising the Pentateuch and Jonathan for revising the Prophets (Alexander 1985:17–21; Würthwein, 1995:80).

Targums were created for each of the books of the Bible (excluding Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel), sometimes more than one for a specific book (Brotzman and Tully, 2016:77, Tov, 2012:148). Although the Aramaic version of the Targum was translated from the Hebrew Bible, its division differs from that of the Hebrew Bible. It is divided into two main divisions, namely the Targum Ketuvim (the Writings) and Targum Torah (Pentateuch). Both the Targum Psalms and the Targum Job share a common characteristic, namely the use of multiple translations (Stec, 2017:90).

3.6.2.1 Targum Onkelos

The Targum Onkelos is the best known of the Targumim and it was created by Onkelos, the proselyte, under the guidance of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (Tov, 2012:149). It follows the 'simple' or 'plain' sense of Scripture, but in the poetical sections, it contains many exegetical elements. There is no single authoritative form of a text and, as a result, all manuscripts of this Targum differ from each other to a greater or lesser extent. There is no agreement among scholars with regard to the date of the origin of this Targum in its present form.

The Targum Onkelos is the official Targum of the Pentateuch (Brotzman, 1994:70). This Targum presents a more literal translation of the Hebrew text, though there is a tendency to paraphrase sometimes. Brotzman (1994:70) further argues that the Targum Onkelos was probably reduced to writing in the second century AD, but that its text is based on pre-Christian traditions. Judaism officially recognised and accepted the Targum Onkelos.

3.6.2.2 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, also known as Jerusalem Targum 1

Following Tov (2012:149), the Jerusalem Targum 1 has been incorrectly named 'Targum Jonathan' since the fourteenth century (Fischer, 2014:135). Its final redaction is dated as the seventh and eighth centuries.

Like the Targum Onkelos, the Targum Jonathan, which also originated from Palestine, was officially recognised and accepted by Judaism. At the dawn of the fourth century AD, the Targum Jonathan was cited as authoritative in the Babylonian Talmud (Brotzman, 1994:70). Unlike the Targum Onkelos, the Targum Jonathan contains prophetic books of the Old Testament: the Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings) and the Latter Prophets (the Major Prophets, excluding Daniel and the Minor Prophets). It also contains more paraphrases than the Targum Onkelos. The book of Isaiah is the best example of the style. Fischer states that the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is by far the most comprehensive Targum of the Pentateuch (Fischer, 2014:135).

A brief description of the Targum Psalms will now be given.

3.6.2.3 The Targum Psalms

Following Stec (2004:1), the Targum Psalms (TgPs) was neither widely known nor widely used until at a relatively late date. The author (Stec, 2004:2) continues that the date of compilation of this Targum remains uncertain. It is suggested that the written form has come into existence during the fourth to sixth century AD, although it is just an assumption. To him, it is even possible that it contains material belonging to more than one period.

3.6.2.4 Character of the Targum Psalms

Alexander classifies the Targum into two broad types, namely Type A and Type B (Alexander, 1985:17–21; see also Stec, 2004:2). He states that Type A is composed of a base translation plus explanatory expansions. He further argues that the base translation follows the Hebrew very closely and as a whole it corresponds to it, while explanatory pluses are inserted in such a way that they can normally be bracketed out, leaving a linguistically viable and non-expansive version of the original. According to him, Type B consists of a free-running paraphrase in which the original is more or less 'dissolved' into the expanded translation, so that it is difficult, if not impossible, to extract a grammatically viable base translation from the mass of pluses. He is of the opinion that

Type A is normal in the Pentateuch, while Type B is common in the Five Megilloth[17] (Stec, 2004:2). Many of the changes made to the Hebrew original in Type A as base translation are stylistic and follow certain well-established conventions.

Stec (2004:3) indicates that a feature the Targum Psalms shares with the Targum of Job (TgJob) is the use of multiple translations. He further comments that in some cases a whole verse has two translations, but there are many individual words or phrases for which an alternative translation is given, usually in the margin. The double translation of verses appears more frequently in the Targum Job than in the Targum Psalms: in the Targum Job there are forty-two verses with a double translation and four with a triple translation, while the Targum Psalms have five verses with a double translation (76:11; 77:11; 78:64; 88:3; 110:1) and none with a triple translation (Stec, 2004:3). Regarding the alternative translation of individual words or phrases, it is argued that most of the deviations of the Targum Psalms from the Masoretic Psalms are supported by both the Septuagint (Smith, 2017:82) and the Peshitta (Carbajosa, 2017:93–98). These deviations are mainly the result of a different vocalisation of the same consonantal text (Stec, 2017:92).

3.6.3 The Vulgate

From the outset, it is vital to note that regarding the Latin Bible translations, a distinction is made between the *Vetus Latina/Old Latin*, which is a translation based on the Septuagint, and the *Vulgata,* which is a translation based on the Hebrew text (Fischer, 2014:140). It is a translation of Scripture (Old and New Testament) and most of the Apocrypha into Latin. Between 390 and 405 AD, the church father Jerome translated the Hebrew Bible into Latin after having undertaken a revision of the Vetus Latina of Psalms, which later became known as 'Psalterium Romanum', as well as a revision of the Book of Psalms in the 'Hexapla', the 'Psalterium Gallicanum' (Dickie, 2017:104; Tov, 2012:153; Würthwein, 1995:96). The Latin Vulgate differs from other ancient translations, in so far as it was translated by a single author.

There are two critical editions that are based on medieval manuscripts, the earliest manuscript being the codex Amiatinus, which dates to the beginning of the eighth century. The Vulgate is very important to the history of exegesis of the Bible, especially in comparison with Jerome's

[17] Five scrolls.

commentaries on the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah, which was written between 406 and 420 AD. These commentaries provided space for Jerome to deviate from his earlier translation (Tov, 2012:153). The text of the Vulgate reflects the Masoretic text (Tov, 2012:153). According to Sasson (2017:105), Jerome's earliest translation, *Iuxta Hebraeos*, is based on the Hebrew Psalter; for this reason, it more closely resembles the Hebrew than later translations of the other Biblical books.

According to Sasson, the following aspects are very important when investigating the translation technique of the Vulgate psalms in relation to the Masoretic psalms: stereotyping and semantic equivalence, Hebrew idioms, attention to context, style and transliterations (Sasson, 2017:106–109). Concerning the translation technique, Jerome extols the virtue and the need of translation as 'sense for sense' (*sensum de sensu*), and he emphasises the value of translating Scripture according to sense and not just simply the words (Sasson, 2017:283). In as far as the text-critical value is concerned Sasson mentions that it is vital to be aware of three issues: confusion of consonants, omissions and additions, as well as vocalisation and *Ketiv*/*Qere* (Sasson, 2017:109–110). Most scholars have noted that the Hebrew text or *Vorlage* underlying the Vulgate is in its entirety very close to the consonantal text of the Masoretic text. According to Sasson, the relative lack of consistency in rendering the Hebrew expressions by the Vulgate leads to tremendous difficulties in reconstructing the *Vorlage* and does not render many variants for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible (Graves, 2016:287). The Vulgate very seldom reflects a variant in the consonantal text reading in the same way as the one in the Masoretic manuscript. The Vulgate is very significant for the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible (Graves, 2016:287).

3.6.4 The Syriac version (Peshitta)

At a rather late date, The Syriac church designated the version of the Old Testament in common use as the *Peshitta*, 'the simple or plain version' (Carbajosa, 2016:262; Fischer, 2014:136; Tov, 2012:151; Weitzman, 1999:2; Würthwein, 1988:85, 1995:85). It is a complex text lacking a critical edition that describes the manuscript tradition. Syriac information about the origin of the Peshitta is largely of a legendary nature and of little value (Würthwein, 1988:85, 1995:85). Tov (2012:151) states that several scholars identified presumably Christian elements in the Peshitta (contested by Weitzman, 1999:240–44) and, accordingly, believe that the Peshitta originated with the early

Christians in the first or second century AD, probably the second century AD at the time of the conversion of Abgar IX, King of Edessa, to Christianity.

The Peshitta Psalter was translated from a proto-Masoretic, unvocalised Hebrew text that was in circulation around the second century AD (Carbajosa, 2008:2; Strawn, 2017a:42–61) before the Vulgate (Sasson, 2017:104–114) and Targum translations (Stec, 2017:88–93), therefore attesting to a *Vorlage* close to the Masoretic text (Carbajosa, 2017:93).

The Peshitta plays a vital role in textual criticism, as its Hebrew source was close to the Masoretic text on the one hand, but on the other hand, it reflects more variants than the Targumim and the Vulgate (Tov, 2012:153). Some scholars note a clear agreement between the Peshitta and the Targumim or the Septuagint; therefore, they argue that the Peshitta was influenced by both the Targum and the Septuagint (Tov, 2012:152).

Like Carbajosa,[18] Wolters (1999:27) says that the transmission history of the Syriac Biblical text can be divided into three phases, but his dating differs from Carbajosa's: the first stage ends with the sixth century AD; the second corresponds roughly to the seventh and eighth centuries; and the third begins in the ninth century. Wolters (1999:27) contends that the divergences of Syriac from Hebrew, especially in the third stage, should not be attributed to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* but rather to development within the Syriac tradition itself.

The research on the Peshitta is essential to establish its history and textual importance for all the books of the Old Testament. Without doubt, it can be affirmed that as a version in a language closely related to Hebrew, the Peshitta is very important among the early witnesses to the Old Testament text, and it certainly has to be taken into account when practising textual criticism.

3.6.4.1 Translation technique of the Peshitta

It is significant that the most characteristic feature of the Peshitta Psalter is the clarity and readability of the translation. The translator of the Peshitta Psalter was more concerned about the reader than an exact rendering of the original text and therefore focused on producing a readable and comprehensible translation (Carbajosa, 2008:381, 2017:96). Carbajosa (2017:96) distinguishes three phenomena that characterise the Peshitta Psalter and attest to its free translation technique:

[18]See *Free but faithful to the original text* (p. 11).

accommodation to the context, harmonisation and assimilation. The Peshitta Psalter did not follow the Hebrew text or *Vorlage* at its disposal in a very literal translation, but frequently translated the sentences according to the standards of the Syriac language. It is clear that the Peshitta version respects the Syriac syntactic rules in its aspiration to produce a clear and readable final product in correct Syriac. It remained faithful to the Syriac language structure. This attitude is reflected in adding words, phrases or parts not present in its Hebrew *Vorlage* or adding them.

The Peshitta is vital for textual criticism as a witness to the Hebrew Bible, but it must be used with great caution precisely because of its translation technique characterised by flexibility and freedom (Carbajosa, 2017:96).

3.6.4.2 Relationship of the Peshitta to the other major ancient versions

In order to use the translation technique of the Peshitta in textual criticism to reconstruct a Hebrew archetype it is necessary to be informed about the relationship of the Peshitta with the other ancient versions to evaluate textual similarities and dissimilarities.

The Peshitta and the Masoretic Text

Several authors comment on the relationship between the Peshitta and the Masoretic Text. This study aligns it to the view of Weitzman (1999:15), who argues that for the most part, the Peshitta stands close to the Hebrew of the Masoretic text as regards meaning. According to Weitzman, the Peshitta can be fairly described as an idiomatic, though faithful translation of the Hebrew original (Weitzman, 1999:6). Following Tov (2012:152), as regards Isaiah and Psalms, the two translations often reflect a common exegetical tradition. Regarding the textual character of the Peshitta, Fischer (2014:137–138) also argues that it has been long known and accepted that the Peshitta translation of the Pentateuch was largely dependent on the Masoretic Text and also closely related to the Targums; for this reason, all these ancient versions are very important to particular Bible books.

Once again, it must be emphasised that one should analyse each book on its own rather than generalise about its features. This is also true of the translation technique employed in every book.

The Peshitta and the Septuagint

As has been indicated previously, many scholars characterise the Peshitta ('the simple translation') by stating it was directly influenced by the Septuagint (Lund, 1995:85).[19] One cannot ignore the fact that Septuagint did play a role in shaping the Peshitta text, but the Syriac maintains its structure and its independence as language. Lund further argues that the extent of the Septuagint influence has to be ascertained, since it is clear the translation technique differs from one book to another, and it is alleged to be clearly perceived in the psalms. A specific characteristic of the Peshitta is that it sometimes has more than one Syriac word as an equivalent for a single word in the Hebrew, or it can even use a noun with a similar meaning in the place of a verb.

Individual books of the Peshitta and the other ancient versions

As it has been remarked previously, one cannot generalise when investigating the translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into the Peshitta, but one has to study each book individually as the books differ from each other.[20] As few remarks are now made about the Syriac translations of individual books or groups of books since the translation technique of each is to be determined.

As far as the Pentateuch is concerned, it is widely accepted that it is largely dependent on the Masoretic text and it is further believed that Ezra-Chronicles were translated in 200 AD (Tov, 2012:137). Regarding the textual character of the Peshitta, Fischer (2014:137) states it is a well-known fact that the Peshitta is largely based on the Masoretic text and very closely related to the Aramaic Targum. Apart from the Pentateuch, the books of Chronicles also indicate a very close relation to the Targum tradition, especially with regard to its choice and use of the concept of the divine presence, thus differing completely from the Masoretic text (Fischer, 2014:137). Furthermore, the book of Proverbs has different textual features and it is also closer to the Targum than the Masoretic text. Fischer further indicates that in relation to other Old Testament books like Isaiah, Twelve Prophets and Psalms, the influence of the Targum tradition is minimal and that the relation of the Peshitta to the Septuagint is much closer, sometimes they are even identical (Fischer, 2014:137). As Weitzman (1999:68) indicates, parallels are found in the Peshitta and the Septuagint in relation to the Masoretic text, although with striking differences from book to book.

[19] See 3.6.4 The Syriac version (Peshitta) (p. 84).
[20] See 3.5.2 Identification with or deviation from the Masoretic Text (p. 74).

Weitzman (1999:68) further argues that the Septuagint influence is frequent in Ezekiel, the Twelve Prophets, Proverbs, Song of Songs and Qohelet, while it is only occasionally found in Genesis, Joshua, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms and Esther; and it is non-existent in Samuel, Kings, Job, Lamentations and Chronicles. Weitzman adds the parallels regarding Daniel are rather with Theodotion.

There is further mention of striking parallels in the Peshitta and Targum Pentateuch. Sometimes they are attributed to the fact that the Peshitta was dependent on the Targum as a source text rather than on the Masoretic text (that is, a Hebrew *Vorlage* almost identical to the Masoretic text), according to Weitzman (1999:86–88). The author further attests that in most books of the Writings, the parallels found between the Peshitta and the Targums are even less common than those found in the Prophets, while in Proverbs, the large number of parallels demonstrates dependence (Weitzman, 1999:109).

From the previous overview, it is clear that each book has to be investigated in its own right rather than making a general conclusion. The value the above overview is that conclusions can be made about the translation technique where the Syriac variants differ from the Masoretic text due to the language requirements and, in particular, the attitude of the translator. Studying these variants helps one to understand the style of the Syriac translation. Carbajosa (2008) mentions three levels of investigation, namely the syntactic level (pp. 21–45), morphological level (pp. 46–55) and semantic level (pp. 55–71).

3.6.4.3 Study of variants

The study and investigation of variants creates a platform to get acquainted with the style (pattern) of the Syriac version (Carbajosa, 2008:21). Carbajosa analysed the Peshitta psalms at three levels: syntactic, morphological and semantic. The grammar of Syriac emphasises the flexibility and freedom of Syriac language with regard to word order in a sentence (Nöldeke, 1966:248, par 324; Brockelmann, 1951:118 par 223; Carbajosa, 2008:21). As a result of this feature or characteristic, there is a general expectation that the Peshitta psalms would reflect the Masoretic text word order in the Syriac as the target language, but this is not always the case. Quite often the Syriac word order does not follow the Hebrew. Carbajosa (2008:21) argues that it can be seen in a number of

cases in the Peshitta psalms that the Syriac version shows a change in word order in relation to the Masoretic Text. The changes in the Peshitta psalms are the result of the translator being faithful to the Syriac syntax and structure and his quest to render a readable and clear final product. The issue of word order, as well as the variants in the Peshitta in comparison with the Masoretic text and other versions, will be discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff) and Chapter 5 (pp. 297 ff).

3.6.4.4 The Peshitta and the textual criticism of the Old Testament

The Peshitta is an ancient translation of the Hebrew original into Syriac and it has been preserved by the church. It is noteworthy that both languages (Hebrew and Syriac) are of the Northwest Semitic group, which means they are related in respect of typology as well as vocabulary. Alongside the Septuagint, the Aramaic translations (the Targumim), the Vulgate and the Arabic version, the Peshitta is one of the earliest witnesses to the Hebrew Old Testament (Tov, 2012:127; Mushayabasa, 2014:1). The Peshitta as a version is a very significant witness to the text of the Hebrew Bible and has implications that cannot be ignored when it comes to textual criticism, of which the aim is to reconstruct the most accurate text since the original text is lost. The Peshitta can contribute positively in identifying and helping to solve text-critical problems found in the Hebrew.

The Peshitta is not only significant for the study of textual criticism, but it is also of prime importance as a monument of the Syriac language and an important witness to early exegesis (Dirksen, 1992:376). The Peshitta is in importance second only to the Septuagint, but it is primarily a significant witness to the Hebrew Bible. Koster (1993:254) argues that the Peshitta is an ancient and independent translation of an early stage of the Masoretic Text. Textual criticism aims at recovering the unique *Urtext* that underlies the Peshitta or had been the source of Peshitta translation. It can be added that the Peshitta has its own value and significance as an ancient interpretation of the Hebrew text and as a translation that at times reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic Text (Zipor, 2002:63).

In conclusion, further research on the Peshitta is necessary to determine its history and textual importance for all the Old Testament books. It has already been established that as a translation in a language very closely related to Hebrew the Peshitta as one of the early witnesses is very

important for the Old Testament text, and must certainly be considered as an important version for textual criticism.

3.7 Value of the ancient translations in textual criticism

After the discussion of textual criticism above,[21] an overview of the ancient translations has been given.[22] In the overview, special attention has been paid to the value of the ancient versions for text-criticism[23] and in what way they agree or differ from the Masoretic text.[24] The discussion also applies when considering the value of the ancient translations in the *literary criticism* of a Biblical text.

The purpose of using ancient translations in textual criticism of the Old Testament is solely employed to trace the Hebrew text underlying the translation, that is, the *Vorlage* of the translator(s) by comparing it to the Masoretic text (Aejmelaeus, 1993:77).

3.8 Conclusion

Translation technique is a primary step in bringing the witnesses of various versions into a whole corpus of the text-critical studies of the Old Testament (Adair, 2000:21; Tov, 1999:19). How the translation technique is reflected in the differences between the Syriac verbal system in the Peshitta and the Hebrew verbal system is the main subject of this research and will be treated extensively in Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff).

[21] **S**ee 3.2 Textual criticism of the Old Testament (p. 61).
[22] See 3.5 The ancient translations (p. 72) to 3.6 Septuagint, Aramaic Targums, Vulgate and Peshitta (p. 75).
[23] See 3.5.1 Value of the ancient translations before and after Qumran (p. 73).
[24] See 3.5.2 Identification with or deviation from the Masoretic Text (p. 74).

Chapter 4
Rendering of the verbal forms in the Peshitta Psalms

Introduction

The study of verbs forms an integral part of this study on book three of Psalms (73–89). The main question in this chapter is what the characteristics of the verbal forms in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text are and how verbal forms in the same psalms in the Peshitta Psalter compare to those of the Masoretic Text. Although this chapter is concerned with the translation of verbal forms, the term 'rendering' will mostly be used. The reason for preferring the term 'render' in this chapter is because the focus is not only on the meaning of the verbs, but especially on *the way* the verbs are rendered in the Peshitta translation. The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* significantly defines *rendering* as 'a piece of writing that has been translated into a different language; the particular way in which it has been translated'. *Collins English Dictionary* confirms the way of translation, saying, 'To render something in a particular language or in a particular way means to translate it into that language or in that way'.

The verbs have been analysed and grouped according to their verbal form and character in the Masoretic Text. Subsequently, the way the Peshitta deals with each of these groups in the seventeen psalms will be compared with the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text. In this report, an example of each Hebrew verbal form in each of these psalms will be given together with the different renderings employed by the Peshitta, while the rest will only be listed. Some of the examples require a more detailed discussion and will be treated accordingly. Verbs that are directly affected by text-critical problems will be mentioned, but they will be studied further in Chapter 5 (pp. 297 ff), which deals with the other versions. To differentiate between different verbs in a single verse of a psalm, they will be labelled as 'a', 'b', 'c', etc. An example is the labelling of the verbs in Psalm 73, which will be noted as 73:2a, 73:2b, 73:2c, etc. At the end, verbs with same verbal renderings will be grouped together and a detailed analysis will be made of the way the Peshitta translators handled the Hebrew text at their disposal. Conclusions will be made about the character of the renderings in relation to the Masoretic Text.

The systematic grouping or classification of the Hebrew verbs with regard to their forms as found in the Masoretic Text and how these forms are rendered in the Peshitta Psalter will be treated under the following headings:

4.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 91)

4.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 145)

4.3 Verbs in the imperative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (207)

4.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 220)

4.5. Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 226)

4.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text and their rendering into the Peshitta (p. 234)

4.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 258)

4.8 Constructs without verb in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta (p. 270)

4.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In this section, the focus is on the group of verbs that have the perfect verbal form in the Masoretic Text and on the way the Peshitta rendered them. Within this group, two main subgroups have been identified, namely perfect verbs without a waw and perfect verbs with a waw. They will be analysed under the following headings:

4.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text (p. 91) and

4.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic text (p. 135).

4.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text

It has been found that perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text can be classified into the following eight categories:

4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 92)

4.1.1.2 Perfect without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 114)

4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle (p. 122)

4.1.1.4 Perfect verb without waw rendered as no verb (p. 125)

4.1.1.5 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 127)

4.1.1.6 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative (p. 129)

4.1.1.7 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a participle (p. 130)

4.1.1.8 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 132)

4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw

First and foremost, a study is made of verbs in the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text. The perfects in the Masoretic Text are not always treated in the same way by the Peshitta. One would expect that the Peshitta would also use a perfect without waw in all instances by following and agreeing with the Masoretic Text, but it is not always the case.

Psalm 73

Example: 73:9a

MT: שַׁתּוּ בַשָּׁמַיִם פִּיהֶם P: □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: Their mouths lay claim to heaven) (They set their mouths against heaven)

The observation of the above is that the Syriac has changed the word order (with the object following the verb), but that the change has not affected the meaning.

Other similar examples are 73:11b, 73:13a, 73:15a, 73:19a, 73:19b, 73:22c and 73:25.

In these examples, the Peshitta indeed renders a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, as one would expect. It is, however, not the case in some of the other verses of this psalm where the perfect without waw occurs.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Example: Psalm 73:6a

The first of these is Psalm 73:6a. The Hebrew and the Syriac are as follows:

MT: לָכֵן עֲנָקָתְמוֹ גַּאֲוָה P: □□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: Therefore pride is their necklace) (Therefore contempt took hold of them)

The verb עֲנָקָתְמוֹ, which the Hebrew uses, is a rare word. It is a qal perfect third person feminine singular plus a suffix third person masculine plural of ענק (‘to enchain’/‘to put on as necklace’, ‘to adorn with a necklace or serve as necklace’) (VanGemeren, 1997c:466). This rare Hebrew word occurs in the qal only in this verse, and in the hiphil in Deuteronomy 15:14. It occurs twice.

The Syriac simplifies this rare Hebrew word and renders it as □□□□, the peal perfect third person feminine singular of □□□ ('to be seized, caught, taken, e.g. by lot'; see also Payne Smith, 1903:10; Sokoloff, 2009:21). It is possible that the translator did not know the Hebrew verb and translated it according to the context. The Syriac verb does not have the object suffix attached to it as is the case of the Hebrew verb above. The plural suffix 'them' is always expressed by means of the personal pronoun, masculine, □□□□ or feminine □□□□. The Syriac retains the perfect.

Verse 28 will be discussed in Chapter 5, as it has text-critical problems.[25]

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:8a

MT: אָמְרוּ בְלִבָּם P: □□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: They said in their hearts) (They said in their hearts)

In this instance, the Peshitta also renders the perfect verb without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, which is the verbal form normally expected. The verb in the Masoretic Text is a qal perfect third person common plural and in the Syriac a peal perfect third person masculine plural. The Peshitta retains the meaning of the Masoretic Text in its translation, as in the following examples: 74:7a, 74:14a, 74:15a, 74:15b, 74:16, 74:17b (in the latter example, the personal pronoun for verbal suffix of the Hebrew is added), 74:18d and 74:20b.

Some examples are discussed in more detail.

Psalm 74:1a

MT: לָמָּה אֱלֹהִים זָנַחְתָּ לָנֶצַח P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Why have you rejected us forever, O God?) (O God, why have you forgotten me forever?)

The Masoretic Text has the verb 'to reject', which is the second person masculine singular, while the Peshitta has the verb 'to wander', 'to forget', which is the second person masculine singular

[25] See *Psalm 73:28* (p. 346).

plus suffix first person common singular. This Hebrew verb is always translated into the Peshitta Psalter as this Syriac verb. The Peshitta adds a suffix not found in Hebrew, but the object is implied by the verb. The translator added the suffix first person common singular to refer to himself. The use of the Syriac verb could perhaps be ascribed to a euphemistic rendering of the Hebrew ('to forget' instead of 'to reject').

Psalm 74:4a

MT: שָׁאֲגוּ צֹרְרֶיךָ בְּקֶרֶב מוֹעֲדֶךָ

P: ܫܓܘ ܒܥܠܝ ܒܓܘ ܒܡܬܟܢܣ̈ܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܟ

(NIV: Your foes roared in the place where you met with us)

(Your enemies boasted in your festival)

The verb 'to roar' in the Masoretic Text is translated into the Peshitta using a verb with a different meaning, namely 'to boast'. It could be that the translator wanted to make the metaphor more literal. Elsewhere, he translated the verb regularly using the Syriac verb ܫܓܐ ('to roar').

Psalm 74:4c:

MT: שָׂמוּ אוֹתֹתָם אֹתוֹת

P: ܣܝܡܘ ܐܬܘܬܗܘܢ ܐܬܘܬ

(NIV: They set up their standards as signs)

(They make their standards signs)

In the above example, the word order is the same in both languages. The Peshitta translates according to the sense of the Hebrew and does not follow the verbal root of the Hebrew.

Psalm 74:9

MT: אוֹתֹתֵינוּ לֹא רָאִינוּ | אֵין עוֹד נָבִיא וְלֹא אִתָּנוּ יֹדֵעַ עַד מָה

(NIV: We are given no miraculous signs; no prophets are left, and none of us knows how long this will be)

P: ܐܬܘܬܝܢ ܠܐ ܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܢܒܝܐ ܕܥܡ ܕܥ ܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܢ ܕܝܥ ܥܕ ܡܐ

(Their signs are not visible, there is no prophet as well, there is also no wise man among us)

In this instance, the Hebrew has a verb in the first person plural ('we do not see our signs'), while the Peshitta has the third person plural ('they do not see their signs'). At the end of the verse in the Peshitta, the plural of the first person is also used. The change in the first part of the verse could perhaps be harmonisation with the third person of the previous verse.

Psalm 74:13a

MT: אַתָּה פוֹרַרְתָּ בְעָזְּךָ יָם P: □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□

(NIV: It was you who split open the sea by your power) (You divided the sea by your might/power)

The Peshitta deviates from the word order in the Masoretic Text by placing the prepositional phrase before the verb.

Sometimes, where the Hebrew has an implicit relative construction, the Peshitta adds the relative particle to make it explicit.

Example: Psalm 74:2b and 74:2c

MT: זְכֹר עֲדָתְךָּ קָנִיתָ קֶדֶם גָּאַלְתָּ שֵׁבֶט נַחֲלָתֶךָ | הַר צִיּוֹן זֶה שָׁכַנְתָּ בּוֹ

(NIV: Remember the people you purchased of old, the tribe of your inheritance, whom you redeemed, Mount Zion, where you dwelt)

P: □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

(Remember the people that you purchased of old, the tribe of your inheritance, one whom you redeemed, Mount Zion, where you dwelt)

The Peshitta renders the perfect in both 74:2b and 74:2c in the Masoretic Text as □ plus the perfect. The □ in 74:2b is added by the Peshitta to make the implicit relative clause in the Masoretic Text explicit, while the addition of □ in 74:2c is only made for stylistic purposes. The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text. Psalm 74:20b is a similar example of the Peshitta using □ □□□ to translate the Hebrew כִּי. In verse one, the Peshitta employs the use

of ☐. It is probable that the translator wanted to retain the sequence here also (Muraoka, 1987:43; Nöldeke, 1966:197–201).

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:2a and 75:2b

MT: הוֹדִינוּ לְךָ אֱלֹהִים הוֹדִינוּ	P: ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐
(NIV: We give thanks to you, O God, we give thanks)	(We give thanks to you, O God, we give thanks to you)

In this verse, the two perfects without waw in the Masoretic Text are rendered by perfects without waw in the Peshitta. The Syriac adds the second ☐☐, which is absent from the Hebrew, after the second verb in the verse.

Psalms 75:4c and 75:5a have text-critical issues and will be discussed in Chapter 5.[26]

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:4

MT: שָׁמָּה שִׁבַּר רִשְׁפֵי קֶשֶׁת | מָגֵן וְחֶרֶב וּמִלְחָמָה סֶלָה	P: ☐☐̈☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐̈☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐
(NIV: There he broke the flashing arrows, the shields and the swords, the weapons of war. *Selah*)	(There he broke the forearm of the arrows, the shields and the swords of war)

In the above verse, the verb exhibits the character of a perfect without waw being rendered by a perfect without waw. The Masoretic Text has שִׁבַּר, the piel perfect third person masculine singular of שׁבר (‘to break’), while the Peshitta has ☐☐☐, the peal perfect third person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ (‘to break’). Here the respective verbs in the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta are in agreement as could be expected. ☐☐☐ could be a pael agreeing with the Hebrew piel.

Psalms 76:6c and 76:9b are similar examples.

[26] See *Psalm 75:4* (p. 352) and *Psalm 75:5* (p. 352).

Psalm 76:6a

MT: אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ אַבִּירֵי לֵב P: ܐܬܬܪܓܙܘ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ ܠܒ̈ܐ

(NIV (5): "Valiant men lie plundered") (All the stout-hearted were shaken)

The verb אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ, which is the hithpoel perfect third person masculine plural of שׁלל ('to plunder/spoil'), appears only here in the Masoretic Text (Tate, 1990:262). This is a *hapax legomenon* that has a form different from the expected third person masculine plural, namely הִשְׁתּוֹלְלוּ. The א as a prefix in the verb אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ in the Masoretic Text is probably a scribal error that occurred either during copying or transmission. Tate (1990:262) is of the opinion that the א in the Masoretic Text could either be a scribal error or an Aramaic form. The Peshitta renders this uncommon Hebrew verb, אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ, using a more common verb ܐܬܬܪܓܙ (*etdeleg*), the ethpeel perfect third person masculine plural of ܪܓܙ ('to be shaken or disturbed'). The Peshitta uses a verb different from the Hebrew root. Despite this being the case, the Peshitta renders a perfect for a perfect to maintain agreement in tense, gender and number with the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta translates this uncommon verb according to context, since its root is not found in Syriac. The *hapax legomenon* in this verse added to the translator's trouble with the unvocalised Hebrew text.

Psalm 76:9a has text-critical problems and will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:3a

MT: בְּיוֹם צָרָתִי אֲדֹנָי דָּרָשְׁתִּי P: ܒܝܘܡ ܥܩܬܝ ܡܪܝ ܒܥܝܬ

(NIV: When I was in distress, I sought the Lord) (In the day of my trouble/distress I seek the Lord)

In this instance, the expected Hebrew word order is kept and translated accordingly. The following examples are of the same character: 77:17a (both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have an object suffix), 77:18b, 77:19a, 77:19b, 77:20 and 77:21.

Some examples will be discussed in more detail.

Psalm 77:5b: The verb נִפְעַמְתִּי

MT: נִפְעַמְתִּי וְלֹא אֲדַבֵּר P: □□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: I was too troubled to speak) (I am silent and cannot speak)

Syriac does not have the niphal stem formation of the Hebrew (Muraoka, 1987:26). It normally uses the ethpeel for the same meaning as the niphal. In Psalm 77:5, the Peshitta uses a peal. In this case, it is necessary to look for other places in the Old Testament to find out how the Peshitta renders the niphal, particularly in the case of the verb פעם. The verb פעם occurs five times in the Old Testament: once in the qal (Judges 13:25), three times in the niphal (Ps 77:4(5), Gen 41:8 & Dan 2:3) and once in the hithpael (Dan 2:1) (VanGemeren, 1997c:649).

In Judges 13:25, the verb is used to indicate how Samson was stirred up and empowered by the Spirit of the Lord. It enforces the idea that all he did was through the work of the Spirit of God in him. In Psalm 77:4[5], the psalmist is so much disturbed (niphal) by his worries that he is unable to speak. In Genesis 41:8, the Pharaoh's emotions are described by the niphal, how his dreams disturbed or troubled him. The niphal in Daniel 2:3 also defines how Daniel's spirit (*rûaḥ*, same as in Gen. 41:8) was troubled or disturbed. This verb is also used in Daniel 2:1 in a hithpael form with the meaning of 'being troubled', as in the above (VanGemeren, 1997c:649).

The five different uses of the verb פעם found in the above five verses in the Masoretic Text (Hebrew) posed serious difficulties to the Peshitta translator. He dealt with the problems by translating the text according to sense and, at times, using words with different consonants but with the same meaning. In this way, exact/close correspondence was attained between the Hebrew and the Syriac, for example in Judges 13:25. It is possible that the translator saw the niphal verb in Hebrew as a qal. The translator maintained the Syriac structure and syntax. In Judges 13:25, the qal infinitive is translated as □□□□□□□□, the infinitive peal of □□□. In the niphal, the Hebrew verb is used to express that someone is troubled by dreams or sleeplessness (HALOT). In Genesis 41:8, the ethpaal of □□□ is used ('to be shaken, jolted'). In Daniel 2:3, the ethpaal of □□□ is used ('to be transfigured, transformed'). The same Syriac verb is used for the hithpael of the Hebrew verb in Daniel 2:3. It is clear that the translator of the Peshitta Psalter did not know

these other translations and resorted to translating them according to the context, using the opposite of 'to speak'.

Psalm 77:10

MT: הֲשָׁכַח חַנּוֹת אֵל | אִם קָפַץ בְּאַף רַחֲמָיו סֶלָה

(NIV: Has God forgotten to be merciful? Has he in anger withheld his compassion?)

P: □□□□□ ·□ □□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□□□

(Has God forgotten to be merciful? Has he put away his mercies in his anger?)

The interesting feature of this verse is not the translation of the Hebrew verbs, but the way in which the Syriac treats the double question of the Hebrew. Syriac does not have an interrogative particle like the Hebrew הֲ. Hebrew uses the interrogative particle הֲ in the first part of the verse plus אִם at the beginning of the second part of the verse to introduce a double question (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:322b). Syriac uses □□ at the beginning of both the first and second lines for this rhetorical question in Hebrew.

Psalm 77:3b has text-critical problems and will be treated in the Chapter 5.[27]

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:4d

MT: וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה

(NIV: And the wonders that he has done)

P: □□□□ □□ ·□□□□□

(And the wonders that he has done)

The Peshitta follows the Masoretic Text and renders perfect as perfect as could be expected. In 78:4d, the Masoretic Text has 'עָשָׂה , the qal perfect third person masculine singular of עשׂה ('to do'), which the Peshitta correctly renders as □□□, the peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ ('to do'). Other similar examples are 78:3c, 78:5b, 78:8c, 78:9c, 78:10a, 78:11c, 78:12, 78:13a, 78:20a, 78:21a, 78:21d, 78:22a, 78:22b, 78:24c, 78:25a, 78:26b, 78:30, 78:31a, 78:31c, 78:32a, 78:41c, 78:42a, 78:50b, 78:50c, 78:53b, 78:53d, 78:56c, 78:63a, 78:64a, 78:68b and 78:69c.

[27] See *Psalm 77:3* (p. 358).

In 78:10a, the Syriac has □□□ before the negative, which is not the case in Hebrew. In 78:12, the Syriac has □ before the verb in the perfect tense, which is the same in Hebrew. The Hebrew has the relative clause אֲשֶׁר before the verb 'to do'; hence Syriac makes it a relative as well. In 78:68b, there is a relative in the Masoretic Text as well.

The examples below require more attention.

Psalm 78:3a

MT: אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ

P: □□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: What we have heard)

(What we have heard)

The Peshitta translates the relative אֲשֶׁר in the Masoretic Text as a relative □. Other similar examples are 78:5c, 78:42b and 78:43. In 78:43, the Peshitta uses a more general verb for a specific verb in the Masoretic Text. In 78:3a, an addition of □□□□□ is found at the beginning of the verse. The Hebrew relative particle has no antecedent, but the Syriac adds one.

Psalm 78:54b

MT: וַיְבִיאֵם אֶל גְּבוּל קָדְשׁוֹ | הַר זֶה קָנְתָה יְמִינוֹ

(NIV: Thus he brought them to the border of the holy land, to the hill country his right hand had taken)

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□

(He brought them to the boundary of the holy land, to the mountain his right hand has acquired)

The Peshitta adds □ to make the implicit relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit.

Psalm 78:23b

MT: וְדַלְתֵי שָׁמַיִם פָּתָח

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: And [he] opened the doors of the heavens)

(And the doors of heavens were opened)

In other instances, a change of subject occurs. Psalm 78:23b offers a befitting example.

The Masoretic Text has the verb פָּתַח, a qal perfect third person masculine singular, while the Peshitta has the verb □□□□□□, an ethpeel perfect third person masculine plural. The object of the active verb in the Masoretic Text has become the subject of the passive verb in the Peshitta. Psalm 78:37a is a similar example, where the singular subject, a collective, has been changed to the plural in the Peshitta.

Psalm 78:8d

MT: וְלֹא נֶאֱמְנָה אֶת אֵל רוּחוֹ P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: Whose spirits were not faithful to Him) (And his spirit was not faithful to God)

Quadriliteral verbs have not been found in previously treated psalms; they are discussed here for the first time. Psalm 78:8d provides an example of this feature: נֶאֱמְנָה, the niphal perfect third person feminine singular of אמן ('to be faithful') is rendered as □□□□, the quadriliteral perfect third person masculine singular ('to be faithful') and it has the same root as the Hebrew. Similar examples are 78:32b, 78:37b and 78:40a.

Psalm 78:67b

MT: וּבְשֵׁבֶט אֶפְרַיִם לֹא בָחָר P: □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: he did not choose the tribe of Ephraim) (but as for the tribe of Ephraim, he did not consider)

In this example, 'to choose' is a specific word in the Masoretic Text as opposed 'to consider', a more general word in the Peshitta. The reason for the translation could be to prevent repetition of the first word in the next verse, where the Masoretic Text repeats the verb at the end of verse 67.

Psalm 78:10b

MT: וּבְתוֹרָתוֹ מֵאֲנוּ לָלֶכֶת P: □□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: And refused to live by his law) (But they did not want to walk/live by his laws)

In this case, the Hebrew says, 'they refused to go', while the Syriac says, 'they did not want to go'. The Masoretic Text has a strong word ('refused to go'), but the Peshitta softens it by using 'did not want to go'. The Peshitta gives an idiomatic translation.

Psalm 78:60c and 63b have text-critical issues and will be discussed in Chapter 5.[28]

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:2

MT: נָתְנוּ אֶת נִבְלַת עֲבָדֶיךָ

P: □□□ ̈□ □□□□ □□□ ̈□□□

(NIV: They have given the dead bodies of your servants)

(They have given the dead bodies of your servants)

What is observed from the above example is that the Peshitta retains the perfect, gender and number as in the Masoretic Text. The latter has נָתְנוּ, the qal perfect third person common plural of נתן ('to give'), which is rendered into the Peshitta as □□□□, the peal perfect third person common plural of □□□ ('to give'). Other examples that are similar to this one are 79:1a, 79:3a, 79:4, 79:6b and 79:7b. In 79:6b, each one of the verbs in the Masoretic Text and in the Peshitta has a suffix.

Some examples will be discussed.

Example: Psalm 79:12b

MT: חֶרְפָּתָם אֲשֶׁר חֵרְפוּךָ אֲדֹנָי

P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: the reproach they have hurled at you, O Lord)

(the insult they reproached you with, O Lord)

In 79:12b, it is important to note that the Peshitta retains the relative sentence as it is found in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta thus employs the use of □ for the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר.

Psalm 79:8d

Psalm 79:8d provides a perfect example of the rendering in the Peshitta of the conjunction כִּי. Here □ is not added, but part of □ □□□ is used as a translation for כִּי.

[28] See *Psalm 78:60* (p. 364) and *Psalm 78:63* (p. 365).

MT: כִּי דַלּוֹנוּ מְאֹד P: □□□□□□□ □□□ □□

(NIV: for we are in desperate need)/for we have been greatly weakened (For we have been greatly humbled)

It is important to note that the Peshitta uses □ □□□ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:13a

MT: לָמָּה פָּרַצְתָּ גְדֵרֶיהָ P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV (12): Why have you broken its walls) (Why have you broken its walls)

The above verse provides a befitting example of what could normally be expected. The Peshitta renders and retains the perfect without the waw that follows the interrogative.

Some examples will be discussed.

Psalm 80:6a

MT: הֶאֱכַלְתָּם לֶחֶם דִּמְעָה P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV (5): You have fed them with the bread of tears) (You fed them with bread of tears)

It is significant to note that Hebrew has a suffix third person masculine plural, הֶאֱכַלְתָּם (hithpael perfect second person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine plural of אכל), which Syriac renders as a personal pronoun, that is □□□□ (third person masculine plural as well). This happens often where the Syriac uses a personal pronoun instead of the suffix found in Hebrew.

Psalm 80:10a

In verse 10a, it is probable that the Peshitta takes the Hebrew verb to be a qal and not a piel.

MT: פִּנִּיתָ לְפָנֶיהָ P: □□ □□□

(NIV (9): You cleared the ground for it) (You gave heed to it/you considered it)

Psalm 80:16

In verse 16, the Masoretic Text has אֲשֶׁר before the first verse and does not repeat it. The Peshitta adds □ in both instances. The addition of the second □ by the Peshitta is to make the implicit relative construction in Hebrew explicit.

MT: וְכַנָּה אֲשֶׁר נָטְעָה יְמִינֶךָ | וְעַל בֵּן אִמַּצְתָּה לָּךְ

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: The shoot your hand has planted, the son you have raised up for yourself)

(And the shoot your right hand has planted, and the son you have made strong for yourself)

Psalm 80:18b

This psalm is similar to Psalm 80:16b.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:6a

MT: עֵדוּת בִּיהוֹסֵף שָׂמוֹ בְּצֵאתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

P: □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□

(NIV: He established it a statute for Joseph when he went out against Egypt)

(He made it a decree for Joseph when he went out to the land of Egypt)

In the above example, a perfect is rendered as a perfect, and the word order in the Peshitta is the same as that of the Masoretic Text, which is what could be expected. A similar example is Psalm 81:7a.

Some examples will be discussed where more details will be provided.

Psalm 81:8a

MT: בַּצָּרָה קָרָאתָ וָאֲחַלְּצֶךָּ

P: □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: In your distress you called and I rescued you)

(In his distress/trouble he called me and I rescued him)

Here the Peshitta adds a suffix first person singular, which is absent in Hebrew, thus adding the object (‘he called me’). The addition of the suffix could be to clarify the Hebrew. In addition, the

Peshitta changes the subject from second person masculine singular to third person masculine singular. In verse 6, both the Septuagint and the Peshitta use the third person masculine singular. The Septuagint has the same in verse 7, which may also be a reason for the change in this verse. The Peshitta maintains the sequence.

Psalm 81:12a

Psalm 81:12a provides an example of a changed word order in the Peshitta.

MT: וְלֹא שָׁמַע עַמִּי לְקוֹלִי P: □□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: But my people would not listen to me) (But my people did not listen to my voice)

The Hebrew has the conjunction plus the negative followed by verb, subject and object. The Peshitta has subject, negative particle, verb and then object. Although the word order has been altered, it does not affect or change the meaning.

Psalm 81:12b

MT: וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא אָבָה לִי P: □□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: Israel would not submit to me) (But Israel did not obey me)

'Israel' is singular in Hebrew (a collective noun), but the Peshitta has the plural verb for Israel. Perhaps the Peshitta does not see nation as collective but as a group of individuals; hence the plural verb to agree with the subject.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:5a

MT: לֹא יָדְעוּ וְלֹא יָבִינוּ P: □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: They know nothing, they understand nothing) (They do not know and they do not understand)

The above example provides a befitting example of what could be expected regarding the translation of the Masoretic Text by the Peshitta. The Peshitta retains the perfect without waw as in the Masoretic Text. Psalm 82:6 is a similar example.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:3d

MT: כִּי הִנֵּה אוֹיְבֶיךָ יֶהֱמָיוּן | וּמְשַׂנְאֶיךָ נָשְׂאוּ רֹאשׁ

(NIV: See how your enemies are astir, how your foes rear their heads)

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ ..□□ □□□ □□□
□ ..□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□

(For behold, your enemies make an uproar, and those/them that hate you they raised their heads)

The above verse provides a clear example of what could be expected in translating from the Masoretic Text into the Peshitta. Both the verbs, in Hebrew, נָשְׂאוּ, and in Syriac, □□□□□, have the same meaning and both are perfect third person masculine plural.

Some examples will be discussed in more detail.

Psalm 83:9a

MT: גַּם אַשּׁוּר נִלְוָה עִמָּם

(NIV: Even Assyria has joined them)

P: □□□□□□ □□
□□□□□ □□□□□

(Even Assyria has united with them)

The Peshitta uses the verb □□□□□ (ethpeel □□□, 'to join together', 'to be united with') for the Hebrew common verb נִלְוָה ('to join', 'to attach oneself'). Syriac has the verb □□□ ('to accompany', 'to follow') with the same root as the Hebrew, but chooses to use a more common verb in the example.

Psalm 83:11a

MT: נִשְׁמְדוּ בְעֵין דֹּאר

(NIV: Who perished at Endor)

P: □□□□□□□
□□□□□□□

(That they were killed Endor)

Here □ is used as an implicit relative clause to connect verse 11 to the previous verse (10). The verb is more concrete than the Hebrew ('killed' as opposed to 'perished').

Psalm 83:13a

MT: אֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ P: □□□□□

(NIV: Who said) (Who said)

In this instance, the Peshitta uses the relative particle □ to render the Hebrew relative particle אֲשֶׁר. The clause in the Peshitta follows the Hebrew.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:4a

MT: גַּם צִפּוֹר מָצְאָה בַיִת P: □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□

(NIV: Even the sparrow has found a home) (Even the sparrow has found for itself a home)

This is a straightforward example, as the Peshitta may be expected to render the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw. The prepositional phrase in the next phrase is moved forward in the Peshitta. Some similar examples are 84:3a, 84:4b and 84:11a.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:2a

MT: רָצִיתָ יְהוָה אַרְצֶךָ P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: You showed favour to your land, O Lord) (You took pleasure in your land, O Lord)

The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw as a perfect without waw and the word order is the same. Psalm 85:12 is similar to Psalm 85:2a.

Some examples will be discussed in more detail.

Psalm 85:3a

MT: נָשָׂאתָ עֲוֹן עַמֶּךָ P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: You forgave the iniquity of your people) (You forgave the iniquity of your people)

The New International Version translates נָשָׂאתָ using the past tense of 'to forgive', but the Hebrew is a construct of the root meaning 'to lift or raise'. The verb נשׂא does have the sense of 'forgiveness'

or ‘pardon’. In a legal expression, as in the case of Genesis 40:13 and 2 Kings 25:27, it means ‘to pardon'.

The Peshitta translates according to the meaning. It translates a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text by a perfect without waw and retains the word order. The noun עָוֹן in the Masoretic Text is in a construct state and thus translates ‘the iniquity of’; the Peshitta uses □ before □□□ to present this meaning. Syriac uses □ to link two nouns or noun phrases with ‘of’ (Muraoka, 1987:50).

Psalm 85:11a

MT: חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת נִפְגָּשׁוּ

P: □□□□□□
□□□□□□
□□□□□□

(NIV: Love and faithfulness meet together)

(Kindness and truth meet me)

Here the Hebrew verb נִפְגָּשׁוּ (niphal perfect third person masculine plural) means ‘to meet one another’ and it is a reflexive (the word ‘they’ refers to love and faithfulness as subject). The Peshitta has □□□□□□ (peal perfect third person masculine plural plus suffix first person singular), with an object (suffix first person common singular) not found in the Masoretic Text. The addition of the suffix by the Peshitta names the object. Literally, the verb in the Peshitta means ‘they meet me’. The Peshitta changes the meaning of the Hebrew by this addition.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:14a

MT: אֱלֹהִים זֵדִים קָמוּ עָלַי

P: □□ ̈□□ □□□□
□□□ □□□

(NIV: The arrogant are attacking me, O God)

(The evil men rose up against me, O God)

The Peshitta follows the Masoretic Text as could be expected and renders the perfect without waw as a perfect without waw. The following are similar to this example: 86:14b (the translation is free in Syriac; the suffix points forward to the next noun), 86:14c (the Peshitta adds a suffix) and 86:17e (the Peshitta adds a suffix).

Psalm 86:9a

MT: כָּל גּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ יָבוֹאוּ וְיִשְׁתַּחֲווּ לְפָנֶיךָ אֲדֹנָי | וִיכַבְּדוּ לִשְׁמֶךָ

P: □□□□□ □□ ̈□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: All the nations you have made will come and worship before you, O Lord; they will bring glory to your name)

(All nations whom you have made, shall come and worship before/to you, O Lord, and glorify your name)

The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw as could be expected. The Peshitta renders the Hebrew relative particle אֲשֶׁר as a relative particle □. This is normal, although it does not happen always.

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:4c

MT: זֶה יֻלַּד שָׁם

P: □□□□□ □□□ □□□

('This one was born in Zion.')

(This [man] was born there)

The Peshitta translates a perfect without waw as a perfect without waw and retains the Hebrew word order as one would expect. Similar examples in this category are 87:5b and 87:6c.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:2a

MT: יוֹם צָעַקְתִּי בַלַּיְלָה נֶגְדֶּךָ

P: □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Day and night I cry before you)

(Day and night I cry before you)

As expected, the Peshitta renders the Hebrew as found in the Masoretic Text. Other similar examples are 88:4b, 88:5a and 88:6d, in which the Peshitta uses a general verb [□□□□] for a specific one in Hebrew [נִגְזָרוּ]; in seven other examples, a specific verb is found in Syriac, while a general verb is used Hebrew, namely in 88:8b, 88:9a, 88:10a, 88:14a, 88:16b, 88:17b (both the

Syriac and the Hebrew have suffixes), 88:18a (both the Syriac and the Hebrew have suffixes) and 88:19a.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 88:4a

MT: כִּי שָׂבְעָה בְרָעוֹת נַפְשִׁי

P: □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□

(For my soul is full of trouble)

(For my soul is filled with evils)

The Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□□ to render the conjunction כִּי in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta also changes the word order by placing the subject after the verb.

Psalm 88:6c

MT: אֲשֶׁר לֹא זְכַרְתָּם עוֹד

P: □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Whom you remember no more)

(Those whom you remember no more)

In this instance, □ is used by the Peshitta to render the Hebrew relative אֲשֶׁר as found in the Masoretic Text. It is also significant to note that the Masoretic Text has a suffix third person masculine plural and the Peshitta uses the personal pronoun □□□□ (third person masculine plural) for the object. The Peshitta also places □□□□□ before the relative, supplying an antecedent that is lacking in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 88:8a

MT: עָלַי סָמְכָה חֲמָתֶךָ | וְכָל מִשְׁבָּרֶיךָ עִנִּיתָ סֶלָה

(NIV: Your wrath lies heavily upon me; you have overwhelmed me with all your waves. *Selah*)

P: □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□

(And all his anger lies upon me, and all your storm is over me)

The Peshitta changes the subject of 8a from third person feminine to third person masculine. Anger is either masculine or feminine. The Peshitta takes it to be masculine. Psalm 88:8b is a similar example. In 88:17a, the Peshitta changes the third person masculine plural in the Masoretic Text

to third person masculine singular because of rendering the plural noun of the Masoretic Text as a more common singular noun (the Masoretic Text has חֲרוֹנֶיךָ בְּעוּתֶיךָ, while Peshitta has).

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:4a

MT: כָּרַתִּי בְרִית לִבְחִירִי P:

(NIV: You said, 'I have made a covenant with my chosen one')

(I have cut a covenant with my chosen one)

The Peshitta has a perfect without waw in agreement with the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text, but it changes the word order. Some similar examples are 89:11c, 89:13a, 89:36a, 89:41a, 89:45b and 89:48b.

A few other examples will be discussed in more detail.

Psalm 89:12

MT: תֵּבֵל וּמְלֹאָהּ אַתָּה יְסַדְתָּם P:

(NIV: You founded the world and all that is in it)

(The world with its fullness you founded)

The Masoretic Text has יְסַדְתָּם, which is qal perfect second person masculine singular plus suffix third person masculine plural, while the Peshitta has , the peal perfect second person masculine singular, not rendering the suffix. This is because of the use of the preposition () in the place of the waw in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89:21b

MT: מָצָאתִי דָוִד עַבְדִּי | בְּשֶׁמֶן קָדְשִׁי מְשַׁחְתִּיו P:

(NIV: I have found David my servant; with my sacred oil I have anointed him)

(And found David my servant; with my holy oil I have anointed him)

In this instance, the Peshitta follows the Masoretic Text as could be expected. A similar example is 89:44b.

Psalm 89:39a

MT: וְאַתָּה זָנַחְתָּ וַתִּמְאָס P: ܘܐܢܬ ܫܒܩܬ ܘܪܚܩܬ
ܠܝ

(NIV: But you have rejected, you have spurned) (But you overlooked me and rejected me)

In 89:39a, the Peshitta adds a suffix first person common singular, which is not found in Hebrew. The suffix refers back to the 'servant' (David). A similar example where the Peshitta adds a suffix is found in 89:52a.

Psalm 89:20a

MT: אָז דִּבַּרְתָּ בְחָזוֹן לַחֲסִידֶיךָ P: ܗܝܟܢܐ ܡܠܠܬ
ܒܚܙܝܐ ܥܡ
ܚܣܝܕܝܟ

(NIV: Once you spoke in a vision with your faithful) (Then he spoke in visions to his faithful)

The Peshitta changes the subject from second to third person. It has referred to the Lord in the previous verse.

Psalm 89:20c

MT: שִׁוִּיתִי עֵזֶר עַל גִּבּוֹר P: ܣܝܡܬ ܥܘܕܪܢܐ
ܥܠ ܓܒܪܐ

(NIV: I have bestowed strength on a warrior) (That I placed/granted strength on a warrior)

The Peshitta adds ܕ to make an implicit relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit. Psalm 89:50 is a similar example.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw in the Masoretic text rendered as a perfect verb without waw in Peshitta

A perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered by a perfect without waw by the Peshitta occurs the following number of times in Psalms 73–89:

Table 6: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73	9
74	16
75	4
76	5
77	10
78	49
79	9
80	5
81	5
82	2
83	4
84	4
85	4
86	4
87	3
88	17
89	15
	165

This Syriac perfect verb without waw is used to render a Hebrew perfect verb without waw occurs 165 times in the Peshitta and it is a rendering that follows the Hebrew closely. It is important to take note of instances where some variations occur in these examples. In 73:6a, the Peshitta simplifies the Masoretic Text by using a verb that is different from the rare verb in the Masoretic Text. In 77:10, the Masoretic Text has a rhetorical question introduced by the interrogative particle הֲ in the first part of the verse; at the beginning of the second part, אִם is added to introduce a double question. The Peshitta renders the rhetorical Hebrew question using □ □ at the beginning of both the first and second lines. In 85:3a, the Peshitta uses □ to link two nouns.

4.1.1.2 Perfect without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw

Attention is here given to the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered in the Peshitta as a perfect with waw. This rendering occurs frequently at the beginning of a verse and at the beginning of a new line or subsection in a verse. The waw added at the beginning of the verse is used to connect it with the previous verse, as is the case with the waw in the second line of a verse. An example of this pattern will be given from most of these seventeen psalms; the rest will just be listed. In this section, only the above characteristics will receive attention.

Sometimes, two verbs in Hebrew follow one another without a connecting waw; Syriac does not give preference to this construct, but rather follows the pattern of adding a waw to the second verb to connect the two verbs. The examples where the waw occurs, but not in one of the afore-mentioned positions, will be analysed and discussed in detail.

Psalm 73

Example 73:7a

MT: יָצָא מֵחֵלֶב עֵינֵמוֹ P: □□□ □□□□

□□□□□□ □□□□

(Their eyes bulge with fat) (And their iniquity goes out like fat)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the verse; the waw is not present in the Masoretic Text. It is possible that the Peshitta wants to connect this verse with the previous one. This verse has text-critical issues, but they are not vital for adding the waw at the beginning of the verse. Other similar examples are 73:7b and 73:26.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 73:19c

MT: סָפּוּ תַמּוּ מִן בַּלָּהוֹת P: □□ □□□□□ □□□

□□□□□□

(NIV: Completely swept away by terrors!) (They are finished, they are consumed from terror/fear)

In the above example in the Masoretic Text, two verbs follow one another, סָפּוּ (qal perfect third person masculine plural) and תַמּוּ (qal perfect third person masculine plural), without a waw

connecting them. The Peshitta adds the waw between the two verbs by attaching it to the second one and thus connecting the two verbs. The Peshitta presents them as □□□ (peal perfect third person masculine plural) and □□□□□ (waw + peal perfect third person masculine plural). The addition of a waw (□) by the Peshitta is just for stylistic purposes.

Psalm 74

Example 74:2b

MT: גָּאַלְתָּ שֵׁבֶט נַחֲלָתֶךָ P: □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□

(NIV: The tribe of your inheritance, whom you redeemed)

(And you rescued the tribe of your inheritance)

The Peshitta adds a waw to connect the second line with the previous line. It has a tendency of rendering a perfect verb without waw in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus perfect. The addition of the conjunction □ is for stylistic purposes and is not ascribed to the possibility that the translator of the Peshitta could have had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* before him. In this instance, the Masoretic Text has two implicit relative sentences. The Peshitta makes the first one explicit by adding the relative particle, while it makes the second a coordinate sentence by adding the waw. Psalm 74:13b is a similar example.

Psalm 75

Example 75:2d

MT: סָפְרוּ נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ P: □□□□□□□
□□□□□
□□¨□□□□

(NIV: Men tell of your wonderful deeds)

(And we will tell all of your deeds)

In this instance as well, the Peshitta changes the subject from third person masculine plural in the Masoretic Text and translates it as a first person common plural. Furthermore, the Peshitta adds the conjunction □, which is not found in the Masoretic Text at the beginning of a line.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:6b

MT: נָמוּ שְׁנָתָם P: □□□□□
□□□□□□

(NIV: They slept their last sleep) (And they slept their sleep)

The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus a perfect. The Peshitta adds a waw, which is absent from the Masoretic Text. The waw, which is added at the beginning of the second line, connects this new line to the previous one. The Peshitta also moves the subject of the next verb to this sentence, while the Masoretic Text has the same subject for the first two verbs of the verse.

נָמוּ שְׁנָתָם literally means, 'they slept their sleep', and □□□□□□ □□□□□ also literally means, 'And they slept their sleep'. It means that they slept the last or eternal sleep, that is, they are dead (Tate, 1990:262). In verses 5–7, God triumphs over the enemy of Israel. Psalm 76:9c is a similar example.

Psalm 77

Example 77:6

MT: חִשַּׁבְתִּי יָמִים מִקֶּדֶם P: □ ̈□□□ □□□□□
□□□ □□□

(NIV: I thought about the former days) (And I thought of the days of old)

In this instance, as well as in the previous psalms, the Peshitta adds the conjunction □ at the beginning of the new line, probably connecting it to the previous one. Examples 77:15b and 77:16 are similar to 77:6.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 77:5a

MT: אָחַזְתָּ שְׁמֻרוֹת עֵינָי P: □ ̈□□□□
□□□□□□□
□□ ̈□□□

(NIV: You kept my eyes from closing)/(Literal: You seized the eyelids of my eyes) (And dizziness seized me at my eyes)

The Peshitta changes the subject from the second person masculine singular as found in the Masoretic Text to the third person masculine plural. Furthermore, the Peshitta adds a suffix not present in the Masoretic Text, thus naming the object of the verb. Again, the addition of the waw is just for stylistic purposes. It is also added at the beginning of the line.

Psalm 78

Example 78:40b

MT: יַעֲצִיבוּהוּ בִּישִׁימוֹן P: □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: And grieved him in the wasteland!) (And he angered him in the desert)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a new line and also connects the line to the previous sentence. Psalms 78:19b, 78:57c and 78:59a are similar examples.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 78:62b

MT: וּבְנַחֲלָתוֹ הִתְעַבָּר P: □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□

(NIV: He was very angry with his inheritance) (And he did not care about his inheritance)

The Peshitta adds a waw to the verb □□□□ at the beginning of a new line, after changing the word order. The waw is absent from the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta has the preposition מִן ('from') between the verb and the noun. In the Peshitta, the verb is to be read together with the preposition to translate the hithpael in the Masoretic Text. Semantically, the verbs differ in meaning ('to become angry/to show anger' *versus* 'to desist/to neglect/to not care about'). The word order in the Peshitta differs from the Masoretic Text. The waw is added after the verb has been moved to the beginning of the verse. The preposition מִן is used here by the Peshitta to render the Hebrew preposition בְּ.

Psalm 79

Psalm 79:1b

MT: טִמְּאוּ אֶת הֵיכַל קָדְשֶׁךָ P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: They have defiled your holy temple) (And they have defiled your holy temple)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of this line. The waw is not found in the Masoretic Text. The addition of the waw is for the sake of the Syriac syntax.

Psalm 80

Example 80:11

MT: כָּסּוּ הָרִים צִלָּהּ P: ܘܟܣܝ ܛܘܪ̈ܐ ܒܨܠܠܗ̇
ܕܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܒܪ̈ܝܫ

(NIV: The mountains were covered with its shade) (And the mountains were hidden from its shade)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the verse, thus probably connecting it to the previous verse.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:5a

MT: אָמְרוּ לְכוּ וְנַכְחִידֵם מִגּוֹי P: ܘܐܡܪ̈ܘ ܗܒ ܢܫܬܝܢ
ܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܡܢ
ܥܡܐ

(NIV: ‘Come,’ they say, ‘let us destroy them as a nation…’) (And they said, ‘Come, destroy them from a nation…’)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a verse, which is for stylistic purposes. Psalm 83:9a and 83:11b are examples similar to 83:5a.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:3b

MT: נִכְסְפָה וְגַם כָּלְתָה נַפְשִׁי לְחַצְרוֹת יְהוָה P: ܢܦܫܝ ܬܐܒܬ
ܘܐܦ ܟܠܬ ܠܡܬܟ̈ܫ
ܒܬܪ̈ܥܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ

(My soul yearns, even faints, for the courts of the Lord) (And my soul longs and desire/hope for the courts of the Lord)

In this instance, the Hebrew has וְגַם and the Peshitta just translates ☐, while גַּם is not translated. This example is a bit different from the other examples, as the waw is not just an addition, but it takes the place of וְגַם. The Peshitta renders a perfect without waw as a perfect plus waw.

Psalm 85

Example 85:2b

MT: שַׁבְתָּ שבות [שְׁבִית קרי] יַעֲקֹב P: ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: You restored the fortunes of Jacob) (And you turned the captivity of Jacob)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second line. The addition is for stylistic purposes. Psalms 85:3b and 85:4b are similar examples.

The following example needs a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 85:4a

MT: אָסַפְתָּ כָּל עֶבְרָתֶךָ P: ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: You set aside all your wrath) (And you took away all your wrath/anger)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the verse, just for stylistic purposes. Here also, there is a slight difference in the meanings of the verbs. In the Hebrew, the verb normally means 'to gather'. Here it is translated by ☐☐☐☐, according to the sense within the context.

Psalm 88

Example 88:5c

MT: הָיִיתִי כְּגֶבֶר אֵין אֱיָל P: ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: I am like a man without strength) (I am like a man that is without strength)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second line, which is for stylistic purposes. Similar examples are 88:9c (where both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have suffixes), 88:10b (where both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta again have suffixes) and 88:18b.

The following example needs a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 88:10c

MT: שִׁטַּחְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ כַּפָּי P: ܘܐܫܪܝܬ ܠܘܬܟ ܐܝܕܝ

(NIV: I spread out my hands to you) (And I stretched out my hand to you)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a new line (second line). The addition of a waw is just for stylistic purposes. The Peshitta has the object (my hand) before the prepositional phrase thus not following the word order as it is in the Hebrew, though the change does not affect the meaning. The object is also moved to before the prepositional phrase in the Peshitta.

Psalm 89

Example Ps 89:4b

MT: נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְדָוִד עַבְדִּי P: ܐܡܠܬ ܠܕܘܝܕ ܥܒܕܝ

(NIV: I have sworn to David my servant) (And I have sworn to David my servant)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second line, just for stylistic purposes. Some examples similar to this one are 89:20d, 89:21a, 89:39c, 89:40a, 89:40b, 89:42a, 89:42c, 89:43a, 89:43b, 89:45a, 89:46a and 89:52c.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 89:41b

MT: שַׂמְתָּ מִבְצָרָיו מְחִתָּה P: ܘܗܪܣܬ ܟܠ ܡܒܨܪܘܗܝ

(NIV: and reduced his strongholds to ruins) (And you have demolished his strongholds)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a new line. The Masoretic Text has the verb 'to put/set/lay/place', while the Peshitta has the verb meaning 'to throw down/demolish'. There is semantic difference between the two verbs. The Peshitta has a free translation of this part by translating the Hebrew verb and the noun referring to 'ruin' together with the one verb 'to demolish'.

Psalm 89:46b

MT: הֶעֱטִיתָ עָלָיו בּוּשָׁה סֶלָה

P: □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

(NIV: You have covered him with a mantle of shame. *Selah*)

(And you dressed/covered him in/with shame)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a new line. Furthermore, it adds and uses a suffix (object) in the place of the Hebrew עַל and translates it as such.

This tendency of the Peshitta to render the Hebrew verb in perfect without waw as a perfect with waw does not suggest a different *Vorlage*. The addition of the waw was made by the translator in his attempt to clarify the Hebrew or to render it in accordance with Syriac syntactic style.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw

The number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta is set out in the table below.

Table 7: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73	4
74	2
75	1
76	2
77	4
78	5
79	1
80	1
81	0
82	0
83	3
84	1

Psalm	Number of occurrences
85	4
86	0
87	0
88	5
89	15
	48

A perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered in Peshitta as a perfect plus waw occurs 48 times. A waw at the beginning of the verse, which is absent in Hebrew, is added 14 times by the Peshitta. In 28 instances, the Peshitta added the waw not found in Hebrew at the beginning of a new line or a section of a line in the verse, in this way connecting the new line or section to the previous one. Furthermore, in five instances, the Peshitta adds a waw between two verbs connecting them, while the waw is absent from the Hebrew. The Peshitta does not give preference to the use of two verbs following each other without a waw; therefore it adds the waw. The additions are mostly related to the Syriac syntactic style and they are not the result of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, for example in 73:7a.

4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle

The Peshitta in some instances renders the perfect in the Masoretic Text as a perfect of □□□ plus the participle of the verb corresponding to the Hebrew verb. The psalms in which this method of rendering verbs is found will be treated in this section. Verbs directly affected and referred to by footnotes in BHS or text-critical problems will be dealt with in 5.9 Texts with text-critical issues (p. 344).

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:2b

MT: כְּאַ֥יִן שׁפכה [שֻׁפְכוּ קרי] אֲשֻׁרָ֑י

P: □□□ □□ □□□□ □□ ¨□ □□ ¨□□□□ □□□□ ¨□

(NIV: I had nearly lost my foothold)

(And my walking was almost poured out)

The Masoretic Text has שֻׁפְכֵה, the pual perfect third person common plural of שׁפך ('to be made to slip'), which the Peshitta renders as □□ ̈□ □□ ̈□□□□, the ethpeel participle masculine plural of □□□ ('to be poured') plus the peal perfect third person feminine plural □□□ ('to be'). The Peshitta uses this compound tense to render the perfect in the Masoretic Text. The use of the perfect of □□□ plus the participle, in this instance, indicates an ongoing, repeated or habitual action in the past (Muraoka, 1987:46; Nöldeke, 1966:197, par 263).

Psalm 73:2a has a text-critical problem and will therefore be treated in Chapter 5.[29]

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:34a

MT: אִם הָרָגָם וּדְרָשׁוּהוּ | וְשָׁבוּ וְשִׁחֲרוּ אֵל

(NIV: Whenever God slew them, they would seek him; they eagerly turned to him again)

P: □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□ □□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□

(Whenever he killed them, they would strive after him; and they place [themselves] before him)

In this instance, the Peshitta uses □ □□ to render the Hebrew אִם found in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders the Masoretic Text הָרָגָם, the qal perfect third person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine plural of הרג ('to kill'), as a compound tense of □□□□, the participle □ + □□ + peal participle masculine singular of □□□ ('to kill') + □□□ peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ ('was'). The compound tense of the perfect of □□□ plus a participle expresses habitual or repetitive action in the past.

Psalm 78:34b

In this instance as well, the Peshitta uses a compound of the perfect of □□□ plus a participle, □□□□ (peal participle third person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine plural □□□ 'to strive after, pursue') + □□□ (peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'was') to render a perfect with waw, that is וּדְרָשׁוּהוּ (conjunction + qal perfect third person common plural + suffix third person masculine singular of דרשׁ 'to seek'). The Peshitta keeps the suffix as in the Hebrew. The use of a compound tense refers to a habitual or repetitive action.

[29] See *Psalm 73:2* (p. 335).

Psalm 78:34c

Also in this instance, the Peshitta uses the compound tense of the perfect of □□□ plus a participle, □□□□□ (peal participle masculine plural of □□□ 'to turn back, return' + □□□, the peal perfect third person masculine singular □□□ 'was') to render the perfect plus waw, that is וְשָׁבוּ, (conjunction + qal perfect third person common plural of שׁוּב 'to return'), found in the Masoretic Text. The use of □□□ plus participle indicates habitual or repetitive action. When analysing the verse as a whole, its syntactic construction, 'whenever/when…then…', indicates repetition of an event that took place in the past (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:297; Muraoka, 1987:46; Nöldeke, 1966:197, par 263).

Psalm 78:34d (וְשָׁחֲרוּ/□□□□□□□) is directly affected by a text-critical note and will receive full attention in Chapter 5.[30]

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:6c

MT: שְׂפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֶשְׁמָע	P: □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□
(NIV: I heard a voice I did not recognise)	(He heard a language which he did not understand)

The Peshitta uses the compound of □□□ □□□ to render יָדַעְתִּי, the qal perfect first person common singular of ידע ('to know'). The verb □□□ always follows the participle. The Peshitta adds □, making an implicit relative clause in the Masoretic Text explicit. It also changes the subject from first person to third person. The third person refers to Joseph at the beginning of the verse.

Summary: Perfect verb rendered as a perfect □□□ plus participle

A perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle. This use occurs only in the psalms indicated in the table below.

[30] See Psalm 78:34d (p. 297).

Table 8: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (2a, 2b)	2
78 (34a, 34b, 34c, 34d)	4
81 (6c)	1
	7

This use occurs 7 times in this group of psalms (Pss 73–79). In most instances, the Peshitta uses this construction for habitual action in the past. In the above examples, it uses a compound of □□□ plus participle to render the perfect in the Masoretic Text (e.g. 73:2b). In 78:34a, the Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□ to render אִם in the Masoretic Text. In 81:6c, the Peshitta adds □ to make the implicit relative clause in the Masoretic Text explicit. It changes the subject from the first person common singular to third person masculine singular (81:6c).

4.1.1.4 Perfect verb without waw rendered as no verb

No verb means that the source language (Hebrew) has a verb and the target language (Syriac) does not render it at all in its translation.

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:12

MT: הִנֵּה אֵלֶּה רְשָׁעִים | וְשַׁלְוֵי עוֹלָם הִשְׂגּוּ חָיִל

(NIV: This is what the wicked are like – always carefree, they increase in wealth)

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□

(Behold! These are the wicked who are always at ease, and they [grow strong] increase in wealth/riches)

For the verb הִשְׂגּוּ, the hiphil perfect third person common plural of שׂגה (*hiphil* means ‘to make great; *qal* means ‘to grow great’), in the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta has □□□□□□□ □□□□□, an adjective derived from the verb ‘to be strong’. It is interesting that the Peshitta

uses the adjective, even though it has the corresponding verb ☐☐☐ (‘to be numerous, increase’).

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:18c

MT: זְכָר זֹאת אוֹיֵב חֵרֵף יְהוָה P: ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: Remember how the enemy has mocked you, O Lord) (Remember O Lord, the reproach of the enemy)

The Peshitta renders the Hebrew verb חֵרֵף, the piel perfect third person masculine singular of חרף (‘to reproach, scorn oneself’), in the Masoretic Text as ☐☐☐☐, a noun for the Hebrew verb, as if it is translated from the Hebrew noun חֶרְפָּה (‘reproach’). This is a good translation, for the translator used a noun that has a meaning related to the meaning of the Hebrew verb, even though the Syriac has a verb with the same root consonants as the Syriac noun.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:3d

MT: מֵאֲנָה הִנָּחֵם נַפְשִׁי P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: And my soul refused to be comforted) (There is no comforter for my soul)

The Peshitta renders the verb מֵאֲנָה (piel perfect third person feminine singular מאן ‘to refuse’), in the Masoretic Text as ☐☐☐☐, a conjunction + predicator of existence of ☐☐☐ ‘and there is not’, the negative of ☐☐☐). ☐☐☐ introduces an existential clause (‘there is …’; Muraoka, 1987:65, par 107).

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:71b

MT: מֵאַחַר עָלוֹת הֱבִיאוֹ P: ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐

(NIV: And took him from the sheep pens) (And from behind the sheep)

The Peshitta omits the Hebrew verb, the hiphil perfect third person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine singular of בוא (hiphil, 'to bring, carry in or let someone come, bring home'). It connects this verse to the previous one, with the last verb of the previous verse also valid for this verse.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw rendered by no verb

A perfect without waw rendered by no verb in the Peshitta occurs only in the psalms listed in the table below.

Table 9: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (12)	1
74 (18c)	1
77 (3d)	1
78 (71b)	1
	4

This rendering occurs four times and is usually related to contextual issues. It does not indicate a different *Vorlage*. In 73:12, the Peshitta uses an adjective to render the Hebrew verb, even though it has a verb with the same meaning.

4.1.1.5 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:27b

MT: הִצְמַתָּה כָּל זוֹנָה מִמֶּךָּ

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: You destroy all who are unfaithful to you)

(And you destroy all who wander or stray against you forever)

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second line, thus connecting it to the previous part of the verse. This connecting waw that the Peshitta adds here is not present in the Masoretic

Text. The Hebrew has a euphemistic meaning (literally ‘to silence’, translated by ‘destroy’ in the NIV), whereas the Syriac has the verb ‘to destroy’ or ‘to put to death’. The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus an imperfect. In the first half of the verse, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect, which is rendered as an imperfect. The Peshitta harmonises the second verb, the perfect in the Masoretic Text, with the preceding imperfect in both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:8c

MT: אָמְרוּ בְלִבָּם נִינָם יָחַד | שָׂרְפוּ כָל מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל בָּאָרֶץ

(NIV: They said in their hearts, ‘We will crush them completely!’ They burned every place where God was worshipped in the land)

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□

who is of the opinion that the verb נְשֹׂרֵף should be used. Though the Hebrew uses a difficult word, it needs to be retained with a change of person, that is, first person plural instead of third person plural.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw

A perfect without waw rendered as an imperfect with waw is found in the relevant psalms as indicated in the table below.

Table 10: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences in P
73 (27b)	1
74 (8c)	1

As indicated above, this use occurs only twice in this group of psalms (73–89). In 73:27b, the Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a new line in the verse, connecting it to the previous line. In some instances, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text (74:8c).

4.1.1.6 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative

Psalm 74

Example 74:7c

MT: לָאָרֶץ חִלְּלוּ מִשְׁכַּן שְׁמֶךָ

P: ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: They defiled the dwelling-place of your name)

(And pollute the dwelling-place of your name)

The Peshitta in this instance renders the perfect, חִלְּלוּ (piel perfect third person common plural of חלל ‘to pollute/defile’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is ☐☐☐☐ (peal imperative masculine plural of ☐☐☐ ‘to pollute’). The reason for using this verbal form in rendering may be a different interpretation of the unvocalised Hebrew. The Peshitta also adds a verb in the first part of the verse. This imperative of the Peshitta does not fit into the context. It may be that the Peshitta also regards the first two verbs in the verse in the Masoretic Text as imperatives, which is possible

in an unvocalised Hebrew text. This verse may thus be an example where the translator of the Peshitta did not understand the Hebrew.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative

A perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by an imperative in the Peshitta and this use occurs only once, in Psalm 74:7c. It could be an example where the translator of the Peshitta did not understand the Hebrew.

4.1.1.7 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a participle

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:3c

MT: כָּל הֵרַע אוֹיֵב בַּקֹּדֶשׁ

P: □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: All this destruction the enemy has brought on the sanctuary)

(All the evil that the enemy has brought in your sanctuary)

This method where a perfect in the Masoretic Text is rendered by a participle in the Peshitta occurs often. As the perfect indicates event(s) that took place in the past, the Peshitta uses the participle especially in the passive voice to emphasise the results of some events in the past (Muraoka, 1987:44; Nöldeke, 1966:209–211). The Peshitta renders the verb in the Masoretic Text, namely הֵרַע (hiphil perfect third person masculine singular of רעע 'to do evil, bring calamity, to cause damage') as □□□□ (aphel participle masculine of □□□ 'to do evil'). It is also noteworthy that the Peshitta adds □ before the participle. The Masoretic Text has כָּל ('all') before the verb, an unusual use in Hebrew (cf Ezra 1:6; Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:602, 36.2.1e:17), and the Peshitta uses □□ ('all') to render this followed by □. In this instance, the Peshitta makes an implicit relative sentence in the Masoretic Text explicit.

Psalm 77

Example 77:9a

MT: הֶאָפֵס לָנֶצַח חַסְדּוֹ

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□

(NIV: Has his unfailing love vanished forever?) (Or did he forever remove his steadfast love from me?)

The Masoretic Text has a rhetorical question introduced by הֲ, which the Peshitta translates as ☐☐☐. The Peshitta further adds the prepositional phrase ☐☐☐, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta still renders a perfect verb, הֶאָפֵס (qal perfect of אפס 'be gone, be at an end'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is ☐☐☐☐ (aphel participle masculine singular of ☐☐☐ 'to remove'). In this instance, the perfect in the Hebrew is used much like a present perfect and the rendering as a participle in the Peshitta makes good sense. Psalm 77:9b is a similar example.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:5

MT: עַד מָתַי עָשַׁנְתָּ בִּתְפִלַּת עַמֶּךָ P: ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐

(NIV: How long will your anger smoulder against the prayers of your people?) (Until when will you be angry against the prayers of your servants?)

Also in this verse, the Peshitta renders the perfect, עָשַׁנְתָּ (qal perfect second person masculine singular of עשׁן 'to be wrapped in smoke', 'smoke', 'ascending smoke'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (peal participle masculine singular of ☐☐☐ 'to be angry' + pronoun second person masculine singular 'you'). The Peshitta adds a pronoun second person masculine singular to render the second person masculine singular subject of the Hebrew verb (עָשַׁנְתָּ). This occurs in a question in the Hebrew and the Peshitta.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:11a

MT: אַתָּה דִכִּאתָ כֶחָלָל רָהַב P: ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐¨☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐¨☐☐☐

(NIV: You crushed Rahab like one of the slain) (You, you humbled the boastful people like killed people)

As in the previous psalm, the Peshitta renders a perfect, דְּכִאתָ, the piel perfect second person masculine singular of דכא (‘to beat to pieces, crush’), in the Masoretic Text as the participate □□□□, the pronoun + pael participle masculine singular of □□□ (‘to spread out’, ‘to extend’, ‘to crouch down’). It is vital to note that the Masoretic Text has a pronoun with a perfect (pronoun before 89:11a) and the Peshitta repeats the pronoun, that is before 89:11a and after.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw rendered as a participle

A perfect in the Masoretic Text is rendered by a participle in the Peshitta and it occurs only in the psalms as shown in the table below.

Table 11: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (3c)	1
77 (9a, 9b)	2
80 (5)	1
89 (11a)	1

The use of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta occurs five times in this group of psalms (73–89). The examples seem to be found where the perfect in the Masoretic Text is not used to indicate an event that is clearly in the past such as questions about the state of affairs. The Peshitta adds □ before the participle in 74:3c. In 74:3c, the Masoretic Text has כָּל before the verb, an unusual use in Hebrew, and the Peshitta renders it as □ □□. The Peshitta makes an implicit relative sentence in the Masoretic Text explicit. In 77:9a, a rhetorical question in the Masoretic Text introduced by הֲ is rendered in the Peshitta as □□ □.

4.1.1.8 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:11b

MT: צֶדֶק וְשָׁלוֹם נָשָׁקוּ P: □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Righteousness and peace kiss each other) (Righteousness and peace kiss each other)

In the above example, the Peshitta also renders the perfect verb without waw, נָשָׁקוּ (qal perfect third person common plural of נשׁק 'to kiss'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw, that is □□□□□□ (peal imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to kiss'). The reason for this is not clear. The Peshitta retains the perfect in the first half of the verse. The Hebrew perfect is used for a general statement.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:3a

MT: כִּי אָמַרְתִּי P: □□□ □□□□

(NIV: For I say) (For I will say)

The Peshitta uses an imperfect for the Hebrew perfect. For rendering the Hebrew conjunction כִּי, the Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□□. It may be that the Hebrew perfect is interpreted as a perfect pointing to the present (a per-formative) and thus is translated as an imperfect in the Peshitta.

Summary: Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

A perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by an imperfect without waw and the use occurs only in the psalms indicated in the table below.

Table 12: Number of occurrences of a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
85 (11b)	1
89 (3a)	1

This use occurs only twice. The Peshitta uses □ □□□ to render the Hebrew כִּי.

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering a perfect verb without waw

The table[31] below summarises the rendering of a perfect without waw in the psalms discussed.

Table 13: Distribution of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render perfect verbs without a waw as found in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences in P
4.1.1 (p. 92)	Perfect without waw		Total = 234
4.1.1.1 (p. 92)		Perfect without waw	165
4.1.1.2 (p. 114)		Perfect with waw	48
4.1.1.3 (p. 122)		Perfect of *hwy* + participle	7
4.1.1.4 (p. 125)		No verb	4
4.1.1.5 (p. 127)		Imperfect + waw	2
4.1.1.6 (p. 129)		Imperative	1
4.1.1.7 (p. 130)		Participle	5
4.1.1.8 (p. 132)		Imperfect without waw	2

A perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta using the various possibilities as presented in the above analysis. A perfect without waw occurs 234 times in the Masoretic. The distribution of the renderings of the 234 occurrences is as follows: in 165 instances, a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by perfect without waw in the Peshitta, which is what one would expect; 48 times a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a perfect plus waw in the Peshitta; seven times a perfect waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a participle in the Peshitta; four times a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as no verb in the Peshitta; twice a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta; once a perfect without waw is rendered as an imperative in the Peshitta; five times a perfect in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a participle; and twice a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect without waw. It is obvious from the above that the Peshitta renders a perfect as a perfect and this is made clear by its frequent

[31] In all of the tables, the 'Heading and page nos' in column 1 refers to the relevant heading number and page number of this study.

occurrences in 4.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text (p. 92) and in 4.1.1.2 Perfect without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 114). The other groups (4.1.1.3–4.1.1.8) seldom occur, 21 times in total.

At times, the Peshitta does not retain the word order as in the Masoretic Text, for example in Psalm 73:9a. The Peshitta simplifies rare Hebrew words, for example in Psalm 73:6a. Throughout, the Peshitta renders the Hebrew conjunction כִּי as a combination of □ □□□. It uses the relative particle □ to render the relative particle אֲשֶׁר in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta further adds □ to make the implicit relative clause or construction in the Masoretic Text explicit. It adds □ at the beginning of the verse to join it to the previous. It further adds □ at the beginning of the second line and also at the beginning of the new line. It sometimes adds a waw between two verbs to join them, where there is no waw in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta uses the combination □ □□ to render the conditional particle אִם. It uses □ □□ to render the interrogative particle הֲ employed in the Masoretic Text.

4.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic text

The rendering of perfect verbs with waw copulative are discussed under the following two headings:

4.1.2.1 Perfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 135)

4.1.2.2 Perfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a participle with waw (p. 137)

4.1.2.1 Perfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw

Psalm 77

Psalm 77:2

MT: קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְאֶצְעָקָה | קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְהַאֲזִין אֵלָי

(NIV: I cried out to God for help; I cried out to God to hear me)

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(With my voice, I cried/called to God. And he heard me and my voice I raised to him and he answered me)

The verse as a whole will be treated in Chapter 5.[32]

Example: Psalm 77:2d

MT: וְהַאֲזִין אֵלָי P: □□□□□

(NIV: And he will hear me) (And he answered me)

The Peshitta renders the Hebrew verb in a perfect form without waw, וְהַאֲזִין (waw copulative + hiphil perfect third person masculine singular of אזן), in the Masoretic Text as a conjunction plus a perfect, that is □□□□□ (conjunction □ + peal perfect third person masculine singular + first person common singular of □□□ 'to answer'). The difference in meaning is striking, because the Syriac gives a technical translation. In this instance, 77:2d in the Masoretic Text has a specific verb ('to give ear' or 'to listen to'), while the Peshitta uses a general verb ('to answer') and renders the Hebrew according to sense, not following the grammar as the Hebrew text. The addition of the two verbs by the Peshitta earlier in the verse and the use of the two verbs (2c and 2d) that is different in meaning but correct in meaning contribute to the translation technique of rendering a free translation.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:13b

MT: וְאָרוּהָ כָּל עֹבְרֵי דָּרֶךְ P: □ ̈□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: So that all who pass by pick its grapes?) (And all who passed on the road, trampled it)

The Peshitta renders the perfect verb with a waw, וְאָרוּהָ (waw copulative + qal perfect third person masculine plural + suffix third person feminine singular of ארה 'to pluck'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw, namely □□□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to trample'). The meaning of the verb used by the Peshitta ('to trample') is not the same as the one used by the Masoretic Text ('to pluck'). The Peshitta has the suffix third person feminine singular like the Masoretic Text (80:13b).

[32] 5.5.2 Cohortative as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions, Psalm 77:2a (p. 319); Psalm 77:2 (p. 357).

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:17f

MT: וְנִחַמְתָּנִי P: □□□□□□□

(NIV: And comforted me)/(Literal: And you comforted me) (And you comforted me)

The Peshitta renders a verb with perfect plus waw, that is וְנִחַמְתָּנִי (waw copulative + piel perfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person common singular of נחם 'to comfort'), in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus perfect, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction + pael perfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person singular of □□□ 'to console, comfort'). The Peshitta retains the suffix as in the Masoretic Text; it agrees with the Masoretic Text in all respects.

A perfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a waw plus a perfect in the Peshitta. This rendering occurs in three psalms as shown in the table below.

Table 14: Number of occurrences of a perfect verb with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect verb with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
72:2d	1
80:13b	1
86:17f	1

This rendering of verbs occurs three times in the above examples.

4.1.2.2 Perfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a participle with waw

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:34d

This is an example of a perfect with waw copulative rendered as a participle with waw.

MT: וְשָׁבוּ וְשִׁחֲרוּ אֵל P: □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: They eagerly turned to him again)/(Literal: And they turned/repented and sought for God eagerly)

(They returned and they truly/eagerly came before him)

The Peshitta uses a general verb (□□□□□□□) for a specific verb (וְשִׁחֲרוּ), in the Masoretic Text. It renders a perfect with waw, וְשִׁחֲרוּ (waw copulative + piel perfect third person common plural of שׁחר), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus a waw, that is □□□□□□□ (a conjunction + pael participle masculine plural of □□□ 'to come before him'). In this instance, there is a text-critical problem, but it is of no critical importance to the verb. A similar example is 78:38c.

A perfect with waw copulative rendered as a participle with waw occurs once in Ps 78:34d and once in Psalm 78:38c; therefore, this rendering occurs twice.

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering a perfect verb with waw copulative

The table below summarises the rendering of a perfect with waw copulative in the psalms discussed.

Table 15: Number of occurrences of a perfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw or participle with waw in the Peshitta

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.1.2 (p. 135)	Perfect verb with waw copulative		Total = 5
4.1.2.1 (p. 135)		Perfect with waw	3
4.1.2.2 (p. 137)		Participle with waw	2

The rendering of a perfect with waw copulative appears only five times in the Peshitta. A perfect with waw copulative is rendered as a perfect plus waw or as a participle with waw. In all of the above examples, the Peshitta does not add the waw, but the waw is merely a rendering of the waw copulative found in the Masoretic Text. There are only a few examples of a perfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text that are rendered in a similar way by the Peshitta.

4.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic text

The rendering of the perfect with waw consecutive is discussed under the following headings:

4.1.3.1 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 139)

4.1.3.2 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 140)

4.1.3.3 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 140)

4.1.3.1 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb with waw

The focus here is on the rendering of the perfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with waw.

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:11

MT: וְאָמְרוּ P: □□□□□□□

(NIV: They say) (And they say)

In the verse above, the Peshitta renders the perfect with a waw consecutive, וְאָמְרוּ (waw consecutive + qal perfect third person common plural), as a waw plus imperfect, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction + peal imperfect third person masculine plural □□□). It is vital in this instance to note that the Peshitta regards the waw as a waw consecutive, hence the translation 'And they say' in the Peshitta. It is also interesting that the Peshitta uses the same verb here as the one used in the Masoretic Text; in other instances, the Peshitta uses the verb □□□ instead of □□□.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:5b

MT: וּבָנִיתִי לְדֹר וָדוֹר כִּסְאֶךָ P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: I will establish your throne for ever) (And I will establish your throne for generations)

In the above example, the Peshitta renders the verb with waw consecutive plus perfect in the Masoretic Text, namely וּבָנִיתִי (waw consecutive + qal perfect first person common singular of בנה 'to build [up]', 'to fortify') as a waw plus imperfect, namely □□□□□ (conjunction + peal imperfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to build').

To sum up, the rendering of a perfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta occurs twice in Psalms 73–89, once in 73:11 and once in 89:5b.

4.1.3.2 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

Psalm 89

In this instance, a waw consecutive plus perfect is rendered by an imperfect without a waw.

Psalm 89:26a offers a good example of this method of rendering a verbal form.

MT: וְשַׂמְתִּי בַיָּם יָדוֹ P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: I will set his hand over the sea) (I will place his hand over the sea)

A waw consecutive plus perfect, וְשַׂמְתִּי (waw consecutive + qal perfect first person singular of שׂוּם 'to put, set, place'), in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect without a waw, namely □□□□ (peal imperfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to put, set, place') by the Peshitta. Probably the Peshitta sees this verse as not being connected to the previous one and that it forms a completely new line. Psalms 89:24a, 89:30 and 89:33 are similar examples.

Summary: Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

To sum up, the rendering of a perfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw occurs four times in Psalms 73–89, as indicated in the table below.

Table 16: Number of occurrences of a verb with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect verb without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
89 (24a, 26a, 30, 33)	4

4.1.3.3 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb with waw

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:13a

MT: וְהָגִיתִי בְכָל פָּעֳלֶךָ P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ ̈□□

(NIV: I will meditate on all your works) (And I meditated on all your works)

The Peshitta renders the perfect with waw, that is וְהָגִיתִי (conjunction + qal perfect first person common singular of הגה ‘to meditate’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw, that is ☐☐☐☐☐ (peal perfect first person common singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to meditate, reflect on, think’ + conjunction). The Peshitta agrees with the Masoretic Text. In the second part of the verse, the Peshitta also renders an imperfect as a perfect, placing the whole verse in the past.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:13b

MT: וְהִצַּלְתָּ נַפְשִׁי מִשְּׁאוֹל תַּחְתִּיָּה

P: ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: and (you) will deliver my life from the depths of Sheol)

(And you have delivered my soul from the lowest sheol)

The Peshitta renders a conjunction plus perfect, that is וְהִצַּלְתָּ (waw consecutive + hiphil perfect second person masculine singular of נצל ‘to save, to rescue, take away, pull out, extricate’), in the Masoretic Text as a conjunction plus a perfect, that is ☐☐☐☐☐ (conjunction + pael perfect second person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to save’, ‘to deliver’, ‘to separate’).

To sum up, a perfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered in the Peshitta as a perfect with waw occurs twice, as indicated in the table below.

Table 17: Number of occurrences of a perfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
77:13a	1
86:13b	1

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering a perfect plus waw consecutive

The different renderings of a perfect plus waw consecutive described in 4.2.3.1 (p. 139), 4.2.3.2 (p. 140) and 4.2.3.3 (p. 140) together occur eight times in Psalms 73–89: twice as an imperfect plus waw, four times as imperfect without waw and twice as a perfect plus waw (see table below). In

most instances, the Peshitta translator remained faithful to the Hebrew text at his disposal. He retained the word order and rendered a perfect as a perfect.

In the instances where the Peshitta uses a perfect with waw, it interprets the waw in the Masoretic Text not as a waw consecutive, but as a waw copulative.

Table 18: Categories of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render a perfect verb with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.1.3 (138)	Perfect with waw consecutive		TOTAL = 8
4.1.3.1 (p. 139)		Imperfect with waw	2
4.1.3.2 (p. 140)		Imperfect without waw	4
4.1.3.3 (p. 140)		Perfect with waw	2

Syriac is very flexible and changes the word order at certain points. At other points, it deviates from the Hebrew or even changes the subject. The Syrian translator mostly remained faithful to the Syriac structure and syntax, for example Psalms 73:7b and 73:19c.

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text by the Peshitta

The perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered by the Peshitta as a perfect without waw occurs 165 times (e.g. in 73:9a). This rendering follows the Hebrew closely. In another 48 instances, a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as a perfect plus waw, but this does not imply a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (74:2b); the Peshitta translator added the waw in these instance in an attempt to clarify the Hebrew. The addition of the waw by the Peshitta translator occurs at the beginning of a verse, the beginning of a new line or section in a verse or between the two verbs. There is no correspondence with the relevant Hebrew psalms in any of these three instances (e.g. 73:7a, 74:2b and 73:19c). Furthermore, a perfect without a waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered seven times in the Peshitta as the perfect of □ □ □ plus a participle (e.g. 78:34a). The Peshitta uses the construct of □ □ □ plus participle to indicate habitual action in the past. In the other four occurrences (e.g.77:3d), the Peshitta renders the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as no verb, and such renderings are for contextual issues and do not imply a

different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Furthermore, the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an imperfect plus waw in two other instances (for example 74:8c).

On one occasion, a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an imperative, which is clearly a case of misunderstanding the Hebrew (74:7c). In five other examples, the Peshitta renders the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a participle (e.g. 80:5). Lastly, the Peshitta renders the perfect without waw on two other occasions as an imperfect without waw (e.g. 85:11b). In total, a perfect without waw is rendered 234 times.

The perfect with waw copulative occurs five times and in three of these instances, it is rendered as a perfect plus waw (e.g. 86:17f) and twice as a participle plus waw (e.g. 78:34d). Lastly, a perfect with waw consecutive is translated eight times, that is, twice as an imperfect plus waw (e.g. 73:11), four times as an imperfect without waw (e.g. 89:5b) and twice as a participle with waw (e.g. 77:13a). In total, a perfect with waw copulative plus waw consecutive occurs thirteen times.

The verbs in the perfect with or without waw occur 247 times in Psalms 73–89. To sum up the above, the perfect without waw is the most common verbal form in the psalms discussed. It is rendered as a perfect without or with a waw in the large majority of instances (i.e. 165 times and 48 times respectively). The table below demonstrates this analysis clearly.

Table 19: Classification of the perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

Heading & page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Frequency
4.1.1 (p. 92)	Perfect without waw		Total = 234
4.1.1.1 (p. 92)		Perfect without waw	165
4.1.1.2 (p. 114)		Perfect with waw	48
4.1.1.3 (p. 122)		Perfect of *hwy* + participle	7
4.1.1.4 (p. 125)		No verb	4
4.1.1.5 (p. 127)		Imperfect + waw	2
4.1.1.6 (p. 129)		Imperative	1
4.1.1.7 (p. 130)		Participle	5
4.1.1.8 (p. 132)		Imperfect without waw	2

Heading & page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Frequency
4.1.2 (p. 135)	Perfect verb with waw copulative		
4.1.2.1 (p. 135)		Perfect with waw copulative	Total = 5
4.1.2.2 (p. 137)		Perfect with waw	3
		Participle with waw	2
4.1.3 (138)	Perfect with waw consecutive		TOTAL = 8
4.1.3.1 (p. 139)		Imperfect with waw	2
4.1.3.2 (p. 140)		Imperfect without waw	4
4.1.3.3 (p. 140)		Perfect with waw	2
			Grand total of uses=247

In certain instances, Syriac simplifies rare Hebrew words, for example in 73:6a. Syriac adds certain features not present in Hebrew or omits words found in Hebrew, as in 77:9a.[33] Sometimes, Syriac uses the personal pronoun for the suffix in Hebrew, and sometimes the Peshitta adds a suffix that is absent from the Hebrew or it omits suffixes found in Hebrew (77:5a; 89:12). At times, the Peshitta renders a verb freely or according to sense (e.g. 74:4a).

Syriac also uses a more general or common word for Hebrew specific words or *vice versa* (78:57a; 85:12a; 86:6b; 88:6d). The Peshitta sometimes uses words that are totally different in meaning from the words used in Hebrew (73:8a; 89:8a). The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a verse or of a new line, or at the beginning of the second line for stylistic purposes (89:23a and 85:14b respectively). In 78:6d, the Peshitta adds a waw between two verbs. The Peshitta at certain points renders the Hebrew text in such a way to maintain harmony, to effect simplification or retain agreement (73:6; 73:15b).

The Peshitta employs the use of □ □□□ to translate the Hebrew אִם … הָ at certain points (77:10, 79:8d). It repeats □□ in both the first and second lines to render a rhetorical question in the Masoretic Text (cf 77:10). It also translates the Hebrew conjunction כִּי as □ □□□, for

[33] See 4.1.1.7 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a participle (p. 128).4.1.1.7 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a participle

example 74:2b and 74:2c. The Peshitta uses the relative particle ܕ for the relative particle אֲשֶׁר, also to make the implicit relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit (78:3a, 83:11a). The Peshitta uses ܐ ܕ to translate the Hebrew אִם (78:34a). It renders a rhetorical question introduced by הֲ as ܗ ܐ ܕ (77:9a). It further uses ܘ to link two nouns (85:3a).

4.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In this large group of verbal forms, the imperfect with or without waw will be the main focus. To deal adequately with these imperfect verbs the following verbal forms in the Masoretic Text will receive attention:

4.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text (p. 145)

4.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text (p. 188)

4.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative (p.198)

4.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text

Eight renderings of Hebrew imperfect verbs without waw into Syriac have been identified. They are discussed under the following headings:

4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 145)

4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw (p. 158)

4.2.1.3 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle (p. 161)

4.2.1.4 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 169)

4.2.1.5 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 176)

4.2.1.6 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect of *hwy* plus participle (p. 181)

4.2.1.7 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a no verb construct (p.183)

4.2.1.8 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative (p. 184)

4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:17a

MT: עַד אָבוֹא אֶל מִקְדְּשֵׁי אֵל P: ܥܕ ܐܥܠ ܠܩܕܫ ܐܠܗܐ
ܘܐܬܒܘܢܢ ܠܐܚܪܝܬ ܕܢܗܘܢ

(NIV: Till I entered the sanctuary of God) (Until I entered into the holy place of God)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect verb without waw, אָבוֹא (qal imperfect first person common singular of בוא), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw, that is ☐☐☐☐☐ (relative ☐, the peal imperfect first person common singular of ☐☐). It is interesting to note how the Peshitta handles the preposition עַד before the verb in the Masoretic Text, namely by using the combination ☐ ☐☐☐☐. Psalms 73:18a and 73:27a are similar examples.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 73:10b

MT: יִמָּצוּ לָמוֹ P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: And is drained by them) (They are completely able)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, יִמָּצוּ (niphal imperfect third person masculine plural of מצה 'to squeeze out, drain'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw, namely ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (peal imperfect third person masculine plural of ☐☐☐ 'to be glorious, to be able'), as expected. The Hebrew verb is strange ('to be pressed/drained out') and the Peshitta translates it quite differently ('to be able /glorious/to find'). Syriac has a verb with a similar meaning (☐☐☐ 'to squeeze/out') as the one used in Hebrew, but does not use it. It is probable that the Peshitta translator misunderstood the Hebrew. Though the Syriac is different from Hebrew, the same tense is retained to maintain agreement. Psalm 73:10a has a text-critical issue and will receive attention in Chapter 5.[34]

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:21c

MT: עָנִי וְאֶבְיוֹן יְהַלְלוּ שְׁמֶךָ P: ☐☐☐☐¨☐☐ ☐¨☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: May the poor and the needy praise your name) (May the poor and the needy praise your name)

[34] *Psalm 73:10* (p. 339).

The Peshitta renders the imperfect verb without waw, that is יְהַלְלוּ (piel imperfect third person masculine plural הלל ‘to praise’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect verb without waw, that is □□□□□□ (peal imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to praise, glorify, proclaim’). The imperfect in Syriac is used to present events in the future. The method where an imperfect in the Masoretic Text is rendered by an imperfect in the Peshitta is often used in these psalms, thus the rendering is expected. It is the method the Peshitta applies to maintain agreement.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:8b

MT: אָמְרוּ בְלִבָּם נִינָם יָחַד | שָׂרְפוּ כָל מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל בָּאָרֶץ

(NIV: They said in their hearts, ‘We will crush them completely!’ They burned every place where God was worshipped in the land)

P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□

used there. The Hebrew ינה (‘to oppress’, ‘to exploit’, ‘to enslave’) is semantically closely related to עשׁק (‘to oppress’, ‘to exploit’, ‘to enslave’) in meaning (Holladay, 1988:136, 286; VanGemeren, 1997b:471). The Peshitta opts to render this verb as ‘to put an end to’/’to commit to death’/’to destroy’, that is, according to sense. The unvocalised Hebrew text at the disposal of the Peshitta translator must have added to his frustration, if one follows the footnote in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* The footnote proposes the verbal root ינה, with reference to the reading of the Peshitta, is to read □□□□ without □. The unvocalised ינה can be a noun meaning ‘offspring’/’dove’/’proper name Jonah’ or it can be a qal participle feminine singular, meaning ‘oppressing’ (Koehler and Baumgartner, 1958:374 & 385).

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:3b

MT: אֲנִי מֵישָׁרִים אֶשְׁפֹּט

P: □□□□
□□□□□□□□
□□□□

(NIV: It is I who judge uprightly) (And it is I who judge uprightly)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect verb without waw, that is אֶשְׁפֹּט (qal imperfect first person common singular of שׁפת ‘to judge’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw, that is □□□□ (peal imperfect first person common singular of □□□ ‘to judge’), as could be expected. The Peshitta maintains agreement by rendering an imperfect as an imperfect. Psalm 75:3a (the Peshitta renders כִּי in Hebrew as □ □□□), 75:9c and 75:11a are similar examples.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 75:10a

MT: וַאֲנִי אַגִּיד לְעֹלָם

P: □□□□
□□□□ □□□

(NVI: As for me, I will declare this forever) (I will live forever)

The Peshitta maintains agreement by rendering an imperfect, אַגִּיד, (hiphil imperfect first person common singular of נגד ‘to tell’) as an imperfect, namely □□□ (peal imperfect first person common singular of □□□ ‘to live’ or ‘to be alive’). The root in Syriac has a yod in the middle.

One would expect a form of the verb □□□, but in this instance Syriac used a word that differs in meaning from the Hebrew root. It might be an early mistake in the Syriac transmission.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:8b

MT: וּמִי־יַעֲמֹד לְפָנֶיךָ מֵאָז אַפֶּךָ

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: Who can stand before you when you are angry?)

(Who will stand up before you in this anger?)

The Peshitta does not use the same verb as the Hebrew uses, but a verb with the same meaning. The Syriac root with the same consonants as the Hebrew has a different meaning (‘to immerse’). The Peshitta also renders the imperfect יַעֲמֹד, the qal imperfect third person masculine singular of עמד (‘to stand’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect □□□□, the peal imperfect third person masculine singular of □□ (‘to stand’, ‘to stand up’). Similar examples are 75:11a, 75:11b and 75:12c.

Verse 11 as a whole will receive more attention in Chapter 5 since the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text.[35]

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:17c

MT: יָחִילוּ

P: □□□□□

(They trembled)

(And they feared)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect, יָחִילוּ (qal imperfect third person masculine plural of חוּל ‘to tremble’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□ (peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to fear, be afraid, revere’, ‘to tremble’). A similar example is 77:17b.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:4a

[35] See Psalm 76:11 (p. 355).

MT: לֹא נְכַחֵד מִבְּנֵיהֶם P: □□□ □□□ □□□ □□□ □□ □□□□

(NIV: We will not hide from their children) (We will not conceal/hide from their son)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect verb, נְכַחֵד (piel imperfect, i.e. future, first person common plural of כחד 'to hide'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, namely □□□□ (pael imperfect first person common plural of □□□ 'to conceal'). Similar examples are 78:6a (the Peshitta uses □ for לְמַעַן in the Masoretic Text), 78:7b, 78:7c, 78 :8a and 78:44c.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:8c

MT: מַהֵר יְקַדְּמוּנוּ רַחֲמֶיךָ P: □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: May your mercy come quickly to meet us) (May your mercy come quickly to meet us)

The Peshitta retains an imperfect as in the Masoretic Text. Both verbs have suffixes: the Masoretic Text has יְקַדְּמוּנוּ, the piel imperfect (future) third person masculine plural plus suffix first person common plural of קדם ('be in front', 'meet someone with something'), and the Peshitta has □□□□□□□□, the pael imperfect third person masculine plural plus suffix first person common plural of □□□ ('go before', 'to come up'). Similar examples are 79:10a, 79:10b, 79:11a, 79:13a and 79:13b

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80: 17c

MT: יֹאבֵדוּ P: □□□□□□

(NIV: Your people perish) (They perish)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect as an imperfect. Similar examples are 80:18a, 80:19a and 80:19c.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:10a

MT: לֹא־יִהְיֶה בְּךָ אֵל זָר P: □□□ □□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□

(NIV: You shall have no foreign god among you) (It/there shall not be for you a foreign god)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect as an imperfect, as could be expected. Similar examples are 81:9d (note the Peshitta uses a suffix for the preposition לִי in the Masoretic Text), 81:10c and 81:19d.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:7a

MT: אָכֵן כְּאָדָם תְּמוּתוּן P: □□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □¨□□□□□

(NIV: But you will die like mere men) (Now you will die like ordinary/mere men)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect, תְּמוּתוּן (qal imperfect second person masculine plural of מוּת 'to die'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, namely □□□□□□ (peal imperfect second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to die'), as could be expected. The Peshitta retains the imperfect to maintain the agreement with the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are 82:7b and 82:8c.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:5d

MT: וְלֹא יִזָּכֵר שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹד P: □□□ □□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□□ □□□

(NIV: …That the name of Israel be remembered no more) (…That the name Israel is remembered no more)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect, יִזָּכֵר (niphal imperfect third person masculine singular of זכר 'to remember'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, namely □□□□□ (ethpeel imperfect first person common plural of □□□ 'to recall, remember') and uses the very same verb as in Hebrew. The Peshitta retains the imperfect and the word order to indicate agreement. Psalms 83:18a and 83:18c are similar examples.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:5b

MT: עוֹד יְהַלְלוּךְ סֶלָה P: □□□□□□□
□□□□

(NIV: …They are ever praising you. *Selah*) (…They glorify you forever)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect, יְהַלְלוּךְ (piel imperfect third person masculine plural of הלל ‘to praise’, ‘to sing’ + suffix second person masculine singular), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□□□□ (pael imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ + suffix second person masculine singular ‘to praise, glorify’), and retains the suffix as well, as in the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are 84:7c, 84:8a, 84:12a, and 84:12b.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:6b

MT: תִּמְשֹׁךְ אַפְּךָ לְדֹר וָדֹר P: □□□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□□□

(NIV: Will you prolong your anger through all generations?) (And will you not keep your anger through generations?)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect, תִּמְשֹׁךְ (qal imperfect second person masculine singular of משׁך ‘to prolong’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□ (peal imperfect second person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to keep, to guard, to secure’). This part is the continuation of the rhetorical question and the Peshitta uses □□□. At the beginning of verse 6, that is 85:6a, the Masoretic Text has the interrogative particle הֲ for the rhetorical question, while the Peshitta has the negative statement □□□ repeated in 85:6b. Psalms 85:6a, 85:7c, 85:8a, 85:12a (where the Masoretic Text has a general verb which the Peshitta renders with a specific verb), 85:13a, 85:13b and 85:14a are similar examples.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:3b

MT: כִּי אֵלֶיךָ אֶקְרָא כָּל הַיּוֹם P: □□□□ □□□
□□□□□ □□□

(NIV: For I call to you all day long) (For to you I cry/call all the day)

The Peshitta maintains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. It renders the imperfect, אֶקְרָא (qal imperfect first person common singular of קרא 'to call'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□ (peal imperfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to call'). The Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□□ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי. Psalm 86: 4b, 86:9b and 86:12a are similar examples.

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:4a

MT: אַזְכִּיר רַהַב וּבָבֶל לְיֹדְעָי

P: □□□□□ □□□□
□□ ̈ ̣□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: I mention Rahab and Babylon to my followers.)

(I mention Rahab and Babylon to my followers)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect, אַזְכִּיר (hiphil imperfect first person common singular of זכר 'to remember, recall'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, namely □□□□□ (ethpeel imperfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to remember, recollect'). This is what could be expected. Similar examples are 87:5a, 87:5c and 87:6a.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:3a

MT: תָּבוֹא לְפָנֶיךָ תְּפִלָּתִי

P: □□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□

(NIV: May my prayer come before you)

(May my prayer come/enter before you)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect, תָּבוֹא (qal imperfect third person feminine singular of בוא 'to go in, penetrate, come in, come up to'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is□□□□ (peal imperfect third person feminine singular of □□□ 'to enter'), as could be expected. The Peshitta retains the imperfect to maintain agreement between the source text and the target text. Psalms 88:9e, 88:11c, 88:14b and 15a are similar examples.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 88:13a

MT: הֲיִוָּדַע בַּחֹשֶׁךְ פִּלְאֶךָ

P: ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: Are your wonders known in the place of darkness?)

(It shall be known, your wonders in the dark/Your wonders shall be known in the dark(ness))

The Peshitta renders the imperfect, הֲיִוָּדַע (interrogative particle הֲ + niphal imperfect third person masculine singular of ידע 'to know'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is ☐☐☐☐☐ (ethpeel imperfect third person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ 'to know'). The Peshitta retains the same word order and has a statement, while the Masoretic Text has a question.

Psalm 88:15b

MT: תַּסְתִּיר פָּנֶיךָ מִמֶּנִּי

P: ☐☐☐̈☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐

(NIV: …hide your face from me?)

(And you did not turn your face back from me)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect, that is תַּסְתִּיר (hiphil imperfect second person masculine singular of סתר 'to hide') as an imperfect, that is ☐☐☐☐ (peal imperfect second person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ 'to turn back', 'to turn away'), as could be expected. The Peshitta uses a verb with the meaning 'to turn away' (general/common), while the Masoretic Text has a verb with the meaning 'to hide' (specific). Even though this is the case, the meaning remains the same. The first part of the verse is a question in the Masoretic Text, and the second part is also a question. The Peshitta makes the whole question in the MT (88:15a and 88:15b) a negative statement.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:2b

MT: חַסְדֵי יְהוָה עוֹלָם אָשִׁירָה | לְדֹר וָדֹר אוֹדִיעַ אֱמוּנָתְךָ בְּפִי

(NIV: I will declare that your love stands firm for ever, that you established your faithfulness in heaven itself)/I will sing continually about the LORD's faithful deeds; to future generations I will proclaim your faithfulness

P: ܕܐܝܕܝ ܠܥܠܡ ܐܪܚܡ ܘܠܕܪ ܘܕܪ ܐܗܘܕܥ ܫܘܪܪܝܬܟ ܒܦܘܡܝ

(I will sing that the love of the Lord is for ever, to generation and generation I will declare his faithfulness with my mouth)

The Peshitta retains the imperfect, אוֹדִיעַ (hiphil imperfect first person common singular of ידע 'to make known, inform or announce'), in the Masoretic Text and renders it as an imperfect, that is ܐܗܘܕܥ (afeel imperfect first person common singular of ܝܕܥ 'to make known, declare'). The Peshitta uses the same verb as the one in the Masoretic Text. Psalms 89:3b, 89:3c, 89:14a, 89:16b, 89:17a, 89:17b, 89:18a, 89:24c, 89:25, 89:27, 89:29b, 89:31b, 89:34b, 89:35b, 89:36b, 89:37, 89:38a and 89:49c are similar examples.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 89:28a

MT: אַף־אֲנִי בְּכוֹר אֶתְּנֵהוּ | עֶלְיוֹן לִמַּלְכֵי אָרֶץ[36]

(NIV: I will also appoint him my firstborn; the most exalted of the kings of the earth)

P: ܘܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܒܟܪܐ ܐܫܘܝܝܗ ܠܗ ܥܠ ܡܠܟܝ ܐܪܥܐ

(I will also appoint him my firstborn; and I will make him high/exalt him over the kings of the earth)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect, אֶתְּנֵהוּ (qal imperfect first person common singular + suffix third person masculine singular of נתן 'to give'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is ܐܫܘܝܝܗ (aphel imperfect first person common singular + suffix third person masculine singular of ܝܬܒ 'to make, perform, carry out'). The Peshitta maintains agreement.

The Peshitta does not render עֶלְיוֹן ('*Elyon*) as in the Hebrew, but adds a preposition ܥܠ ('above', 'upon'). This preposition corresponds to the Hebrew עַל ('higher than' > 'on', 'over'), but עַל is not found in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta also adds ܘܐܪܝܡ, a verb with a waw, the conjunction + aphel imperfect first person common singular + third person masculine singular of ܪܝܡ ('to exalt high, make high, arise'), which is not found in Hebrew text, probably because the Peshitta reads עֶלְיוֹן (*'Elyon*) as a verb. The Peshitta misinterprets the adjective עֶלְיוֹן ('upper or

[36] *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia:* Ps 89:28 (Bible, 2003).

exalted') and renders it as the verb □□□□□□□□□ ('to exalt or make high or arise'). This is probably the reason why there is an extra verb in the Peshitta in comparison with the Masoretic Text. Although the Peshitta renders the adjective in the Masoretic Text as a verb, it provides a good translation with same meaning; in truth, the meaning is not affected at all. The unvocalised Hebrew text probably added to translator's problem of making a decision in this instance. The waw is added at the beginning of the second line.

Psalm 89:49a

MT: מִי גֶבֶר יִחְיֶה וְלֹא יִרְאֶה מָוֶת

(NIV: What man can live and not see death?)

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□

(Who is the man that can live in order that he may not see death?)

The Peshitta has a relative sentence, which is perhaps implicit in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders an imperfect, יִחְיֶה (qal imperfect third person masculine singular of חיה 'to live'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□ (relative □ + peal imperfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to live') and keeps the original word order. The Peshitta adds the relative particle □ before the verb.

Summary: Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text

The rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text by the Peshitta as an imperfect without waw occurs 93 times in Psalms 73–89: 5X in 73; 2X in 74; 5X in 75; 4X in 76; 2X in 77; 6X in 78; 6X in79; 4X in 80; 4X in 81; 3X in 82; 3X in 83; 5X in 84; 8X in 85; 4X in 86; 4X in 87; 7X in 88 and 21X in 89. The table below shows the number of the psalm and the number of occurrences of each method of rendering in each psalm. This is the rendering that one would normally expect.

Table 20: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73	5
74	2
75	5

Psalm	Number of occurrences
76	4
77	2
78	6
79	6
80	4
81	4
82	3
83	3
84	5
85	8
86	4
87	4
88	7
89	21

The Peshitta uses □ □□□□ to render the preposition עַד in the Masoretic Text (73:17a). An imperfect with suffix third person masculine plural in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect after □, plus an independent pronoun □□□□, the third person masculine plural (74:8b) instead of a suffix. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of the second line of a verse (74:8b). The Peshitta renders the Hebrew כִּי as a combination of □ □□□ (75:3b; 86:3b). In Psalm 78:6a, the Peshitta uses □ *d* to render the Hebrew לְמַעַן in the Masoretic Text. In Psalm 81:9d, the Peshitta uses a suffix to render the Hebrew preposition לִי. The Peshitta handles the rhetorical questions in the Masoretic Text differently. Sometimes, the interrogative particle הֲ in the Masoretic Text introducing the rhetorical question is rendered as a negative statement using □□□; or, sometimes, only as □□ (85:6b; 88:15b). The Peshitta sometimes renders the question in the Masoretic Text just as a statement (88:13a). In other instances, it adds the relative particle □ before the verb (89:49a).

4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:6b

MT: תְּדַבְּרוּ בְצַוָּאר עָתָק

P: □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□

(NIV: Do not speak with outstretched neck)

(And they do not speak with outstretched neck)

In this instance (75:6b), the Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, that is תְּדַבְּרוּ (piel imperfect second person masculine plural of דבר 'to speak') as an imperfect plus waw, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction □ + pael imperfect second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to speak deliberately'). The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of the new/middle line of the verse; in the same way, it adds the waw at the beginning of the verse. Both the waws are absent from the Masoretic Text. The function of the additions is to connect a line or verse with the previous one.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 75:9d

MT: אַךְ שְׁמָרֶיהָ יִמְצוּ יִשְׁתּוּ כֹּל רִשְׁעֵי אָרֶץ

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□¨□ □□□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: And all the wicked of the earth drink it down to its very dregs)

(All the wicked of the earth must drain its dregs and all drink/All the wicked of the earth squeeze and drink it down to its very dregs/dirt)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, that is יִשְׁתּוּ (qal imperfect third person masculine plural of שׁתה 'to drink'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, that is □□□□□□ (conjunction □ + peal imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to drink'). The Peshitta retains the word order and also uses the same verbs as in the Masoretic Text. In Hebrew, as found in the Masoretic Text, two verbs follow one another without a connecting waw (יִשְׁתּוּ יִמְצוּ). Syriac does not prefer this use; hence the addition of the connecting waw (□□□□□□ □□□□).

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:8b

MT: יֵלְכוּ מֵחַיִל אֶל חָיִל | יֵרָאֶה אֶל אֱלֹהִים בְּצִיּוֹן

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: They go from strength to strength till each appears before God in Zion)

(They go from strength to strength and each appear before the Lord)/(They go from strength to strength and he appears before God in Zion)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, that is יֵרָאֶה (niphal imperfect third person masculine singular of ראה 'to appear, become visible'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with waw, that is □□□□□□ (ethpeel imperfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to see'). Both the verbs in the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta are third person masculine singular, while the first verb at the beginning is plural; thus it has a plural subject. This addition is at the beginning of the second line of the verse.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:11b

MT: הוֹרֵנִי יְהוָה דַּרְכֶּךָ אֶהֱלַךְ בַּאֲמִתֶּךָ

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Teach me your way, O Lord, and I will walk in your truth)

(Teach me your way, O Lord, and I will walk in your truth)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, אֶהֱלַךְ (piel imperfect first person common singular הלך 'to walk') as an imperfect plus a waw, that is □□□□□ (conjunction + pael imperfect first person common singular, that is □□□ 'to walk'). It also retains the word order as found in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a line. Psalm 88:12 is a similar example.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:11d

MT: אִם רְפָאִים יָקוּמוּ יוֹדוּךָ סֶלָה

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Do those who are dead rise up and praise you?)

(Or will the strong men rise up and praise you?)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, יוֹדוּךָ (the hiphil imperfect third person masculine plural + suffix second person masculine singular of ידה ‘praise [obj. God]’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with waw, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (conjunction + aphel imperfect third person masculine plural of ☐☐☐ ‘to praise, to thank, to confess’). The Peshitta adds the waw in the second half of the line. It uses ☐☐ for the suffix second person masculine singular in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:14b

MT: תָּרוּם יְמִינֶךָ

P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: Your right hand exalted)

(And your right hand is exalted)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, תָּרוּם (qal imperfect third person feminine singular of רום ‘to be high, reach high’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (conjunction + ettaphel imperfect third person feminine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to be exalted, elevated, rise up, stand up’). The addition of the waw is made in a new line. Psalm 89:49b is a similar example.

Psalm 89:44a

MT: אַף תָּשִׁיב צוּר חַרְבּוֹ

P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: You have turned back the edge of his sword)

(And you have turned back the edge of his sword)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, תָּשִׁיב (hiphil imperfect second person masculine singular of שוב ‘to go back, return’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (conjunction + aphel imperfect second person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to turn, turn around’, ‘to bring back’). The Peshitta retains the word order as found in the Masoretic Text. It uses a waw to translate אַף.

Summary: Imperfect verbs without waw

The rendering of an imperfect without a waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw in the Peshitta occurs nine times: twice in Psalm 75, once in Psalm 84, twice in Psalm 86, once in Psalm 88 and three times in Psalm 89. The waw is added at the beginning of a new line (75:6b; 84:8b; 86:11b; 88:11d; 89:44a) or between two verbs (75:9d).

Table 21: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
75 :6b & 9d)	2
84 (8b)	1
86 (11b & 12)	2
88 (11d)	1
89 (14b, 44a & 49b)	3

4.2.1.3 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle

Here the focus is on all the instances in Psalms 73–89 where an imperfect without waw is rendered as a participle in the Peshitta Psalter 73–89.

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:9b

MT: וּלְשׁוֹנָם תִּהֲלַךְ בָּאָרֶץ

P: □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: And their tongues take possession of the earth)

(And their tongues take possession of the earth)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, תִּהֲלַךְ (qal imperfect third person feminine singular of הלך ‘to walk, go’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is □□□□ (pael participle feminine singular of □□□ ‘to walk, go’). The Syriac uses a participle (□□□□) where the Hebrew has an imperfect (תִּהֲלַךְ) for a general truth. Similar examples are Psalms 73:22b and 73:5. In the latter psalm, the Syriac has □□□□□□□, the ethpaal participle masculine plural of □□□. (‘to touch’). Syriac does not have the root for the Hebrew verb נגע, but uses a

verb of which the first two letters are the same (□□□) as the Hebrew נגע. The basic meaning of the Syriac verb is 'to touch', but it has various nuances in different contexts. Here it has a negative connotation. Asaph complains in this psalm that the wicked around him have never experienced this touch of God. The Peshitta retains the word order. It is a good translation by the Peshitta.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:10a

MT: עַד מָתַי אֱלֹהִים יְחָרֵף צָר

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: How long will the enemy mock you, O God?)

(Until when will the enemy insult you, O God)

In the verse above, the Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יְחָרֵף (piel imperfect third person masculine singular חרף 'to reproach, revile'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is □□□□ (pael participle masculine singular of □□□ 'to insult, revile, dishonour, shame'). The Peshitta retains the word order as found in the Masoretic Text to show agreement. The Peshitta uses □□□□□ □□□□ to translate the Hebrew עַד מָתַי. Psalm 74:10b is a similar example.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:8b

MT: כִּי אֱלֹהִים שֹׁפֵט | זֶה יַשְׁפִּיל וְזֶה יָרִים

P: □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: But it is God who judges: He brings one down, he exalts another)

(But it is God who judges: He brings one down and he exalts another /But God is the judge; He puts this one down and lifts up that one)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יַשְׁפִּיל (hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular of שפל 'to put down, to be low'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□□ (aphel participle masculine singular of □□□ 'to be low, put down'). The Peshitta retains the word order. A similar example is 75:8c. The use of the participle complies with the use of an imperfect as it expresses events taking place now or in the future.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:13a

MT: יִבְצֹר רוּחַ נְגִידִים

P: □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□¨□□

(NIV: He breaks the spirit of rulers)

(He who humiliate the spirit of the rulers)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יִבְצֹר (qal imperfect third person masculine singular of בצר 'to humble or reduce'), in the Masoretic Text as a relative particle □ plus a participle, namely □□□□□ (relative □ + pael participle active masculine singular of □□□ 'to humiliate, humble'), which results in a good translation of the Hebrew. The Peshitta adds □ to connect this part with the previous statement. The Hebrew verb is a *hapax legomenon* that occurs only here in Psalm 76:13 (see VanGemeren, 1997a:697). It is problematic and the Peshitta translates it as 'humiliate' according to meaning and context.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:8b

MT: וְלֹא יֹסִיף לִרְצוֹת עוֹד

P: □□□ □□□□ □□□
□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: Will he never show his favour again?)

(And will he not add to be pleased anymore with me?)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, יֹסִיף (hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular of יסף 'to add, enhance, increase'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is □□□□ (aphel participle active or perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to add or increase'). The Peshitta retains the word order. This second part continues the question. A similar example of translating according to meaning is Psalm 77:18c.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:6c

MT: יָקֻמוּ וְיִסַּפְּרוּ לִבְנֵיהֶם

P: □□□□□□
□□□□□¨□□
□□□□□□

(NIV: And they in turn would tell their children) (And they will rise to tell their children)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יָקֻמוּ (qal imperfect third person masculine plural of קוּם ‘to rise up’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle with waw, namely □□□□□□ (conjunction + peal participle masculine plural of □□□ ‘to rise up’). The Peshitta retains the word order as found in the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are 78:6b (□), 78:20d, 78:20f, 78:38b, 78:38e and 78:39c.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 78:19c

MT:הֲיוּכַל אֵל לַעֲרֹךְ שֻׁלְחָן בַּמִּדְבָּר P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

futurity (Muraoka, 1987:43; Nöldeke, 1966:202–207, par 269–76). In this instance, the sentence structure of the Peshitta with the subject of the verb following the participle is not the same as that of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:6d

MT: שְׂפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֶשְׁמָע

P: □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□

(NIV: Where I heard a language I did not understand)

(Where he heard a language he does not understand)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without a waw, אֶשְׁמָע (qal imperfect first person common singular of שׁמע 'to hear, listen'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□ (peal participle masculine singular □□□ 'to hear, listen'). The Peshitta uses the same verb as the Hebrew uses.

The whole verse requires a more detailed analysis and will be dealt with in Chapter 5.[37]

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:2a

MT: עַד מָתַי תִּשְׁפְּטוּ עָוֶל

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: How long will you defend the unjust?)

(Until when will you judge unjustly?)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, תִּשְׁפְּטוּ (qal imperfect second person masculine plural of שׁפט 'to judge, bring judgment'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is □□□□□ (peal participle masculine plural of □□□ 'to judge, bring a lawsuit'). The Peshitta uses □□□□□ □□□□ to render the Hebrew עַד מָתַי. Psalm 82:2b is a similar example.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:3b

[37] See *Psalm 81:6* (p. 368).

MT: כִּי הִנֵּה אוֹיְבֶיךָ יֶהֱמָיוּן

P: □□□ □□□
□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□

(NIV: See how your enemies are astir)

(See how your enemies rage/are roaring)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, יֶהֱמָיוּן (qal imperfect third person masculine plural המה 'to roar'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□□□□□ (ethpeel participle masculine plural of □□□ 'to be in an uproar, rage'). The word order is retained. Similar examples are 83:15a and 83:15b.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:9c

MT: כִּי יְדַבֵּר שָׁלוֹם אֶל עַמּוֹ

P: □□ □□□□ □□□□□
□□□

(NIV: He promises peace to his people)

(He promises peace to his people)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, יְדַבֵּר (piel imperfect third person masculine singular דבר 'to speak, talk'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, □□□□□ (relative particle □ + pael participle masculine singular of □□□ 'to speak, talk'). The Peshitta uses □ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי. Psalm 85:9b is a similar example.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:11b

MT: הֲלַמֵּתִים תַּעֲשֶׂה פֶּלֶא

P: □□□ □□¨□□□ □□
□□¨□□□□ □□□

(NIV: Is your loved declared in the grave?)

(Shall your mercy be declared in the grave?)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without a waw, תַּעֲשֶׂה (qal imperfect second person masculine singular of עשׂה 'to do'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus personal pronoun, that is □□□ (peal active participle masculine singular of □□□ 'to do' + pronoun second person masculine singular). The Peshitta retains the word order to show agreement.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:10c

MT: אַתָּה מוֹשֵׁל בְּגֵאוּת הַיָּם | בְּשׂוֹא גַלָּיו אַתָּה תְשַׁבְּחֵם

(NIV: You rule over the surging sea; when its waves mount up, you still them)

P: □□□□ □□□ □□¨□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□

(You rule over the rough sea; the confusion of the waves mount up, you still them)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, תְשַׁבְּחֵם (piel imperfect second person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine plural of שׁבח 'to hush, still, quiet'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□□ □□□ (pronoun + pael participle masculine singular of □□□ 'to be silent'). The Peshitta uses the pronoun □□□ for the suffix in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta retains the word order to maintain agreement. Similar examples are 89:13b, 89:15, 89:47b and 89:47a (the latter is a question).

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 89:7a and 7b

MT: כִּי מִי בַשַּׁחַק יַעֲרֹךְ לַיהוָה | יִדְמֶה לַיהוָה בִּבְנֵי אֵלִים

(NIV: For who in the skies above can compare with the Lord? Who is like the Lord among the heavenly beings?)

P: □□¨□□□ □¨□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□□ □□¨□□ □□□□

(For who in the heaven shall be ranked with the Lord? Who among the sons of the mighty is like the Lord?)

The Peshitta uses □ □□□ to render the Hebrew כִּי מִי as an interrogative. In both 89:7a (□□□□) and 89:7b (□□□□□), the Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw as a participle.

Summary: Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle

Among the nine questions in the Hebrew examples, four are rendered as general statements (77:8b; 78:19c; 89:7a & 89:7b), while the other five are instances where the Hebrew points to the present (74:10a; 74:10b; 79:5a; 82:2a & 89:47a). In another instance, the Peshitta produces a good translation of what is found in the Masoretic Text (73:9b), even though it does not use a word that

has the same root as the Hebrew. Rare words are sometimes translated according to meaning and context, since they are problematic (76:13a). The Peshitta occasionally renders a question in the Masoretic Text by changing it to a negative statement (77:8b). In other instances, the interrogative particle הֲ in the Masoretic Text, which introduces the rhetorical question, is rendered in the Peshitta as □ □ □ □ (78:19c). There are also examples, as in 79:5a, where the syntactic structure in the Peshitta differs from the Masoretic Text. As in the case of the previous psalm, the Peshitta renders כִּי in the Masoretic Text as a combination of □ □ □ □ (83:3b). Sometimes, as in 85:2, the Peshitta renders the Masoretic כִּי as □. In 89:7a, it uses □ □ □ □ to render the Hebrew כִּי מִי as an interrogative.

An imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta occurs 33 times in Psalms 73–89: 3X in 73; 2X in 74; 2X in 75; 1X in 76; 2X in 77; 8X in 78; 1X in 79; 1X in 81; 2X in 82; 3X in 83; 2X in 85; 1X in 88 and 7X in 89. The table below sets out the distribution.

Table 22: Number of occurrences of an imperfect verb without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (5, 9b & 22b)	3
74 (10a & 10b)	2
75 (8b & 8b)	2
76 (13a)	1
77 (8b & 18c)	2
78 (6b, 6c, 19c, 20d, 20f, 38b, 38e & 39)	8
79 (5a)	1
81 (6b)	1
82 (2a & 2b)	2
83 (3b, 15a & 15b)	3
85 (9b & 9c)	2
88 (11b)	1
89 (7a, 7b, 10c, 13b, 15, 47a & 47b)	7

4.2.1.4 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:8c

MT: יָמִיקוּ וידַבְּרוּ בְרָע עֹשֶׁק | מִמָּרוֹם יְדַבֵּרוּ

(NIV: They scoff, and speak with malice; in their arrogance they threaten oppression)

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□

(They consider, and speak with evil and unjustly; upon/from on high they speak)

Regarding 73:8c the Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יְדַבֵּרוּ (piel imperfect third person masculine plural of דבר), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is □□□□ (pael perfect third person masculine plural of □□□). Both verbs in the two languages have the same meaning. Psalm 73:21a is a similar example.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 73:8a

(See the verse above.)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect, יָמִיקוּ (hiphil imperfect third person masculine plural of מוק 'to mock'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, namely □□□□□□ (ethpeel perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to think, consider'). The verb in Syriac ('to consider' or 'to think') differs semantically from the verb in Hebrew ('to mock'). The Peshitta has the word with the same consonants and meaning, namely □□□ ('to mock'), as the one used in the Masoretic Text, namely מוק ('to mock'). The reason why the Peshitta translator did not use this Syriac verb is not clear.

Psalm 73:21b

MT: כִּי יִתְחַמֵּץ לְבָבִי | וְכִלְיוֹתַי אֶשְׁתּוֹנָן

(NIV: When my heart was grieved and my spirit [literal kidneys] embittered)

P: □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□¨□□ □□□□¨□□□

(When my heart was agitated and my kidneys were transformed)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, אֶשְׁתּוֹנָן (hithpael imperfect first person common singular of שׁנן ‘to be sharply stabbed/pierced’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, that is □□□ ¨□□ (ethpaal perfect third person feminine plural of □□□ ‘to be out of one’s mind’, ‘to be transformed’). Apart from rendering the perfect as an imperfect, the Peshitta changes the first person common singular of the Masoretic Text to third feminine plural, with ‘kidneys’ as subject. The Hebrew verb in this form appears only here in the Masoretic Text. It is quite probable that the Peshitta translator did not understand this verb and rendered it using a Syriac verb of which the first two root consonants are the same as those of the Hebrew verb, despite the meaning being different.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:6

P: □□□□ □□□□	MT: וְעַתָּה [קרי פִּתּוּחֶיהָ יָחַד] בְּכַשִּׁיל
□□□̈□	וְכִילַפּוֹת יַהֲלֻמוּן
□□□□□¨□□ □□□□□̈□	
(They split together the doors or gates with axes and with hatchets)	(NIV: They smashed all the carved panelling with their axes and hatchets)

At the beginning of this verse, the Peshitta has a verb that is not present in Hebrew, as the verse in the Masoretic Text begins with ועת. It is probable that the translation in the Peshitta could be a rendering of the verb at the end of the verse in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta begins with the verb to link this verse with previous verse. It could be that the Peshitta rearranged the difficult Hebrew in the Masoretic Text to make sense of it and easier to understand.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:11a

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□	MT: לָמָּה תָשִׁיב יָדְךָ וימינֶךָ
□□□□□□	
(Why did you hold back your hand, your right hand?)	(NIV: Why do you hold back your hand, your right hand?)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, תָשִׁיב (hithpael imperfect second person masculine singular of שׁוב ‘to hold back, return, turn back’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that

is □□□□□ (aphel perfect second person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to turn away, avert’). The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text. Psalms 74:6b and 74:10b are similar examples.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:3c

MT: יָדִי לַיְלָה נִגְּרָה וְלֹא תָפוּג

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: At night I stretched out untiring hands/) A more literal translation: At night my hand was extended and did not grow weak)

(And his hand in the night pulled me away and I did not rest)

The Peshitta translates the imperfect without waw, תָפוּג (qal imperfect third person feminine singular of פוּג (‘be feeble/numb cold’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, namely □□□ (peal perfect first person common singular of □□□□ ‘to keep silent’, ‘to be at peace’). The Peshitta uses a general verb ‘to keep silent, be at peace’ for a specific Hebrew verb that means ‘to be feeble/numb cold’. Although not affecting the verb directly, the Peshitta changes ‘my hand’ in the Masoretic Text to ‘his hand’ and changes the third person feminine singular verb to the first person singular. The line as a whole demonstrates a simplification of the Hebrew. Similar examples are 77:5c and 77:8a.

Psalm 77:12a has a Kethib and Qere issue, which will be discussed in Chapter 5.[38]

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:15a

MT: יְבַקַּע צֻרִים בַּמִּדְבָּר

P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□

(NIV: He split the rocks in the desert)

(He breaks through the rock in the desert)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יְבַקַּע (piel imperfect third person masculine singular of בקע ‘to split, divide’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without a waw, that is □□□ (peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to break in pieces, break through’). The Peshitta retains the same word order to maintain agreement. Similar examples are 78:20c, 78:26a,

[38] See *Psalm 77:12* (p. 362).

78:29c, 78:36b, 78:45a, 78:47, 78:49, 78:58b, 78:64b and 78:72b. In Psalm 78:20c, the Peshitta changes the subject from plural to singular and in Psalm 78:29c, it is important to note that two imperfects with waw consecutive occur in the first part of the verse.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:7a and 7c

MT: תְּשִׂימֵנוּ מָדוֹן לִשְׁכֵנֵינוּ | וְאֹיְבֵינוּ יִלְעֲגוּ לָמוֹ

P: □□□ ·□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ ·□□

(NIV: You have made us a source of contention to our neighbours and our enemies mock us)

(You have made us a source of contention to our neighbours and our enemies mock us)

For 80:7a, the Peshitta uses the object suffix for the first person plural. Both in 80:7a and 80:7c, an imperfect without waw is rendered as a perfect without waw. In 7a, the imperfect without waw, תְּשִׂימֵנוּ (qal imperfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person common plural of שׂים 'to put, set, place, appoint') is rendered as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□□ (peal perfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person common plural of □□□ 'to make, work, do'). In Psalm 80:7c, the imperfect without waw, יִלְעֲגוּ (qal imperfect third person masculine plural of לעג 'to ridicule, laugh') is rendered as an imperfect without waw, that is □□□□ (pael perfect third person plural of □□□ 'to mock, deride'). Similar examples are 80:9a, 80:9b, 80:12 and 80:14b. In 80:9b, the meaning is not quite the same: 'drive out' versus 'destroy'; in 80:12, the meaning is not exactly the same: 'to send' versus 'to throw'.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:7b

MT: כַּפָּיו מִדּוּד תַּעֲבֹרְנָה

P: □□ □□□□□ ·□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Their [his] hands were set free from the basket)

(And I set my hands free from the basket)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, תַּעֲבֹרְנָה (qal imperfect third person feminine plural of עבד ('to till, cultivate, work, serve'), as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□ (peal perfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to loosen'). The Peshitta changes the subject of the Masoretic Text third person masculine plural to first person common singular. Similar examples

are 81:14b, 80:16b and 80:17b. In the latter, the Peshitta changes the subject to third person masculine singular.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:5b

MT: לֹא יָדְעוּ וְלֹא יָבִינוּ

P: □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: They know nothing, they understand nothing)

(They know nothing, and they understand nothing)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw, יָבִינוּ (qal imperfect third person masculine plural of בין 'to understand') as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□□□ (ethpeel perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to understand'). The Peshitta retains the word order for the sake of agreement. The Peshitta adds □ at the beginning of the line. It uses a different verb and different consonants for the Hebrew verb בין**.** Syriac has the same verb as the one the Hebrew uses (□□□ – 'to make someone understand' or 'teach' in a pael), but the peal does not occur in Syriac. The Peshitta translator opted for the ethpeel of a different root for it fit into the context better.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:4a

MT: עַל עַמְּךָ יַעֲרִימוּ סוֹד

P: □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□

(NIV: With cunning they conspire against your people)

(With their cunning they secretly conspire against your people)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יַעֲרִימוּ (hiphil imperfect third person masculine plural of ערם 'to have a sly discussion'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, namely □□□□ (peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to plan, consider, conspire, plot'). The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:3c

MT: לִבִּי וּבְשָׂרִי יְרַנְּנוּ אֶל אֵל חָי

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: My heart and flesh cry out for the living God)

(My heart and flesh praise the living God)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יְרַנְּנוּ (piel imperfect third person masculine plural of רנן 'to shout with joy'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□ (pael perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to praise, glorify'). The previous verse has a perfect and to maintain consistency the Peshitta uses a perfect in this instance as well. The Peshitta retains the word order.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:7a

MT: בְּיוֹם צָרָתִי אֶקְרָאֶךָּ כִּי תַעֲנֵנִי

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: In the day of my trouble I will call to you, for you will answer me)

(In the day of my distress/trouble I called unto you and you answered me)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, אֶקְרָאֶךָּ (qal imperfect first person common singular + suffix second person masculine singular of קרא 'to call'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□□ (peal perfect first person common singular + pronoun second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to call'). The Peshitta retains the word order to maintain agreement.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:22a and 22b

MT: אֲשֶׁר יָדִי תִּכּוֹן עִמּוֹ | אַף זְרוֹעִי תְאַמְּצֶנּוּ

P: □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: My hand will sustain him; surely my arm will strengthen him)

(My hand will help him, surely my arm will strengthen her)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw in both 89:22a and 89:22b as a perfect without waw. The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text to maintain agreement. Another reason for rendering an imperfect as a perfect is that the earlier verses have perfects and consistency is assured in this way. Psalm 89:23c is a similar example.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 89:23a

MT: לֹא יֵשָּׂא אוֹיֵב בּוֹ P: □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: No enemy will subject him) (And the enemy will benefit nothing)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יֵשָּׂיא (hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular of נשׂא 'to trick, deceive, exact'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□ (aphel perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to benefit'). In this case, the verb used by the Peshitta is different from the one in Hebrew ('to deceive/trick versus to benefit'). It is probable that the Peshitta translator had trouble understanding the unvocalised Hebrew and thus translated according to the context.

Summary: Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw

An imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered in the Peshitta as a perfect without waw occurs 41 times as shown in the table below. At times, the Peshitta uses a verb different in meaning from the one used in the Masoretic Text (73:21b; 89:23a). In other instances, the Peshitta simplifies the Hebrew used in the Masoretic Text (77:3c). The Peshitta changes the subject as it is found in the Masoretic Text (78:20c) and, in other instances, it changes the plural to singular or *vice versa*.

Table 23: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (8a, 8b, 21a & 21b)	4
74 (6a, 6b, 10b & 11a)	4
77 (3c, 5c, 8a & 12a)	4

Psalm	Number of occurrences
78 (15a, 20c, 26a, 29c, 36b, 45a, 47, 49, 58a, 64b & 72b)	11
80 (7a, 7b, 9a, 9b, 12 & 14b)	6
81 (7b, 14b, 16b & 17b)	4
82 (5b)	1
83 (4a)	1
84 (3c)	1
86 (7a)	1
89 (22a, 22b, 23a & 23c)	4

4.2.1.5 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:1b

MT: יֶעְשַׁן אַפְּךָ בְּצֹאן מַרְעִיתֶךָ

P: □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: Why does your anger smoulder (smoke) against the sheep of your pasture?)

(And why make your anger heavy against the sheep of your pasture?)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יֶעְשַׁן (qal imperfect third person masculine singular of עשׁן ‘to wrap in smoke, smoke’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, namely □□□□□□ (conjunction □ + aphel perfect second person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to be heavy, strong, powerful’/‘to make heavy’). It is significant here that the Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second question not present in the Masoretic Text. The Masoretic Text uses לָמָּה at the beginning of the verse, which the Peshitta renders as □□□□ – also at the beginning of the sentence in order to render it as a question. Neither of the two texts repeats this particle in the second half of the sentence, but the question continues. Unlike in the first part of the sentence, the Peshitta retains the word order in the second part. Psalms 74:5a and 74:14b are similar examples.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:38a

MT: וְהוּא רַחוּם יְכַפֵּר עָוֹן וְלֹא יַשְׁחִית

P: ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐

(NIV: Yet he was merciful; he forgave their iniquities and did not destroy them)

(And that he was merciful and he forgave their sins and did not destroy them)

The Peshitta translates the imperfect without waw, יְכַפֵּר (piel imperfect third person masculine singular of כפר ‘to appease, make amends, atone’, ‘to forgive’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is ☐☐☐☐ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to abandon, leave, to condone’, ‘to forgive’). The Peshitta retains the word order to maintain agreement. The adjective of the Masoretic Text at the beginning of the line is rendered as a participle by the Peshitta. The result is that the participle is followed by a finite verb in the Peshitta. The Peshitta adds a waw to the second verb, so as to not have a second verb following directly on the first verb (the participle in the Peshitta). Psalm 78:50a is a similar example.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:5b

MT: תִּבְעַר כְּמוֹ אֵשׁ קִנְאָתֶךָ

P: ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: How long will your jealousy burn like fire?)

(Shall your jealousy burn like fire?)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, תִּבְעַר (qal imperfect third person feminine singular of בער ‘to burn (up), blaze up’), as a perfect plus waw, ☐☐☐☐ (conjunction ☐ + peal perfect third person masculine singular of ☐☐☐). The Peshitta verb ☐☐☐☐ follows a participle and it may be a participle too. The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second line, a continuation of the rhetorical question. At the beginning of the verse, the Peshitta uses ☐☐☐☐ (‘until when’) to render the Hebrew interrogative particle עַד מָה. This particle is not repeated in the second line by the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta. The Peshitta retains the word order.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:14a

MT: יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה חֲזִיר מִיָּעַר P: ܘܚܙܝܪܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܐ ܢܐܟܠܝܢܝܗ

ܠܗ

(NIV: Boars from the forest ravage it) (And the pigs of the forest consume it)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה (piel imperfect, i.e. future, third person masculine singular + suffix third person feminine singular of כרסם ‘to ravage, gobble up’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is ܘܐܟܠ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine singular + suffix third person feminine singular of ܐܟܠ ‘to eat, consume’) at the beginning of a verse. The Peshitta gives a generic translation. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a verse. The Hebrew verb is a *hapax legomenon*.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:8c

MT: בַּצָּרָה קָרָאתָ וָאֲחַלְּצֶךָּ | אֶעֶנְךָ בְּסֵתֶר רַעַם אֲבְחָנְךָ עַל מֵי מְרִיבָה סֶלָה

(NIV: In your distress you called and I rescued you, I answered you out of a thundercloud; I tested you at the waters of Meribah. *Selah*)

P: ܒܥܘܬܟ ܩܪܝܬ ܘܦܪܩܬ ܠܟ ܘܐܣܬܪ ܠܟ ܒܓܘ ܣܬܪܐ ܒܫܘܒܚܐ

ܕܥܠ ܡ̈ܝ ܡ̈ܪܝܒܬ

ܘܒܚܬ ܠܟ ܗ̇ ܘܒ̈ܚ̈ܢ̈ܬ ܠܗ

(In your distress you called me and I delivered you, and I covered him in my protection with glory, and I tested [examine] him at the waters of Meribah)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, אֶעֶנְךָ (qal imperfect first person common singular + suffix second person masculine singular of ענה ‘to answer’) as a perfect with waw, that is ܘܐܣܬܪ (conjunction + pael perfect first person common singular + suffix third person masculine singular of ܣܬܪ ‘to cover, to hide, conceal’). The verb employed by the Peshitta in this instance to render the Hebrew verb differs in meaning from the word in the Masoretic Text. The Syriac word means ‘to cover’, ‘to hide, conceal’ versus the Masoretic word that means ‘to answer’. The last two waws are added at the beginning of new lines. The Peshitta changes the object in אֶבְחָנְךָ (second person masculine singular) to third person masculine singular, namely ܠܗ.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:5d

MT: יִמּוֹטוּ כָּל מוֹסְדֵי אָרֶץ

P: ܘܢܬܙܥܙܥܘ ܟܠ ܡܘܣܕ̈ܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ

(NIV: All the foundations of the earth are shaken)

(And all the foundations of the earth are shaken)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יִמּוֹטוּ (niphal imperfect third person masculine plural of מוֹט ‘to be shaken, stagger’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is ܘܢܬܙܥܙܥ (conjunction + peal perfect third person feminine plural of ܙܥܙܥ ‘to be shaken’). The Peshitta retains the word order, except that it adds a waw at the beginning of a new line. The Peshitta rendering of the Hebrew verb in this instance is very good.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:7b

MT: עֹבְרֵי בְּעֵמֶק הַבָּכָא מַעְיָן יְשִׁיתוּהוּ

P: ܕܥܒܪ̈ܝܢ ܒܥܡܩ ܒܟܐ ܡܥܝܢ ܢܥܒܕ̈ܘܗܝ ܒܪ̈ܟܬܐ ܐܦ ܡܛܠ ܡܘܪ̈ܝ ܢܬܟܣܐ ܒܗ

(NIV: As they pass through the valley of Baca, they make it a place of springs)

(And as they passed through the valley of Baca, and they made it their dwelling-place)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יְשִׁיתוּהוּ (qal imperfect third person masculine plural + suffix third person masculine plural of שִׁית ‘to fix, to fix one’s refuge’; ‘to fix one’s boundary), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is ܘܥܒܕ̈ܘܗܝ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine plural of ܥܒܕ ‘to do’). The Peshitta retains the word order. It changes the participle at the beginning of the verse to a perfect and thus it has two independent sentences connected by a waw.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:7b

MT: בְּיוֹם צָרָתִי אֶקְרָאֶךָּ כִּי תַעֲנֵנִי

P: ܒܝܘܡ ܥܩܬܝ ܩܪ̈ܝܬ ܠܟ ܕܬܫܡܥܢܝ

(NIV: In the day of my trouble I will call to you, for you will answer me)

(In the day of my trouble I called to you, and you answered me)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, תַּעֲנֵנִי (qal imperfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person common singular of ענה 'to answer') as a perfect plus waw, namely □□□□□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect second person masculine singular + pronoun first person common singular of □□□ 'to answer'). The Peshitta in this case retains the word order as in the Hebrew and uses the waw to translate the Hebrew conjunction כִּי.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:16c

The whole line is a problem and has text-critical issues in both Syriac and Hebrew, thus it will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.[39]

Summary: Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw

The rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw occurs twelve times as shown in the table below. In 74:1b, the interrogative particle לָמָּה in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as □□□□. The Peshitta adds the waw five times at the beginning of a new line in a sentence or section of the verse (74:1b; 79:5b; 81:8c; 82:5d; 84:7b). The Peshitta further adds the waw twice between two verbs (78:38a; 88:16c). At certain places, it uses the waw once to render the conjunction כִּי in the Masoretic Text (86:7b).

The rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta occurs twelve times as follows: 3X in 74; 2X in 78; 1X in 79; 1X in 80; 1X in 81; 1X in 82; 1X in 84; 1X in 86 and 1X 88.

Table 24: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (1b, 5a & 14b)	3
78 (38a & 50a)	2

[39] *Psalm 88:16* (p. 376).

Psalm	Number of occurrences
79 (5b)	1
80 (14a)	1
82 (5d)	1
84 (7b)	1
86 (7b)	1
88 (16c)	1

4.2.1.6 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect of hwy plus participle

In this section, the focus is on the imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text and its rendering by the Peshitta as a participle plus the perfect of □□□.

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:3c

MT: שְׁלֹום רְשָׁעִים אֶרְאֶה

(NIV: When I saw the prosperity of the wicked)

P: □□□□ □□□ □□
□□□□ ·□□ □□□□

(When I saw the prosperity of the wicked)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, אֶרְאֶה (qal imperfect first person common singular of ראה 'to see'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus the perfect of □□□, that is□□□□ □□□ (peal active participle masculine singular of □□□, followed by the peal perfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to be'). It is also significant that the participle precedes the perfect of *hwy*. The Peshitta uses □□ ('when'), which is implied in the Masoretic Text. It also changes the word order, with the verbal construct following □□.

The first part of the verse has a perfect in the Masoretic Text. The imperfect at the end points to habitual action in the past. The rendering of the Peshitta as the perfect of □□□ and a participle is a good rendering of the Hebrew.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:15b and 15c

MT: כִּמְעַט אוֹיְבֵיהֶם אַכְנִיעַ | וְעַל צָרֵיהֶם אָשִׁיב יָדִי

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□

(NIV: How quickly would I subdue their enemies and turn my hand against their foes)

(And in a little I would have destroyed their enemies, and I would have turned my hand against their foes)

In both sentences, the Peshitta renders the two imperfects without waw, that is אַכְנִיעַ (hiphil imperfect first person common singular of כנע 'to humble someone, subdue'), and אָשִׁיב (hiphil imperfect first person common singular of שׁוּב 'to return'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus a perfect of *hwy*, that is □□□□ □□□□ (peal participle masculine singular of □□□ + □□□□, peal imperfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be', 'to become'), and □□□□ □□□□ peal participle masculine singular of □□□ ('to turn back, return', 'to be changed, converted, come to one's senses') + □□□□ , the peal imperfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be', 'to become') respectively. It is also to be noted that the participle in both instances precedes the perfect of □□□. In the first sentence, the Peshitta places the verbal construct before the object. It retains the word order of the second sentence.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:5c

MT: בַּחֲשֵׁכָה יִתְהַלָּכוּ יִמּוֹטוּ כָּל מוֹסְדֵי אָרֶץ

(NIV: They walk about in darkness, all the foundations of the earth are shaken)

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□

(They walk about in darkness, all the foundations of the earth are shaken)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, יִתְהַלָּכוּ (hithpael imperfect third person masculine plural of הלך 'to walk'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus the perfect of *hwy*, that is □□□□□□ (pael participle masculine plural of □□□ 'to walk') + □□□ (peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be'). Like the above examples in this category, the

participle precedes the perfect of □□□. The Peshitta keeps the word order of the Hebrew to maintain agreement.

Summary: Imperfect verb without waw rendered as perfect of hwy plus participle

A rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect of □□□ plus a participle occurs four times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 73; 2X in 81 and 1X in 82) as shown in the table below. It usually denotes a continuous action in the past or present and is a good contextual rendering of the Hebrew. At times, the Peshitta uses particles implied but not present in the Masoretic Text, thus making them explicit. The Peshitta uses □□ implied in the Masoretic Text in 73:3c, and as a result changes the word order, with the verbal construction after □□. This is a good rendering of an imperfect in Hebrew as the perfect of □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta.

Table 25: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect of *hwy* plus participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (3c)	1
81 (15b & 15c)	2
82 (5c)	1

4.2.1.7 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a no verb construct

In this instance, the focus is on the imperfect without waw that in the Masoretic Text that is rendered by the Peshitta by not presenting a verb in the translation.

Psalm 81:13b

MT: וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ בִּשְׁרִירוּת לִבָּם | יֵלְכוּ בְּמוֹעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם

(NIV: So I gave them over to their stubborn hearts to follow their own devices)

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□

(They went in the desires of their hearts and the thinking of their soul[s]).

The Peshitta omits the verb corresponding to וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ and moves יֵלְכוּ to the beginning of the sentence, changing the construction of the sentence and using two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:32a and 89:32b

Both the imperfects without waws in the Masoretic Text are rendered as no verb constructs in the Peshitta. These two examples are probably mistakes in the Peshitta. They have text-critical problems but with no significance as they are in the MT; thus they will not receive detailed attention in Chapter 5.

Summary: Imperfect verb without waw rendered as no verb

The rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a no verb construct in the Peshitta occurs three times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 81 and 2X in 89) as shown in the table below. In other instances such as 81:13b, the Peshitta omits the first verb in the verse and moves the second forward. Consequently, it changes the construction of the sentence and uses two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb.

Table 26: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
81 (13b)	1
89 (32a & 32b)	2

4.2.1.8 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw as an imperative in a few instances.

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:24a

MT: בַּעֲצָתְךָ תַנְחֵנִי | וְאַחַר כָּבוֹד תִּקָּחֵנִי

(NIV: You guide me with your counsel, and afterwards you will take me into your glory)

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(Console me with your counsel and afterwards you will guide into your glory)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, תַּנְחֵנִי (hiphil imperfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person common singular of נחה 'to lead, guide'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□□□□ (pael imperative masculine singular with suffix first person singular of □□□ 'to comfort'). It is probable that in the case of the last verb, the Peshitta has a word that differs from the one in the Masoretic Text in respect of the last consonant, that is, from the root נחם. The Peshitta translator had a problem in analysing the unvocalised Hebrew text. The verb has a text-critical problem and will be discussed in detail in the Chapter 5.[40] Also the next imperfect is rendered as an imperative. It could be that the Peshitta took the imperfects as jussives and rendered them as imperatives.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:16a and 16b

MT: כֵּן תִּרְדְּפֵם בְּסַעֲרָךְ | וּבְסוּפָתְךָ תְבַהֲלֵם

P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: So pursue them with your tempest and terrify them with your storm)

(So pursue them with your tempest and terrify [agitate] them with your storm)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperative in both instances. It translates the Hebrew כֵּן as □□□□. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text to maintain agreement. It probably regards the imperfects as jussives, or as imperfects expressing a command. It could be following the imperative in the next verse.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:7a and 7b

MT: הֲלֹא אַתָּה תָּשׁוּב תְּחַיֵּנוּ | וְעַמְּךָ יִשְׂמְחוּ בָךְ

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□

(NIV: Will you not revive us again, that your people may rejoice in you?)

(Will you not return to me and keep me alive so that your people may rejoice in you?)

[40] *Psalm 73:24* (p. 345).

The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperative in both instances. The Masoretic Text uses the interrogative particle הֲ to introduce a rhetorical question and the Peshitta uses the imperative for a request. Psalm 85:8b is a similar example.

Summary: Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative

The rendering of an imperfect without a waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperative in the Peshitta occurs six times in Psalms 73–89: 1X in 73; 2X in 83 and 3X in 85. The distribution is outlined in the table below. In these renderings, the Peshitta in Psalm 83:16a translates the Hebrew כֵּן in the Masoretic Text as □□□□. For the rendering of the rhetorical question in the Masoretic Text introduced by הֲ, the Peshitta uses an imperative for a request (85:7).

Table 27: Number of occurrences of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperative in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (24a)	1
83 (16a & 16b)	2
85 (7a & 7b)	2

Analysis and conclusions: Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and how they are rendered in the Peshitta

Verbs in the imperfect without waw occur 201 times in the Masoretic Text; in the Peshitta, these verbs can be divided into eight categories according to the verbal form of rendering. The distribution is set out in the table below.

Table 28: Categories of the different verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.2.1 (p. 145)	Imperfect verbs without waw		
4.2.1.1 (p. 145)		Imperfect without waw	93
4.2.1.2 (p. 158)		Imperfect with waw	9

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.2.1.3 (p. 161)		Participle	33
4.2.1.4 (p. 169)		Perfect without waw	41
4.2.1.5 (p. 176)		Perfect with waw	12
4.2.1.6 (p. 181)		Perfect of *hwy* plus participle	4
4.2.1.7 (p. 183)		No verb	3
4.2.1.8 (p. 184)		Imperative	6

The above table presents an analysis of the occurrence of the different verbal forms employed to render the Hebrew imperfect verbs without waw into Syriac. The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw as follows: 93 times as an imperfect without waw, nine times as imperfect with waw, 33 times as a participle, 41 times as a perfect without waw, twelve times as a perfect with waw, four times as a perfect of □□□ plus participle, three times as no verb and six times as an imperative. The straight-forward examples in this category are the rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta, which occurs frequently as could be expected.

The Peshitta uses □ □□□□ to render the Hebrew עַד as used in the Masoretic Text (73:17a). At times, the Peshitta adds □ just for syntactic purposes and not to establish correspondence with the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta often uses the combination of □ □□□ to render the Hebrew כִּי as found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 86:3b. The Peshitta in other instances deviates from the Masoretic Text, for example in 76:11. The Masoretic Text uses הֲ to introduce a rhetorical question; the Peshitta uses □□□, which it repeats in both halves of the verse, for example in 85:6 and 88:15b. The rhetorical particle הֲ in the Masoretic Text is sometimes rendered by the Peshitta as □□□□, for example in 78:19c. The Peshitta sometimes renders the question in the Masoretic Text as a negative statement or just as a statement (88:13a). At times, it adds a waw not present in the Masoretic Text at the beginning of the verse, thus connecting the verse to the previous one. In Psalm 89:22b, the Peshitta uses the waw to render the Hebrew אף. It renders the Hebrew כִּי מִי in the Masoretic Text as □ □□□, for example 89:7. In other instances, the Peshitta changes the word order of the Masoretic Text, for example 73:3c. The Peshitta at times

omits words or verbs in the Masoretic Text, for example in 81:13b. In this category, the Hebrew כֵּן is rendered as □ □ □ □ by the Peshitta. In other instances, a waw is added at the beginning of a new line (75:6b; 84:8b; 86:11b; 88:11d; 89:44a) or between two verbs (75:9d). In some instances, the Peshitta simplifies the Hebrew used in the Masoretic Text (77:3c). It changes the subject found in the Masoretic Text (78:20c) in other instances, for example the plural to singular or *vice versa*. In 74:1b, the interrogative particle לָמָּה in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as □ □ □ □. The Peshitta at certain points uses the waw first person to render the conjunction כִּי in the Masoretic Text (86:7b). It uses □ □ implied in the Masoretic Text in 73:3c and as a result changes the word order, with the verbal construct after □ □. The Peshitta omits the first verb in the verse, as in 81:13b, and moves the second forward; thus, it changes the construction of the sentence and uses two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb. The Peshitta translator in other instances wanted to make the Hebrew clearer and remained faithful to the Syriac syntax.

4.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text

In this section, attention is paid to all the imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in Psalms 73–89 and how the Peshitta has rendered them. Three different groups of renderings have been distinguished:

4.2.2.1 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 188)

4.2.2.2 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as perfect verb with waw (p. 191)

4.2.2.3 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 197)

Only the psalms in which these renderings appear will be discussed here.

4.2.2.1 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw

In the following examples, the imperfect plus a waw consecutive is rendered as a perfect.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:9b

MT: וַיִּגַּר מְזֶּה P: □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□

(NIV: He pours it out)/(And He pours out from it [this]) (And he lowered it to himself)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with a waw consecutive, וַיֵּגֶר (waw consecutive + hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular of נגר ‘to pour out’) as a perfect without waw, that is ☐☐☐☐ (aphel perfect third person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to inline, bend, avert, lower, lead’). The Peshitta omits the waw in the Masoretic Text in this instance.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:11a

MT: וָאֹמַר P: ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: Then I thought) (And I said)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw. The imperfect with waw consecutive points to the past here and the Peshitta renders it using the perfect.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:3b

MT: אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ וַנֵּדָעֵם P: ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: What we have heard and known) (What we have heard and known)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וַנֵּדָעֵם (waw consecutive + qal imperfect first person common plural + suffix third person masculine plural of ידע ‘to know’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without a waw, namely ☐☐☐☐ (peal perfect first person common plural ☐☐☐ ‘to know’). The Peshitta uses ☐☐☐☐ for the suffix third person masculine singular in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta makes use of ☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ to render the Hebrew relative particle אֲשֶׁר. It retains the word order. Because of the translation without waw, the Peshitta changes the structure of this verse as well, as it is linked to the next verse. In the Masoretic Text, verse 3 is a *casus pendens* for verse 4, while the Peshitta makes verse 4 subordinate to verse 3. Similar examples are: 78:5a (☐ subordination), 78:16a, 78:24a (generic in the Peshitta for specific in the Masoretic Text), 78:27, 78:29a, 78:33 (the Peshitta changes the subject to plural), 78:35a, 78:36a, 78:39a, 78:44a, 78:46, 78:48, 78:51 (specific verb in the Peshitta), 78:52a, 78:53a, 78:54a, 78:55a, 78:61, 78:62a, 78:65a, 78:66a, 78:67a, 78:68a, 78:69a and 78:70a.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:17a

MT: וַיַּאֲכִילֵהוּ מֵחֵלֶב חִטָּה P: □□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: But you would be fed with the finest of wheat)/ (Literal translation: He made him eat of the fat of the wheat)

(He made him eat from the fat of the wheat)

The Peshitta translates the imperfect with waw consecutive, that is וַיַּאֲכִילֵהוּ (waw consecutive + hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine singular of אכל 'to eat') as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□□ (aphel of third person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to eat'). The word order is the same except that the Peshitta adds the relative particle □.

The following example needs a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 81:13a

MT: וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ בִּשְׁרִירוּת לִבָּם P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: So I gave them over to their stubborn hearts)/(And I send him away to the pleasure of their hearts)

(They went according to the will of their hearts)

The Peshitta omits the verb corresponding to וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ and rather moves יֵלְכוּ to the front of the sentence, changing the construction of the sentence and using two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb. The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, that is וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ (waw consecutive + piel imperfect first person common singular + suffix third person masculine singular of שׁלח 'to let go, let loose, let free'), as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□ (peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to make go, walk'). In the light of the omission of the first verb and the changes in the Peshitta, the verse in the Peshitta differs from the verse in the Masoretic Text.

Summary: Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw

A rendering of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw occurs 30 times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 75; 1X in 77; 26X in 78 and 2X in 81). This distribution is summarised in the table below.

Table 29: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
75 (9b)	1
77 (11a)	1
78 (3b, 5a, 16a, 24a, 27, 29a, 33, 35a, 36a, 39a, 44a, 46, 48, 51, 52a, 53a, 54a, 55a, 61, 62a, 65a, 66a, 67a, 68a, 69a, 70a)	26
81 (13a & 17a)	2

It is interesting to note the large number of occurrences in Psalm 78. However, this psalm is very long. It relates the history of the people of Israel, which explains the use of the imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text.

4.2.2.2 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as perfect verb with waw

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:14

MT: וָאֱהִי נָגוּעַ כָּל הַיּוֹם P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□

(NIV: All day long I have been plagued) (For all day long I have been touched)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וָאֱהִי (waw consecutive + qal imperfect first person common singular of הִיה 'to be'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw, that is □□□□□ (peal perfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to be'). The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text to maintain agreement. In this verse, a Hebrew passive participle is rendered as a noun.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:7d

MT: עִם לְבָבִי אָשִׂיחָה וְיְחַפֵּשׂ רוּחִי

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: My heart mused and my spirit enquired)

(And in my heart I thought and I search my spirit. And I said)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וְיְחַפֵּשׂ (waw consecutive + piel imperfect third person masculine singular of חפשׂ 'to inquire'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw, that is □□□□□ (waw + peal perfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to inquire'). The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the line and uses the preposition □ to translate the Hebrew עִם. The Peshitta also adds a verb at the end of the verse, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. Psalm 77:19c is a similar example.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:11a

MT: וַיִּשְׁכְּחוּ עֲלִילוֹתָיו וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר הֶרְאָם

(NIV: They forgot what he had done, the wonders he had shown them)

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□¨□□□□□ □□□□¨□□ □□□□

(And they forgot his deeds and his wonders which he had shown them)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וַיִּשְׁכְּחוּ (waw consecutive + qal imperfect third person masculine plural of שׁכח) as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to forget'). Similar examples are 78:13b (the Peshitta uses a personal pronoun for the suffix in the Masoretic Text), 78:13c, 78:14, 78:15b, 78:16c, 78:17a, 78:18a, 78:20b, 78:21b, 78:23a, 78:26b, 78:29b, 78:31b, 78:41a, 78:41b, 78:45b, 78:45d, 78:52b, 78:55b, 78:56b, 78:57a (a specific verb is used in the Masoretic Text, while a general verb is used in the Peshitta), 78:57b, 78:58a, 78:59b, 78:59c, 78:60a, 78:70b and 78:72a

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 78:19a

MT: וַיְדַבְּרוּ בֵּאלֹהִים אָמְרוּ

P: ܘܡܠܠܘ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܡܪܘ

(NIV: They spoke against God, saying)

(And they spoke against God, and they said)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect plus waw consecutive, וַיְדַבְּרוּ (waw consecutive + piel imperfect third person masculine plural of **דבר**) as a perfect plus waw, that is ܘܡܠܠܘ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine plural of ܡܠܠ 'to speak or mumble'). The Peshitta retains the word order to maintain agreement. The Hebrew has a general verb, while the Peshitta has a specific verb. Syriac does not have the root *dbr* for 'speaking' as Hebrew has. The verb *dbr* in Syriac means 'to lead, guide or drive', not 'to speak'. The Peshitta translates the verb according to sense. Before the verb ܘܡܠܠܘ, the Peshitta adds a waw, which is absent in Hebrew.

Psalm 78:28

MT: וַיַּפֵּל בְּקֶרֶב מַחֲנֵהוּ סָבִיב לְמִשְׁכְּנֹתָיו

P: ܘܢܦܠ ܒܡܨܥ ܡܫܪܝܬܗ ܘܒܟܠ ܡܫܟܢܗ

(NIV: He made them come down inside their camp, all around their [his] tents)

(And they fell down in their camp, all around their tents)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect plus a waw consecutive, וַיַּפֵּל (waw consecutive + hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular of **נפל**) as a perfect plus waw, that is ܘܢܦܠ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine plural of ܢܦܠ 'to fall'). It changes the subject from third person masculine singular to third person masculine plural and changes the causative verb to the corresponding transitive verb.

Psalm 78:55c

MT: וַיַּשְׁכֵּן בְּאָהֳלֵיהֶם שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

P: ܘܫܪܝ ܒܡܫܟܢܗ ܕܫܒܛ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ

(NIV: He settled the tribes of Israel in their homes)

(And the tribe of Israel settled/dwelled in their tents)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect plus waw, וַיַּשְׁכֵּן (waw consecutive + hiphil imperfect third person masculine singular of **שכן** 'to settle someone, let/make someone/something dwell'), in the

Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□ (conjunctive + peal perfect third person masculine plural □□□ 'to make dwell', 'to settle', 'to set up'). The Peshitta changes the subject third person masculine singular in the Masoretic Text to third person masculine plural. The Peshitta retains the same word order to maintain the agreement. The causative verb is also replaced by an intransitive verb.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:6b

MT: וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ בִּדְמָעוֹת שָׁלִישׁ P: □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: You have made them drink tears by the bowlful)/(And you have made them drink with tears for the third time)

(And you have made them drink with tears)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect plus waw, וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ (waw consecutive + hiphil imperfect second person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine plural of שׁקה 'to give a drink to, to supply a drink') as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□□□ (conjunction + afael perfect second person masculine singular + pronoun third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to give to drink'). The Peshitta uses the pronoun for the object, while the Masoretic Text has the suffix. The Peshitta omits שָׁלִישׁ found in the Hebrew.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:8b

MT: בַּצָּרָה קָרָאתָ וָאֲחַלְּצֶךָּ P: □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: In your distress you called and I rescued you)

(In your distress you called me and I delivered you)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וָאֲחַלְּצֶךָּ (waw consecutive + piel imperfect first person common singular + suffix second person masculine singular of חלץ 'to save, deliver') as a perfect plus waw, namely □□□□□□ (conjunction + pael perfect first person common singular + suffix second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to save, deliver'). The Peshitta retains the word order of the Hebrew.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:39b

MT: וְאַתָּה זָנַחְתָּ וַתִּמְאָס

P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□

(NIV: But you have rejected, you have spurned)

(But you forgot me, and you rejected me)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וַתִּמְאָס (waw consecutive + qal imperfect second person masculine singular of מאס 'to refuse, reject') as a perfect with waw, namely □□□□□□□□ (conjunction + pael perfect second person masculine singular + suffix first person common singular of □□□ 'to reject, despise'). The Peshitta adds a suffix not present in Hebrew, as in the case of the previous verb. The Peshitta retains the word order to maintain agreement.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 89:20b

MT: אָז דִּבַּרְתָּ בְחָזוֹן לַחֲסִידֶיךָ וַתֹּאמֶר שִׁוִּיתִי עֵזֶר עַל גִּבּוֹר | הֲרִימוֹתִי בָחוּר מֵעָם

(NIV: Once you spoke in a vision, to your faithful people and you said: 'I have bestowed strength on a warrior; I have exalted a young man from among the people')

P: □□□̈□□□□ □□ □□□□̈□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(Then he spoke in visions to his honest/faithful people and he said: I had placed help on the warrior, and I exalted a young man from among the people)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, וַתֹּאמֶר (waw consecutive + qal imperfect second person masculine singular of אמר 'to say'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to say'). The Peshitta changes the subject in Hebrew from second person masculine singular to third person masculine singular. It is probable the Peshitta translator wanted to maintain the same sequence as in the previous verses. It retains the word order of the Masoretic Text.

Summary: Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb with waw

In 39 instances, the verb in an imperfect plus waw consecutive form in the Masoretic Text is rendered in the Peshitta as a perfect plus waw. The waw is added at the beginning of a new line (77:7d). The preposition ܥ is used by the Peshitta to render the Hebrew עִם (77:7d). The Peshitta adds a waw before the verb, which is not the case in the Masoretic Text (78:19a). The Peshitta changes the subject from third person masculine singular to third person masculine plural, and further changes the causative verb to the corresponding transitive verb (78:28; 78:55c). The Peshitta uses the pronoun ܗܘ ܗܝ ܗܢ ܗܢ for the object in the place of the suffix in the Masoretic Text (80:6b). In other instances, the Peshitta omits a word present in the Masoretic Text, for example, the omission of שָׁלִישׁ in 80:6b. Furthermore, it can be deduced that the Peshitta adds a suffix not present in the Masoretic Text (89:39b), rendering it in the same way as the previous verb in the text. Finally, in these renderings, the Peshitta changes the subject from second person masculine singular to third person masculine singular (89:20b).

These renderings of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw in the Peshitta in Psalms 73–89 occur as follows: 1X in 73; 2X in 77; 32X in 78; 1X in 80, 1X in 81 and 2X in 89. The distribution is set out in the table below.

Table 30: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (14)	1
77 (7d & 19c)	2
78 (11a, 13b, 13c, 14, 15b, 16c, 17a, 18a, 19a, 20b, 21b, 23a, 26b, 28, 29b, 31b, 41a, 41b, 45b, 45d, 52b, 55b, 55c, 56b, 57a, 57b, 58a, 59b, 59c, 60a, 70b & 72a)[41]	32
80 (6b)	1
81 (8b)	1
89 (20b & 39b)	2

[41] With regard to Psalm 78, see the remark on the length of the psalm in *Summary: Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw (*p. 186).

4.2.2.3 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:3

MT: וַיְהִי בְשָׁלֵם סֻכּוֹ | וּמְעוֹנָתוֹ בְצִיּוֹן

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: [and] His tent is in Salem, (and) his dwelling place in Zion)

(His tent is in Salem, and his dwelling place in Zion)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect with waw consecutive, וַיְהִי (waw consecutive + qal imperfect third person masculine singular of היה 'to be') as an imperfect verb without a waw, that is □□□□ (peal imperfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be'). The Peshitta omits the waw at the beginning of the verse, but retains the word order.

Summary: An imperfect with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect without waw

The rendering of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta occurs only once in Psalms 73–89 (in 76). The Peshitta omits the waw at the beginning of the verse, which is present in the Masoretic Text.

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of the Hebrew imperfect with waw consecutive

The rendering of an imperfect with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text occurs 70 times and is rendered in three categories in the Peshitta, namely (i) as a perfect without waw, which occurs 30 times, (ii) a perfect with waw, which occurs 39 times and (iii) an imperfect without waw, which occurs only once. The table below will clarify this distribution.

Table 31: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.2.2 (p. 188)	Imperfect with waw consecutive in MT		Total in MT= 70
4.2.2.1 (p. 188)		Perfect without waw	30
4.2.2.2 (p. 191)		Perfect with waw	39

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.2.2.3 (p. 197)		Imperfect without waw	1

An imperfect plus waw consecutive points to events in the past and/or completed events in Hebrew. The translator of the Peshitta understood this function of the verbal form; hence the Peshitta renders it mostly as a perfect with or without waw. The Peshitta at times changes the structure of a verse and links it to the next verse, for example in 78:3b. It uses a combination of □ □□□□□ to render אֲשֶׁר. In other instances, it omits the first verb in the Hebrew verse and moves the second verse of the sentence to the front, for example in 81:13a. Sometimes, it adds the waw at the beginning of the verse linking it to the previous verse and adding the preposition □ to render the Hebrew עִם. At other times, it adds an extra verb not present in the Masoretic Text, for example in 77:7d. It shows the tendency of changing the subject, for example in 78:55c. The Peshitta omits certain parts of the verse in Hebrew, for example 80:6b. The Peshitta at times changes the word order of the Masoretic Text, for example in 81:8b. At times, the Peshitta omits the waw present in the Masoretic Text, for example in 76:3.

4.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text

Imperfect verbs with waw copulative are rendered in the following four ways by the Peshitta:

4.2.3.1 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 198)

4.2.3.2 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 200)

4.2.3.3 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 202)

4.2.3.4 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as □ plus imperfect (p. 204)

4.2.3.1 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb with waw

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:11c

MT: הַרְחֶב פִּיךָ וַאֲמַלְאֵהוּ

P: □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□

(NIV: Open wide your mouth and I will fill it)

(Open wide your mouth and I will fill it)

The Peshitta renders an imperfect with waw copulative, וַאֲמַלְאֵהוּ (waw copulative + piel imperfect first person common singular + suffix third person masculine singular of מלא ‘to fill something’) as an imperfect plus waw, that is □□□□□□□□ (conjunction + pael imperfect first person common singular + suffix third person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to fill up’). The Peshitta retains the word order.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:14b

MT: צֶדֶק לְפָנָיו יְהַלֵּךְ | וְיָשֵׂם לְדֶרֶךְ פְּעָמָיו

P: □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Righteousness goes before him and prepares the way for his steps)

(And righteousness goes before him and sets/ prepares the way for his steps)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וְיָשֵׂם (conjunction + qal imperfect third person masculine singular of שׂים ‘to put, set, place’)[42] in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with waw, that is □□□□□ (conjunction + peal imperfect third person masculine singular of □□ ‘to put, set, place’). The Peshitta retains the word order. It adds the waw, which is not present in Hebrew, at the beginning of the line, thus connecting it to the previous one.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:9d

MT: וְיכַבְּדוּ לִשְׁמֶךָ

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: They will bring glory to your name)/ (And they shall glorify your name)

(And they shall glorify your name)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וְיכַבְּדוּ (waw copulative + piel imperfect third person masculine plural of כבד ‘to bring glory, praise’) as an imperfect plus waw, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction + pael imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to

[42] The footnote in the BHS proposes the noun for ‘peace’ as verse 11 has, but this proposal has no text-critical support.

praise, glorify, proclaim'). The Peshitta retains the word order to maintain agreement. Similar examples occur in 86:9c and 86:17d.

Summary: Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb with waw

The rendering of an imperfect plus waw copulative in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus a waw occurs only five times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 81; 1X in 85 and 3X in 86). In 85:14b, the Peshitta adds a waw, which is not present in Hebrew, at the beginning of the line, thus connecting it to the previous one.

Table 32: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
81 (11c)	1
85 (14b)	1
86 (9c, 9d & 17d)	3

4.2.3.2 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:6d

MT: יָקֻמוּ וְיסַפְּרוּ לִבְנֵיהֶם

P: ܘܢܩܘܡܘ ܘܢܣܦܪܘ ܠܒܢܝܗܘܢ

([and] They shall rise up and tell their children)

(And they shall rise up to tell their sons)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וְיסַפְּרוּ (waw copulative + piel imperfect third person masculine plural of ספר 'to tell, expound'), as an imperfect without a waw, that is ܢܣܦܪܘ (ܢ + ethpaal imperfect third person masculine plural of ܣܦܪ 'to tell, expound'). The Peshitta adds a waw before ܢܣܦܪܘ, because in the Hebrew there are two verbs following each other without a waw; the Peshitta connects them with a waw. The Masoretic Text has a waw before וְיסַפְּרוּ, but the Peshitta renders it using ܘ instead of a waw, hence

□□□□□□□. This makes the second verb subordinate to the first. Psalm 78:7a is a similar example.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:17b

MT: עֲשֵׂה עִמִּי אוֹת לְטוֹבָה | וְיִרְאוּ שֹׂנְאַי וְיֵבֹשׁוּ כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה עֲזַרְתַּנִי וְנִחַמְתָּנִי

(NIV: Give me a sign of your goodness, that my enemies may see it and be put to shame, for you, O Lord, have helped me and comforted me)

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(Give me a sign of your goodness, that my enemies may see it and are kept awake [be ashamed] for you, O Lord, have helped me and have comforted me)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וְיִרְאוּ (waw copulative + qal imperfect third person masculine plural of ראה 'to see'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with □ (instead of a waw as one would expect), namely □□□□□□ (relative □ + peal imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to see'). This links the verb to the previous imperative, עֲשֵׂה/ □□□. It is a good idiomatic translation of the Hebrew. The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:6

MT: וְיוֹדוּ שָׁמַיִם פִּלְאֲךָ יְהוָה

P: □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: The heavens praise your wonders, O Lord)

(The heavens praise your wonders, O Lord)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וְיוֹדוּ (waw copulative + hiphil imperfect third person masculine plural of ידה 'to praise, confess, thank'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw, that is □□□□□ (aphel imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to praise, confess, acknowledge, thank'). The Masoretic Text has a waw at the

beginning of a new verse, which the Peshitta omits, but apart from that, the Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Summary: Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as an imperfect verb without waw

A rendering of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta occurs only four times in Psalms 73–89 (2X in 78, 1X in 86 and 1X in 89), as shown in the table below. From these four examples, the following can be deduced: the Peshitta adds the waw between two verbs for which there is no waw in the Masoretic Text (78:6b). The waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as □ in 78:6d, thus making the second verb subordinate to the first verb. Psalm 86:17b is an example of a good idiomatic translation of the Hebrew by the Peshitta. In 89:6, the Peshitta omits the waw found at the beginning of the verse in the Masoretic Text.

Table 33: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
78 (6d & 7a)	2
86 (17b)	1
89 (6)	1

4.2.3.3 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:8b

MT: יָמִיקוּ וִידַבְּרוּ בְרָע עֹשֶׁק | מִמָּרוֹם יְדַבֵּרוּ

(NIV: They scoff, and speak with malice; in their arrogance they threaten oppression)

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□

(They thought and spoke evil and cruelty, against the supreme one. They spoke)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וִידַבְּרוּ (waw copulative + piel imperfect third person masculine plural of דבר ‘to speak’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus a waw, that is □□□□□ (conjunction + pael perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to speak’). The Peshitta also renders the imperfect without waw as a perfect at the beginning of the verse and thus remains consistent in rendering the verbs in this verse.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:4b

MT: אֶזְכְּרָה אֱלֹהִים וְאֶהֱמָיָה | אָשִׂיחָה וְתִתְעַטֵּף רוּחִי סֶלָה

(NIV: I remembered you, O God, and I groaned; I mused, and my spirit grew faint. *Selah*)

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□

(I remembered God and I was troubled or agitated, and I reflected and my spirit was faint)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וְתִתְעַטֵּף (waw copulative + hithpael imperfect third person feminine singular of עטף ‘to faint’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, namely □□□□□□□ (conjunction + ethpaal perfect third person feminine singular of □□□ ‘to be faint/aroused’). The Peshitta retains the word order. It probably regards the imperfects of the Hebrew as referring to the past and renders them accordingly.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:4b

MT: עַל עַמְּךָ יַעֲרִימוּ סוֹד | וְיִתְיָעֲצוּ עַל צְפוּנֶיךָ

(NIV: With cunning they conspire against your people; they plot against those you cherish)

P: □□¨□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□

(Literal: Against your people with their cunning they conspire secretly and they deliberate/ consult against your holy ones)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, that is וְיִתְיָעֲצוּ (waw copulative + hithpael imperfect third person masculine plural of יעץ ‘to take counsel’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction + ethpeel perfect third person masculine plural

of □□□ ‘to deliberate, consult’). The Peshitta has a general word, while the Masoretic Text is specific.

Summary: Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as a perfect verb with waw

An imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect plus waw in the Peshitta occurs only three times (1X in 73; 1X in 77 and 1X in 83) as indicated in the table below. At the beginning of 73:8, the Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw as a perfect and remains consistent in rendering verbs in this verse (see 73:8b). In 77:4b, it is probable that the Peshitta regards the imperfects of the Hebrew as referring to the past and renders them as such. Psalm 83:4b is an example where the Peshitta renders the specific word in the Masoretic Text as a general word.

Table 34: Number of occurrences of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (8b)	1
77 (4b)	1
83 (4b)	1

4.2.3.4 Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as □ plus imperfect verb

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:17b

MT: מַלֵּא פְנֵיהֶם קָלוֹן | וִיבַקְשׁוּ שִׁמְךָ יְהוָה

(NIV: Cover their faces with shame so that men will seek your name, O Lord)

P: □□□□ □□□□□ ̈□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(Cover their faces with reproach so that they appear or meet your name, O Lord)

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, וִיבַקְשׁוּ (waw copulative + piel imperfect third person masculine plural of בקשׁ ‘to seek, look for’), in the Masoretic Text as □ plus imperfect, that is □□□□□□ (relative particle □ + peal imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to go to meet, appear, arise’). The Peshitta retains the word order. In the Masoretic Text,

an imperative is often followed by an imperfect with waw to indicate its result or purpose. The Peshitta understands the sequence and uses □ plus imperfect to indicate purpose (Muraoka, 1987:43, 124; Nöldeke, 1966:198–199; Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:171).

Summary: Imperfect verb with waw copulative rendered as □ plus imperfect verb

The rendering of an imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus □ in the Peshitta occurs only once in 83:17b, to indicate purpose.

The table below gives a summary of how the imperfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text is rendered in the Peshitta.

Table 35: Categories of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in the P	Number of occurrences
4.2.3 (p. 198)	Imperfect with waw copulative		Total in Hebrew = 11
4.2.3.1 (p. 198)		Imperfect plus waw	5
4.2.3.2 (p. 200)		Imperfect without waw	4
4.2.3.3 (p. 202)		Perfect plus waw	1
4.2.3.4 (p. 204)		d plus imperfect	1

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of imperfect verbs without waw and with both waw consecutive and waw copulative

The imperfect without waw occurs 276 times in the Masoretic Text and is rendered as different verbal forms by the Peshitta (imperfect without waw occurs 195 times, imperfect with waw consecutive occurs 70 times and imperfect with waw copulative occurs 11 times). The table below demonstrates this distribution.

Table 36: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in the P	Number of occurrences
4.2.1 (p. 145)	Imperfect verbs without waw		Total in MT = 201
4.2.1.1 (p. 145)		Imperfect without waw	93
4.2.1.2 (p. 158)		Imperfect with waw	9
4.2.1.3 (p. 161)		Participle	33
4.2.1.4 (p. 169)		Perfect without waw	41
4.2.1.5 (p. 176)		Perfect with waw	12
4.2.1.6 (p. 181)		Perfect of *hwy* plus participle	4
4.2.1.7 (p. 183)		No verb	3
4.2.1.8 (p. 184)		Imperative	6
4.2.2 (p. 188)	Imperfect with waw consecutive		Total in MT= 70
4.2.2.1 (p. 188)		Perfect without waw	30
4.2.2.2 (p. 191)		Perfect with waw	39
4.2.2.3 (p. 197)		Imperfect without waw	1
4.2.3 (p. 198)	Imperfect with waw copulative		Total in MT = 11
4.2.3.1 (p. 198)		Imperfect plus waw	5
4.2.3.2 (p. 200)		Imperfect without waw	4
4.2.3.3 (p. 202)		Perfect plus waw	1
4.2.3.4 (p. 204)		d plus imperfect	1
Grand total			282

The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a line or verse that is absent from the Masoretic Text (cf 85:14). It adds a waw between two verbs following each other in the Masoretic Text without a waw (cf 73:19). It does not give preference to the construct where two verbs follow each other

without a waw, and thus adds a waw to connect them (cf 73:19). At times, the Peshitta renders a waw in the Masoretic Text as □, thus making the second verb subordinate to the first, for example 78:6d. In other instances, it omits the waw at the beginning of a new verse in the Masoretic Text, for example in 89:6. In the Masoretic Text, an imperative is often followed by an imperfect with waw to indicate purpose. Syriac understands this Hebrew syntax, and retains this sequence of the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta uses an imperfect plus □ to indicate purpose like the Masoretic Text, for example in 83:17b. The Peshitta uses □□□□ □ to render the Hebrew עַד as used in the Masoretic Text (73:17a). At times, the Peshitta adds □ just for syntactic purposes, while not having any correspondence with the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta often uses the combination of □□□ □ to render the Hebrew כִּי as used in the Masoretic Text, for example in 86:3b. In other instances, it deviates from the Masoretic Text, for example in 76:11. The Masoretic Text uses הֲ to introduce a rhetorical question, for which the Peshitta uses □□□ and repeats it in both halves of the verse, for example in 85:6 and 88:15b. The rhetorical particle הֲ in the Masoretic Text is at times rendered by the Peshitta as □□□□, for example in 78:19c. The Peshitta sometimes renders a question in the Masoretic Text as a negative statement or just as a statement (88:13a). It renders the Hebrew מִי כִּי in the Masoretic Text as □□□ □, for example in 89:7. In 74:1b, the interrogative particle לָמָּה in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as □□□□. The Peshitta also uses a waw once to render the conjunction כִּי in the Masoretic Text (86:7b). It uses □□, which is implied in the Masoretic Text in 73:3c, and as a result it changes the word order, with the verbal construction after □□. In other instances, as in 81:13b, it omits the first verb in the verse and moves the second forward, thus changing the structure of the sentence and using two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb.

4.3 Verbs in the imperative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In this section, the focus is on imperatives as they feature in the Masoretic Text and how the Peshitta deals with imperatives. In comparing the verbal forms in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text with the verbal forms in the same psalms in the Peshitta, the following two renderings have been identified:

4.3.1 Imperative rendered as an imperative (p. 208)

4.3.2 Imperative rendered without verb (p. 216)

4.3.1 Imperative rendered as an imperative

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:2a

MT: זְכֹר עֲדָתְךָ קָנִיתָ קֶדֶם

P: ܐܬܘܟܪ ܟܢܝܫܬܟ ܕܩܢܝܬ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ

(NIV: Remember the people you purchased of old)

(Remember the people that you purchased of old)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the imperative, זְכֹר (qal imperative second person masculine singular of זכר 'to remember'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is ܐܬܘܟܪ, the ethpeel imperative second person masculine singular of ܕܟܪ 'to remember'), with the same verbal root as in the Hebrew, which could be expected. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Psalms 74:3a, 74:18a and 74:20a are similar examples.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 74:22b and 74:22c

MT: קוּמָה אֱלֹהִים רִיבָה רִיבֶךָ | זְכֹר חֶרְפָּתְךָ מִנִּי נָבָל כָּל הַיּוֹם

(NIV: Rise up, O God, and defend your cause, remember how fools mock you all day long)

P: ܩܘܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܢܟ ܘܐܬܘܟܪ ܚܣܕ ܡܢ ܣܟܠܐ ܟܠ ܝܘܡܐ

(Rise up, O God, and give your judgment, and remember your shame from the fools all day long)

In both 74:22b (רִיבָה) and 74:22c (זְכֹר) of the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta renders the imperative as a waw plus an imperative (74:22b as ܘܐܬܘ and 74:22c as ܘܐܬܘܟܪ). The addition of the waw in both instances by the Peshitta is just because of Syriac syntactic preferences and the meanings are not affected.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:12a and 76:12b

MT: נִדְּרוּ וְשַׁלְּמוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם

כָּל סְבִיבָיו יוֹבִילוּ שַׁי לַמּוֹרָא |

P: ܢܕܪܘ ܘܫܠܡܘ ܠܡܪܝܐ ܐܠܗܟܘܢ

ܟܠ ܕܚܘܠܗ ܢܝܬܘ ܫܘܕܪܐ

ܠܕܚܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܝܬܘ

ܫܘܕܪܐ ܠܕܚܠܬܐ

(NIV: Make vows to the Lord your God and fulfill them, let all the neighbouring lands bring gifts to the One to be feared)

(Vow and fulfil them to the Lord your God, let all his surroundings bring gifts to the Fearful One)

The Peshitta renders both the imperatives, נִדְּרוּ (qal imperative masculine plural of נדר ‘to make a vow’) and וְשַׁלְּמוּ (waw conjunction + piel imperative second person masculine plural of שׁלם ‘to fulfil a vow, pay’), in the Masoretic Text as imperatives, that is ܢܕܪܘ (peal imperative second person masculine plural of ܢܕܪ ‘to vow’) and ܘܫܠܡܘ (waw + pael imperative second person masculine plural of ܫܠܡ ‘to complete, to be fulfilled’) respectively. In this case, the waw in 76:12b in the Peshitta renders the waw in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:6a

MT: שְׁפֹךְ חֲמָתְךָ אֶל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר לֹא יְדָעוּךָ

P: ܐܦܩ ܚܡܬܟ ܥܠ ܥܡܡܐ ܕܠܐ

ܝܕܥܘܟ ܘܥܠ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ

ܩܪܝܘ ܒܫܡܟ

(NIV: Pour out your wrath on the nations that do not acknowledge you)

(Pour out your wrath/anger on the nations that/who have not known you [that do not acknowledge you])

The Peshitta renders the imperative, שְׁפֹךְ (qal imperative second person masculine singular of שׁפך ‘to pour, spill’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, namely ܐܦܩ (peal imperative second person masculine singular of ܐܦܩ ‘to pour, shed’). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. The following are similar examples: 79:9a, 79:9b, 79:9c, 79:11b and 79:12a.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:2b

MT: רֹעֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל הַאֲזִינָה נֹהֵג כַּצֹּאן
יוֹסֵף

P: □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: Hear us, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead Joseph like flock)

(Listen/give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead Joseph like a flock)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, הַאֲזִינָה (hiphil emphatic imperative second person masculine singular of אזן 'to listen to'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, namely □□□ (peal imperative second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to listen to'). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are: 80:3a, 80:3b, 80:4b, 80:8a, 80:8b, 80:15a, 80:15b, 80:15c, 80:15d, 80:20a and 80:20b.

In 80:4b, 8b and 20b (all having the same refrain), the imperative in the Hebrew is followed by a cohortative with waw to express the purpose of the command. The Syriac retains the waw before the Hebrew cohortative.

Some examples require a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 80:2e

MT: רֹעֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל הַאֲזִינָה נֹהֵג כַּצֹּאן יוֹסֵף | יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים הוֹפִיעָה

P: □□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□
□□□ □□ □□ □□□
□□□□□

(NIV: Hear us, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead Joseph like flock; you who sit enthroned between the cherubim, shine forth)

(Listen/give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead Joseph like a flock; you who dwell between the cherubim, be revealed)

The Peshitta renders the imperative, הוֹפִיעָה (hiphil emphatic imperative second person masculine singular of יפע 'let shine, rise [as of sun], appear in radiance'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, namely □□□□□ (ethpeel imperative second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be revealed, uncovered'). This is an interesting example, as the Hebrew verb reads 'to shine forth' or 'to shine out', while the Syriac verb reads 'to be revealed' or 'to be uncovered'. Semantically, the two differ a bit in meaning. This Hebrew verb does not occur often in the Old

Testament, but it is used in Psalm 50:2 and in Psalm 94:1. The same Syriac verb as in this instance is used in 94:1, but a different verb in 50:2 (□□□). This verb is confined to theophanic contexts (VanGemeren, 1997:497). The Hebrew verb does not occur in Syriac and the translator probably did not know this Hebrew verb, hence it was rendered as 'uncovered' or 'revealed'. In the case of rare and unknown Hebrew words, the Peshitta sometimes deviates from the meaning of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 80:4a

MT: אֱלֹהִים הֲשִׁיבֵנוּ P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: Restore us, O God) (Bring us back, O God Almighty)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, הֲשִׁיבֵנוּ (hiphil imperative second person masculine singular + suffix first person common plural of שׁוּב 'to return, turn back, go/come back'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□□ (aphel imperative second person masculine singular + suffix first person common plural of □□□ 'to bring back)), as could be expected. The Masoretic Text uses a specific verb, 'to turn', while the Peshitta uses a general verb, 'to bring back'. The Peshitta adds 'almighty' or 'hosts', which is absent from the Masoretic Text, but apart from this, it retains the word order.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:2a

MT: הַרְנִינוּ לֵאלֹהִים עוּזֵּנוּ P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Sing for joy to God our strength)/ Sing aloud to God our strength (Praise God our strength)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, הַרְנִינוּ (hiphil imperative second person masculine plural of רנן 'to make someone shout with joy, ring out a shout of joy'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□□ (pael imperative second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to praise, glorify, proclaim'). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. The following are similar examples: 81:2b, 81:3a, 81:4, 81:9a and 89:11b.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:3a

MT: שִׁפְטוּ דַל וְיָתוֹם | עָנִי וְרָשׁ הַצְדִּיקוּ

(NIV: Defend the cause of the weak and fatherless; maintain the rights of the poor and oppressed)

P: □□□ □□□□ ̈□□□ □□□ ̈□□□□ □□□□ □□□ ̈□□ □□□□□ ̈□

(Judge the fatherless and the sad people, the poor and oppressed)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, שִׁפְטוּ (qal imperative second person masculine plural of שׁפט 'to judge'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□□ (peal imperative second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to judge'). Similar examples are: 82:3b, 82:4a, 82:8a and 82:8b.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:5b

MT: אָמְרוּ לְכוּ וְנַכְחִידֵם מִגּוֹי | וְלֹא יִזָּכֵר שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹד

(NIV: Come, they say, let us destroy them as a nation, that the name of Israel be remembered no more)

P: □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□

(And they say, come, let us destroy them as a nation, that the name Israel will never be remembered no more)

The Peshitta adds the waw both at the beginning of the first line of the verse and at the beginning of the second line. The Peshitta renders an imperative, לְכוּ (qal imperative second person masculine plural of הלך 'to walk'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, namely □□ (peal imperative second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to come'), as could be expected. The Peshitta has minor additions, but that does not alter the meaning as found in the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are Psalms 83:10, 83:14 and 83:17a. In 83:17a, the imperative is followed by an imperfect with waw to express the purpose of the command. The Peshitta renders that result by □ and an imperfect.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 83:12

MT: שִׁיתֵמוֹ נְדִיבֵמוֹ כְּעֹרֵב וְכִזְאֵב | וְכָל נְסִיכֵמוֹ וְכִזֶבַח וּכְצַלְמֻנָּע

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□

(NIV: Make their nobles like Oreb and Zeeb, all their princes like Zebah and Zulmunna)

(Kill them and destroy them like Oreb and like Zeeb and like Zebah and Shalmunah, all their rulers).

The Peshitta renders an imperative, שִׁיתֵמוּ (qal imperative second person masculine singular + suffix third person masculine plural of שׁית 'to put, set, lay, make something or someone [into] something, impose, order'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□□ (peal imperative second person masculine singular of □□□ + pronoun third person masculine plural 'to slay, kill, destroy'). The verb (□□□□) used by the Peshitta differs semantically in meaning from the verb used by the Masoretic Text (שִׁיתֵמוּ). This Hebrew verb שׁית is a synonym of שׂים and of the eighty-five occurrences in the Bible, שׁית seems to appear most frequently in passages that are from an earlier (pre-exilic) period or exhibit an elevated (poetic) style (VanGemeren, 1997d:100). Syriac does not have this root and due to the rarity of this verb in later Biblical books and other Hebrew literature of the Second Temple Period and later, it was rarely used (VanGemeren, 1997:100). The Peshitta translator did not understand this and rendered the word differently.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:9a

MT: יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת שִׁמְעָה תְפִלָּתִי

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: Hear my prayer, O Lord God Almighty)

(O Lord God Almighty, hear my prayer)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, שִׁמְעָה (qal imperative second person masculine singular of שׁמע 'to hear, listen'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□ (peal imperative second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to listen, hear'), as could be expected. The Peshitta

retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Psalms 84:9b, 84:10a and 84:10b are similar examples.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:5a

MT: שׁוּבֵנוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵנוּ P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: Restore us again, O God our Saviour)

(Turn us, O God our Saviour/O God of our salvation)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, that is שׁוּבֵנוּ (qal imperative masculine singular + suffix first person common plural of שׁוּב 'to turn, return'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, namely □□□□ (aphel imperative masculine singular + suffix first person common plural of □□□ ('to turn, return'). The Peshitta has a verb with consonants different from the Hebrew verb in the Masoretic Text. Syriac has the verb with the same consonants as the Hebrew one here, but it has a total different meaning (□□□, 'to whither or dry up'). Even though the Peshitta uses a verb with consonants different from the one in the Masoretic Text, it gives a good translation. The meaning of the verse is also not affected. The Peshitta retains the word of the Masoretic Text order in this instance as well. Similar examples are 85:5b and 85:8a.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:2a

MT: שָׁמְרָה נַפְשִׁי P: □□□□□ □□□

(NIV: Guard my life)

(Guard my soul [life])

The Peshitta renders an imperative (שָׁמְרָה, the qal imperative second person masculine singular + emphatic ה-*ah* of שׁמר 'to guard'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□ (peal imperative second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to watch, protect, take heed, keep secure'). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are 86:2b, 86:3a (here the Peshitta uses a preposition □□ for the suffix in the Masoretic Text), 86:4a, 86:6a, 86:6b (a specific verb is used in the Masoretic Text, while the Peshitta has a general verb), 86:11a, 86:16a, 86:16b, 86:16c, 86:16d and 86:17a.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:3b

MT: תָּבוֹא לְפָנֶיךָ תְּפִלָּתִי | הַטֵּה אָזְנְךָ לְרִנָּתִי

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: May my prayer come before you, turn your ear to my cry)

(May my prayer come before you, and lower your ear to my cry)

The imperative is found in the second part of the verse, with the hiphil imperative, הַטֵּה, rendered as the aphel imperative, □□□□□. The Peshitta also adds a waw at the beginning of the second line of the verse.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:48a

MT: זְכָר אֲנִי מֶה חָלֶד

P: □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□

(NIV: Remember how fleeting is my life)

(Remember me from shame or from the grave)

The Peshitta renders the imperative, זְכָר (qal imperative second person masculine singular + pronoun first person common singular of זכר 'to remember, recall'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, that is □□□□□□□□ (ethpeel imperative second person masculine singular + pronoun first person common singular of □□□ 'to remember, recollect, to call to mind'). The Peshitta uses the preposition □□ to render the Hebrew מֶה. It retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. The Masoretic Text has a problematic pronoun 'I', which is rendered as the object suffix to the verb by the Peshitta.

Summary: Imperative rendered as an imperative

A rendering of an imperative in the Masoretic Text as an imperative in the Peshitta occurs 65 times in Psalms 73–89: 6X in 74; 2X in 76; 6X in 79; 14X in 80; 6X in 81; 5X in 82; 5X in 83; 4X in 84; 3X in 85; 12X in 86; 1X in 88 and 1X in 89. The table below will describe this distribution clearly.

Table 37: Number of occurrences of an imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperative in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (2a, 3a, 18a, 20a, 22a & 22b)	6
76 (12a & 12b)	2
79 (6a, 9a, 9b, 9c, 11b & 12a)	6
80 (2b, 2e, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 8a, 8b, 15a, 15b, 15c, 15d, 20a & 20b)	14
81 (2a, 2b, 3a, 4, 9a & 11b)	6
82 (3a, 3b, 4a, 8a & 8b)	5
83 (5b, 10, 12, 14 & 17)	5
84 (9a, 9b, 10a & 10b)	4
85 (5a, 5b & 8a)	3
86 (2a, 2b, 3a, 4a, 6a, 6b, 11a, 16a, 16c, 16d & 17a)	12
88 (3a)	1
89 (48a)	1

The Peshitta adds a waw twice at the beginning of a new line (e.g. 74:22b and 74:22c). At times, it fails to render rare words in the Masoretic Text as they are unknown in Syriac (e.g. 80:2e). In some instances, the Masoretic Text uses a specific word that the Peshitta translates as a general word (80:4a). In other instances, it adds the waw at the beginning of a verse and also at the beginning of the second line in the verse (83:5b, 88:3b). Sometimes, the Peshitta does not understand the Hebrew as used in the Masoretic Text and translates it differently (83:12). At times, it uses a verb different from the verb in the Masoretic Text (e.g. 85:5a). In 86:3a, it uses the preposition □□ for the suffix in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta uses the preposition □□ to render the Hebrew מָה.

4.3.2 Imperative rendered without verb

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:11b

MT: לָמָּה תָשִׁיב יָדְךָ וִימִינֶךָ | מִקֶּרֶב
חוקך [חֵיקְךָ קרי] כַּלֵּה

P: ܠܡܐ ܬܗܦܟ ܐܝܕܟ ܘܝܡܝܢܟ
ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܥܝܢܝܟ ܐܦ ܐܦ ܠܝܡܝܢܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܥܝܢܝܟ

(NIV: Why do you hold back your hand, your right hand? Take it from the folds of your garment and destroy them)

(Why turn your hand away? even your right hand from inside your garment/bosom)

In the example above, the Peshitta renders an imperative, כַּלֵּה (piel imperative masculine singular of כלה 'make an end, complete'), in the Masoretic Text without a verb. It omits the verb in the Masoretic Text and does not translate it. The verb כלה in the qal means 'to bring the process to completion', and in the piel, 'to finish, complete, end or destroy', while in the pual it means 'to be finished' (Koehler and Baumgartner, 1958:437–438; Holladay, 1988:158). Following VanGemeren, (1997b:641), the verb כלה occurs more than 200 times in the Old Testament (as a qal 64 times, a piel 140 times and a pual twice). He further attests that the range of contexts makes it difficult to find a simple English equivalent. The complexities of various contexts probably added to the Peshitta translator's problem. It is not clear why the verb was omitted.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:8b

MT: אַל תִּזְכָּר לָנוּ עֲוֹנֹת רִאשֹׁנִים | מַהֵר
יְקַדְּמוּנוּ רַחֲמֶיךָ כִּי דַלּוֹנוּ מְאֹד

P: ܠܐ ܬܗܘܝ ܠܢ ܠܐ ܠܥܘܠܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ
ܠܐ ܢܗܘܘ ܠܢ ܠܐ ܠܪܚܡܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܛܠ ܕܫܦܠ ܫܦܠ ܠܢ ܫܦܠ
ܠܐ ܢܗܘܘ ܠܢ ܠܐ ܠܪܚܡܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܛܠ ܕܫܦܠ ܫܦܠ ܠܢ ܫܦܠ

(NIV: Do not hold against us the sins of the fathers; may your mercy come quickly to meet us, for we are in desperate need)/ Literal: O do not remember for us the iniquities of our first fathers; speedily let it meet us your tender mercies for we have been weakened greatly)

(Do not remember/ hold against us the iniquities of the first before us, let your mercies quickly go before us for we are greatly humbled)

Here the Peshitta renders an imperative, מַהֵר (piel imperative second person masculine singular of מהר 'to hurry, come quickly'), in the Masoretic Text as an adverb with a preposition, namely

□□□□ (adverb with preposition בְּ ‘hastily, quickly, swiftly’). This is a good translation in the context.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:3b

MT: שְׂאוּ זִמְרָה וּתְנוּ תֹף | כִּנּוֹר נָעִים עִם נָבֶל

P: □¨□□□□ □□ □□□¨□□□ □□□□□ □□□¨□ □□□¨□□□□

(NIV: Begin the music, strike the tambourine, play the melodious harp and lyre)

(Lift up drums, and lyres and sweet [instruments] with zithers/lyres)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, וּתְנוּ (conjunction + qal imperative second person masculine plural of נתן ‘to give’), in the Masoretic Text without a verb. It does not translate/omits the Hebrew verb וּתְנוּ as it appears in the Masoretic Text. The use of the verb ‘to give’ is a bit unusual with musical instruments. The Peshitta probably makes all the instruments objects of the verb ‘to lift’.

Psalm 82

Example: Psalm 82:4b

MT: פַּלְּטוּ דַל וְאֶבְיוֹן | מִיַּד רְשָׁעִים הַצִּילוּ

P: □□□¨□□□ □□□ □□□¨□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□¨□□ □□

(NIV: Rescue the weak and needy; deliver them from the hand of the wicked)

(Deliver the poor and the needy from the hand of the wicked)

The Peshitta renders an imperative, הַצִּילוּ (hiphil imperative second person masculine plural of נצל ‘to deliver, take away’), in the Masoretic Text without verb. It omits this verb and does not render it in translation. Because of this omission, the Peshitta has only one verb, while the Masoretic Text has two verbs for each line. The two verbs in the Masoretic Text are synonyms and omitting the verb at the end of the verse could be a way of simplifying the Hebrew.

Summary: Imperative rendered as no verb

The rendering of an imperative in the Masoretic Text as a no verb in the Peshitta occurs four times in Psalms 73–89 [1X in 74; 1X in 79 and 1X in 81] as shown in the table below. From these renderings, the following deductions can be made: the Peshitta omits the verb in the Masoretic

Text for no obvious reason (74:11b), the Peshitta at times renders an imperative as an adverb plus preposition בְּ (79:8b) and lastly, the Peshitta simplifies the Masoretic Text (e.g. 82:4b).

Table 38: Number of occurrences of an imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (11b)	1
79 (8b)	1
81 (3b)	1
82 (4b)	1

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of imperatives

The rendering of the imperative in Psalms 73–89 occurs 69 times. The imperative in the Masoretic Text is rendered in two ways by the Peshitta, namely as an imperative or as no verb. The Peshitta renders an imperative as an imperative 65 times, while it renders an imperative as no verb only four times in these seventeen psalms. It clearly shows a preference for rendering imperatives as imperatives.

Furthermore, the imperative is rendered by the Peshitta either as an imperative without waw or as an imperative with waw. The waw is added either for stylistic purposes or for the sake of the Syriac syntax, for example in 74:22b and 74:22c. The Peshitta fails to render the rare words used in the Masoretic Text as in the Hebrew; thus it renders them differently from the Masoretic Text (80:2e, 83:12). Sometimes, the Peshitta uses a general word or verb for a specific one in the Masoretic Text (80:4a). At other times, it adds a waw not present in the Masoretic Text, for example in 80:4a. The waw is added at the beginning of the first line in the verse and in the beginning of a new line in the verse (83:5b, 88:3b). In other instances, the Peshitta uses a verb different from the one used in the Masoretic Text (85:5a). The imperative in the Masoretic Text is sometimes followed by a waw plus cohortative, expressing the purpose of the imperative; the Peshitta renders it with □ plus imperfect to express the purpose of the command. In certain instances where the Peshitta uses verbs different from the ones used in the Masoretic Text, it

retains the imperative, for example in Psalm 80:2e. In other instances, the Peshitta omits verbs present in the Masoretic Text and does not render them at all, for example in 74:11b, 81:3b and 82:4b. The Peshitta also deviates from the Masoretic Text due to omissions or additions of words not found in the Masoretic Text.

Table 39: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperatives found in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verb form in MT	Translation in P	Number of occurrences
4.3 (p. 207)	Imperative		Total = 69
4.3.1 (p. 208)		Imperative	65
4.3.2 (p. 216)		No verb	4

4.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In this section, a study is made of all the jussive forms in Psalms 73–89 and of the way the Peshitta Psalter handles them. In the analysis, the following three categories have emerged:

4.4.1 Jussive rendered as an imperfect verb (p. 220)

4.4.2 Jussive rendered as an imperfect verb *plus d* (p. 223)

4.4.3 Jussive rendered as a perfect verb (p. 224)

4.4.1 Jussive rendered as an imperfect verb

As Syriac does not have a different form for a jussive, and also not for the negative particle that is used with the jussive in the Masoretic Text, one would expect the use of □□ plus the imperfect in the Peshitta in many instances where the negative particle is used in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:23a

MT: אַל תִּשְׁכַּח קוֹל צֹרְרֶיךָ | שְׁאוֹן קָמֶיךָ עֹלֶה תָמִיד

P: □□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: Do not ignore the clamour of your adversaries, the uproar of your enemies, which rises continually)

(And do not forget the voice/noise/rumour of your adversaries and the uproar of your enemies, which rises continually)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the jussive after אַל in the construct אַל־תִּשְׁכַּח (negative אַל + qal jussive second person masculine singular of שׁכח 'to forget'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect after □□, that is □□□□ (aphel imperfect second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to forget' after □□). The Peshitta retains the word order. Similar examples are 74:19a, 74:19b and 74:21a.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:6a

MT: אַל תָּרִימוּ לַמָּרוֹם קַרְנְכֶם
תְּדַבְּרוּ בְצַוָּאר עָתָק |

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: Do not lift your horns against heaven; do not speak with outstretched neck)

(And do not lift up your horns against heaven [literal: 'height']; and do not speak with a stiff neck)

The jussive after אַל־ in the construct אַל תָּרִימוּ (hiphil jussive second person masculine plural of רוּם 'to lift or rise up, elevate' after the negative אַל־ 'not'), in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an imperfect, that is □□□□□□ (aphel imperfect second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to be exalted, elevated, to rise up' after □□). The jussive in Hebrew follows אַל־ ('certainly not') and the Peshitta offers this as an imperfect after □□ following □, which is an addition since it is not present in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta has a waw at the beginning of the verse, as well as at the beginning of a new line. The Syriac does not have a jussive and instead renders it with an imperfect after □□.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:8a

MT: אַל תִּזְכָּר לָנוּ עֲוֹנֹת רִאשֹׁנִים | מַהֵר
יְקַדְּמוּנוּ רַחֲמֶיךָ כִּי דַלּוֹנוּ מְאֹד

P: □□ □□□□□ □□
□¨□□□□ □□□□¨□

□□□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□
□□ □□□□□□□ □□□

(NIV: Do not hold against us the sins of the fathers; may your mercy come quickly to meet us, for we are in desperate need)/Literal: O do not remember for us the iniquities of our first fathers; speedily let it meet us your tender mercies for we have been weakened greatly

(Do not remember/hold against us the iniquities of the first before us, let your mercies quickly go before us for we are greatly humbled)

The Peshitta renders the jussive after אַל, that is in the construct אַל תִּזְכָּר (qal jussive second person masculine singular of זכר 'to remember'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect after □□, that is □□□□□ □□ (ethpeel imperfect second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be called for remembrance'). The Peshitta retains the word order.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:2a

MT: אֱלֹהִים אַל דֳּמִי לָךְ | אַל תֶּחֱרַשׁ וְאַל תִּשָּׁקֵט אֵל

P: □□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: O God, do not keep silent; be not quiet, O God, be not still)

(O God, what is blood to you? Do not be silent and do not cease, O God)

The Peshitta translates the jussive after אַל, that is in אַל־תֶּחֱרַשׁ (negative particle אַל + qal jussive second person masculine singular of חרשׁ 'to keep still, be silent'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect after □□, that is □□□□□ (peal imperfect second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be forced to keep silent, to be silent', plus □□). Psalm 83:2b is a similar example.

At the beginning of the verse, a noun follows אַל in the Masoretic Text, but the Peshitta does not understand it. It makes the negative remark a question and translates the word for 'silence' as 'blood'.

Summary: Jussive rendered as an imperfect

A rendering of a jussive after אַל in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect after □□ in the Peshitta occurs seven times in Psalms 73–89 (4X in 74; 1X in 75; 1X in 79 and 1X in 83) as shown in the table

below. Since Syriac does not have the jussive, it translates אַל plus jussive with □□ plus the imperfect (e.g. 74:23a). The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a verse (75:6a). In other instances, the Peshitta changes a negative remark in the Masoretic Text into a question (83:2a).

Table 40: Number of occurrences of a jussive in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (19a, 19b, 21a & 23a)	4
75 (6a)	1
79 (8a)	1
83 (2a)	1

4.4.2 Jussive rendered as an imperfect verb plus *d*

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:5c

MT: אָמַרְתִּי לַהוֹלְלִים אַל תָּהֹלּוּ | וְלָרְשָׁעִים אַל תָּרִימוּ קָרֶן

(NIV: "To the arrogant I say, 'Boast no more,' and to the wicked, 'Do not lift up your horns'")

P: □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ ̈□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ ̈□□

(You said to the foolish, 'Do not be foolish anymore,' and to the wicked, 'Do not lift up your horns')

The Peshitta translates a jussive after אַל, that is in the construct אַל־תָּהֹלּוּ (אַל־ + qal jussive second person masculine plural of הלל 'to be confused, deluded') as an imperfect after □□ preceded by □, that is □□□□□ □□□ (peal imperfect second person masculine plural of □□□ 'to be or become insane, foolish', plus □). Psalm 75:5d is a similar example, although without □. The □ is here probably used to introduce direct speech.

The Peshitta uses □ plus imperfect, hence □□□ before the imperfect. The object sentence is introduced by □ in the Peshitta, but nothing of such a nature is found in the Hebrew. This is related to Syriac style.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:9d

MT: וְאַל יָשׁוּבוּ לְכִסְלָה P: □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□

(NIV: But let them not return to folly) (so that they do return to their evil)

The Peshitta renders the jussive after אַל preceded by a waw in the construct וְאַל יָשׁוּבוּ (qal jussive third person masculine plural of שׁוּב 'to turn, return' + negative particle), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect following □□ preceded by □, that is □□□□□□ □□□ (peal imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to return, come back', the negative particle). The Peshitta uses □ in this instance to render the Hebrew waw in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta takes the final part of the verse as expressing the purpose of the imperative at the beginning of the verse.

Summary: Jussive rendered as an imperfect plus □

The rendering of a jussive following אַל in the Masoretic Text as □□□ followed by an imperfect occurs three times in Psalms 73–89 (2X in 75 and 1X in 85), as shown in the table below. The Peshitta translates אַל plus jussive in the Masoretic Text as □□□ plus imperfect (75:5c). In 85:9d, the Peshitta uses □ to render the waw in the Masoretic Text.

Table 41: Number of occurrences of a jussive in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect plus □ in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
75 (5c & 5d)	2
85 (9d)	1

4.4.3 Jussive rendered as a perfect verb

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:16c

MT: מְשַׂנְאֵי יְהוָה יְכַחֲשׁוּ לוֹ | וְיִהִי עִתָּם לְעוֹלָם

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□¨□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: Those who hate the Lord would cringe [to be found liars] before him, and their punishment would last forever)

(The enemies of the Lord lied before him and their trembling lasts forever)

The Peshitta renders the jussive with waw copulative, that is וְיִהִי (waw copulative + qal jussive third person masculine singular of הִיה 'to be'), in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus perfect, that is □□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□/□□□ 'to be, was'). The waw at the beginning of the second line is not an addition by the Peshitta, but a rendering of the waw copulative in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders the imperfect at the beginning of the verse as a perfect and follows this verbal form with the second verb.

A rendering of a jussive with a waw copulative in the Masoretic Text as a perfect in the Peshitta occurs once in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 81). In this example, the waw at the beginning of a second line is not an addition by the Peshitta, but a rendering of the waw in the Masoretic Text.

Analysis and conclusion: Rendering of jussives

Syriac does not have a jussive like Hebrew. The Peshitta uses the imperfect to render the jussive used in the Masoretic Text and this rendering occurs eleven times. In all cases where the Masoretic Text uses a jussive after the negative particle אַל ('certainly not'), the Peshitta renders it as an imperfect after the negative particle □□. In other cases, the Peshitta adds a waw that is not present in the Masoretic Text, for example in 75:6a. At times, the Peshitta misinterprets the Hebrew and uses a word with a meaning different from the one used in the Masoretic Text, for example in 83:2. In other instances, it uses □ and not an addition to render the waw in the Masoretic Text, for example in 85:9d. Sometimes, where the Masoretic Text has the negative אַל followed by a jussive, the Peshitta renders it as □□□ followed by an imperfect *e*, for example in 75:5c. In other instances, the Peshitta changes a negative remark in the Masoretic Text into a question (83:2a). Sometimes, the Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a verse (75:6a) and in 81:16c, it adds a waw at the beginning of the second line of the verse.

Table 42: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render jussives in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.4 (p. 220)	Jussive		Total = 11
4.4.1 (p. 220)		Imperfect	7
4.4.2 (p. 223)		Imperfect plus □ (*d*)	3
4.4.3 (p. 224)		Perfect	1

4.5. Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In this section, the focus is on the cohortatives as they occur in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text, and how the Peshitta Psalter renders them. To achieve this goal, attention will be paid to the following renderings that have been established during the research:

4.5.1 Cohortative rendered as an imperfect verb (p. 226)

4.5.2 Cohortative rendered as a perfect verb (p. 231)

4.5.3 Cohortative rendered as no verb (p. 233)

4.5.1 Cohortative rendered as an imperfect verb

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:17b

MT: עַד אָבוֹא אֶל מִקְדְּשֵׁי אֵל | אָבִינָה לְאַחֲרִיתָם

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: Till I entered the sanctuary of God, then I understood their final destiny)

(Until I entered the sanctuary of God, then I understood their destiny)

The final word of the sentence is the same word as used in the Masoretic Text, but in Syriac without the initial aleph.

The Peshitta in this instance renders the cohortative, אָבִינָה (qal cohortative first person common singular of בין ‘to understand’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, □□□□□□ (conjunction + ethpeel imperfect first person common singular of □□□ ‘to understand’). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:10b

MT: וַאֲנִי אַגִּיד לְעֹלָם | אֲזַמְּרָה לֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב

P: ܘܐܢܐ ܐܚܝ ܠܥܠܡ ܐܫܒܚ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܥܩܘܒ

(As for me, I will declare this forever; I will sing praise to the God of Jacob)

(And I will live forever and sing praise to the God of Jacob)

The Peshitta in this instance translates a cohortative, אֲזַמְּרָה (piel cohortative first person common singular of זמר 'to declare'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with waw, that is ܘܐܫܒܚ (conjunction + peal or pael imperfect first person common singular of ܫܒܚ 'to make sing, praise, declare'). In this case, the Peshitta uses the verb with the same consonants and meaning as the verb in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of this second line, connecting it to the previous line. The waw added is not present in the Masoretic Text. Syriac does not have a cohortative, thus the rendering as an imperfect is to be expected.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:2a

MT: אֶפְתְּחָה בְמָשָׁל פִּי

P: ܗܐ ܐܦܬܚ ܐܦܬܚ ܦܘܡܝ ܒܡܬܠܐ ܘܐܡܠܠ

(NIV: I will open my mouth in parables)

(Behold, for I will open my mouth in parables/ stories)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative, אֶפְתְּחָה (qal cohortative first person common singular of פתח 'to open'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, ܐܦܬܚ (peal imperfect first person common singular of ܦܬܚ 'to open'). The Peshitta starts this new line differently from the Masoretic Text by adding ܗܐ ܐ, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. Apart from this deviation, it retains the word order of the Hebrew text. It is probable that the Peshitta adds ܗܐ ܐ just to emphasise its intentions.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:4c

P: □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

MT: אֱלֹהִים הֲשִׁיבֵנוּ | וְהָאֵר פָּנֶיךָ
וְנִוָּשֵׁעָה

(Strengthen us, O God Almighty; and make your face shine upon us, that we may be saved)

(NIV: Restore us, O God; make your face shine upon us, that we may be saved)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative, וְנִוָּשֵׁעָה (conjunction + niphal cohortative (imperfect) first person common plural of ישׁע ‘to receive help’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with a waw, that is □□□□□□ (ethpeel imperfect first person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to save, liberate, to remove’) in this case. The Peshitta adds □□□□□□, which is not present in the Masoretic Text, but apart from this addition, it retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Similar examples are 80:8c and 80:20c.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:9c

MT: שְׁמַע עַמִּי וְאָעִידָה בָּךְ | יִשְׂרָאֵל אִם תִּשְׁמַע לִי

(NIV: Hear, O my people, and I will warn you- if you would but listen to me, O Israel)

P: □□□□□□ □□□ □□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□□

(Hear, O my people, and I will speak, and Israel will testify against you whether you listen to me)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative, וְאָעִידָה (conjunction + hiphil cohortative imperfect first person common singular of עוד ‘to call someone to witness, be/serve as a witness, assure’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□ (peal/pael imperfect first person common singular of □□□ (‘to testify or to bear witness’). The Peshitta adds a suffix to render the Hebrew לִי. It changes the word order but this does not affect the meaning of the verse. The Peshitta brings ‘Israel’ forward in the verse and adds a waw to it, which is not the case in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:13b

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□
□□□□□

MT: אֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ נִירְשָׁה לָּנוּ | אֵת
נְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים

(NIV: Who said, “Let us take possession of the pasture-lands of God”)

(Who said, ‘Let us take possession of the field or land of God’)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative, נִירְשָׁה (qal imperfect cohortative first person common plural of ירשׁ ‘take possession of’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, □□□□ (peal imperfect first person common plural of □□□ + pronoun ‘to inherit, take into possession, gain, acquire’). The Peshitta uses the relative □ for the relative particle אֲשֶׁר. It retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:9a

MT: אֶשְׁמְעָה מַה יְדַבֵּר הָאֵל יְהוָה

P: □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(NIV: I will listen to what God the Lord will say)

(We will listen to what the Lord their God will say)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative singular, אֶשְׁמְעָה (qal cohortative first person common singular of שׁמע ‘to hear’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plural, that is □□□□□ (relative □ + peal imperfect first person common plural of □□□ ‘to hear’). The Peshitta adds □, which is not present in the Masoretic Text. It translates the verb as sub-ordinate to the previous verse, stating the purpose of what is said there.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:12b

MT: אוֹדְךָ אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהַי בְּכָל לְבָבִי | וַאֲכַבְּדָה שִׁמְךָ לְעוֹלָם

(NIV: I will praise you, O Lord my God, with all my heart; I will glorify your name forever)

P: □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□ □□□

(I will praise you, O Lord my God, with all my heart; I will glorify your name forever)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative, וַאֲכַבְּדָה (conjunction + piel cohortative – imperfect – first person common singular of כבד ‘to honour, glorify’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with

waw, namely □□□□□ (conjunction + pael imperfect first person common singular of □□□ ‘to praise, glorify, proclaim’). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:2a

MT: חַסְדֵי יְהוָה עוֹלָם אָשִׁירָה

(NIV: I will sing of the Lord’s love forever)

P: □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(I will forever sing of the goodness/kindness of the Lord)

The Peshitta renders a cohortative, אָשִׁירָה (qal cohortative [imperfect] first person common singular of שִׁיר ‘to sing’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□ (pael imperfect first person common singular of □□□ ‘to make sing’). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Summary: Cohortative rendered as an imperfect verb

The rendering of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect by the Peshitta occurs eleven times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 73; 1X in 75; 1X in 78; 3X in 80; 1X in 81; 1X in 83; 1X in 85; 1X in 86 and 1X in 89). The number of occurrences is clearly shown in the table below. The cohortative in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta as could be expected, since Syriac does not have a cohortative. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a new line of the verse (e.g. 73:17b and 75:10b). At times, the Peshitta adds words for which there is no correspondence in the Masoretic Text (78:2a and 80:4c). In other instances, the Peshitta changes the word order (81:9c). In 81:9c, the Peshitta uses a suffix to translate לִי in the Masoretic Text. In 83:13b, it uses the relative □ to render the relative אֲשֶׁר in the Masoretic Text, while in 85:9a, it is just added. Furthermore, in 85:9a, the Peshitta renders a verb as subordinate to the previous one.

Table 43: Number of occurrences of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect verb in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (17b)	1
75 (10b)	1

Psalm	Number of occurrences
78 (2a)	1
80 (4c, 8c, & 20c)	3
81 (9c)	1
83 (13b)	1
85 (9a)	1
86 (12b)	1
89 (2a)	1

4.5.2 Cohortative rendered as a perfect verb

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:2a

MT: קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְאֶצְעָקָה | קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְהַאֲזִין אֵלָי

(NIV: I cried out to God for help; I cried out to God to hear me)

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(With my voice I cried out to God and He heard me, and my voice rouse up to him and he answered me)

The Peshitta renders a waw copulative as a cohortative, that is וְאֶצְעָקָה (waw copulative + qal cohortative first person common singular of צעק 'to cry'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without a waw, that is □□□□ (peal perfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to cry'). The Peshitta adds a verb □□□□□, which is also a perfect with waw in the second part of the verse, probably because the previous verb is a perfect with waw. Similar examples are 77:4a (where the whole verse is rendered in the past tense), 77:7a and 77:7c.

The following examples require a more detailed analysis.

In Psalm 77:4b, the Peshitta renders a cohortative with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, while in 77:4c, the Peshitta renders a cohortative without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:4b & 77:4c

MT: אֶזְכְּרָה אֱלֹהִים וְאֶהֱמָיָה | אָשִׂיחָה וְתִתְעַטֵּף רוּחִי סֶלָה

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: I remember you, O God, and I groaned; I mused, and my spirit grew faint. *Selah*)

(I remembered God and/when I was troubled and I meditated and my spirit fainted)

In 77:4b, the Peshitta renders the cohortative as a waw copulative, that is וְאֶהֱמָיָה (waw copulative + qal cohortative first person common singular of המה 'to be troubled, agitated'), in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus perfect, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction + ethpaal or ethpeel perfect third person feminine singular of □□□ 'to get agitated, confounded, troubled'). The Peshitta uses a word with the same meaning, though with different consonants. It is a good rendering of the verb in the Masoretic Text.

In 77:4c, the Peshitta renders the cohortative without a waw, that is אָשִׂיחָה (qal cohortative first person common singular of שִׂיחַ 'to meditate'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect first person common singular of □□□ 'to reflect on, think, meditate'). The Peshitta adds the waw before the perfect, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. In this instance as well, the Peshitta renders a good translation of the verb in the Masoretic Text. It retains the word order as in the Hebrew verse found in the Masoretic Text. Psalm 77:13a is a similar example.

Summary: Cohortative rendered as a perfect verb

The rendering of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text as a perfect in the Peshitta occurs six times in Psalms 73–89 (6X in 77), which will be shown in the table below. The Syriac does not have a cohortative like its Hebrew counterpart and thus renders it as a perfect in these instances. The Peshitta adds an extra verb with waw in 77:2a. In 77:4c, it adds a waw, which has no correspondence in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta sometimes renders an imperfect in the Masoretic Text as a perfect (see 77:4d, 77:5c, 77:7d, 77:8a, 77:11a, 77:12a, 77:17b, 77:17c and 77:19c).

Table 44: Number of occurrences of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
77 (2a, 4a, 4b, 4c, 7a & 7c)	6

4.5.3 Cohortative rendered as no verb

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:12b

MT: אזכיר [אֶזְכּוֹר קרי] מַעַלְלֵי יָהּ | כִּי אֶזְכְּרָה מִקֶּדֶם פִּלְאֶךָ

(NIV: I will remember the deeds of the Lord; yes, I will remember your miracles of long ago)/(I will remember the works of the Lord, surely I will remember your wonders of old)

P: □□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□¨□□□□

(Because I will remember your previous deeds)

The Peshitta has only one sentence, while the Masoretic Text has two coordinate sentences. In this instance, the Peshitta abbreviates or combines the two sentences so that only one remains. The Peshitta does not translate the cohortative, אֶזְכְּרָה (qal cohortative first person common singular of זכר 'to remember'), in the Masoretic Text. In Psalm 77:12b, the Peshitta omits this verb as found in the Masoretic Text. As a result of shortening the verse in the Masoretic Text, the meaning is not the same. The Peshitta keeps the word order of the second line. It is also probable that the Peshitta translator might have thought that the repetition of זכר was a mistake and therefore not necessary to repeat. It could also be due to misinterpreting the Hebrew.

Summary: Cohortative rendered as no verb

The rendering of a cohortative in the Masoretic Text as no verb in the Peshitta occurs only once in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 77). In 77:12, the Peshitta omits the verb present in the Masoretic Text and shortens the verse, thus not retaining the word order.

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of cohortatives

The Syriac language does not have a cohortative like its Hebrew counterpart. Due to this lack, the Peshitta would normally render the cohortative as an imperfect, for example in 73:17b. The

cohortatives in Psalms 73–89 occur eighteen times in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders these cohortatives as an imperfect (11 times), a perfect (6 times) and as no verb (once), as the table below will show.

Table 45: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render cohortatives found in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verb form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in the P	Number of occurrences
4.5 (p. 226)	Cohortative		Total = 18
4.5.1 (p. 226)		Imperfect	11
4.5.2 (p. 231)		Perfect	6
4.5.3 (p. 233)		No verb	1

At times, the Peshitta adds a □, a waw at the beginning of the second line, for example in 75:10b. In other instances, it adds words not found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 80:4c. In 81:9c, the Peshitta adds a suffix to the verb to render the Hebrew לִי. It changes the word order, but this does not change or affect the meaning of the verse. At times, the Peshitta adds □, which does not have a corresponding construct in the Masoretic Text. In 77:2a, the Peshitta adds a verb with waw, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. The addition of the waw may probably be because the previous verb has a perfect form plus waw. The Peshitta does this to maintain consistency. In another instance, like in 77:12b, the Peshitta abbreviates the verse in the Masoretic Text by leaving out some parts, including the cohortative, and as a result it has a different word order, thus deviating from the Masoretic Text.

4.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text and their rendering into the Peshitta

The focus is here on the Masoretic Text participle, which is rendered in various ways by the Peshitta. During the investigation into Psalms 73–89 of the Masoretic Text in relation to the Peshitta Psalter 73–89, the following renderings have been identified:

4.6.1 Participle rendered as a participle (p. 235)

4.6.2 Participle rendered as a participle in a relative construction with □ (p. 240)

4.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun (p. 244)

4.6.4 Participle rendered as an imperfect verb in a relative construction with ☐ (p. 249)

4.6.5 Participle rendered as perfect verb (p. 250)

4.6.6 Participle rendered as an imperfect verb (p. 255)

4.6.1 Participle rendered as a participle

Here attention is given to the participles in the Masoretic Text rendered as participles in the Peshitta.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:5b

MT: יְוָדַע כְּמֵבִיא לְמָעְלָה | בְּסָבָךְ עֵץ קַרְדֻּמוֹת

P: ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐¨☐☐☐ ☐☐¨☐☐☐

(NIV: They behaved like men wielding axes to cut through a thicket of trees)

(And she/I know(s) like one raising upwards like a forest of trees with axes)

Although the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta both have texts difficult to understand, the Peshitta renders a participle, כְּמֵבִיא (preposition כְּ + hiphil participle masculine singular of בוא 'to enter/go in, penetrate'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely ☐☐☐☐☐ (pael participle masculine singular of ☐☐☐ 'to raise', 'to exalt'). The Peshitta renders the Hebrew כְּ as ☐☐☐. The Peshitta repeats ☐☐☐ in both halves of the sentence, which is not the case in Hebrew. Psalm 74:21 is a similar example, with a niphal participle rendered as a peal passive participle.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:5b

MT: אָמַרְתִּי לַהוֹלְלִים אַל תָּהֹלּוּ | וְלָרְשָׁעִים אַל תָּרִימוּ קָרֶן

(NIV: To the arrogant I say, 'Boast no more,' and to the wicked, 'Do not lift up your horns')

P: ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐¨☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐¨☐☐

(You said to the foolish, 'Do not be foolish anymore,' and to the wicked, 'Do not lift up your horns')

The Peshitta renders the participle with preposition לְ, that is לַהוֹלְלִים (preposition ל + definite article ה; + qal active participle masculine plural of הלל 'to be boastful'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus preposition ☐, that is ☐☐☐̈☐☐ (preposition ☐ + peal active participle

masculine plural of □□□ ‘to be boastful, insane, foolish’). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:2

MT: נוֹדָע בִּיהוּדָה אֱלֹהִים | בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל גָּדוֹל שְׁמוֹ

P: □□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: In Judah God is known; his name is great in Israel)

(In Judah God is known and his name is great in Israel)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders a participle, נוֹדָע (niphal participle masculine singular of ידע ‘to know’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□□ (peal participle passive masculine singular of □□□ ‘to know’). The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the second line, connecting it to the first line. It retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Psalms 76:13b, 76:5a and 76:8a are similar examples. The Peshitta in all these examples renders the niphal participle in the Masoretic Text as a peal passive participle, a good rendering, since Syriac does not have a niphal form.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:2a

MT: רֹעֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל הַאֲזִינָה נֹהֵג כַּצֹּאן יוֹסֵף | יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים הוֹפִיעָה

P: □□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□
□□□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□□
□□□ □□ □□ □□□
□□□□□

(NIV: Hear us, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead Joseph like flock; you who sit enthroned between the cherubim, shine forth)

(Listen/give ear, O Shepherd of Israel [he who tends his flock Israel], you who lead Joseph like a flock; you who dwells between the cherubim or cherubs, be revealed)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders a participle, רֹעֵה (qal active participle masculine singular construct of רעה (‘to graze, pasture, tend, shepherd’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus suffix, namely □□□□ (peal participle active masculine singular + suffix third person masculine singular before □ □□□ ‘to graze sheep, tend flock’), though the suffix is absent from the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta uses a suffix before □. (□□□□□□□ □□□□). There is no construct state employed in this instance in the Peshitta as in the Masoretic Text (רֹעֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל). Similar examples are 80:2c, 80:2d and 80:13c.

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:3c

MT: כִּי הִנֵּה אוֹיְבֶיךָ יֶהֱמָיוּן | וּמְשַׂנְאֶיךָ נָשְׂאוּ רֹאשׁ׃

(NIV: See how your enemies are astir, how your foes rear their heads)

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□

(For behold, your enemies make an uproar, and those/them that hate you they raised their heads)

The Peshitta renders a participle with conjunction plus suffix, that is וּמְשַׂנְאֶיךָ (conjunction + piel participle masculine plural + suffix second person masculine singular of שׂנא ‘to hate’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle with a waw plus suffix, that is □□□□ □□ (conjunction + peal participle masculine plural + suffix second person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to hate’), as could be expected. Psalm 83:8 is a similar example.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:10a

MT: כִּי גָדוֹל אַתָּה וְעֹשֵׂה נִפְלָאוֹת | אַתָּה אֱלֹהִים לְבַדֶּךָ׃

(NIV: For you are great and do marvelous deeds; you alone are God.)

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□
□□□ □□□ □□□□

(For you are great, you who do marvellous deeds, you alone are God.)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders a participle with conjunction, וְעֹשֵׂה (conjunction + qal active participle masculine singular construct of עשׂה ‘to do’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle without

waw, that is ☐☐☐ (peal participle masculine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to work’, ‘to do’, ‘to make’), a rendering not expected. In this instance, the Peshitta omits the waw that is present in the Masoretic Text. At the beginning of this first line, the Peshitta uses the combination of ☐☐☐☐ ☐ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי used in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:3a

MT: נִכְבָּדוֹת מְדֻבָּר בָּךְ | עִיר הָאֱלֹהִים סֶלָה

P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐

(NIV: Glorious things are said of you, O city of God: *Selah*)

(Glorious [precious] things are said of you, O city of God)

The Peshitta renders a participle, נִכְבָּדוֹת (niphal participle feminine plural of כבד ‘to be honoured’, ‘to appear in one’s glory’, ‘what is splendid, glorious’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ (peal passive participle feminine plural used almost like an adjective feminine plural of ☐☐☐ ‘to be honoured’, ‘to be precious’, ‘to be dear’, ‘to be esteemed’), which is what could be expected. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Psalm 87:4b, in which both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have suffixes, is a similar example.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:5b

MT: נֶחְשַׁבְתִּי עִם יוֹרְדֵי בוֹר

P: ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: I am counted among those who go down to the pit)

(I am counted among those who go down to the pit)

The Peshitta renders a participle, יוֹרְדֵי (qal active participle masculine plural construct of ירד ‘to go down’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is ☐☐ ☐☐ (peal active participle masculine plural of ☐☐☐ ‘to go down, descend’, ‘to move downwards’), as could be expected. Similar examples are Psalms 88:6a, 88:9b (here both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have suffixes), 88:11a, 88:16a and 88:19c.

One example requires a more de`tailed analysis.

Psalm 88:19b

MT: הִרְחַקְתָּ מִמֶּנִּי אֹהֵב וָרֵעַ

P: ܐܪܚܩܬ ܡܢܝ ܚܒ̈ܝ ܘܪ̈ܥܝ

(NIV: You have taken my companions and loved ones from me)

(You have taken my companions and my friends from me)

The Peshitta renders a participle without waw, that is אֹהֵב (qal active participle masculine singular of אהב ‘to love’; ‘befriend’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus a waw, namely ܚܒ̈ܝ (peal participle masculine plural of ܚܒܐ + suffix first person common singular, meaning ‘friend’).

Summary: Participle rendered as participle

The rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as a participle in the Peshitta occurs 23 times (i.e. 2X in 74; 1X in 75; 4X in 76; 4X in 80; 2X in 83; 1X in 86; 2X in 87 and 7X in 88), a tendency to be expected. The table below shows the number of occurrences. In 74:5b, the Peshitta uses ܐܝܟ to render כְּ, which occurs in the first line of the verse in the Masoretic Text, but it repeats ܐܝܟ in the second half as well. In 76:2, the Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of the second line of the verse.

Table 46: Number of occurrences of a participle in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (5b & 21)	2
75 (5b)	1
76 (2, 13b, 5a & 8a)	4
80 (2a, 2c, 2d & 13c)	4
83 (3c)	1
86 (10a)	1
87 (3a & 4b)	2

Psalm	Number of occurrences
88 (5b, 6a, 9b, 11a, 16a, 19b & 19c)	7

4.6.2 Participle rendered as a participle in a relative construction with □

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:12b

MT: וֵאלֹהִים מַלְכִּי מִקֶּדֶם | פֹּעֵל יְשׁוּעוֹת בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ

(NIV: But you, O God, are my king from of old; you bring salvation upon the earth)

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□

(But you, our God are king, who brings salvation upon the middle of the earth)

The Peshitta renders a participle, פֹּעֵל (qal active participle of פעל 'to make/make something into something, do'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle with □, that is □□□□ (probably the peal participle + □ □□□ 'to do'). Similar examples are 74:23c and 74:23d. The Peshitta uses a participle with relative □ to express the idea of futurity, prospective presence (Muraoka, 1987:43). The rendering by the Peshitta of the participle as a participle plus □ as in the Masoretic Text occurs often. The translator used this combination to express the idea of the future, prospective present and surety of fulfilment in the same way as the English construction 'be going to' + infinitive does (Muraoka, 1987:43). The Peshitta has shortened the verse.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:71a

MT: מֵאַחַר עָלוֹת הֱבִיאוֹ | לִרְעוֹת בְּיַעֲקֹב עַמּוֹ וּבְיִשְׂרָאֵל נַחֲלָתוֹ

(NIV: From tending the sheep he brought him to be the shepherd of his people Jacob, of Israel his inheritance)

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□

(And from tending the sheep that are suckling he brought him to be the shepherd of his people Jacob, and of Israel his inheritance)

The Peshitta renders a participle, עָלוֹת (qal active participle feminine plural of עול 'to nurse, suckle'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun plus participle plus □, that is □□□□□□ (relative pronoun □ + pael participle masculine singular □□□ 'to suckle'). The Peshitta renders a good translation for the Hebrew verb here. It adds the waw at the beginning of the verse.

The following example requires a more detailed analysis.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:39b

MT: וַיִּזְכֹּר כִּי בָשָׂר הֵמָּה | רוּחַ הוֹלֵךְ וְלֹא יָשׁוּב

(NIV: He remembered that they were but flesh, a passing breeze that does not return)

P: □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□ □□□
□□□□

(NIV: He remembered that they were but flesh, a passing wind or perishing spirit and does not return)

The Peshitta renders a participle, הוֹלֵךְ (qal active participle of הלך 'to go/walk'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus □, that is □□□□□ (the participle □ + peal participle feminine singular of □□□ 'to go', 'to perish'), and not as a waw. The Peshitta uses □ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי as used in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta adds □ in the second line for stylistic purposes. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:3b

MT: שָׁפְכוּ דָמָם כַּמַּיִם סְבִיבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלָ͏ִם וְאֵין קוֹבֵר

(NIV: They poured out blood like water all around Jerusalem, and there is no one to bury the dead)

P: □□□□□□□ □□̤□□□ □□̤□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□□□

(They poured their blood like water all around Jerusalem, and there is no one burying/to bury the dead)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders a participle, קוֹבֵר (qal active participle of קבר ‘to bury, be buried’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus the relative particle □, that is □□□□ (the participle □ + peal participle third person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to bury’), which could be a perfect as well. The Peshitta follows the Masoretic Text and retains the word order.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:5a

MT: אַשְׁרֵי יוֹשְׁבֵי בֵיתֶךָ P: □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: Blessed are those who dwell in your house) (Blessed are they who dwell in your house)

The Peshitta retains the participle as in the Masoretic Text and further uses a preposition in a relative phrase. The Peshitta does not use the construct state as in the Masoretic Text, but rather a relative clause, hence the use of the relative particle □ before the participle with a preposition (□□□□□□□). The Peshitta in this instance renders a participle, יוֹשְׁבֵי (qal participle masculine plural construct state of ישׁב ‘to dwell’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus □ plus □, that is □□□□□□□ (the preposition □ + relative □ + peal participle masculine plural of □□□ ‘to dwell, stay’). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. It uses the preposition before ‘house’, which is not present in the Masoretic Text. This is a case of not using the construct chain. Similar examples are 84:12c and 84:13 (both with relative clauses).

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:2c

MT: הוֹשַׁע עַבְדְּךָ אַתָּה אֱלֹהַי | הַבּוֹטֵחַ אֵלֶיךָ P: □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□

(NIV: You are my God; save your servant who trusts in you) (You are God, save your servant who trusts in you)

The Peshitta renders a participle with definite article, that is הַבּוֹטֵחַ (definite article ה; + qal active participle masculine singular of בטח ‘to trust, be full of confidence’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus relative □, that is □□□□□ (the relative □ + pael participle masculine singular of □□□ ‘to hope, expect, wait for, think’). The Peshitta uses a relative particle □ to render the

Hebrew definite article ה as used in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:6a

MT: כְּמוֹ חֲלָלִים שֹׁכְבֵי קֶבֶר

P: ܕܟܝܢܐ ܩܛܝܠ̈ܐ ܕܒܩܒ̈ܪܐ ܕܫܟܒ̈ܝܢ

(NIV: Like the slain who lie in the grave)

(Like the slain/pierced ones who lie in the grave)

The Peshitta renders a participle שֹׁכְבֵי (qal active participle masculine plural construct state of שכב 'to lie down'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle with ܕ, that is ܕܕܫܟܒ̈ܝܢ (the relative ܕ + peal passive participle masculine singular of ܩܛܝܠ 'to lie down'). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Again, the construct state of the Masoretic Text is rendered as the absolute state plus preposition.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:16a

MT: אַשְׁרֵי הָעָם יוֹדְעֵי תְרוּעָה

P: ܛܘܒܝܗܘܢ ܥܡܐ ܕܝܕܥ̈ܝܢ ܗܬܦܪ̈ܝܪ

(NIV: Blessed are those have learned to acclaim you)/Blessed are the people who know the joyful sound or shout of joy)

(Blessed is the people who know your glory or mercies)

The Peshitta renders a participle, that is יוֹדְעֵי (qal active participle masculine plural construct of ידע state 'to know'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle with a relative particle ܕ, that is ܕܕܝܕܥ̈ܝܢ (the relative ܕ + peal active participle masculine singular of ܝܕܥ 'to know'). The Peshitta retains the word order following the Masoretic Text.

Summary: Participle rendered as a participle in a relative construct with ܕ

The rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as a combination of a participle plus a relative ܕ construction occurs twelve times in Psalms 73–89 (3X in 74; 2X in 78; 1X in 79; 3X in 84; 1X in 86; 1X in 88 and 1X in 89). This will be shown in the table below. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of the verse (78:71a). It uses ܕ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי in 78:39b and also

adds an extra □, with no correspondence in the Masoretic Text. In 84:5a, the Peshitta uses the combination □ plus □ plus participle to render the participle in the Masoretic Text. In 86:2c, the Peshitta uses □ to render the definite article הַ in the Masoretic Text. In 88:6a, the construct state in the Masoretic Text is rendered in the Peshitta as an absolute state plus a preposition.

Table 47: Number of occurrences of a participle in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (12b, 23c & 23d)	3
78 (39b & 71a)	2
79 (3b)	1
84 (5a, 12c & 13)	3
86 (2c)	1
88 (6a)	1
89 (16a)	1

4.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:3b

MT: כִּי קִנֵּאתִי בַּהוֹלְלִים P: □□ ¨□□□ □□□□ □□□

(NIV: For I envied the arrogant) (For I was jealous of the boastful/arrogant)

The Peshitta renders a participle with preposition plus definite article, that is בַּהוֹלְלִים (preposition + definite article הַ + qal active participle masculine plural of הלל 'to be confused, deluded', 'to be infatuated, make a fool of'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is □□ ¨□□□ (noun masculine plural of □□□). The Hebrew verb is not well known; hence the Peshitta renders it as a noun. The Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□□ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי as used in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta retains the word order following the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:3d

MT: כָּל הֵרַע אוֹיֵב בַּקֹּדֶשׁ

P: ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: All this destruction the enemy has brought on the sanctuary)

(The enemy who has done all evil in your sanctuary)

The Peshitta renders a participle, אוֹיֵב (qal active participle masculine singular of איב 'the enemy'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (noun masculine singular of 'enemy'). The Peshitta adds the object suffix in 'your sanctuary' and follows the word order in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:8a

MT: כִּי אֱלֹהִים שֹׁפֵט

P: ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(NIV: But it is God who judges)

(For/but it is God who judges)/For God is the judge

The Peshitta renders a participle, שֹׁפֵט (qal participle masculine singular or noun masculine of שׁפט singular 'to judge'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is ☐☐☐☐ (noun masculine singular of 'judge'; it can also be a participle as well, but in this instance a noun is preferred). Also in this instance, the Peshitta renders the Hebrew conjunction כִּי as a ☐ ☐☐☐☐. Similar examples are 75:2e and 75:4b.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:4c

MT: וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה

P: ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: And the wonders he has done)

(And his wonderful works/wonders that he has done)

The Peshitta renders a participle with waw plus waw, וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו (conjunction + niphal participle feminine plural + suffix third person masculine singular of פלא 'wonderful works', 'marvellous'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun plus waw plus suffix, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (waw + noun feminine plural ☐☐☐☐☐☐ 'marvellous thing'/'wonder'). The Peshitta adds ☐ before ☐☐☐☐, of which nothing is found in the Masoretic Text to justify this rendering. The Peshitta follows the word order in the Masoretic Text. Although it uses a noun with consonants different from the verb used in the Masoretic Text, the noun has the same meaning as the verb. It is a good rendering. Psalms

78:11b, 78:16b, 78:32c, 78:35b (here the suffix in the Masoretic Text is third person masculine plural, while in the Peshitta it is masculine singular), 78:44b, 78:53c and 78:69b are similar examples.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:17b

MT: שְׂרֻפָה בָאֵשׁ כְּסוּחָה | מִגַּעֲרַת פָּנֶיךָ יֹאבֵדוּ

P: ܘ̈ ̈ ̈

MT: שִׁפְטוּ דַל וְיָתוֹם | עָנִי וָרָשׁ
הַצְדִיקוּ

(NIV: Defend the cause of the weak and fatherless; maintain the rights of the poor and oppressed)

P: □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□

(Defend the poor and the fatherless; do justice to the afflicted and needy/innocent)

The Peshitta renders a participle with waw, וָרָשׁ (conjunction + qal active participle masculine singular of רוּשׁ ‘to be poor’), in the Masoretic Text as a noun plus waw plus □, that is □□□□□□□ (conjunction + noun masculine plural of □□□□□□□ ‘poor person, without means, lacking').

Psalm 83

Example: Psalm 83:3a

MT: כִּי הִנֵּה אוֹיְבֶיךָ יֶהֱמָיוּן | וּמְשַׂנְאֶיךָ נָשְׂאוּ רֹאשׁ:

(NIV: See how your enemies are astir, how your foes rear their heads)

P: □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□

(For behold, your enemies make an uproar, and those/them that hate you they raised their heads)

The Peshitta renders a participle with suffix, אוֹיְבֶיךָ (qal active participle masculine plural + suffix second person masculine singular of איב ‘enemy’), in the Masoretic Text as a noun plus suffix, that is □□□□□□□□□ (noun masculine plural of □□□□□□□□ ‘enemy’ + suffix second person masculine singular). The Peshitta renders the Hebrew כִּי הִנֵּה as □□□ □□□, and follows the word order in the Masoretic Text. Psalm 83:4c is a similar example.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:10b

MT: כִּי גָדוֹל אַתָּה וְעֹשֵׂה נִפְלָאוֹת | אַתָּה אֱלֹהִים לְבַדֶּךָ

(NIV: For you are great and do marvelous deeds; you alone are God)

P: □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□ □□□ □□□□

(For you are great, you who do marvellous deeds, you alone are God.)

The Peshitta renders a participle, נִפְלָאוֹת (niphal participle absolute feminine plural of פלא ‘to be too hard, difficult’, ‘to be too marvellous’), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is ☐☐☐☐☐ (noun feminine plural of ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ‘marvellous things, wonders’). The Peshitta renders the Hebrew conjunction כִּי as a combination of ☐ ☐☐☐☐. It retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:23b

MT: לֹא יֵשֵׁא אוֹיֵב בּוֹ | וּבֶן עַוְלָה לֹא יְעַנֶּנּוּ

(NIV: No enemy will subject him to tribute; no wicked man will oppress him)

P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(And his enemy did not benefit anything and the son of the evildoer did not humble him)

The Peshitta renders a participle, אוֹיֵב (qal active participle masculine singular of איב ‘enemy’), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (noun masculine plural of ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ‘enemy’ + suffix third person masculine singular). Similar examples are 89:43c and 89:52b.

Summary: Participle rendered as a noun

The rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as a noun in the Peshitta occurs 23 times (1X in 73; 1X in 74; 3X in 75; 8X in 78; 2X in 80; 2X in 81; 1X in 82; 2X in 83; 1X in 86 and 3X in 89). The table below shows the number of occurrences.

Table 48: Number of occurrences of a participle in the Masoretic Text rendered as a noun in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (3b)	1
74 (3d)	1
75 (2e, 4b & 8a)	3
78 (4c, 11b, 16b, 32c, 35b, 44b, 53c & 69b)	8

Psalm	Number of occurrences
80 (7b & 17b)	2
81 (15a & 16a)	2
82 (3b)	1
83 (3a & 4c)	2
86 (10b)	1
89 (23b, 43c & 52b)	3

The noun for ‘enemy’ is used four times. In 73:3b, the Hebrew verb as used in the Masoretic Text is not well known; hence the Peshitta renders it as a noun. In 74:3d, the Peshitta adds an object suffix. In 78:4c, it uses a noun with the same meaning as the Hebrew verb in the Masoretic Text. In 80:17b, the Peshitta adds a suffix not found in the Masoretic Text. In 82:3b, a participle with waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a participle plus waw plus □.

4.6.4 Participle rendered as an imperfect verb in a relative construction with □

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:11a

MT: אָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הַמַּעַלְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

P: □□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□

□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□

NIV: I am the Lord your God, who brought you up out of Egypt)

(I, I am the Lord your God, who raised you up from the land of Egypt)

The Peshitta renders a participle with suffix, הַמַּעַלְךָ (hiphil participle + suffix second person masculine singular of עלה ‘to bring up, lead up’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with suffix plus relative particle □, that is□□□□□□ (relative □ + aphel imperfect second person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to make ascend’, ‘to raise up’, ‘to offer/sacrifice’). The Peshitta has

an additional □□□ (probably for emphasis), which is not the case in the Masoretic Text. The Syriac uses □ plus the imperfect to indicate purpose.

Summary: Participle rendered as an imperfect verb in a relative construction with □

The rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with □ construction occurs once in Psalms 73–89 [1X in 81]. The Peshitta adds □□□, which is not in the Masoretic Text.

4.6.5 Participle rendered as perfect verb

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:7

MT: מִגַּעֲרָתְךָ אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב | נִרְדָּם וְרֶכֶב וָסוּס

P: □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□ □□□ □□□ □□□ □□□

(NIV: At your rebuke, O God of Jacob, both horse and chariot lie still [snore/fell in deep sleep])

(At your rebuke, O God of Jacob, the horsemen of the chariots fell asleep)

The Peshitta renders a participle, נִרְדָּם (niphal participle masculine singular of רדם 'to snore, be in deep sleep, lie stupefied'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is □□□ (peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to sleep, fall asleep'). The Peshitta renders this participle as a singular with a perfect plural, because it renders the subject in the plural. The Peshitta uses a verb with consonants different from the one the Hebrew uses, but gives a good translation. It joins 'the chariot' and 'the horse' of the Masoretic Text in a construct chain.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:15a

MT: אַתָּה הָאֵל עֹשֵׂה פֶּלֶא

P: □□□□ □□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□

(NIV: You are the God who performs miracles)

(You are the God who performs wonders)

The Peshitta renders a participle, עֹשֵׂה (qal active participle masculine singular construct state of עשׂה 'to do'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus □, that is □□□□□ (relative participle □ + peal perfect second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to do, make'). The Peshitta uses □□ □□□, while Hebrew has אַתָּה הָ. The Peshitta retains the word order.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:9a and 78:9b

MT: בְּנֵי אֶפְרַיִם נוֹשְׁקֵי רוֹמֵי קָשֶׁת | הָפְכוּ בְּיוֹם קְרָב

(NIV: The men [sons] of Ephraim, though armed with bows, turned back on the day of battle)

P: □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ ̈□□
□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

(The sons of Ephraim that are equipped with bowstrings and they shoot with the bow, but they turned around in the day of battle)

In both instances, the Peshitta renders the two participles, נוֹשְׁקֵי (qal active participle masculine plural construct of נשׁק ‘to arm oneself’) and רוֹמֵי (qal active participle masculine plural construct of רמה ‘to throw’), in the Masoretic Text as perfects, that is □□□□□ (□ + peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ‘to draw a string’) and □□□□ (conjunction + peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□/□□□ ‘to loosen’, ‘to throw, shoot with the bow’) respectively. The Peshitta gives an idiomatic translation. It divides the two participles that are part of one construct chain in the Masoretic Text into two separate clauses.

Psalm 79

Example: Psalm 79:10d

MT: לָמָּה יֹאמְרוּ הַגּוֹיִם אַיֵּה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם | יִוָּדַע בַּגּוֹיִם לְעֵינֵינוּ נִקְמַת דַּם עֲבָדֶיךָ הַשָּׁפוּךְ

(NIV: Why should the nations say, “Where is their God?” Before our eyes, make known among the nations that you avenge the outpoured blood of your servants)

P: □□ ̈□□□□ □□ ̈□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□
□□ ̈□□ □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ ̈□□□ □□□□□

(That the nations should not say, ‘Where is their God?’ Let it be known among the nations before our eyes, the avenging of the blood of your servants that has been poured out)

The Peshitta renders a participle passive with a definite article, הַשָּׁפוּךְ (definite article + qal passive participle of שׁפך ‘to shed, pour out, spill’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus relative particle □, that is □□□□□□ (participle □ + ethpeel perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ ‘to be poured out, spilled out, overflow’). The Peshitta uses the ethpeel perfect after □

to render the Hebrew passive participle. At the beginning of the verse, the Peshitta renders the interrogative particle as the particle □ followed by a negative statement.

Psalm 80

Example: Psalm 80:17a

MT: שְׂרֻפָה בָאֵשׁ כְּסוּחָה | מִגַּעֲרַת פָּנֶיךָ יֹאבֵדוּ

(NIV: Your vine is cut down, it is burned with fire; at your rebuke your people perish)

P: □□ ̈□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ ̈□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□

(He burned with fire her punishments, and from the rebuke of your anger they perished)

The Peshitta renders a participle, שְׂרֻפָה (qal passive participle feminine singular of שׂרף 'to burn), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is □□□□ (aphel perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to burn up'). It is probable that the Syriac verb can also be an imperative. The first line of the Peshitta differs from 80:17b in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:14a

MT: לוּ עַמִּי שֹׁמֵעַ לִי

(NIV: If my people would but listen to me, O if my people were hearing me!)

P: □□□ □□□ □□□□□

(O if my people listened to me)

The Peshitta renders a participle, שֹׁמֵעַ (qal active participle masculine singular of שׁמע 'to listen, hear'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with pronoun, that is □□□□□ (peal perfect third person masculine singular + pronoun first person common singular of □□□ 'to listen, hear'). The Peshitta uses a pronoun first person singular for the Hebrew preposition ל with pronominal suffix first person singular (לִי). The Peshitta follows the word order of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:7a

MT: עֹבְרֵי בְעֵמֶק הַבָּכָא מַעְיָן יְשִׁיתוּהוּ | גַּם־בְּרָכוֹת יַעְטֶה מוֹרֶה ׃

(NIV: As they pass through the Valley of Baca, they make it a place of springs; the autumn rains also cover it with pools)

P: □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□
□□□□□ □□□

(They will go through the valley of weeping and they will make it a dwelling place. Also the law-giver will cover it with blessings)

The Peshitta renders a participle, עֹבְרֵי (qal participle masculine plural in the construct state of עבר 'to go through, pass through'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is □□□□, the pael perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ 'to pass, cross over').

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:2

MT: אֹהֵב יְהוָה שַׁעֲרֵי צִיּוֹן | מִכֹּל מִשְׁכְּנוֹת יַעֲקֹב

(NIV: The Lord loves the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob)

P: □□□□□□ □□□□□¨□□ □□□□□ □□ □□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□¨□□□ □□□□□□□

(The Lord loves the gates of Zion better than all the dwellings of Jacob)

The Peshitta renders a participle, אֹהֵב (qal active participle masculine singular of אהב 'to love'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is □□□ (peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to love'; this could be peal participle masculine singular as well). The Peshitta uses a combination of □□ □□ to render the Hebrew preposition מִן used for comparison. It follows the word order of the Masoretic Text. Psalm 87:3b is a similar example.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:9d

MT: הִרְחַקְתָּ מְיֻדָּעַי מִמֶּנִּי | שַׁתַּנִי תוֹעֵבוֹת לָמוֹ כָּלֵא וְלֹא אֵצֵא

(NIV: You have taken from me my closest friend and have made me repulsive from them. I am confined and cannot escape)

P: ܐܢܬ ܪܚܩܬ ܡܢ ܝܕܥ̈ܝ ܠܘܬ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐ ܠܝ ܐܬ ܣܓܝ̈ܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܬܟܠܝ ܘܠܐ ܐܦܩ

(You have taken my friends away from me; you have made me a hateful thing to them; I am held back so that I cannot go out/escape)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders a participle passive, כָּלֻא (qal passive participle masculine singular of כלא 'to keep [back], withhold') as an ethpeel perfect, that is ܐܬܟܠܝ (ethpeel perfect first person common singular of ܟܠܐ 'to be held back', 'to be prevented', 'to decline, refuse'). The Peshitta retains the word order.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:8a

MT: אֵל נַעֲרָץ בְּסוֹד קְדֹשִׁים רַבָּה וְנוֹרָא עַל כָּל סְבִיבָיו

(NIV: In the council of the holy ones God is greatly feared; he is more awesome than all who surround him)/ God is greatly to be feared in the congregation of the saints, and to be adored by all around him)

P: ܐܠ ܡܬܩܛܪ ܒܟܢܫܬܐ ܕܩܕ̈ܝܫ̈ܐ ܘܐܬܝܪܐ ܗܘ ܥܠ ܟܠ ܕܚܘܝܗ̈ܝ

(God stands up in the congregation of the holy ones and he is feared above all who are around him)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders a participle, נַעֲרָץ (niphal participle masculine singular of ערץ 'to inspire terror, to be dreadful'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is ܩܡ (peal perfect third person masculine singular of ܩܘܡ 'to rise, stand [up]'). The Hebrew verb occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament and has been freely rendered as 'to be terrified', 'to terrify', 'to cause terror', 'to torment', 'to shake', 'to dread' and 'to stand in awe' (VanGemeren, 1997c:543). The Peshitta uses a verb with a meaning different from the one the Masoretic Text uses. In this case, the source text (Masoretic Text) and target text (Peshitta) has 'to be feared' and 'to rise/stand up' respectively.

Summary: Participle rendered as a perfect verb

The rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as a perfect by the Peshitta occurs twelve times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 76; 1X in 77; 2X in 78; 1X in 79; 1X in 80; 1X in 81; 1X in 84; 2X in 87; 1X in 88 and 1X in 89). The table below sets out the occurrences.

Table 49: Number of occurrences of rendering a participle in the Masoretic Text as a perfect in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
76 (7)	1
77 (15a)	1
78 (9a, 9b)	2
79 (10d)	1
80 (17a, 17b)	2
81 (14a)	1
84 (7a)	1
87 (2, 3b)	2
88 (9d)	1
89 (8a)	1

In 76:7, the Peshitta uses a verb with consonants different from the one in the Masoretic Text, but it gives a good translation. The Peshitta further joins 'the chariot' and 'the horse' in a construct chain, which is not the case in the Masoretic Text (76:7). In 78:9a and 78:9b, the Peshitta divides the participles in the construct chain in the Masoretic Text into two separate clauses. At the beginning of the verse (79:10), the Peshitta renders the interrogative particle as the particle □ followed by a negative statement (79:10d). In 81:14a, it uses a pronoun first person common singular to render the preposition ל as a pronominal suffix first person common singular (לִי). In 87:2, the Peshitta uses □□ □□ to render the Hebrew preposition מִן as used in the Masoretic Text. In 89:8a, it uses a verb with a meaning different from the one used in the Masoretic Text.

4.6.6 Participle rendered as an imperfect verb

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:4b

MT: לֹא נְכַחֵד מִבְּנֵיהֶם לְדוֹר אַחֲרוֹן
מְסַפְּרִים תְּהִלּוֹת יְהוָה | וְעֻזּוֹ
וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה

(NIV: We will not hide them from their children; we will tell the next generation the praiseworthy deeds of the Lord, his power, and the wonders that he has done)

P: ܠܐ ܢܟܚܕ ܡܢ ܒܢܝܗܘܢ ܠܕܪ ܐܚܪܢ ܡܫܬܥ̈ܐ
ܬܫܒ̈ܚܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܘܚܝܠܗ ܘܢܦ̈ܠܐ
ܕܥܒܕ ܗ̈ܘ

(We will not hide from their children, but tell to the coming generation the glorious deeds of the Lord, and his might, and the wonders that he has done)

The Peshitta renders a participle, מְסַפְּרִים (piel participle masculine plural of ספר ‘to declare, tell’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is ܢܫܒ̈ܚ (ethpaal imperfect first person common plural of ܫܒ̈ܚ ‘to declare, tell’). The Peshitta retains the Hebrew word order following the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:29b

MT: לְעוֹלָם אשמור [אֶשְׁמָר] לוֹ חַסְדִּי | וּבְרִיתִי נֶאֱמֶנֶת לוֹ

(NET: I will always extend my loyal love to him, and my covenant with him is secure[43])

P: ܠܥܠܡ ܢܛܪ ܠܗ ܚܣܕܝ ܘܩܝܡܬܝ ܗܝ ܩܝܡܐ ܥܡܗ

(And forever I will guard for him my kindness and my everlasting covenant will endure with him)

The Peshitta renders a participle, נֶאֱמֶנֶת (niphal participle feminine singular of אמן ‘to be reliable, stay faithful, have stability’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is ܩܝܡܐ (quadriliteral imperfect third person masculine singular of ܗܝܡܢ ‘to be believed, trust, rely upon, trustworthy’).

Summary: Participle rendered as an imperfect verb

Rendering a participle in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect in the Peshitta does not occur frequently, only twice in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 78 and 1X in 89).

[43] The English translation of Ps 89:29b is taken from The NET Bible (Bible, 2005).

Analysis and conclusions: Participles in the Masoretic Text and how they are rendered in the Peshitta

The rendering of a participle in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text by the Peshitta takes place 73 times. The rendered participles in the Peshitta can be divided into six different categories of verbal forms as shown in the table below.

Table 50: Classification of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render participles in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verb form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.6 (p. 234)	Participle		Total occurrences = 73
4.6.1 (p. 235)		Participle	23
4.6.2 (p. 240)		Participle in a relative construction with □	12
4.6.3 (p. 244)		Noun	23
4.6.4 (p. 249)		Imperfect in relative construction with □	1
4.6.5 (p. 250)		Perfect	12
4.6.6 (p. 255)		Imperfect	2

The Peshitta has the tendency of rendering the niphal participle in the Masoretic Text as a peal participle instead of the ethpeel participle as would be expected. The Peshitta renders the Hebrew נְ in the Masoretic Text as □□□ and repeats it, which is not the case in the Masoretic Text in 74:5b. In other instances, the Peshitta does not render the construct chain found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 80:2a. The כִּי in the Masoretic Text is often rendered as a combination of □ □□□□ in the Peshitta, for example in 86:10a. Sometimes, the Peshitta omits the waw found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 86:10a. The Peshitta uses a combination of a participle plus □ to express a future idea/prospective presence or surety of fulfilment, for example in 74:12b. The Peshitta frequently adds a waw at the beginning of a verse. It translates כִּי in the Masoretic Text as □. In other instances the Peshitta adds □ in the second line for stylistic purposes. The Peshitta adds a preposition not present in the Masoretic Text sometimes, for

example in 84:5a. In other cases, it uses □ to render the Hebrew definite article הַ found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 86:2c. The Peshitta in other instances renders unknown Hebrew verbs in the Masoretic Text as nouns, for example in 73:3b. At times, it uses a noun that has consonants different from the Hebrew but the same meaning as the verb in the Masoretic Text, for example in 78:4c. The Peshitta sometimes adds object suffixes or uses suffixes not present in the Masoretic Text, for example in 80:17b. The use of □ plus imperfect expresses purpose, for example 81:11a. In other instances, the Peshitta renders a participle in the singular in the Masoretic Text as a participle in the plural, mainly because it has interpreted the subject differently, for example in 76:7. The Peshitta in other cases divides two participles in one construct chain in the Masoretic Text into two separate clauses, a type of rendering of which 78:9a and 78:9b are good examples. At times, the Peshitta uses a pronoun to render the preposition לִי in the Masoretic Text, of which Psalm 81:14a provides a good example. In 87:2, the Peshitta uses □ □ □ □ to render the Hebrew preposition מִן as used in the Masoretic Text. In 89:8a, the Peshitta uses a verb with a meaning different from the one used in the Masoretic Text.

4.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In this section, the focus is on the verb in the Hebrew infinitive construct and how the Peshitta renders it. All the infinite constructs in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text have been identified and they fall into four categories according to the Syriac verbal forms used to render them. These will be discussed under the following headings:

4.7.1 Infinitive construct rendered as an infinitive (p. 258)

4.7.2 Infinitive construct rendered as a construct with □ (relative or otherwise) (p. 261)

4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun (p. 265)

4.7.4 Infinitive construct rendered as □ □ plus perfect verb (p. 269)

4.7.1 Infinitive construct rendered as an infinitive

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:10c

MT: בְּקוּם לַמִּשְׁפָּט אֱלֹהִים | לְהוֹשִׁיעַ כָּל עַנְוֵי אֶרֶץ סֶלָה

(NIV: When you, O God, rose up to judge, to save all the afflicted of the land. *Selah*)

P: □□□□□ □□¨□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□

(When you, O God, rose up to judgment and save all the afflicted/humble of the earth)

The Peshitta renders the infinitive construct with preposition לְ, that is לְהוֹשִׁיעַ (preposition ל + hiphil infinitive construct of ישׁע 'to safe, rescue'), in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus □ plus an infinitive, that is □□□□□□ (waw + □ + peal infinitive of □□□ 'to safe, rescue'). The Peshitta adds the waw, which is not present in the Masoretic Text, because of the rendering of the infinitive at the beginning of the verse as □ □□ plus participle. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:8c

MT: הַלְעוֹלָמִים יִזְנַח אֲדֹנָי | וְלֹא יֹסִיף לִרְצוֹת עוֹד

(NIV: Will the Lord reject forever? Will he never show his favour again?)

P: □□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□

(Will the Lord forget me forever? Will he not increase kindness that he is pleased with me?)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition לְ that is לִרְצוֹת (preposition לְ qal infinitive construct of רצה 'to be pleased'), in the Masoretic Text as an infinitive plus preposition □ (□□□□□□□, the preposition □ ethpeel infinitive of □□□ 'to be pleased'). In the second part, the Peshitta following the first part adds the object 'with me', which is absent from the Masoretic Text. Psalm 77:10b is a similar example, where the Peshitta adds the preposition 'ל', which is not used in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:10c

MT: וּבְתוֹרָתוֹ מֵאֲנוּ לָלֶכֶת

P: □□□ □□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: And refused to live by his law)

(But they did not want to walk by his laws)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct plus preposition לְ, that is לָלֶכֶת (preposition לְ qal infinitive construct of הלך ‘to go’), in the Masoretic Text as an infinitive with preposition □, that is □□□□□□ (preposition □ + pael infinitive construct of □□□ ‘to walk’). In this case, the Hebrew says, ‘they refused to go’, while the Syriac says, ‘they did not want to go’. The Peshitta gives an idiomatic translation. Similar examples are 78:17b, 78:17c, 78:18b, 78:19d, 78:20e, 78:24b, 78:38d and 78:71c.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:11c

MT: כִּי טוֹב יוֹם בַּחֲצֵרֶיךָ מֵאָלֶף | בָּחַרְתִּי הִסְתּוֹפֵף בְּבֵית אֱלֹהַי מִדּוּר בְּאָהֳלֵי רֶשַׁע

(NIV: Better is one day in your courts than a thousand elsewhere; I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God than dwell in tents of the wicked)

P: □□□ □□ □□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□

(For better is one day in your dwelling than a thousand, I desire to dwell in the house of God. It is better than to dwell in the tent of the wicked)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the infinitive construct without לְ, that is הִסְתּוֹפֵף (hithpael infinitive construct of ספף ‘to lie at the threshold’), in the Masoretic Text as an infinitive plus □, that is □□□□□, the preposition □ + peal infinitive construct □□□ ‘to dwell’). The infinitive as used in the Masoretic Text is a rare word appearing only here, and it adds to the difficulties the Peshitta translator faced. The unvocalised Hebrew text also does not make the matter easy but complicates it further. The Peshitta uses an infinitive with a common verb for the uncommon Hebrew verb, but the meaning fits into the context. The Peshitta gives a good translation.

Summary: Translation of an infinitive construct plus preposition לְ as an infinitive construct plus ܠ

The rendering of an infinitive construct plus preposition לְ in the Masoretic Text as an infinitive construct plus ܠ in the Peshitta occurs thirteen times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 76; 2X in 77; 9X in 78 and 1X in 84) as shown in the table below.

Table 51: Number of occurrences of an infinitive construct plus preposition לְ in the Masoretic Text rendered as an infinitive construct plus ܠ in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
76 (10c)	1
77 (8c, 10b)	2
78 (10c, 17b, 17c, 18b, 19d, 20e, 24b, 38d, 71c)	9
84 (11c)	1

In 84:11c, the Masoretic Text has an infinitive construct without preposition לְ, but the Peshitta renders it as an infinitive construct plus ܠ. The Peshitta maintains consistency by rendering the infinitive in 84:11c with ܠ, following the previous uses in this regard.

4.7.2 Infinitive construct rendered as a construct with ܕ (relative or otherwise)

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:20a

MT: כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ | אֲדֹנָי בָּעִיר צַלְמָם תִּבְזֶה

P: ܐ ܐ ܐ

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition מִן, that is מֵהָקִיץ (preposition מִן + hiphil infinitive construct of קוּץ/קיץ 'to be awake'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus ܕ, that is ܕܡܬܥܪ̈ܝܢ (ܕ + ethpeel participle masculine singular of ܥܪ̈ܐ 'to be awake'). The Peshitta renders the Hebrew preposition מִן ('from') as ܐ ܐ̈ ܐ̈ܐ ('like one who'). Psalm 73:28d, in which the Peshitta renders the verb with preposition ל as a relative ܕ plus an imperfect, is a similar example. The Hebrew of this verse is a bit strange with the use of מִן, thus the Peshitta paraphrases the whole section to clarify the meaning.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:10a

MT: בְּקוּם לַמִּשְׁפָּט אֱלֹהִים | לְהוֹשִׁיעַ כָּל עַנְוֵי אֶרֶץ סֶלָה

(NIV: When you, O God, rose up to judge, to save all the afflicted of the land. *Selah*)

P: ܒ̈ܕ ܐ̈ܬ̈ܐ ܕ̈ܐ̈ ܕ̈ܐ̈ ܕ̈ܐ̈ ܕ̈ ܕ̈ ܕ

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition ל plus suffix, that is לְהוֹדִיעָם (preposition ל + hiphil infinitive construct + suffix third person masculine ידע ‘to know’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus □ without a suffix, that is □□□□□□□ (participle □ + □□□ ‘to make known’, aphel imperfect third person masculine plural). The Peshitta uses □ for the Hebrew ל and retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. Here, even an infinitive with לְ in a final construction is rendered as a sentence with □.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:11c

MT: כִּי טוֹב יוֹם בַּחֲצֵרֶיךָ מֵאָלֶף | בָּחַרְתִּי הִסְתּוֹפֵף בְּבֵית אֱלֹהַי מִדּוּר בְּאָהֳלֵי רֶשַׁע

P: □□□ □□□ □□ □□ □□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□ □□□□□□ □□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□¨□□ □□□□□□

(NIV: Better is one day in your courts than a thousand elsewhere; I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God than dwell in tents of the wicked)

(For better is one day in your dwelling than a thousand, I desire to dwell in the house of God. It is better than to dwell in the tent of the wicked)

The Peshitta translates an infinitive construct with preposition מִן, that is מָדוּר (preposition מִן + qal infinitive construct of דּוּר ‘to dwell’), in the Masoretic Text as an infinitive plus □ plus preposition □, that is □□□□□□ (relative □ + preposition □ + peal infinitive construct of □□□ ‘to dwell’). The Peshitta uses a common for an uncommon and rarely used verb in Hebrew, but the meaning fits. The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text. Here מִן is used in a comparative construction in Hebrew.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:11d

MT: יַחֵד לְבָבִי לְיִרְאָה שְׁמֶךָ

P: □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: Give me an undivided heart, that I may fear your name)

(My heart is glad with those that fear your name)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with לְ, that is לְיִרְאָה (preposition לְ + qal infinitive construct of ירא ‘to fear’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus ☐, that is ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (relative ☐ + peal participle masculine plural of ☐☐☐ ‘to fear’). The Peshitta uses the particle ☐ to render the Hebrew לְ. It further uses a participle to render the infinitive construct. The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text. It paraphrases the Hebrew with the addition of ‘those who’. Furthermore, it does not render the imperative of the Hebrew, which causes a difference in meaning.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:51b

MT: זְכֹר אֲדֹנָי חֶרְפַּת עֲבָדֶיךָ | שְׂאֵתִי בְחֵיקִי כָּל רַבִּים עַמִּים

(NIV: Remember, Lord, how your servant has been mocked, how I bear in my heart the taunts of all the nations)

P: ☐☐ܕ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐ܕ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐
☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(Remember, O Lord, the reproach of your servants that I carried in my life the whole concern for the nations)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with suffix, שְׂאֵתִי (qal infinitive construct + suffix first person common singular of נשׂא ‘to lift, raise [high]’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect second person masculine singular plus relative particle ☐, that is ☐☐☐☐☐ (relative ☐ + peal perfect second person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ ‘to lift up, raise’, ‘to bring up’), instead. The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text.

Summary: Infinitive construct rendered as a construction with ☐ (relative or otherwise)

A rendering of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text as a construction with ☐ (relative or otherwise) in the Peshitta occurs seven times in Psalms 73–89 (2X in 73; 1X in 76; 1X in 78; 1X in 84; 1X in 86 and 1X in 89) as shown in the table below.

Table 52: Number of occurrences of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text rendered as a construct with ☐ (relative or otherwise) in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (20a, 28d)	2
76 (10a)	1
78 (5d)	1
84 (11c)	1
86 (11d)	**1**
89 (51b)	1

In 73:20a, the Peshitta renders the preposition מִן in the Masoretic Text as ☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐, while in 73:28a, it renders לְ plus infinitive construct as the relative particle ☐ plus imperfect. In 76:10a, the Peshitta renders the preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text as a combination of ☐ ☐☐. In 78:5d, it uses the relative ☐ to render the preposition לְ. Furthermore, in 78:5d, an infinitive with לְ in a final construction is rendered as a sentence with ☐ (see also 86:11d). The Peshitta omits the imperative in 86:11d in the Masoretic Text.

4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:20b

MT: כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ | אֲדֹנָי בָּעִיר צַלְמָם תִּבְזֶה

P: ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐
☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐

(NIV: As a dream when one awakes, so when you arise, O Lord, you will despise them as fantasies)/ 'They are like a dream after one wakes up. O Lord, when you awake you will despise them')

([They are] like one who awakes when he sees a dream. O Lord, in a town you treat their image with contempt)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ, בָּעִיר (preposition בְּ + hiphil infinitive construct of עוּר 'in awaking'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is ☐☐☐☐☐

(preposition □ + noun feminine singular of □□□□□□ ‘city’/’field’). The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text. It is important to bear in mind that the Peshitta translator had an unvocalised Hebrew text before him. The verb עִיר as found in the Hebrew creates confusion, as it has the same consonants for the Hebrew noun ‘city’ with preposition בְּ plus the definite article הַ, namely בָּעִיר, which translates as ‘in the city’. The Peshitta takes this verb as the noun ‘city’. This verb (בָּעִיר) is the contracted form of בְּהָעִיר (hiphil infinitive construct with בְּ temporal) of the root עוּר (‘to raise oneself’, ‘to awake’) (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:149; Kraus, 1993:84; Tate, 1990:229). Hence, the footnote (Ps 73:20c) proposes that בְּהָעִיר is equal or the same as בָּעִיר or perhaps reads בְּעוּרְךָ compare LXX which reads ‘awakening’. Syriac takes it as the word for □□□□□□ (בָּעִיר) (‘a city’) and renders it as such.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:7

MT: כִּי לֹא מִמּוֹצָא וּמִמַּעֲרָב | וְלֹא מִמִּדְבַּר הָרִים

P: □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□

neighbouring psalms that are distinguished by the specific theology related to the divine name (74:7, 10, 18, 21; 76:2). What is evident here is different interpretations of the same unvocalised Hebrew text and not that the variants attest to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:3e

MT: בְּיוֹם צָרָתִי אֲדֹנָי דָּרָשְׁתִּי | יָדִי לַיְלָה נִגְּרָה וְלֹא תָפוּג מֵאֲנָה הִנָּחֵם נַפְשִׁי

(NIV: When I was in distress, I sought the Lord; at night I stretched out untiring hands and my soul refused to be comforted)

P: □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□

(In the day of my trouble/distress, I sought the Lord; and in the night his hand was pulled out and did not keep silent, and there is no comforter for my soul)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct, הִנָּחֵם (niphal infinitive construct of נחם 'to be comforted'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is □□□□□□ (pael verbal noun, used as a noun, i.e. 'a comforter', of □□□ 'to be comforted/consoled'). It is important in this instance that the Peshitta translates the previous verb as □□□□ ('and there is not/and it is not'); hence it renders the Hebrew word as a noun instead of the infinitive. Psalms 77:11b and 77:11c are similar examples.

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:6b

MT: יְהוָה יִסְפֹּר בִּכְתוֹב עַמִּים

(NIV: The Lord will write in the register of the people)

P: □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□ ̈□□□

(The Lord will write [count] in the register [writing/script/document] of the people)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ, that is בִּכְתוֹב (preposition בְּ . + qal infinitive construct of כתב 'to write'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun plus preposition □, that is

□□□□□ (preposition □ + noun masculine of □□□□ 'writing, script'). This is affected directly by a text-critical problem, which will be dealt with in Chapter 5.[44]

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:10b

MT: אַתָּה מוֹשֵׁל בִּגְאוּת הַיָּם | בְּשׂוֹא גַלָּיו אַתָּה תְשַׁבְּחֵם

(NIV: You rule over the surging sea, when its waves mount up, you still them)

P: □□□□ □□□ □□ ¨□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□

(You rule over the rough sea; the confusion of the waves mount up, you still them)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ, namely בְּשׂוֹא (preposition בְּ . + qal infinitive construct of נשׂא ('to lift/rise high'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun plus a waw, namely □□□□□□□ (conjunction + noun masculine of □□□ 'confusion, disorder', 'to agitate').

Analysis: Infinitive construct rendered as a noun

The rendering of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text as a noun in the Peshitta occurs seven times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 73; 1X in 75; 3X in 77; 1X in 87 and 1X in 89) as shown in the table below.

Table 53: Number of occurrences of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text rendered as a noun in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (20b)	1
77 (3e, 11b, 11c)	3
87 (6b)	1
89 (10b)	1

[44] See *Psalm 87:6* (p. 374).

The Masoretic Text uses an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ and the Peshitta renders it as a noun plus preposition ☐ (73:20b and 87:6b). In 89:10b, the Peshitta renders the preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text as a waw.

4.7.4 Infinitive construct rendered as ☐☐ plus perfect verb

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:6b

MT: עֵדוּת בִּיהוֹסֵף שָׂמוֹ בְּצֵאתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

P: ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐

(NIV: He established it as a statute for Joseph when he went out against [the land of]Egypt)

(He established it as a statute for Joseph when he went out against [the land of] Egypt)

The Peshitta renders an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ, that is בְּצֵאתוֹ (preposition בְּ + qal infinitive construct + suffix third person masculine singular of יצא 'to come out, come forth'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect preceded by ☐☐, that is ☐☐☐ (peal perfect third person masculine singular of ☐☐☐ 'to go/come out'). The Peshitta in this instance uses ☐☐ to render the Hebrew preposition בְּ. The Peshitta following the Masoretic Text retains the word order.

Summary: Infinitive construct rendered as ☐☐ plus perfect

The rendering of an infinitive construct plus preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text as *kad* plus perfect in the Peshitta occurs only once in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 81). The preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text is rendered as ☐☐ in the Peshitta.

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of the infinitive construct

The infinitive construct occurs 27 times in the Masoretic Text and it is rendered in four ways in the Peshitta as shown in the table below.

Table 54: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render an infinitive construct found in the Masoretic Text

Heading and page nos	Verb form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.7 (p. 258)	Infinitive construct		Total = 27
4.7.1 (p. 258)		Infinitive	13
4.7.2 (p. 261)		Construction with □	7
4.7.3 (p. 265)		Noun	6
4.7.4 (p. 269)		*Kad* plus perfect	1

The infinitive construct plus לְ in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an infinitive construct plus □, which is normal. In 76:10c, the Peshitta adds a waw not found in the Masoretic Text, because the Peshitta renders the infinitive at the beginning of the verse (76:10a) as □ □□ plus participle. The preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text is rendered as □ □□ in the Peshitta (76:10a). At times, the Peshitta adds prepositions not present in the Masoretic Text. In 84:11c, the Masoretic Text has an infinitive construct without לְ and the Peshitta renders it as an infinitive plus preposition □. The infinitives with prepositions other than לְ are not rendered as infinitives in the Peshitta, for example in 76:10a. In 78:5d, an infinitive with לְ in a final construction is rendered in the Peshitta as a sentence with □. In 86:11d, the Peshitta omits the imperative in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta in other instances misinterprets the unvocalised Hebrew text and renders a verb in the Masoretic Text as a noun, for example in 73:20b. The Masoretic Text uses an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ, which the Peshitta renders as a noun plus preposition □ (see 73:20b and 87:6b). In 89:10b, the Peshitta renders the preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text as a waw. An infinitive construct plus preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text in 81:6b is rendered in the Peshitta as □□ plus perfect.

4.8 Constructs without verb in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

In some instances the Peshitta adds a verb where no verb occurs in the Masoretic Text. It may also render a word that is not a verb as a verb, as indicated in some of the examples below.

4.8.1 No verb rendered as a finite verb (p. 271)

4.8.2 No verb rendered as a participle (p. 274)

4.8.3 No verb rendered as an infinitive (p. 278)

4.8.4 No verb rendered as an imperfect (p. 279)

4.8.5 No verb rendered as a perfect verb (p. 280)

4.8.1 No verb rendered as a finite verb

Psalm 73

Example: Psalm 73:18c

MT: אַךְ בַּחֲלָקוֹת תָּשִׁית לָמוֹ | הִפַּלְתָּם לְמַשּׁוּאוֹת

(NIV: Surely you place them on slippery ground; you cast them down to ruin)

P: □□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□

(Surely you place them on slippery ground and you throw them when they were haughty)

The Peshitta renders the Hebrew noun with preposition לְ, לְמַשּׁוּאוֹת, meaning ‘ruin’ (from מַשּׁוּאוֹת with prep לְ), as an imperfect, that is □□□□□□□□ (ethpeel imperfect third person masculine plural of □□□, ‘to be haughty’). The Hebrew has a rare noun; thus the Peshitta translates it as a verb with a meaning close to the root of the Hebrew noun as used in the Masoretic Text, but then takes it as נשׂא in Hebrew. The unvocalised Hebrew text complicates the case further. This translation indicates a clear case of misinterpreting the Hebrew.

Psalm 75

Example: Psalm 75:2c

MT: וְקָרוֹב שְׁמֶךָ P: □□□ □□□□□

(NIV: For your name is near) (And we called your name)

The Peshitta renders an adjective, וְקָרוֹב (adjective masculine singular + conjunction, ‘near’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, that is □□□□ (verb is a peal perfect first person plural of □□□ ‘to call).

Syriac misinterprets this adjective or changes it because of the perfect verbs earlier in this verse.

Psalm 77

Example: Psalm 77:7b

MT: עִם לְבָבִי אָשִׂיחָה וַיְחַפֵּשׂ רוּחִי

P: ܘܐܡܪܬ ܠܒܒܝ ܘܪܘܚܝ ܐܬܒܥ ܘܐܡܪ

(NIV: My heart mused and my spirit enquired)

(And my heart thought and my spirit inquired, and I said)

The Peshitta adds the verb 'to say' at the end of the verse. This is done to make a transition to the direct speech in the next verse.

Psalm 81

Example: Psalm 81:9b

MT: שְׁמַע עַמִּי וְאָעִידָה בָּךְ | יִשְׂרָאֵל אִם תִּשְׁמַע לִי

(NIV: Hear, O my people, and I will warn you— if you would but listen to me, O Israel)

P: ܫܡܥ ܥܡܝ ܘܐܡܠܠ ܐܢܐ ܘܢܣܗܕ ܒܟ ܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ ܐܢ ܫܡܥ ܐܢ ܠܐ ܠܝ

(Hear, O my people, and I will speak, and Israel will testify against you whether you listen to me)

The Peshitta adds an extra verb not found in the Masoretic Text. It has three verbs in the first line, while the Masoretic Text has only two. The Peshitta translates a no verb in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, that is ܘܐܡܠܠ (conjunction + pael imperfect first person common singular of ܡܠܠ 'to speak'). The word order in the Peshitta is not the same as that of the Masoretic Text due to the extra verb in Syriac. The Peshitta uses ܐܢ to render the Hebrew אִם.

Psalm 86

Example: Psalm 86:13a

MT: כִּי חַסְדְּךָ גָּדוֹל עָלָי

P: ܐܬܪܒܝ ܥܠܝ ܛܝܒܘܬܟ

(NIV: For great is your love towards me)

(For your kindness/mercy multiply on me)

The Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□□ to render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי. It uses the verb, □□□□ (peal perfect third person feminine singular of □□□ 'to be many, multiply') in a perfect tense for the Hebrew adjective גָּדוֹל. It retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:13b

MT: וְצִדְקָתְךָ בְּאֶרֶץ נְשִׁיָּה

P: □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□

(NIV: or your righteous deeds in the land of oblivion?/ And your righteousness in the land forgotten/land of the dead)

(And your righteousness will be in the land which is forgotten)

The Peshitta renders a noun, נְשִׁיָּה (noun masculine singular 'forgetting'), in the Masoretic Text as a relative particle plus a perfect, that is □□□□□□□ (relative □ + ethpeel perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to be completely forgotten'). The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:28b

MT: אַף אֲנִי בְּכוֹר אֶתְּנֵהוּ | עֶלְיוֹן לְמַלְכֵי אָרֶץ

(NIV: I will also appoint him my firstborn, the most exalted of the kings of the earth)

P: □□□□□ □□□̈□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□

(I will also make him my firstborn and exalt him high above the kings of the earth)

The Peshitta renders a noun, עֶלְיוֹן ('the highest, upper'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw with suffix, that is □□□□□□□□□ (conjunction + aphel imperfect first person common singular + third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to exalt high, make high, arise').

Summary: No verb rendered as a finite verb

A rendering of no verb in the Masoretic Text as a finite verb in the Peshitta occurs seven times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 73; 1X in 75; 1X in 81; 1X in 86; 1X in 88 and 1X in 89) as shown in the table below.

Table 55: Number of occurrences of no verb in the Masoretic Text rendered as a finite verb in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
73 (18c)	1
75 (2c)	1
77 (7b)	1
81 (9b)	1
86 (13a)	1
88 (13b)	1
89 (28b)	1

The noun (לְמַשּׁוּאוֹת) in 73:18c in the Masoretic Text is a rare one and the Peshitta renders it as a verb close in meaning to the Hebrew (□ □ □)/(נשׂא) root. In 75:2c, the Peshitta misinterprets the adjective in the Masoretic Text and translates it as a verb. In 77:7b, the Peshitta adds an extra verb not found in the Masoretic Text. In 81:9b, the word order in the Peshitta differs from the word order in the Masoretic Text and it uses □ □ to render the Hebrew אִם. In 89:28b, the Peshitta renders a noun (עֶלְיוֹן 'the highest, upper'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw with suffix.

4.8.2 No verb rendered as a participle

Psalm 74

Example: Psalm 74:3b

MT: הָרִימָה פְעָמֶיךָ לְמַשּּׁאוֹת נֶצַח

P: □□ □□□ ̈□□ □□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□

(NIV: Turn your steps towards these everlasting ruins)

(Raise your servants against those who raise themselves against your power)

The Peshitta renders a noun with preposition לְ, that is לְמַשּּׁאוֹת (noun feminine singular of משׂואה 'deception/ruin'), in the Masoretic Text as a verb in a participle form, that is □□□□□□□ (ethpaal participle masculine plural of □ □ □ 'those who raised themselves against your power'). The

Peshitta in this instance probably sees a form of the verb נשׂא in the Hebrew; hence it renders this noun as a verb.

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:5b

MT: נָאוֹר אַתָּה אַדִּיר מֵהַרְרֵי טָרֶף

(NIV: You are resplendent with light, more majestic than mountains rich with game)

P: □□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□

(You are light and are anointed from your strong mountain)

The Peshitta renders an adjective, אַדִּיר (adjective masculine singular of אדיר 'great/ majestic/splendid/mighty/ beautiful/glorious'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus waw, that is □□□□□ (conjunction + peal passive participle masculine singular of □□□ 'anointed/to anoint'). The Peshitta reads a bit different from the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 84

Example: Psalm 84:7d

MT: עֹבְרֵי בְעֵמֶק הַבָּכָא מַעְיָן יְשִׁיתוּהוּ | גַּם־בְּרָכוֹת יַעְטֶה מוֹרֶה :

(NIV: As they pass through the Valley of Baca, they make it a place of springs; the autumn rains also cover it with pools)

P: □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□

(They went through the valley of weeping and they made it a dwelling place. Also the law-giver will cover it with blessings)

The Peshitta translates a noun, מוֹרֶה (noun feminine singular of מוֹרֶה 'rain'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, that is □□□□□ □□□, with □□□ (peal participle feminine singular of □□□ 'to set, place, put') plus □□□□□ (noun masculine singular of □□□□ 'law'). The Peshitta translates it as 'one who gives the law'/'law-giver or teacher', while the Masoretic Text has 'rain'. Following Holladay (1988:187), מוֹרֶה has three different meanings namely: 'archer', 'rain' and 'teacher' (see also VanGemeren, 1997b:884 and 432). The Peshitta translator probably found it difficult to render the Hebrew as in the Masoretic Text, since the source text at his disposal was

unvocalised. The Peshitta translates the Hebrew as 'teacher of the law', trying to clarify the Hebrew (perhaps .reading the Hebrew as a Hiphil participle of the verb ירה).

Psalm 85

Example: Psalm 85:10a

MT: אַךְ קָרוֹב לִירֵאָיו יִשְׁעוֹ

P: □□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□¨□□□

(NIV: Surely his salvation is near those who fear him)

(His salvation is near those who fear him)/ Near is his salvation to those who fear him)

The Peshitta renders an adjective as a preposition לְ with a suffix, that is לִירֵאָיו (preposition לְ + adjective masculine plural + suffix third person masculine singular of ירא 'fear'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus preposition □ plus a suffix, that is □□□¨□□□ (preposition □ + peal participle masculine plural + pronoun suffix third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to fear'). The word order is retained, except that 'surely' is omitted in the Peshitta.

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:7c

MT: וְשָׁרִים כְּחֹלְלִים | כָּל מַעְיָנַי בָּךְ

P: □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□¨□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□

(NIV: As they make music they will sing, "All my fountains are in you.")/(And the singers, the players of the pipe; all my springs are in you)

(Great is the one who (that) dwell in you, they will rejoice and all who (that) are humbled in you)

The Peshitta renders the Hebrew כְּ as □ and further adds a waw before 'all', which is absent from the Masoretic Text. The verse in the Masoretic Text is very complicated with text-critical problems; hence the Peshitta renders it differently, probably trying to interpret and simplify the Hebrew. The Peshitta renders according to sense and thus deviates completely from the Masoretic Text. In both halves of the line, the Peshitta repeats 'in you', which occurs only at the end of the second line in the Masoretic Text. The verse has text-critical problems and will be dealt with in Chapter 5 (pp. 297 ff).

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:11b

MT: אַתָּה דִכִּאתָ כֶחָלָל רָהַב בִּזְרוֹעַ עֻזְּךָ פִּזַּרְתָּ אוֹיְבֶיךָ

(NIV: You crushed Rahab like one of the slain with your strong arm you scattered your enemies)

P: □□□□ ·□□□ □□□ □□ ·□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□□□□ ·□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□

(You, yes you, crushed those who boast, like those who were killed with your strong/powerful arm, you scattered your enemies)

The Peshitta renders an adjective with preposition, כֶחָלָל (preposition כְ + adjective masculine singular of חָלָל 'the dead, slain, struck dead: carcass'), in the Masoretic Text as a relative particle □ plus preposition □ plus passive participle.

Summary: No verb rendered as a participle

A rendering of a no verb in the Masoretic Text as a participle in the Peshitta occurs six times in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 74; 1X in 76; 1X in 84; 1X in 85; 1X in 87 and 1X in 89) as shown in the table below.

Table 56: Number of occurrences of no verb in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in the Peshitta

Psalm	Number of occurrences
74 (3b)	1
76 (5b)	1
84 (7d)	1
85 (10a)	1
87:7c	1
89 (11b)	1

In 74:3b the Peshitta renders a noun with preposition לְ in the Masoretic Text as a verb in participle form. In other instances, the Peshitta translator found it difficult to render the Hebrew (cf 84:7d). In 87:7c, the Peshitta renders the Hebrew כְ as □ and further adds a waw before □□□ ('and

all'), which is absent from the Masoretic Text. In 89:11b, the Peshitta renders an adjective with preposition כְּ in the Masoretic Text as the relative particle ܕ plus preposition ܒ plus passive participle.

4.8.3 No verb rendered as an infinitive

Psalm 76

Example: Psalm 76:10b

MT: בְּקוּם לַמִּשְׁפָּט אֱלֹהִים | לְהוֹשִׁיעַ כָּל עַנְוֵי אֶרֶץ סֶלָה

(NIV: When you, O God, rose up to judge, to save all the afflicted of the land. *Selah*)

P: ܒܩܘܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܡܕܝܢ ܘܠܡܦܪܩ ܠܟܠ ܥܢܝܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܣܠܐ

(When you, O God, rose up to judgment and save all the afflicted/humble of the earth)

The Peshitta renders a noun, לַמִּשְׁפָּט (preposition לְ + definite article הַ + noun masculine singular of מִשְׁפָּט 'legal decision' > 'justice', 'lawsuit'), in the Masoretic Text as the preposition לְ plus definite article plus an infinitive, that is ܠܡܕܝܢ (preposition ܠ + peal infinitive of the verb ܕܝܢ). Aramaic does not have the same noun for 'judgment' as in Hebrew; hence the verb ܕܝܢ is used as a translation for 'judgment' (מִשְׁפָּט). The Peshitta adds a verb not found in the Masoretic Text, but uses it to render the noun in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 78

Example: Psalm 78:25c

MT: לֶחֶם אַבִּירִים אָכַל אִישׁ | צֵידָה שָׁלַח לָהֶם לָשֹׂבַע

(NIV: Men ate the bread of angels; he sent them all the food they could eat)

P: ܠܚܡ ܓܒܪܐ ܐܟܠ ܓܒܪܐ ܘܙܕܘ ܫܕܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܣܒܥܘܢ

(The stranger [outside man] ate the bread of the angels, and he sent them food that they could be filled/eat)

In this instance, the Peshitta renders the Hebrew noun, לָשֹׂבַע (noun masculine singular 'full, satiated, satisfied'), in the Masoretic Text as an infinitive plus a preposition, that is ܕܢܣܒܥܘܢ

(preposition □ + peal infinitive of □□□ 'to be sated, have one's fill, to be satisfied'). The use of the preposition □ in this instance by the Peshitta is to render the preposition לְ in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta adds a waw in the middle, at the beginning of a new line, but apart from this addition, the word order is retained.

Summary: Rendering no verb as an infinitive

The rendering of no verb in the Masoretic Text by an infinitive in the Peshitta occurs twice in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 76 and 1X in 78). In 76:10b, the Peshitta translates the noun in the Masoretic Text as a verb. The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a new line in this verse.

4.8.4 No verb rendered as an imperfect verb

Psalm 87

Example: Psalm 87:7d

MT: וְשָׁרִים כְּחֹלְלִים | כָּל מַעְיָנַי בָּךְ

(NIV: As they make music they will sing, "All my fountains are in you.")/(And the singers, the players of the pipe; all my springs are in you)

P: □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□¨□ □□□□□

(Great is the one who/that dwell in you, they will rejoice and all who/that are placed in you)

The verse in the Masoretic Text is very complicated with text-critical problems; hence the Peshitta translates it differently, probably trying to interpret and simplify the Hebrew. The Peshitta renders according to sense and thus deviates completely from the Masoretic Text. In both halves of the line, the Peshitta repeats 'in you', which occurs only at the end of the second line in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta rendering is very different. The verse has text-critical problems and will be dealt with in Chapter 5.[45]

Psalm 88

Example: Psalm 88:16d

MT: עָנִי אֲנִי וְגוֹעַ מִנֹּעַר | נָשָׂאתִי אֵמֶיךָ אָפוּנָה

[45] See *Psalm 87:7* (p. 375).

(NIV: From my youth I have been afflicted and close to death; I have suffered your terrors and am in despair)

P: □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□

(I am poor and unable from my youth, I am elevated and I am spread out and you become an heir)

In this instance, the Peshitta has an extra verb, □□□□□ (conjunction + aphel imperfect second person masculine singular of □□□ 'to bequeath, become an heir'), which has no correspondence in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta does not translate 'your terrors'. This example will receive further attention in Chapter 5, since the whole verse (88:16) requires more attention.[46]

Summary: No verb rendered as an imperfect

The rendering of no verb in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect in the Peshitta occurs twice in Psalms 73–89 (1X in 87 and 1X in 88). In 87:7d, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta in 88:16d omits another word in the Masoretic Text.

4.8.5 No verb rendered as a perfect verb

Psalm 89

Example: Psalm 89:35c

MT: לֹא אֲחַלֵּל בְּרִיתִי | וּמוֹצָא שְׂפָתַי לֹא אֲשַׁנֶּה

(NIV: I will not violate my covenant or alter what my lips have uttered)

P: □□□□□ □□ □□□□¨□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□ □□□□

(I will not despise my covenant and everything that went out from my lips I will not change)

The Peshitta renders a noun in a construct state, וּמוֹצָא (noun masculine singular in construct state מֹצָא/מוֹצָא 'what comes out [of lips, mouth]'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus the relative particle □, that is □□□□ (relative □ + peal perfect third person masculine singular of □□□ 'to go out').

[46] See *Psalm 88:16* (p. 376).

Summary: No verb rendered as a perfect verb

A rendering of no verb in the Masoretic Text as a perfect in the Peshitta occurs once in the Psalms 73–89 (1X in 89).

Analysis and conclusions: Rendering of no verbs

The rendering of no verb in the Masoretic Text occurs 20 times and it can be grouped into five different categories of verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render no verb constructs as shown in the table below.

Table 57: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render no verb constructs

Heading and page nos	Verbal form in MT	Verbal forms of rendering in P	Number of occurrences
4.8 (p. 270)	No Verb		Total = 18
4.8.1 (p. 271)		Finite verb	7
4.8.2 (p. 274)		Participle	6
4.8.3 (p. 278)		Infinitive	2
4.8.4 (p. 279)		Imperfect	2
4.8.5 (p. 280)		Perfect	1

The Peshitta at times adds words not found in Hebrew and deviates from the Masoretic Text. A rare Hebrew noun in the Masoretic Text is sometimes rendered as a finite verb in the Peshitta, for example in 73:18c. The Peshitta adds a waw plus an extra verb not found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 77:7b, 76:10b and 88:16d. The Peshitta uses □ □ to render the Hebrew אִם, for example in 81:9b. In some instances, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text, for example in 74:3b. At times, the reading of Peshitta differs from the Masoretic Text, of which the translations of Psalms 74:3b and 87:7c are befitting examples. Other different readings of the Peshitta are Psalms 76:5b and 84:7d, as discussed above. The Hebrew כְּ as used in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as □. In 89:11b, the Peshitta renders כְּ in the Masoretic Text as □ plus □. In some instances, the Peshitta translates according to sense and deviates from the Masoretic Text, for example in 87:7d.

4.9 Summary and conclusions regarding the trends discovered in 4.1–4.8

4.9.1 Number of occurrences of the Hebrew verbal forms found in the Masoretic Text

In Table 58 (p. 283), a summary is given of the occurrences in each of the groups discussed in this chapter.

In the examples discussed, the perfect is used 247 times (see Table 19: Classification of the perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta, p. 143). Of these, 234 are a perfect without waw, five are a perfect with waw copulative and eight are a perfect with waw consecutive. Of the perfects without waw, the Peshitta renders 165 as a perfect without waw and 48 as a perfect with waw. The use of the perfect of *hwy* with a participle in a few instances can also be noted. The addition of a waw to the perfect occurs at the beginning of a verse (88:8a; 89:21), at the beginning of a new line or section in a line (73:19c; 74:2b) and between two verbs where the second one does not have a waw in the Masoretic Text (75:9d; 75:11b). The perfect with waw consecutive occurs only eight times, in six of these (such as in 73:11 and in 89:26a) the rendering as an imperfect or imperfect with waw demonstrates that the translator of Peshitta understood the Hebrew syntax.

In the examples discussed, the imperfect is used 276 times (see Table 36: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text, p. 206). Of these, 195 are an imperfect without waw, 70 an imperfect with waw consecutive and 11 an imperfect with waw copulative.

Table 58: Analysis of the occurrences of Hebrew verbal forms In the Masoretic Text and how the verbal forms are rendered in the Peshitta

Heading & page nos	Main verbal groups	Number of occurrences in MT	Verbal form in MT	Number of occurrences in main groups	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	Number of agreements between MT and P
	Perfect	247					
4.1.1 (p. 92)			Perfect without waw	234			
4.1.1.1 (p. 92)					Perfect without waw	165	165
4.1.1.2 (p. 114)					Perfect with waw	48	
4.1.1.3 (p. 122)					Perfect of ܗܘܐ + participle	7	
4.1.1.4 (p. 125)					No verb	4	
4.1.1.5 (p. 127)					Imperfect + waw	2	
4.1.1.6 (p. 129)					Imperative	1	
4.1.1.7 (p. 130)					Participle	5	
4.1.1.8 (p. 132)					Imperfect without waw	2	
4.1.2 (p. 135)			Perfect verb with waw copulative	5			

Heading & page nos	Main verbal groups	Number of occurrences in MT	Verbal form in MT	Number of occurrences in main groups	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	Number of agreements between MT and P
4.1.2.1 (p. 135)					Perfect with waw copulative		
4.1.2.2 (p. 137)					Perfect with waw	3	3
					Participle with waw	2	
4.1.3 (138)			Perfect with waw consecutive	8			
4.1.3.1 (p. 139)					Imperfect with waw	2	
4.1.3.2 (p. 140)					Imperfect without waw	4	
4.1.3.3 (p. 140)					Perfect with waw	2	2
	Imperfect	282					
4.2.1 (p. 145)			Imperfect without waw	201			
4.2.1.1 (p. 145)					Imperfect without waw	93	93
4.2.1.2 (p. 158)					Imperfect with waw	9	
4.2.1.3 (p. 161)					Participle	33	

Heading & page nos	Main verbal groups	Number of occurrences in MT	Verbal form in MT	Number of occurrences in main groups	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	Number of agreements between MT and P
4.2.1.4 (p. 169)					Perfect without waw	41	
4.2.1.5 (p. 176)					Perfect with waw	12	
4.2.1.6 (p. 181)					Perfect of ואמר plus participle	4	
4.2.1.7 (p. 183)					No verb	3	
4.2.1.8 (p. 184)					Imperative	6	
4.2.2 (p. 188)			Imperfect + waw consecutive	70			
4.2.2.1 (p. 188)					Perfect without waw	30	
4.2.2.2 (p. 191)					Perfect with waw	39	
4.2.2.3 (p. 197)					Imperfect without waw	1	
4.2.3 (p.194)			Imperfect with waw copulative	11			
					Imperfect plus waw	5	5
					Imperfect without waw	4	

Heading & page nos	Main verbal groups	Number of occurrences in MT	Verbal form in MT	Number of occurrences in main groups	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	Number of agreements between MT and P
					Perfect plus waw	1	
					ה plus imperfect	1	
	Imperative	69					
4.3 (p. 207)			Imperative	69			
4.3.1 (p. 208)					Imperative	65	65
4.3.2 (p. 216)					No verb	4	
	Jussive	11					
4.4 (p. 220)			Jussive	11			
4.4.1 (p. 220)					Imperfect	7	
4.4.2 (p. 223)					Imperfect plus ה	3	
4.4.3 (p. 224)					Perfect	1	

Heading & page nos	Main verbal groups	Number of occurrences in MT	Verbal form in MT	Number of occurrences in main groups	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	Number of agreements between MT and P
	Cohortative	18					
4.5 (p. 226)			Cohortative	18			
4.5.1 (p. 226)					Imperfect	11	
4.5.2 (p. 231)					Perfect	6	
4.5.3 (p. 233)					No verb	1	
	Participle	73					
4.6 (p. 234)			Participle	73			
4.6.1 (p. 235)					Participle	23	23
4.6.2 (p. 240)					Participle in a relative construction with ש	12	
4.6.3 (p. 244)					Noun	23	
4.6.4 (p. 249)					Imperfect in relative construction with ש	1	
4.6.5 (p. 250)					Perfect	12	
4.6.6 (p. 255)					Imperfect	2	

Heading & page nos	Main verbal groups	Number of occurrences in MT	Verbal form in MT	Number of occurrences in main groups	Verbal form of rendering in P	Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	Number of agreements between MT and P
	Infinitive Construct	27					
4.7 (p. 258)			Infinitive Construct	27			
4.7.1 (p. 258)					Infinitive	13	13
4.7.2 (p. 261)					Construction with ל	7	
4.7.3 (p. 265)					Noun	6	
4.7.4 (p. 269)					*Kad* plus perfect	1	
	No verb/without verb	18					
4.8 (p. 270)			No verb	18			
4.8.1 (p. 271)					Finite verb	7	
4.8.2 (p. 274)					Participle	6	
4.8.3 (p. 278)					Infinitive	2	
4.8.4 (p. 279)					Imperfect	2	

Number of agreements between MT and P		
Number of occurrences of verbal forms in P	1	
Verbal form of rendering in P	Perfect	
Number of occurrences in main groups		
Verbal form in MT		
Number of occurrences in MT		
Main verbal groups		
Heading & page nos	4.8.5 (p. 280)	

Of the imperfects without waw, the Peshitta translates 93 as an imperfect without waw, 41 as a perfect without waw and 33 as a participle. In the case of the 70 instances of an imperfect with waw consecutive, the Peshitta uses a perfect with waw 39 times, a perfect without waw 30 times and an imperfect without waw once. The imperfect with waw consecutive occurs only eleven times in these Psalms. Five of them are rendered as an imperfect plus waw and four times as a perfect without waw.

In the examples discussed, the imperative is used 69 times (see Table 39: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render imperatives found in the Masoretic Text, p. 220). Of these, 65 are rendered as an imperative and 4 times without a verb. In 74:11b, the Peshitta omits the verb present in the Masoretic Text. In 74:22, the Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a new line and in 83:5b and 88:2e at the beginning of the verse. In 80:2e, the Peshitta omits a rare word.

Furthermore, the jussive is used eleven times (see Table 42: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render jussives in the Masoretic Text, p. 226). The Peshitta renders seven as imperfect, three as imperfect plus □ and one as a perfect. In all cases where the Masoretic Text uses a jussive after the negative particle אַל, the Peshitta renders it as an imperfect after the negative particle □ □. In other instances, the Peshitta adds a waw not present in the Masoretic Text, for example in 75:6a. At times, the Peshitta misinterprets the Hebrew and uses a word with a meaning different from the one used in the Masoretic Text, for example in 83:2. Sometimes, the Peshitta uses □ to render the waw in the Masoretic Text and not an addition, for example in 85:9d. In other instances where the Masoretic Text has the negative אַל followed by a jussive, the Peshitta renders it as □ □ □ followed by an imperfect, for example in 75:5c.

In the examples above, the cohortative is used eighteen times (see Table 45: Classification of the verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render cohortatives found in the Masoretic Text, p. 234). Of these, eleven are rendered as an imperfect, six as a perfect and one as no verb by the Peshitta. In these renderings, as in 75:10, the Peshitta adds □ instead of a waw at the beginning of the second line as could be expected. In other instances, such as 80:4c, the Peshitta adds words not found in the Masoretic Text. In 81:9c, it adds a suffix to render the Hebrew לִי. At times, it adds □ without any corresponding part in the Masoretic Text. In 77:2a, the Peshitta adds a verb with a waw, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. The addition of the waw may probably be because the previous

verb has a waw in a perfect plus waw construct. In other instances, as in 77:12b, the Peshitta shortens the verse in the Masoretic Text by leaving out some parts, including the cohortative.

In the examples above, the participle is used 73 times (see Table 50: Classification of the different verbal forms used in the Peshitta to render participles in the Masoretic Text, p. 257). Of these, twenty-three are rendered by the Peshitta as a participle, twelve as a participle with a relative construct □, twenty-three as a noun, one as an imperfect with a relative construction □, twelve as a perfect and two as an imperfect. The Peshitta shows a tendency to render the niphal participle in the Masoretic Text as a peal passive participle instead of the ethpeel participle as would be expected. In other instances, the Peshitta does not render the construct chain found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 80:2a. Sometimes, the Peshitta omits the waw found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 86:10a. It uses a combination of a participle plus □ to express a future idea/prospective presence or surety of fulfilment, for example in 74:12b. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a verse. In other instances, it adds □ in the second line, and not a waw as one would expect, just for stylistic purposes. The use of □ plus an imperfect expresses purpose, for example in 81:11a. In other instances, the Peshitta renders a participle in singular form in the Masoretic Text as a participle in the plural, mainly because the Peshitta has interpreted the subject differently, for example in 76:7. In other cases, it divides two participles in one construct chain in the Masoretic Text into two separate clauses, of which 78:9a and 78:9b provide good examples.

In the examples discussed above, the infinitive construct is used twenty-seven times (see Table 54: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render an infinitive construct found in the Masoretic Text, p. 270). An infinitive construct is rendered by the Peshitta as infinitives in thirteen instances. Seven times a construction with □, is used, six times nouns and once □ □ plus perfect. The infinitive construct plus לְ in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an infinitive construct plus □. This is normal. In 76:10c, the Peshitta adds a waw not found in the Masoretic Text, because the Peshitta renders the infinitive at the beginning of the verse (76:10a) as □ □□ plus participle. In 86:11d, the Peshitta omits the imperative in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta in other instances misinterprets the unvocalised Hebrew text and translates a verb in the Masoretic Text as a noun, for example in 73:20b. The Masoretic Text uses an infinitive construct with

preposition בְּ and the Peshitta renders it as a noun plus preposition ☐ (73:20b and 87:6b). In 89:10b, the Peshitta renders the preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text as a waw. An infinitive construct plus preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text in 81:6b is rendered in the Peshitta as ☐ ☐ plus perfect.

In eighteen instances, the Peshitta uses a verb where the Masoretic Text does not have a verb (see Table 57: Classification of the verbal forms used by the Peshitta to render no verb constructs, p. 281). Seven times a finite verb is used, six times participles, twice infinitives, twice imperfects and once perfects. The Peshitta adds a waw plus an extra verb that not found in the Masoretic Text, for example in 77:7b, 76:10b and 88:16d. In some instances, the Peshitta translates according to sense and deviates from the Masoretic Text, for example in 87:7d. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a verse and also at the beginning of the second line. Psalm 83:5 provides a befitting example.

4.9.2 Word order

It happens frequently that the Peshitta does not follow the word order of the Hebrew closely. In Psalm 73:9a, it places a prepositional phrase after the subject of the word, resulting in a more normal word order. In Psalm 78:62a, the prepositional phrase is placed after the object. In Psalm 68:62b, a prepositional phrase is placed after the verb.

In Psalm 74:13a, it moves a prepositional phrase to be before the verb, with the object following the verb directly. In Psalm 88:4a, a prepositional phrase is moved to the end of the line, with the subject following the verb directly. In 73:3c, the object is moved (from before the verb) to follow the verb. This changes the chiastic pattern of the verse to a more normal word order.

In Psalm 81:12a, the subject of the verb is moved to a position before the negative particle and the verb, emphasising the subject. In this instance, the Peshitta adapts the word order to the order occurring in the second line of the verse in the Masoretic Text. In Psalm 89:4a, the object is placed before the verb, probably to emphasise the covenant. In Psalm 80:4, the vocative ‘Israel’ is moved forward to be before the verb. The word order in the Peshitta in 78:62d differs from that in the Masoretic Text.

It is clear from these examples that the Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text in the vast majority of instances. Changes in the word order are frequently the result of normalising the word order to adapt to Syriac syntax.

4.9.3 Rendering of particles, prepositions

The Peshitta uses □ □□□ to render the Hebrew אִם … הֲ (77:10, 79:8d). In 77:10c, the Peshitta repeats □□ in both the first and second lines to render the rhetorical question in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta uses □ □□ to render the Hebrew אִם (78:34a). At times, it renders a rhetorical question introduced by הֲ as □ □□ (77:9a). The Masoretic Text uses הֲ to introduce a rhetorical question, for which the Peshitta uses □□□, which it repeats in both halves of the verse, for example in 85:6 and 88:15b. The rhetorical particle הֲ in the Masoretic Text is sometimes rendered by the Peshitta as □□□□, for example in 78:19c. The Peshitta at times renders the question in the Masoretic Text as a negative statement or just as a statement (88:13a). It renders the Hebrew מִי כִי in the Masoretic Text as □□□ □, for example in 89:7. In 74:1b, the interrogative particle לָמָּה in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as □□□□.

The Peshitta sometimes uses a waw to render the conjunction כִי in the Masoretic Text (86:7b). It also renders the Hebrew conjunction כִי as □ □□□, for example in 74:2b, 74:2c and 86:3b. In other instances, it adds □ in the second line. In some places, the Peshitta changes a negative remark in the Masoretic Text into a question (83:2a). In other instances, the Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a verse (75:6a), and in 81:16c, it adds a waw at the beginning of the second line of the verse for stylistic purposes.

The Peshitta uses the relative particle □ to render the Hebrew relative particle אֲשֶׁר used in the Masoretic Text, and also in some instances to make the implicit the relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit (78:3a, 83:11a). The Peshitta further uses □ to link two nouns (85:3a). At times, it translates a waw in the Masoretic Text as □, thus making the second verb subordinate to the first, for example in 78:6d.

In the Masoretic Text, an imperative is often followed by an imperfect with waw to indicate purpose; the Syriac translator understands this Hebrew syntax. To render this sequence in the

Masoretic Text, it uses an imperfect plus ☐ to indicate purpose as in the Masoretic Text, for example in 83:17b.

The Peshitta uses ☐☐☐☐ ☐ to render the Hebrew עַד as used in the Masoretic Text (73:17a). The Peshitta uses ☐☐, which is implied in the Masoretic Text in 73:3c; consequently, it changes the word order with the verbal construction after ☐☐.

In all cases where the Masoretic Text uses a jussive after the negative particle אַל, the Peshitta renders it as an imperfect after the negative particle ☐☐. Sometimes, where the Masoretic Text has the negative אַל followed by a jussive, the Peshitta translates it as ☐☐☐ followed by an imperfect *e*, for example in 75:5c.

The Peshitta renders the Hebrew כְּ in the Masoretic Text as a repetition of ☐☐☐, which is not the case in the Masoretic Text (74:5b). The Peshitta adds the preposition not present in the Masoretic Text in other instances, for example in 84:5a. It renders the Hebrew כְּ as used in the Masoretic Text as ☐. In 89:11b, the Peshitta renders כְּ in the Masoretic Text as ☐ plus ☐.

At times, the Peshitta uses a pronoun to render the preposition לִי in the Masoretic Text, of which Psalm 81:14a provides a good example. In 87:2, the Peshitta uses ☐☐ to render the Hebrew preposition מִן as used in the Masoretic Text.

The infinitive construct plus לְ in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an infinitive construct plus ☐, which is normal. In 76:10c, the Peshitta adds a waw not found in the Masoretic Text, because it renders the infinitive at the beginning of the verse (76:10a) as ☐ ☐☐ plus participle.

The preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text is rendered as ☐ ☐☐ in the Peshitta (76:10a).

At times, the Peshitta adds prepositions not present in the Masoretic Text. In 84:11c, the Masoretic Text has an infinitive construct without לְ and the Peshitta renders it as an infinitive plus preposition ☐. The infinitives with prepositions other than לְ are not rendered as an infinitive in the Peshitta, for example in 76:10a. In 78:5d, an infinitive with לְ in a final construction is rendered in the Peshitta as a sentence with ☐.

The Peshitta, in some instances, misinterprets the unvocalised Hebrew text and renders a verb in the Masoretic Text as a noun, for example in 73:20b. The Masoretic Text uses an infinitive construct with preposition בְּ, and the Peshitta renders it as a noun plus preposition □ (73:20b and 87:6b). In 89:10b, the Peshitta renders the preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text as a waw. An infinitive construct plus preposition בְּ in the Masoretic Text in 81:6b is rendered by the Peshitta as □□ plus perfect.

The Peshitta uses □□ to render the Hebrew אִם when used in a conditional clause, for example in 81:9b.

4.9.4 Rendering of rare words

The Peshitta in 73:6a simplifies the rare Hebrew word and translates it as □□□□. In other instances, it renders unknown Hebrew verbs in the Masoretic Text as nouns, for example in 73:3b. In 73:10b, the Peshitta text is quite different from the Masoretic Text, for in this psalm the Peshitta uses a verb different from the one in Hebrew. Although it has the same verb in Syriac, it opts not to use it. The Peshitta translator might probably have misunderstood the Hebrew in this regard. In 89:8a, the Peshitta uses a verb with a meaning different from the one used in the Masoretic Text. A rare Hebrew noun in the Masoretic Text is at times rendered as a finite verb in the Peshitta, for example in 73:18c.

The Peshitta Psalter translator concentrated on producing a clear translation, but at the same time he wanted to be faithful to the source text. It is also important to note that the Peshitta translator remained faithful to the Syriac syntax in his rendering of the Hebrew. Regarding the verbs, the translator would mainly use similar verbs with the same consonants and meaning as the one in the Masoretic Text, if possible. The translator made changes he thought to be necessary in relation to the Masoretic Text, with the sole aim of providing a translation that is easy to read and adapted to the Syriac language. The Peshitta Psalter translator was mainly concerned with the clarity and consistency of the final product. To achieve his goal, he made changes to accommodate the Syriac syntax and would for example render a perfect following a perfect, even if it would not be the case in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta Psalter translator at certain points changed the word order,

changed rhetorical questions into negative sentences to adapt to the Syriac syntax and make explicit relative clauses or elements which are implicit in the Masoretic Text.

In other instances, the Peshitta adds a waw that is absent in the Masoretic Text at the beginning of a line or verse in the Peshitta (85:14). The Peshitta adds a waw between two verbs following each other and where there is no waw in the Masoretic Text (cf 73:19). The Peshitta does not give preference to the use of two verbs following each other without a waw connecting them; hence the addition of a waw in such instances (73:19). At times, the Peshitta renders a waw in the Masoretic Text as □, thus making the second verb subordinate to the first, for example in 78:6d. The Peshitta in other instances omits the waw at the beginning of a new verse in the Masoretic Text, for example in 89:6. In the Masoretic Text, an imperative is often followed by an imperfect with waw to indicate purpose; Syriac understands this Hebrew syntax. To render this sequence in the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta uses an imperfect plus □ to indicate purpose as is the case in the Masoretic Text, for example in 83:17b.

Chapter 5
Comparison of the Masoretic Text, Peshitta, Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum

Introduction

This chapter aims to make a comparative study of the deviations between the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta in relation to the Septuagint, the Targum and the Vulgate. Attention will be paid to deviations of the Peshitta from the Masoretic Text and whether these deviations are supported or not by the other ancient versions. Special attention will be given to the verbs. First, attention will briefly be given to one example of each category identified in Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff) when dealing with the relation between the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta, and the other ancient versions, namely the Vulgate, the Septuagint and the Targum. After that, the texts with text-critical issues will be discussed.

To achieve the goals as described above, the following verses with critical problems in Psalms 73–89 are important as the verbs are at the centre of the text-critical problems: Psalm 73: verses 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15–16, 20, 24 and 28; Psalm 74: verses 4 and 5; Psalm 75: verses 4, 5 and 7; Psalm 76: verses 6 and 11; Psalm 77: verses 2, 3, 5, 7 and 12; Psalm78: verses 28, 60 and 63; Psalm 79: verse 7; Psalm 80: verse 17a; Psalm 81: verse 6, 9 and 13; Psalm 84: verse 8; Psalm 86: verse 11; Psalm 87: verses 6 and 7; Psalm 88: verse 16; and Psalm 89: verse 48. Some verses that require attention as a whole will also be dealt with. For the Septuagint the NETS translation will be used, while for the Targum Psalms the Targum of Psalms as translated by Stec (2004) will be used. For the Vulgate, translations of the Logos 5 programme will be used as translated by Weber and Gryson (Bible, 1969). The NIV will be used to render the Masoretic Text translations, except where changes will be made. The Peshitta translation is the author's own translation.

Following the scheme of Chapter 4

The numbering of the headings for the different verbal forms in this chapter follows the numbering of the different headings in Chapter 4, keeping in mind that the first digit of a heading refers to the chapter in which the information is found.

5.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text

As has been stated above, attention will briefly be given to one example of each category identified in Chapter 4 when dealing with the relation between the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta, and the other ancient versions, namely the Vulgate, the Septuagint and the Targum.

5.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions

5.1.1.1 Perfect without waw as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:9a

The Masoretic Text has שָׁתוּ בַשָּׁמַיִם פִּיהֶם (NIV: 'Their mouths lay claim to heaven'). It has a perfect and the Peshitta has the same, namely □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ ('They set their mouths against heaven'). The Septuagint reads ἔθεντο εἰς οὐρανὸν τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ('They placed their mouth against [in] heaven'). The Peshitta has a peal perfect third person masculine plural of □□□ ('to put, set, place'), while the Septuagint has an aorist indicative third person masculine plural of τίθημι ('to set, put, place'). The Vulgate has *posuerunt in caelum os suum* ('They have set their mouth against heaven'). The verb *posuerunt* is a perfect third person masculine plural. The Targum has שויאו בקדישי שמיא פומהון ('They have set their mouth against the holy ones of heaven'). The verb is pael perfect third person masculine plural of שוי.

In these instances, the verbs of the versions are in agreement with the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta.

5.1.1.2 Perfect verb without waw as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:2b

The Masoretic Text has גָּאַלְתָּ שֵׁבֶט נַחֲלָתֶךָ (NIV: 'The tribe of your inheritance, whom you redeemed'). The Masoretic Text has the verb in the perfect (גָּאַלְתָּ 2 masc sing), which is also the case in the Peshitta (□□□□□ 2 masc sing) as indicated below. The Peshitta reads □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ ('And you rescued the tribe of your inheritance').

The Vulgate reads *Redemisti virgam haereditas tuae* (‘The sceptre of thy inheritance which thou hast redeemed’). The Vulgate has the verb in the perfect tense (*redimo redimere* perf 2 sing). The Septuagint reads ἐλυτρώσω ῥάβδον κληρονομίας σου (‘thou did ransom the rod of your inheritance’). This version has an aorist middle indicative second person masculine singular of λυτρόω (‘to release on receipt of ransom’, ‘to hold to ransom’). The Targum has שבטי אחסנתך פרקת ממצרים (‘which you redeemed from Egypt, the tribes of your heritage’). It has the verb פרקת (peal perf 2 masc sing of פרק ‘to redeem’).

In these instances, the renderings of the verbs in all these versions are in agreement with the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta. The Masoretic Text does not have the waw, which the Peshitta has added. Both the Vulgate and the Targum have a verb in the perfect without ‘and’. The Septuagint has the verb in the aorist, also without ‘and’. Only the Peshitta has added ‘and’.

5.1.1.3 Perfect without waw as a perfect of □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:2b

The Masoretic Text reads אֲשֻׁרָי [שֻׁפְכוּ קרי] כְּאַיִן שפכה (NIV: ‘I had nearly lost my foothold’) and has the perfect verb without waw, namely שֻׁפְכָה (pual perf 3 c pl שׁפך ‘to be made to slip’). The Peshitta reads □□□□̈□ □□̈□ □□̈□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□ (‘And my walking was almost poured out’) and renders the perfect verb in the Masoretic Text as □□̇□ □□̇□□□□ (ethpeel part masc pl □□□ ‘to be poured’ + peal perf 3 fem pl □□□ ‘to be’). The Vulgate reads *pedes paene effusi sunt gressus mei* (‘My steps had well-nigh slipped’). The vulgate has the verb in the perfect, namely *effusi sunt* (perf indic pass 3 pl *effundo* ‘poured out’). The Septuagint has παρ᾽ ὀλίγον ἐξεχύθη τὰ διαβήματά μου (‘My goings very nearly slipped’). It has the verb ἐξεχύθη (aorist indic pass 3 fem sing ἐξεχέω ‘to pour in’, ‘to slip’). The Targum reads ואנא כזעיר אתמוטטא ריגלי כלמא דאזדעזעא איסתוורי (‘But as me, my feet had almost stumbled, my steps had nearly been shaken’). It has the verb אזדעזעא (hitpalpel perf 3 fem pl זעזע).

In this example, the Masoretic Text has a verb in the perfect, while the Peshitta has a participle plus the perfect of □□¨□. The Vulgate has the perfect passive, while the Septuagint has an aorist. The Targum has a passive perfect.

5.1.1.4 Perfect without waw as no verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:12

The Masoretic Text reads הִנֵּה אֵלֶּה רְשָׁעִים | וְשַׁלְוֵי עוֹלָם הִשְׂגּוּ חָיִל (NIV: 'This is what the wicked are like – always carefree, they increase in wealth'). In this example, the Peshitta has □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□¨□ □□□□ ('Behold! These are the wicked who are always at ease, and they [grow strong] increase in wealth/riches'). The Masoretic Text has the verb הִשְׂגּוּ (hiph perf 3 c pl שׂגה), of which the hiphil means 'to make great' and the qal means 'to grow great'; the Peshitta renders the verb as □□□□□ □□□□□□□, the adjective related to the verb 'to be strong'. It is interesting that the Peshitta uses the adjective, even though it has the corresponding verb □□□ ('to be numerous, to increase'). The Vulgate reads *Ecce ipsi peccatores, et abundantes in saeculo obtinuerunt divitias* ('Behold these are sinners; and yet, abounding in the world they have obtained riches'). It has the verb *obtinuerunt*, the perfect indicative active third person masculine plural of *obtineo obtinere* ('to hold'). The Septuagint reads ἰδοὺ οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ εὐθηνοῦνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατέσχον πλούτου ('Behold, these [are] the sinners, and they that prosper always: they have possessed wealth'). It has the verb κατέσχον, the aorist indicative active third person masculine plural of κατέχω ('to hold fast'). The Targum reads: בעלמא הדין אדביקו נכסין קנו חילא הא אילין רשיעיא דיתבין בשלותא ('Behold, these are the wicked who dwell at ease in the world; they have obtained wealth, they have acquired property'). It has the verb אדביקו, the peal perfect third person masculine plural of דבק ('to stick together').

In this example, both the Targum and Vulgate have the verb in the perfect, the same as the Masoretic Text, while the Septuagint has a verb in the aorist. It is only the Peshitta that makes use of the adjective. This was probable a syntactic choice of the translator, as the translation renders the Hebrew according to its sense.

5.1.1.5 Perfect without waw as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:8c

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

אָמְרוּ בְלִבָּם נִינָם יָחַד |
שָׂרְפוּ כָל מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל בָּאָרֶץ

(NIV: 'They said in their hearts, "We will crush them completely!" They burned every place where God was worshipped in the land').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□ □□ □□□□□

('They said in their hearts, "we will destroy them together" and we will destroy all of them, the festival days/the festivals of God from the earth/land').

This imperfect agrees with the previous imperfect in the Masoretic Text.

The Vulgate reads *Dixerunt in corde suo cognatio eorum simul: Quiescere faciamus omnes dies festos Dei a terra* ('They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together: Let us abolish all the festival days of God from the land'). The verb in the Vulgate, *faciamus*, is the present subjunctive active first person common plural of *facio facere* ('to make, do'), with the infinitive *quiescere* ('to rest, repose' = 'to abolish').

The Septuagint has εἶπαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν ἡ συγγένεια αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό | Δεῦτε καὶ κατακαύσωμεν πάσας τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ('They said in their heart, [even] all their kindred together, come, let us abolish the feasts of the Lord from the earth'). The Septuagint has the verb κατακαύσωμεν, the aorist subjunctive active first person common plural of κατακαίω ('to burn up/abolish').

The Targum reads אמרו בלבהון בניהון כחדא אוקידו אבהתהון כל מערעיא דאלהא בארעא ('Their sons say in their heart together, "Their fathers have burned all the meeting places of God in the land."').

The Targum has the verb אוקידו, an aphel perfect third person masculine plural of the verb יקד (‘to burn’).

The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw, that is שָׂרְפוּ (qal perf 3 c pl שׂרף ‘to burn’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, that is □□□□□ (waw [□] + affix imperf 1 c pl □□□ ‘to put an end to, commit to death, destroy’). It adds the waw, which is not found in Hebrew (Masoretic Text), at the beginning of the second line. It repeats the verb □□□□ (‘to destroy’), and does not follow the Hebrew, which has the verb שָׂרְפוּ (‘to burn’). Further, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text and renders the verb as an imperfect, agreeing with the previous verb. It further uses this verb subordinate to the previous one; thus the Peshitta has a subordinate construction instead of the Hebrew coordinate construction of the Masoretic Text.

The Septuagint and the Peshitta might have had the imperfect וְנִשְׂרֹף (‘and we will burn’) in their *Vorlage* (Tate, 1990:243). The proposal fits into the context much better, since the enemy is speaking, and thus one may agree with Kraus (1993:96) that the verb נִשְׂרֹף should be used here.

Though the Hebrew uses a difficult word, it has to be retained with the change of the person, that is, the first person plural rather than third person plural. The Masoretic Text has a verb in the perfect, while the Peshitta has the imperfect. The Septuagint has a verb in the aorist subjunctive, while the Vulgate has a present subjunctive. The Targum has a perfect, agreeing with the Masoretic Text. In this example, only the Targum agrees with the Masoretic Text, while the other three have similar readings, possibly indicating a different *Vorlage*.

5.1.1.6 Perfect without waw as an imperative in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:7c

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

לָאָרֶץ חִלְּלוּ מִשְׁכַּן שְׁמֶךָ

(NIV: ‘They defiled the dwelling-place of your name to the ground’).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□

(‘And pollute the dwelling-place of your name in the earth’).

The Vulgate has *In terra polluerunt tabernaculum nominis tui* (‘They defiled the dwelling place of thy name on the earth’). It has the verb *polluerunt*, the perfect indicative active third person masculine/feminine plural of *polluo polluere* (‘to defile’).

The Septuagint has εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐβεβήλωσαν τὸ σκήνωμα τοῦ ὀνόματός σου (‘They have profaned the habitation of thy name to the earth’). It has the verb ἐβεβήλωσαν, the aorist indicative active third person masculine plural of βεβήλόω (‘to profane’)

The Targum has לארעא אפיסו משכן דאתקרי ביה שמך (‘To the ground they have desecrated the dwelling place in which your name is invoked’). It has the verb אפיסו, the aphel perfect third person masculine plural of פסס.

The Peshitta in this instance renders the perfect חִלְּלוּ (piel perf 3 c pl חלל ‘to pollute/defile’) in the Masoretic Text as the imperative □□□□ (peal impert masc pl □□□ ‘to pollute’). This may also be a different interpretation of the unvocalised Hebrew. This imperative of the Peshitta does not fit into the context. It may be that the Peshitta translator also regarded the first two verbs in the verse in the Masoretic Text as imperatives, which is possible when having an unvocalised Hebrew text. This verse may thus be an example of the translator of the Peshitta not understanding the Hebrew.

Both the Vulgate and Targum have a verb in the perfect like the Masoretic Text, while the Peshitta has an imperative and the Septuagint an aorist. In this example, the Peshitta is the only version that has an imperative, while the other versions agree with the Masoretic Text.

5.1.1.7 Perfect without waw as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:3c

The Masoretic Text has כָּל הֵרַע אוֹיֵב בַּקֹּדֶשׁ (NIV: ‘All this destruction the enemy has brought on the sanctuary’), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□ (‘All

the evil that the enemy has brought in your sanctuary'). The vulgate has *quanta malignatus est enimicus in sancto* ('See what things the enemy hath done wickedly in the sanctuary'). It has the verb *malignatus est,* the perfect third person masculine singular of *malignor*, *malignari* ('to act badly/wickedly, act/do/contrive maliciously, malign'). The Septuagint has ὅσα ἐπονηρεύσατο ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ('[because of] all that the enemy has done wickedly in thy holy places'). It has the verb ἐπονηρεύσατο, the aorist middle indicative third person masculine singular of πονηρεύομαι ('to be evil, act wickedly'). The Targum has אבאיש בעיל דבבא בקודשא דבכל חיליה ('Because the enemy has with all his strength done evil in the sanctuary'). It has the verb אבאיש, the aphel perfect third person masculine singular of באש ('to be bad, displeasing').

This use where a perfect in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a participle in the Peshitta often occurs. As the perfect indicates event(s) that took place in the past, the Peshitta uses the participle, especially the passive tense, to emphasise the results of some events in the past (Muraoka, 1987:44; Nöldeke, 1966:209–211, par 278–280). The Peshitta renders the verb הֵרַע (hiph perf 3 masc sing רעע 'to do evil, bring calamity, to cause damage') in the Masoretic Text as □□□□ (affix part masc sing of □□□ 'to do evil'). It is also noteworthy that the Peshitta adds □ before the participle. The Masoretic Text has כָּל *kol* before the verb, which is unusual in Hebrew (Ezra 1:6; Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:602 [36.2.1e:17]); the Peshitta uses □□ followed by □ to render it. In this instance, the Peshitta makes an implicit relative sentence in the Masoretic Text explicit.

The Targum has a verb in the perfect as is the case in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta has the participle, while the Septuagint has an aorist. The Vulgate also has a perfect. Only the Peshitta has a participle.

5.1.1.8 Perfect without waw as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 89:3a

The Masoretic Text reads כִּי אָמַרְתִּי (NIV: 'For I say'), with a verb in the qal perfect first person common singular, while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□ ('For I say'), with a verb in the imperfect tense. The Vulgate has *Quia dixisti/Quoniam dixisti* ('For thou hast said'). The Vulgate has the verb as the perfect indicative active second person masculine singular of *dico dicere* ('to

say/speak'). The Septuagint has ὅτι εἶπας ('For you have said'). It has the verb εἶπας, the aorist indicative active second person masculine singular of εἶπον ('to speak, say'). The Targum reads ארום אמרית ('For I said'). It has the verb אמרית, the peal perfect first person common singular of אמר ('to say/speak').

The Peshitta uses an imperfect for the Hebrew participle. To render the Hebrew conjunction כִּי the Peshitta uses the combination of □ □□□. It may be that the Hebrew perfect is interpreted as a perfect pointing to the present (a performative), and thus it is rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta. In this example, the Masoretic Text has a verb in the perfect tense with the first person singular as the subject, while the Peshitta has an imperfect with a first person singular as the subject. The Septuagint and the Vulgate have the second person masculine singular as the subject. The Septuagint has an aorist, the Targum has a perfect and the Vulgate has a perfect as well. The Peshitta is the only version with the imperfect.

5.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and other ancient versions

5.1.2.1 Perfect with waw copulative as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 80:13b

The Masoretic Text reads וְאָרוּהָ כָּל עֹבְרֵי דָּרֶךְ (NIV: 'So that all who pass by pick its grapes'), with the verb in the perfect tense with waw, namely וְאָרוּהָ (waw copulative + qal perf 3 masc pl + suff 3 fem sing ארה 'to pluck'). The Peshitta has □□□□□ □ ̈□□□ □□□ □□□□□ ('And all who passed on the road, trampled it'), with the verb in the perfect plus waw, namely □□□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to trample'). The verb used by the Peshitta ('to trample') is not the same as the one used by the Masoretic Text ('to pluck'). The Peshitta has the suffix third person feminine singular like the Masoretic Text (80:13b). It is possible that the Peshitta translator did not know the Hebrew verb and translated it according to the context.

The Vulgate reads *et vindemiant eam omnes qui praetergrediuntur viam*? ('So that all they who pass by the way to pluck it?'). The Vulgate has the verb in the present tense (*et vindemiant*, namely conj + pres indic act 3 masc pl of *vindemio vindemiare*). The Septuagint reads καὶ τρυγῶσιν

αὐτὴν πάντες οἱ παραπορευόμενοι τὴν ὁδόν (‘while all that pass by the way pluck it?’), with the verb in the perfect tense, namely τρυγῶσιν (pres indic act 3 masc pl of τρυγάω ‘to gather in’). The Targum has ומכסחין יתה כל אורחא (‘So that all who pass along the way pluck it?’), with the participle ומכסחין (conj + pael ptc masc pl כסח ‘to cut, wipe out, pluck’). In this example, the Peshitta has a verb in the perfect tense like the Masoretic Text, while both the Vulgate and the Septuagint have the present tense and the Targum has a participle.

5.1.2.2 Perfect with waw copulative as a participle with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 78:34d

The Masoretic Text reads וְשָׁבוּ וְשִׁחֲרוּ אֵל (NIV: ‘They eagerly turned to him again’/Literally, ‘And they turned/repented and sought for God eagerly’), while the Peshitta has □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ (‘They returned and they truly/eagerly came before him’).

The Vulgate reads *et revertebantur et diluculo veniebant ad Deum* (‘and they returned, and came to him early in the morning’). The Vulgate has the verb *veniebant* in the imperfect tense (imperf indic 3 pl *venio, venire*). The Septuagint has καὶ ἐπέστρεφον καὶ ὤρθριζον πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (‘And they returned and called betimes upon God’). The Septuagint has the imperfect indicative active third person masculine plural ὤρθριζον: ὀρθρίζω (‘to turn about, around’). The Targum reads תייבין ותבעו יתיה ויתובון ויצלון קדם אלהא (‘They turned and sought him, and they turned and prayed before God’). The Targum has the verb in the imperfect tense, namely ויצלון, the pael imperfect third person masculine plural of **צְלִי** (‘to turn’).

The Peshitta uses a general verb (□□□□□□□) for a specific verb (וְשִׁחֲרוּ) in the Masoretic Text. It renders וְשִׁחֲרוּ (perf + waw cop + piel perf 3 c pl שׁחר) in the Masoretic Text as the participle plus waw, that is □□□□□□□ (conj + pael ptc masc sing □□□ ‘to come before him’). In this instance, there is a text-critical problem, but it does not have serious implications for the verb. A similar example is found in 78:38c.

In this example, the Masoretic Text has a perfect verb that is rendered in the same way as the Targum. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render the verb in the Masoretic Text as an

imperfect. The Peshitta renders the perfect with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text as a participle with waw, which is different from the other versions that follow the Masoretic Text.

5.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and other ancient versions

5.1.3.1 Perfect with waw consecutive as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:11

The Masoretic Text has וְאָמְרוּ (NIV: 'They say'), with the verb in the perfect tense (waw cons plus qal perf 3 masc pl אמר 'to say, speak'), while the Peshitta reads ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ('And they say'), with the verb in the imperfect (waw + imperf 3 masc pl ☐☐☐ 'to say, speak'). The Vulgate reads *et dixerunt* ('And they said'), with the indicative verb in the perfect tense (perf indic act 3 pl of *dico dicere* 'to say, speak'). The Septuagint reads καὶ εἶπαν ('And they said') and the verb εἶπαν is the aorist indicative active third person masculine plural of εἶπον ('to speak, say'). The Targum has וימרון, the conjunctive plus peal imperfect third person masculine plural of אמר ('to say, speak').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has the verb in the perfect tense and the Vulgate renders it as such. Both the Peshitta and the Targum render the Hebrew perfect in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, while the Septuagint has an aorist. In this instance, the Peshitta and the Targum understand the verbal form of the Masoretic Text to be a perfect with waw consecutive, while the Vulgate and the Septuagint interpret it as a perfect with waw copulative. It can therefore be said the Targum and Peshitta understand the Hebrew syntax.

5.1.3.2 Perfect with waw consecutive as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 89:26a

The Masoretic Text has וְשַׂמְתִּי בַיָּם יָדוֹ (NIV: 'I will set his hand over the sea'), with the verb in the perfect tense, that is וְשַׂמְתִּי (waw cons + qal perf 1 c sing שׂוּם 'to put, set, place'), while the Peshitta has ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ('I will place his hand over the sea'), with the verb in the imperfect tense, that is ☐☐☐☐ (peal imperf 1 c sing ☐☐☐ 'to put, set, place'). It is probable

that the translator of the Peshitta did not see this verse as connected with the previous one and therefore formed a completely new line.

The Vulgate reads *Et ponam in mari manum eius* ('And I will set his hand in the sea'), with the verb (*ponam*) in the future indicative active first person singular *pono ponere* ('to set'), while the Septuagint has καὶ θήσομαι ἐν θαλάσσῃ χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ('And I will set his hand in the sea'), with the verb in the future, namely θήσομαι (future middle indic 1 c sing τίθημι 'to set, put, place, to establish'). The Targum reads ואשוי במחוזי ימא שולטניה ('And I set his dominion upon the harbors of the sea'), with a verb in the imperfect, namely ואשוי (pael imperf 1 c sing שׁוה 'to make like, set').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has the verb in the perfect with waw consecutive. All the versions understood the Hebrew correctly with regard to the time indicated.

5.1.3.3 Perfect with waw as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 77:13a

The Masoretic Text reads וְהָגִיתִי בְכָל פָּעָלֶךָ (NIV: 'I will meditate on all your works'), while the Peshitta has □□□ ̈□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ ('And I meditated on all your works'). The Vulgate has *et meditabor in omnibus operibus tuis* ('And I will meditate on all thy works'), with the verb *meditabor* as the future indicative passive first person common singular of *meditor meditari* ('to meditate'). The Septuagint has καὶ μελετήσω ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔργοις σου ('And I will meditate on all thy works'), with a verb in the future, namely μελετήσω, the future indicative active first person common singular of μελετόω ('to care for, to exercise or practise'). The Targum reads ורננית בכל עובדך טביא ('And I will meditate on all your good deeds') and has the verb in the perfect tense (conj ו + pael perf 1 c sing רנן 'to meditate').

The Peshitta renders the perfect with waw, that is וְהָגִיתִי (conj + qal perf 1 c sing הגה 'to meditate'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw, that is □□□□□ (peal perf 1 c singular □□□ 'to meditate, reflect on, think' + conj), not understanding that the Hebrew text in truth has a perfect with waw consecutive. The Targum does the same, while both the Vulgate and the Septuagint have the future, demonstrating a better understanding of the Hebrew.

5.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text

5.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw and their rendering in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions

5.2.1.1 Imperfect without waw as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:21c

The Masoretic Text reads עָנִי וְאֶבְיוֹן יְהַלְלוּ שְׁמֶךָ (NIV: 'May the poor and the needy praise your name'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□·□□ □·□□□ ('May the poor and the needy praise your name'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect verb without waw, that is יְהַלְלוּ (piel imperf 3 masc pl הלל 'to praise'), in the Masoretic Text as the imperfect verb without waw, that is □□□□□□ (peal imperf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to praise, glorify, proclaim'). The imperfect in Syriac is used to represent events in the future. The use where the imperfect in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta is often done in these psalms, which is expected. This is how the Peshitta maintains agreement.

The Vulgate reads *pauper et inops laudabunt nomen tuum* ('The poor and needy shall praise thy name'), with the verb *laudabunt* (future indic act 3 plural *laudo laudare*). The Septuagint reads πτωχὸς καὶ πένης αἰνέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά σου ('Let the poor and needy praise thy name'), with the verb αἰνέσουσιν (future indic act 3 pl αἰνέω 'to speak/to praise'). The Targum reads שמך ישבחון (וחשיכא) עניא ('but let the poor and needy praise your name'), with the verb ישבחון (pael imperf 3 masc pl שבח 'to praise').

In this instance, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect verb without the waw and both the Peshitta and the Targum versions follow the Masoretic Text in this regard. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render this verb as a future indicative active.

5.2.1.2 Imperfect without waw as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 75:6b

The Masoretic Text reads תְּדַבְּרוּ בְצַוָּאר עָתָק (NIV: 'Do not speak with outstretched neck'), while the Peshitta has ܘܠܐ ܬܡܠܠܘ ܒܩܫܝܐ ܥܬܝܩܐ ('And do not speak with outstretched neck'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect תְּדַבְּרוּ (piel imperf 2 masc pl דבר 'to speak' without waw) in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, namely ܘܠܐ ܬܡܠܠܘ (conj ܘ + pael imperf 2 masc pl ܠܐ ܬܡܠܠܘ 'to speak deliberately'). The Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of the new/middle line of the verse and at the beginning of the verse; both waws are absent from the Masoretic Text. The purpose of both additions in the Peshitta is solely to connect a line – the middle one – with the previous one.

The Vulgate reads *nolite loqui adversus Deum iniquitatem* ('Speak not iniquity against God'), while the Septuagint has μὴ λαλεῖτε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀδικίαν ('Speak not unrighteousness against God'). The Vulgate has an imperative *nolite* (pres act imperf 2 masc pl *nolo* + *loqui*, pres pass inf *loquor*), while the Septuagint has λαλεῖτε (pres imperf act 2 masc pl λαλέω 'to talk'). The Hebrew does not use the imperative for negative commands. The Vulgate and the Septuagint do it, as in this instance, rendering a good translation of the Hebrew. The Targum reads בתוקפא ובגידופין די ממללין ('You who speak with might and with reviling'), with the participle ממללין (pael ptc masc sing מלל 'to speak, say'), linking this part of the verse to the previous part.

In this example, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect without waw, which the Peshitta renders as a waw plus imperfect, while both the Vulgate and the Septuagint use imperatives. The imperative in the Vulgate is followed by an infinitive and the Targum has a participle.

5.2.1.3 Imperfect without waw as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other ancient versions

Psalm 74:10a

The Masoretic Text reads עַד מָתַי אֱלֹהִים יְחָרֵף צָר (NIV: 'How long will the enemy mock you, O God?), while the Peshitta has ܥܕ ܡܬܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܣܦ ܒܥܠ ܒܪܝܐ ܠܐ ('Until when will the enemy insult you, O God'). Here the Peshitta renders an imperfect

without waw, namely. יְחָרֵף (piel imperf 3 masc sing חרף ‘to reproach, revile’), in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□□ (pael ptc masc sing □□□ ‘to insult, revile, dishonour, shame’).

The Vulgate reads *Usquequo Deus inproperabit inimicus*? (‘How long, O God, shall the enemy reproach?’), while the Septuagint has ἕως πότε, ὁ θεός, ὀνειδιεῖ ὁ ἐχθρός (‘How long, O God, shall the enemy reproach?’). The Targum reads עד אימתי אלהא יחסד מעיקא (‘How long, O God, will the oppressor revile?’), with the verb in the imperfect tense, namely יחסד (pael imperf 3 masc sing חסד ‘to revile’). The Vulgate has *inproperabit*, the future indicative third person singular of *inpropero inproperare*, and the Septuagint has ὀνειδιεῖ, the future indicative active third person masculine singular of ὀνειδιζω (‘to throw a reproach upon me’).

In this example, an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a participle by the Peshitta, as an imperfect without waw by the Targum and the Septuagint and as the future indicative by the Vulgate.

5.2.1.4 Imperfect without waw as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other ancient versions

Psalm 77:3c

The Masoretic Text reads יָדִי לַיְלָה נִגְּרָה וְלֹא תָפוּג (NIV: ‘At night I stretched out untiring hands)/ [A more literal translation: ‘At night my hand was extended and did not grow weak’], while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ (‘And his hand in the night pulled me away and I did not rest’). The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, namely תָפוּג (qal imperf 3 fem sing פוג ‘be feeble/numb/cold’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw, namely □□□ (peal perf 1 c sing □□□□ ‘to keep silent; be at peace'). The Peshitta uses a general verb ‘to keep silent, be at peace’ for a specific Hebrew verb ‘to be feeble/numb/cold’. Although this is not affecting the verb directly, the Peshitta changes ‘my hand’ as found in the Masoretic Text to ‘his hand’ and changes the third person feminine singular verb to the first person singular. The whole line demonstrates a simplification of the Hebrew.

The Vulgate reads *minibus meis nocte contra eum et non sum deceptus* (‘With my hands lifted up to him in the night, and I was not deceived), with the verb *deceptus sum*, the perfect passive

indicative active first person common singular of *decipio decipere*. The Septuagint reads ταῖς χερσίν μου νυκτὸς ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθην ('[even] with my hands by night before him, and I was not deceived'), with ἠπατήθην (aorist indic pass 1 c sing ἀπατόω 'to cheat, trick'). The Targum reads בליליא זלגת עיני דמעתא ולא תפוג ('In the night my eye flowed with tears, and did not become faint'), with the verb in the imperfect tense, namely תפוג (peal imperf 3 fem sing פוג 'to become faint').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect without waw that is rendered the same in the Targum, but the Peshitta renders it as a perfect plus waw. The same verb is presented in the Vulgate as a perfect indicative passive, but as an aorist passive in the Septuagint. It is clear that the Peshitta does not agree with any of these ancient versions.

5.2.1.5 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 80:14a

The Masoretic Text reads יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה חֲזִיר מִיָּעַר (NIV: 'Boars from the forest ravage it'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ ('And the pigs of the forest consume it'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw, that is יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה (piel imperf future 3 masc sing + suff 3 fem sing כרסם 'to ravage, gobble up'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus waw, that is □□□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 masc sing + suff 3 fem sing □□□ 'to eat, consume'], at the beginning of the verse. The Peshitta renders a generic translation in this regard. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a verse. The Hebrew verb is a *hapax legomenon*.

The Vulgate reads *exterminavit eam aper de silva* ('The boar out of the wood has laid it waste'), with the verb *exterminavit*, the perfect indicative active third person singular of *extermino exterminare* ('to banish, expel, dismiss'). The Septuagint has ἐλυμήνατο αὐτὴν σῦς ἐκ δρυμοῦ ('The boar out of the wood has laid it waste'), with the verb ἐλυμήνατο, the aorist middle indicative third person masculine singular of λυμαίνομαι ('to treat with indignity, to maltreat'). The Targum reads חזיר דמן חורשא (יתברינה) ('The boar from the forest gnaws at it'), with the verb in the imperfect, namely יתברינה (pael imperf 3 masc sing + suff 3 fem sing תבר 'fragile').

In this example, an imperfect without waw is rendered in the Peshitta as a perfect plus waw, while the Vulgate renders it as a present indicative active. The Septuagint renders the same verb as an aorist and the Targum as an imperfect.

5.2.1.6 Imperfect without waw as a perfect of □□□ plus participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:3c

The Masoretic Text reads שְׁלֹום רְשָׁעִים אֶרְאֶה (NIV: 'When I saw the prosperity of the wicked'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ ̈□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□ ('When I saw the prosperity of the wicked'). The Peshitta in this instance renders the imperfect without waw, that is אֶרְאֶה (qal imperf 1 c sing ראה 'to see'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus the perfect of □□□, that is □□□□ □□□ (peal act part masc sing □□□ 'followed by' + peal perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to be'). It is also significant that the participle precedes the perfect of *hwy*. The Peshitta uses □□ ('when'), which is implied in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta also changes the word order, with the verbal construction following □□.

The Vulgate has *pacem peccatorum videns* ('seeing the prosperity of sinners'), with a participle. The Septuagint reads εἰρήνην ἁμαρτωλῶν θεωρῶν ('beholding the tranquillity of sinners'), with the verb θεωρῶν, the present active participle nominative masculine singular of θεωρέω ('to look, behold'). The Vulgate has *pacem peccatorum videns*, with the present participle of *video videre*. The Targum reads די שלם רשיעיא אחמי ('At the time when I saw the peace of the wicked'), with the verb in an imperfect tense, namely אחמי (peal imperf 1 c sing חמי 'to see').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect that the Targum renders as such, while the Peshitta renders it as a combination of a participle plus the perfect of □□ ̈□. The Vulgate and the Septuagint have participles. It is clear that the Peshitta follows its own pattern in rendering this verb in the Masoretic Text. The first part of the verse has a perfect in the Masoretic Text. The imperfect at the end points to a habitual action in the past. The rendering of the Peshitta as the perfect of □□□ plus a participle is a good rendering of the Hebrew, as is the participle of the Vulgate and the Septuagint.

5.2.1.7 Imperfect without waw as no verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 81:13b

The Masoretic Text reads וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ בִּשְׁרִירוּת לִבָּם | יֵלְכוּ בְּמוֹעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם (NIV: 'So I gave them over to their stubborn hearts to follow their own devices'), while the Peshitta has ܐܙܠܘ ܒܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܠܒܗܘܢ ܘܒܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܐܙܠܘ (‘They went in the desires of their hearts and the thinking of their soul[s]’). The Masoretic Text has the verb וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ (waw cons + piel imperf 1 c sing + suff 3 masc sing שלח ‘to let go, let loose, let free’), which is rendered as ‘And I send him away’, while the Peshitta has the verb ܐܙܠܘ (peal perf 3 masc pl ܐܙܠ ‘to make go, walk’), which is rendered as ‘And they went’. The difference between the verbs used is due to the fact that the Peshitta omits the verb corresponding with וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ and moves יֵלְכוּ to the front of the sentence, changing the construction of the sentence, and uses two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb.

The Vulgate reads *et dimisi illos secundum desideria cordis eorum ibunt in adinventionibus suis* (‘So I let them go according to the desires of their heart: they shall walk in their own inventions’), with the verb *dimisi*, the perfect indicative active first person common singular of *dimitto dimittere*. It also has the verb *ibunt* (future 3 pl of *eo ire* ‘to go’), rendering both the verbs of the Masoretic Text.

The Septuagint reads καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, πορεύσονται ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν (‘So I let them go after the ways of their own hearts: they will go on in their own ways’), with the verb ἐξαπέστειλα, the aorist indicative active first person common singular of ἐξαποστέλλω (‘to be dispatched’), as well πορεύσονται for the second verb (the future indicative of πορεύω).

The Targum has ותריכתיה בהירהורי לבהון אזלו במלכת רישעהון (‘So I drove them out in the imaginations of their hearts, (and) they walked in their own wicked counsels’), with the verb ותריכתיה (pael perf 1 c sing + plus suff 3 pl תרך ‘to drive out’). It also renders the second verb as אזלו (peal perf 3 pl אזו).

One of the two verbs is omitted by the Peshitta, while the other versions retain it. It is an example of simplification in the Peshitta.

5.2.1.8 Imperfect without waw as an imperative in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 85:7a and 7b

The Masoretic Text reads הֲלֹא אַתָּה תָּשׁוּב תְּחַיֵּנוּ | וְעַמְּךָ יִשְׂמְחוּ בָךְ (NIV: 'Will you not revive us again, that your people may rejoice in you?'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ ('Will you not return to me and keep me alive so that your people may rejoice in you?'). The Masoretic Text has the verbs תָּשׁוּב (qal imperf 2 masc sing שׁוּב 'to turn, return') and תְּחַיֵּנוּ (piel imperf 2 masc sing + suff 1 c pl חיה 'to preserve, keep alive, let live, bring to life'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ (affix imptv 2 masc sing suff 1 c sing □□□ 'to turn, turn around, return') and □□□□□ (conj + affix imptv masc sing + suff 1 c sing ܐܚܝܢ 'to make live, live again, to grant life, to keep alive') for the respective verbs in the Masoretic Text. In this instance, the Peshitta changes the rhetorical question of the Masoretic Text to a command.

The Vulgate reads *Deus tu conversus vivificabis nos et plebs tua laetabitur in te* ('Thou will turn, O God, and bring us to life: and thy people shall rejoice in thee'), while the Septuagint has ὁ θεός, σὺ ἐπιστρέψας ζωώσεις ἡμᾶς, καὶ ὁ λαός σου εὐφρανθήσεται ἐπὶ σοί ('O God, thou will turn and quicken us; and thy people shall rejoice in thee'). The Vulgate has *conversus*, the perfect passive participle masculine singular of *coverto convertere,* and *vivificabis*, the future indicative active second person masculine singular of *vivifico vivificare* respectively, while the Septuagint has ἐπιστρέψας, the aorist participle active nominative masculine singular of ἐπιστρέφω ('to turn about, around') and ζωώσεις, the future indicative active second person masculine singular of ζωόω ('to quicken, make alive') respectively. The Vulgate changes the rhetorical question to a statement, as does the Septuagint and the Targum. The Targum reads יתנא ועמך ייחדון במימרך הלא את תתוב תחיי ('Will you not revive us again, that your people may rejoice in your Memra?'), with the verb תתוב (peal imperf 2 masc sing תוב 'to return, come back') and the verb תחיי (pael imperf 2 masc sing חיי 'to let live').

The Peshitta renders the imperfects without waw (תָּשׁוּב and תְּחַיֵּנוּ) in the Masoretic Text as imperatives (□□□□□ and □□□□□). The Masoretic Text uses the interrogative particle הֲ to introduce a rhetorical question and the Peshitta uses the imperative for a request.

Psalm 85:8b is a similar example. The Septuagint adds 'God' and renders the rhetorical question as a statement. In this example, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect without waw for both verbs, while the Peshitta renders them as imperatives. The Targum renders both verbs as imperfects, following the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate renders the first as a participle and the second as a future indicative active. The Septuagint renders the first as an aorist and the second as a future indicative active. The Peshitta and the other ancient versions deal with the rhetorical question in different ways.

5.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions

5.2.2.1 Imperfect with waw consecutive as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 81:13a

The Masoretic Text reads וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ בִּשְׁרִירוּת לִבָּם (NIV: 'So I gave them over to their stubborn hearts')/'And I sent him away to the pleasure of their hearts'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ ('They went according to the will of their hearts'). The Peshitta omits the verb corresponding to וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ and rather moves יֵלְכוּ to the front of the sentence, changing the construction of the sentence, and uses two prepositional phrases subordinate to the one verb. The Peshitta renders the imperfect with a waw consecutive, that is וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ (waw cons + piel imperf 1 c sing + suff 3 masc sing שׁלח 'to let go, let loose, let free'), as a perfect without waw, that is □□□□ (peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to make go, walk'). Bearing in mind the omission of the first verb and changes in the Peshitta, the two verses differ.

The Vulgate reads *et dimisi illos secundum desideria cordis eorum ibunt in adinventionibus suis* ('So I let them go according to the desires of their heart: they shall walk in their own inventions'), while the Septuagint has καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν ('So I let them go after the ways of their own hearts'). The Vulgate has the verb *dimisi,* the perfect indicative active first person common singular of *dimitto dimittere*. The Septuagint renders it as ἐξαπέστειλα, the aorist indicative active first person common singular of ἐξαποστέλλω ('to be dispatched'). The Targum reads ותריכתיה בהירהורי לבהון ('So I drove them out in the imaginations

of their hearts'), with a verb in the perfect tense, namely ותריכתיה (conj ו + pael perf 1 c sing + suff 3 masc sing תרך 'to drive out').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has the verb in the imperfect with waw consecutive, while both the Peshitta and the Targum render it as a perfect. The Vulgate renders it as perfect indicative active and the Septuagint as an aorist indicative active. In this instance the Peshitta, the Targum and Vulgate agree with each other and do not follow the Masoretic Text.

5.2.2.2 Imperfect with waw consecutive as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 77:7d

The Masoretic Text reads עִם לְבָבִי אָשִׂיחָה וַיְחַפֵּשׂ רוּחִי (NIV: 'My heart mused and my spirit enquired'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ (□□□□ 'And in my heart I thought and I search my spirit. And I said'). The Masoretic Text has the verb in the imperfect tense with waw consecutive, that is וַיְחַפֵּשׂ (waw cons + piel imperf 3 masc sing חפשׂ 'to inquire'), while the Peshitta has the verb in the perfect tense with waw, that is □□□□□ (waw + peal perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to inquire').

The Vulgate reads *cum corde meo exercibatar et scobebam spiritum meum* ('with my own heart and I was exercised and I swept my spirit'), while the Septuagint has τῆς καρδίας μου ἠδολέσχουν, καὶ ἔσκαλλεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ('I communed with my heart by night, and diligently searched my spirit'). The Vulgate has the verb *exercibatar*, the imperfect indicative passive of the first person common singular of *exercito exercitare,* while the Septuagint has ἔσκαλλεν, the aorist indicative active third person masculine singular of ακάλλω ('to stir up'). The Targum reads עמ הירהורי לבבי אמליל ויבלש ניסיא מנדע רוחי ('With the meditation of my heart I speak, and the knowledge of my spirit searches for miracles'), with the verb an imperfect first person common singular of מלל ('to speak').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has the verb as an imperfect plus waw consecutive, the Targum renders it as an imperfect. The Peshitta renders this verb as a perfect plus waw, the Septuagint renders it as an aorist and the Vulgate as an imperfect. The Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint understand the imperfect with waw consecutive correctly.

5.2.2.3 Imperfect with waw consecutive as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 76:3

The Masoretic Text reads וַיְהִי בְשָׁלֵם סֻכּוֹ | וּמְעוֹנָתוֹ בְצִיּוֹן (NIV: '[and] His tent is in Salem, [and] his dwelling place in Zion'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ (‘His tent is in Salem, and his dwelling place in Zion’). The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw consecutive, namely וַיְהִי (waw cons + qal imperf 3 masc sing היה ‘to be’), as an imperfect verb without a waw, namely □□□□ (peal imperf 3 masc sing □□□ ‘to be’). In this instance, the Peshitta omits the waw at the beginning of the verse but retains the word order. The Vulgate reads *et factus est in pace locus eius et habitation eius in Sion* (‘And his place is in peace: and his abode in Sion’), while the Septuagint has καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κατοικητήριον αὐτοῦ ἐν Σιων (‘And his place has been in peace and his dwelling-place in Sion’). The Vulgate has the verb in the perfect passive, the perfect indicative passive third person singular of *facio facere* (‘to make), while the Septuagint has ἐγενήθη ἐν, the aorist indicative passive third person singular of γίνομαι/ γίγνομαι (‘to come into being, to become’).

The Targum reads והוה בירושלם בית מקדשיה ומדוד בית שכינת קודשיה בציון (‘And the house of his sanctuary is in Jerusalem and the dwelling place of the house of his holy Shekinah in Zion’), with the verb in the perfect, namely והוה (conj + peal perf 3 masc sing הוי ‘to be’).

In this example, the Masoretic Text has the verb in an imperfect with waw consecutive and the Peshitta has the same, though without waw. It does not render the imperfect with waw consecutive as referring to the past. The other versions understand the Hebrew correctly. The Vulgate has the verb in the perfect (present) tense, the same as the Targum, and the Septuagint has an aorist.

5.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the other ancient versions

5.2.3.1 Imperfect with waw copulative as an imperfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 86:9d

The Masoretic Text reads וְיכַבְּדוּ לִשְׁמֶךָ (NIV: 'They will bring glory to your name')/'And they shall glorify your name'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□□□□□ ('And they shall glorify your name'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, namely וְיכַבְּדוּ (waw cop + piel imperf 3 masc pl כבד 'to bring glory, praise'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect plus waw, namely □□□□□□□ (conj + pael imperf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to praise, glorify, proclaim'). The Vulgate has *et glorificabunt nomen tuum* ('And they shall glorify [thy] your name'), with the verb *glorificabunt,* future indicative active third person plural of *glorifico glorificare*, while the Septuagint has καὶ δοξάσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά σου ('And shall glorify thy name'), with the verb δοξάσουσιν, the future indicative active third person masculine plural of δοξάζω ('to think, imagine'). The Targum has ויתנון איקר לשמך ('And they shall give glory to your name'), with the verb in the imperfect tense, namely ויתנון (conj ו + peal imperf third person fem pl נתן 'to give'). All the versions understand the Hebrew correctly.

5.2.3.2 Imperfect with waw copulative as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 86:17b

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

עֲשֵׂה עִמִּי אוֹת לְטוֹבָה

וְיִרְאוּ שֹׂנְאַי וְיֵבֹשׁוּ כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה עֲזַרְתַּנִי וְנִחַמְתָּנִי

(NIV: 'Give me a sign of your goodness, that my enemies may see it and be put to shame, for you, O Lord, have helped me and comforted me').

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□□□□ □··□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□

□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

(‘Give me a sign of your goodness, that my enemies may see it and are kept awake [be ashamed] for you, O Lord, have helped me and have comforted me’).

The Vulgate reads *fac mecum signum in bono et videant qui oderunt me et confundantur quoniam tu Domine adiuvasti me et consolatus es me* (‘Show me a token for good: that they who hate me may see, and be confounded, because thou, O Lord, hast helped me and has comforted me’). The Septuagint reads ποίησον μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ σημεῖον εἰς ἀγαθόν καὶ ἰδέτωσαν οἱ μισοῦντές με καὶ αἰσχυνθήτωσαν, ὅτι σύ, κύριε, ἐβοήθησάς μοι καὶ παρεκάλεσάς με (‘Establish with me a token for good; and let them that hate me see [it] and be ashamed; because you, O Lord, has helped me, and comforted me’). The Targum reads as follows:

עביד עמי את לטבא בזמן דיעיל שלמה ברי ית ארונא בבית מקדשא יתפתחן

תרעיא אמטולתי ויחמון סנאי ארום שבקתא לי ויבהתון וידון ארום את יהוה סייעתני ונחמתני׃

(‘Perform for me a sign of good: in the time when Solomon my son brings the ark into the house of the sanctuary, let the gates be opened on my account; and let those who hate me see that you have pardoned me, and let them be put to shame and acknowledge that you, O Lord, have helped me and comforted me’).

The Peshitta renders the imperfect with the waw copulative, namely וְיִרְאוּ (waw cop. + qal imperf 3 masc pl ראה ‘to see’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with □ instead of a waw as would be expected, namely as □□□□□□ (rel □ + peal imperf 3 masc pl □□□ ‘to see’). This links the verb to the previous imperative, עֲשֵׂה or □□□. This is a good idiomatic translation of the Hebrew. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text in this instance.

The Vulgate has the verb *videant*, the present indicative active third person plural of *video videre* (‘to see’), while the Septuagint has ἰδέτωσαν, the aorist imperative active third person masculine plural of εἶδον; ὁράω (‘to see’). The Targum has the verb ויחמון (peal imperf 3 masc pl חמי). The Peshitta has an idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew construction of an imperative followed by an imperfect with waw, indicating the purpose of the imperative.

5.2.3.3 Imperfect with waw copulative as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:8b

The Masoretic Text reads יָמִיקוּ וידַבְּרוּ בְרָע עֹשֶׁק | מִמָּרוֹם יְדַבֵּרוּ (NIV: 'They scoff, and speak with malice; in their arrogance they threaten oppression'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ ('They thought and spoke evil and cruelty, against the supreme one. They spoke'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, namely וַיְדַבְּרוּ (waw copulative + piel imperf 3 masc pl דבר ('to speak'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect plus a waw, namely □□□□□ (conj + pael perf 3 masc pl □□□ ('to speak'). The Peshitta also renders the imperfect without waw as a perfect at the beginning of the verse as a perfect and remains consistent in the rendering of the verbs in this verse.

The Vulgate reads *Cogitaverunt et locuti sunt in nequitia iniquitatem in excelso locuti sunt* ('They have thought and spoken wickedness: they have spoken iniquity on high'), with the verb 'to speak', *locuti sunt,* the present indicative active third person masculine plural of *loquor loqui locutus* ('to speak'). The Septuagint reads διενοήθησαν καὶ ἐλάλησαν ἐν πονηρίᾳ, ἀδικίαν εἰς τὸ ὕψος ἐλάλησαν ('They have taken counsel and spoken in wickedness: they have uttered unrighteousness loftily'), with the verb ἐλάλησαν, the aorist indicative active third person masculine singular of λαλέω ('to talk'). The Targum reads לאבאשא ולטלומא מן רום לבהון ימללון יתמקמקון מן פיטמא וימללון ('They decay through fatness, and they speak of doing evil; and they speak of oppression out of the haughtiness of their heart), and it has the imperfect וימללון (conj ו + pael imperf 3 masc pl מלל 'to speak').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect with waw copulative and the Targum renders the verb as such, while the Peshitta has a perfect. The Vulgate has a perfect indicative active, while the Septuagint has the aorist. All have the waw before the verb. Only the Targum renders it in agreement with the Masoretic Text, while the others render it as an action in the past.

5.2.3.4 Imperfect with waw copulative as □ plus imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 83:17b

The Masoretic Text reads מַלֵּא פְנֵיהֶם קָלוֹן | וִיבַקְשׁוּ שִׁמְךָ יְהוָה (NIV: 'Cover their faces with shame so that men will seek your name, O Lord'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□¨□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ ('Cover their faces with reproach so that they seek your name, O Lord'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect with waw copulative, namely וִיבַקְשׁוּ (waw cop + piel imperf third person masc pl בקשׁ 'to seek, look for'), in the Masoretic Text as □ plus the imperfect, namely □□□□□□ (rel particle □ + peal imperf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to go to meet, appear, arise'). In the Masoretic Text, an imperative is often followed by an imperfect with waw to indicate the result or purpose of the imperative. The Peshitta understands the sequence in this instance and uses □ plus the imperfect to indicate purpose (Muraoka, 1987:43; 124; Nöldeke, 1966:198–199; Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:171).

The Vulgate reads *imple facies illorum ignominia et quaerent nomen tuum Domine* ('Fill their faces with shame; and they shall seek thy name, O Lord'), with the verb in the future, namely *quaerent* (future indic act 3 masc pl *quaero quaerere*). The Septuagint reads πλήρωσον τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἀτιμίας, καὶ ζητήσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά σου, κύριε ('Fill their faces with dishonor; so shall they seek thy name, O Lord'), with a verb in the future tense, ζητήσουσιν (future indic act 3 c pl ζητέω 'to seek'). The Targum reads מלי אפיהון קלנא ויבעון שמך יהוה ('Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek your name, O Lord'), with the verb in the imperfect tense, namely ויבעון (conj ו peal imperf 3 masc pl בעה/בעי 'to seek, request').

In this example, the Masoretic Text has an imperfect, which both the Peshitta and the Targum renders it as such. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render the verb as the future indicative active. Only the Peshitta makes the implied subordinate construction of the Masoretic Text explicit.

5.3. Imperatives in the Masoretic Text

5.3.1 Imperative as an imperative in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:2a

The Masoretic Text reads זְכֹר עֲדָתְךָ קָנִיתָ קֶדֶם (NIV: 'Remember the people you purchased of old'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ ('Remember the people that you purchased of old'). The Peshitta renders the imperative זְכֹר (qal imptv 2 masc sing זכר 'to remember') in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, namely □□□□□ (ethpeel imptv 2 masc sing □□□ 'to remember'), as could be expected. In this instance, the Peshitta uses the verb with the same root as in the Hebrew, but with the Aramaic variant first consonant. The Peshitta retains the word order as in the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate has *memor esto*, an adjective followed by the future active imperative of *sum esse*, while the Septuagint reads μνήσθητι, the aorist imperative passive. The Targum reads אדכר, which is the ethpeel imperative with the same consonants as the ones in the Peshitta.

In this instance, the other versions read the same as the Masoretic Text.

5.3.2 Imperative as no verb and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 82:4b

The Masoretic Text reads פַּלְּטוּ דַל וְאֶבְיוֹן | מִיַּד רְשָׁעִים הַצִּילוּ (NIV: 'Rescue the weak and needy; deliver them from the hand of the wicked'), while the Peshitta has □□□̈□□□ □□□ □□□□̈□□ □□□□ □□ □□̈□□□□ ('Deliver the poor and the needy from the hand of the wicked'). The Peshitta renders the imperative הַצִּילוּ (hiph imptv 2 masc pl נצל 'to deliver, take away') in the Masoretic Text as no verb. In this case, the Peshitta omits the verb. As a result of this omission, it has only one verb, while the Masoretic Text has two verbs, namely a verb for each line. The two verbs in the Masoretic Text are synonyms and omitting the verb at the end of the verse could be a way of simplifying the Hebrew.

The Vulgate reads *Eripite pauperem, et egenu de manu peccatoris liberate* ('Rescue the poor; and deliver the needy out of the hand of the sinner), with two imperatives ('eripite' and 'liberate'). The Septuagint reads ἐξέλεσθε πένητα καὶ πτωχόν, ἐκ χειρὸς ἁμαρτωλοῦ ῥύσασθε ('Deliver

needy and poor; rescue them from a sinner's hand'), with the verb ῥύσασθε, the aorist imperative middle second person plural of ῥύομαι. The Targum reads וחשוכא מן ידיהון דרשיעיא פצו יתהון שזיבו מסכן ('Rescue the poor and the weak; deliver them from the hands of the wicked'), with the verb פצו, which is a peal imperative plural of פצי.

In this instance, the other versions retain the second imperative of the Masoretic Text, with only the Peshitta having just one.

5.4. Jussives in the Masoretic Text

5.4.1 Jussive as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 83:2a

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

אֱלֹהִים אַל דֳּמִי לָךְ | אַל תֶּחֱרַשׁ וְאַל תִּשָּׁקֹט אֵל

(NIV: 'O God, do not keep silent; be not quiet, be not still').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□

('O God, who can compare to you? Do not be silent and do not cease, O God').

The Peshitta renders the jussive after אַל, אַל־תֶּחֱרַשׁ (negative particle אַל + qal jussive 2 masc sing חרשׁ 'to keep still, be silent') in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect after □□, namely □□□□□ (peal imperf 2 masc sing □□□ 'to be forced to keep silent, to be silent' + plus □□). At the beginning of the verse, there is a noun before אַל in the Masoretic Text, but the Peshitta translator did not understand it. Similar to Vulgate and Septuagint, he understood it as the verb דמה and used the Syriac equivalent.

The Vulgate reads *Deus, quis similis erit tibi? ne taceas, neque compesacaris, Deus* ('O God, who shall be like to thee? hold not thy peace, neither be thou still, O God'), with the verb *ne* (present imptv act 2 sing *ne*), while the Septuagint has θεός, τίς ὁμοιωθήσεταί σοι; μὴ σιγήσῃς μηδὲ καταπραΰνῃς, ὁ θεός ('O God, who shall be likened to you? Do not keep silent nor be appeased, O God!'), with the verb σιγήσῃς (aorist subj act 2 sing σιγάω). The Targum reads תשדוך אלהא

אלהים לא תשתוק לך לא תתרשל ולא ('O God, do not be silent; and do not be lax/weak or hold your peace, O God!'), with the verb תתרשל (ethpeel jussive 2 masc sing רשל).

In this instance, it is clear that the Peshitta translator did not understand the first part of the sentence as it is written in the Masoretic Text (He understood it in the same way as the Vulgate and the Septuagint). As a result, it is vital to examine the second part in the Masoretic Text containing the two jussives.

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

אַל־תֶּחֱרַשׁ וְאַל־תִּשְׁקַט אֵל

(NIV: 'be not quiet, O God, be not still').

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□
□□□□

('be not quiet, o God, be not still').

Here the two jussives after אַל in the Masoretic Text are rendered as an imperfect after □ □ by the Peshitta.

The Vulgate has *ne taceas neque conpescaris Deus*[47] ('Hold not thy peace, neither be thou still, O God), with two subjunctives following *ne*. The Septuagint has μὴ σιγήσῃς μηδὲ καταπραΰνῃς, ὁ θεός ('Do not keep silent nor be appeased, O God'), with the verb σιγήσῃς (aorist subj act 2 sing σιγάω). The Targum has two imperfects after לא אלהא תשדוך ולא תתרשל לא ('Do not be silent; and do not be lax/weak or hold your peace, O God!').

In this case, the Masoretic Text has two jussives in the second part of the sentence, both of which the Peshitta and the Targum render as imperfects. The Vulgate and the Septuagint render both as subjunctives.

[47]The text is from *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Bible, 1969).

5.4.2 Jussive as an imperfect plus *d* in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 85:9d

The Masoretic Text reads וְאַל יָשׁוּבוּ לְכִסְלָה (NIV: 'But let them not return to folly'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ ('so that they do return to their backsides'). The Peshitta renders the jussive after וְאַל, which is preceded by a waw, namely וְאַל יָשׁוּבוּ (qal jussive 3 masc pl שׁוּב 'to turn, return' + negative particle), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect following □□□, namely□□□□□□ □□□ (peal imperf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to return, come back' + negative particle). The Peshitta uses □ to render the Hebrew waw in the Masoretic Text. It interprets the final part of the verse as an expression of the purpose of the imperative at the beginning of the verse.

The Vulgate renders the line quite differently, without the negative, while the Septuagint has καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐπιστρέφοντας πρὸς αὐτὸν καρδίαν ('And to those that turn their heart to him), with the verb ἐπιστρέφοντας (pres part act masc pl ἐπιστρέφω). The Septuagint also does not retain the negative. The Targum reads ולא יחזרון לסאורא ('and let them not return to [their] original condition'), with the verb יחזרון (peal imperf 3 masc pl חזר). The Masoretic Text has a jussive, while the Peshitta has an imperfect. The Septuagint and the Vulgate do not retain the negative, while the Targum has the imperfect after לא.

5.4.3 Jussive as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

The Psalm 81:16c

The Masoretic Text has מְשַׂנְאֵי יְהוָה יְכַחֲשׁוּ לוֹ | וְיִהִי עִתָּם לְעוֹלָם (NIV: 'Those who hate the Lord would cringe [to be found liars] before him, and their punishment would last forever'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□¨□□□ □□ □□□□ ('The enemies of the Lord lied before him and their trembling last forever'). The Peshitta renders the jussive with the waw copulative, that is וְיִהִי (waw cop + qal jussive 3 masc sing הִיה 'to be'), in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus perfect, namely □□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 masc sing □□□/ □□□ 'to be, was').

The Vulgate has the following reading: *Inimici Domini mentiti sunt ei, et erit tempus eorum in saecula* ('The enemies of the Lord have lied to him: and their time shall be for ever'), with the verb *erit*, the future indicative of *sum*. The Septuagint has οἱ ἐχθροὶ κυρίου ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔσται ὁ καιρὸς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('The Lord's enemies have lied to him: but their time will be for ever'), with the verb ἔσται, the future middle third person singular of εἰμί. The Targum has the reading סנאי יהוה יכדבון ליה ויהי תוקפהון לעלם ('Those who hate the Lord would cringe toward him, and their anger [literally, 'their strength'] would be for ever), with the verb ויהי (conj + peal imperf 3 masc sing היה).

The Masoretic Text has a jussive, while the Peshitta renders the imperfect at the beginning of the verse as a perfect, and follows this rendering in the second verb to maintain consistency. The Vulgate also renders the verb as a future indicative. The Septuagint has a future middle and the Targum an imperfect. The Peshitta renders the verb as a perfect, and not as a jussive, thus following its own language structure and syntax.

5.5 Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text

5.5.1 Cohortative as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:17b

The Masoretic Text reads עַד אָבוֹא אֶל מִקְדְּשֵׁי אֵל | אָבִינָה לְאַחֲרִיתָם (NIV: 'Till I entered the sanctuary of God, then I understood their final destiny'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ ('Until I entered the sanctuary of God, then I understood their destiny'). The Peshitta renders the cohortative, that is אָבִינָה (qal cohortative 1 c sing בין + הָ 'to understand'), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, namely □□□□□□ (conj + ethpeel imperf 1 c sing □□□ ('to understand').

The Vulgate reads *donec intrem in sanctuarium Dei, et intelligam in novissimis eorum* ('Until I go into the sanctuary of God, and understand concerning their last ends'), with the verb *intelligam* (future indic act). The Septuagint has ἕως εἰσέλθω εἰς τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ συνῶ εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα αὐτῶν ('Until I go into the sanctuary of God; and so understand their latter end'), with the verb συνῶ (aorist subj act 1 c sing συνίημι). The Targum reads אלהא אתבין לסופיהון

עד זמן פורקנא דאיתי לות מקדשי (‘Until the time of redemption when I shall go into the sanctuary of God, [and] I shall understand their end’), with the verb אתבין (ethpaal imperf 1 c sing בין).

The Masoretic Text has a cohortative, while the Peshitta has an imperfect. The Vulgate has the future indicative active, while the Septuagint has the subjunctive and the Targum uses an imperfect like the Peshitta does.

5.5.2 Cohortative as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 77:2a

The Masoretic Text reads קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְאֶצְעָקָה | קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְהַאֲזִין אֵלָי (NIV: ‘I cried out to God for help; I cried out to God to hear me’), while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ (‘With my voice I cried out to God and He heard me, and my voice roused up to him and he answered me’). The Peshitta renders a waw copulative with a cohortative, that is וְאֶצְעָקָה (waw cop + qal cohortative 1 c sing צעק ‘to cry’), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without a waw, that is □□□□ (peal perf 1 c sing □□□ ‘to cry’). The Vulgate reads *Voce mea ad Dominum clamavi; voce mea ad Deum, et intendit mihi* (‘I cried to the Lord with my voice; to God with my voice, and he gave ear to me’), with the verb *clamavi* (perf indic act 1 sing *clamo clamare*). The Septuagint reads Φωνῇ μου πρὸς κύριον ἐκέκραξα, φωνή μου πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ προσέσχεν μοι (‘I cried to the Lord with my voice, yea, my voice was addressed to God; and he gave heed to me’), with the verb ἐκέκραξα (aorist indic act 1 c sing κράζω). The Targum has the reading אצית מימרי קלי קדם יהוה ואקביל קלי קדם אלהא (‘I cry aloud before God; I cry aloud before God, that he may listen to my word’), with the verb ואקביל (conj + pael imperf 1 c sing קבל).

In this case, the Masoretic Text has a cohortative, which the Peshitta, Vulgate and the Targum render as a perfect, while the Septuagint renders it as an aorist indicative active. The Targum has an imperfect, as one would expect.

5.5.3 Cohortative as no verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 77:12b

The Masoretic Text reads אזכיר [אָזְכּוֹר קרי] מַעַלְלֵי יָהּ | כִּי אֶזְכְּרָה מִקֶּדֶם פִּלְאֶךָ (NIV: 'I will remember the deeds of the Lord; yes, I will remember your miracles of long ago')/'I will remember the works of the Lord, surely I will remember your wonders of old'). In contrast, the Peshitta has □□□ □□ ̈□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ ('I will remember your previous deeds'). The Peshitta does not render the cohortative, namely אֶזְכְּרָה (qal cohortative 1 c sing זכר 'to remember'), in the Masoretic Text. Because the Peshitta is shortening the verse as found in the Masoretic Text, the one half of the verse is not translated.

The Vulgate reads *Memor fui operum Domini, quia memor ero ab initiomirabilium tuirum* ('I remembered the works of the Lord: for I will be mindful of thy wonders from the beginning'), with the verb *fui* (perf indic act 1 sing *sum esse*). The Septuagint has ἐμνήσθην τῶν ἔργων κυρίου, ὅτι μνησθήσομαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν θαυμασίων σου ('I called to mind the works of the Lord, because I will remember your wonders of old'), with the verb ἐμνήσθην (aorist indic pass 1 sing μιμνήσκω). The Targum reads אדכר עובדי אלהא ארום אדכר מן לקדמין פרישותך ('I will recall the deeds of the Lord; yea, I will remember your wonders from old'), with the verb אדכר (peal imperf 1 sing דכר).

The Peshitta is the only version omitting the second half of the verse.

5.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text

5.6.1 A participle as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

In this section, attention is paid to the participles in the Masoretic Text rendered as participles in the Peshitta.

Psalm 74:5b

The Masoretic Text has יִוָּדַע כְּמֵבִיא לְמָעְלָה | בְּסָבָךְ עֵץ קַרְדֻּמּוֹת (NIV: 'They behaved like men wielding axes to cut through a thicket of trees'). The Peshitta reads □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□ ̈□□□ □□ ̈□□□ □□□ □□□ ('And she/I know(s) like one raising upwards like a forest of trees with axes'). Although the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta both have

texts difficult to understand, the Peshitta renders the participle כְּמֵבִיא (prep כְּ + hiph ptc masc sing בוא 'to enter/go in, penetrate') in the Masoretic Text as a participle, namely □□□□□ (pael ptc masc sing of □□□ 'to raise, to exalt').

The Vulgate reads *et non cognoverunt sicut in exitu super summum. Quasi in silva lignorum securibus* ('And they knew not both in the going out and on the highest top. As with axes in a wood of trees'). It renders the participle as the noun *exitus*, according to the sense of the Masoretic Text. The Septuagint reads ὡς εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον ὑπεράνω ('As though into the entrance above'), with εἴσοδον (noun acc fem sing εἴσοδος 'entrance above/upper entrance'). The Targum reads יצליף בקורנסא היך גבר דמרים ידיה בסביך קיסיא למקטע בכולביא ('He strikes with a hammer like a man who raises his hand in a thicket of trees to cut with axes'), with the verb יצליף (peal imperf 3 masc sing of צלף 'to strike').

In this instance, the other versions do not use a participle as the Masoretic Text does, which is an indication of the problems relating to the interpretation of the verse. The Hebrew of this verse is very difficult and not easy to interpret, especially the first word, יְוָדַע, about which textual critics differ (cf Alter, 2007:258; Hossfeld and Zenger, 2005:240). The first verb as found in the Hebrew text of this verse does not have a direct object and this creates a huge problem in interpreting or translating this verse (cf Tate, 1990:243). Following Tate (1990:242), the verse can be rendered as two lines namely, (1) 'It seemed as if someone swung axes upward'; (2) 'It seemed as if someone brought axes up…' The verse is to be retained as in the Masoretic Text.

5.6.2 A participle as a participle in a relative construction with □ in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:12b

The Masoretic Text has the following:

וֵאלֹהִים מַלְכִּי מִקֶּדֶם | פֹּעֵל יְשׁוּעוֹת בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ

(NIV: 'But you, O God, are my king from of old; you bring salvation upon the earth').

The Peshitta has:

P: □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□ □□□□

('But our God is king, who brings salvation upon the middle of the earth').

The Peshitta renders the participle, namely פֹּעֵל (qal act ptc. פעל 'to make/make something into something', 'to do')], in the Masoretic Text as a participle with □, namely □□□□ (probably peal ptc □□□ + □ 'to do'). Similar examples are 74:23c and 74:23d. The Peshitta uses a participle with relative □ to express the idea of futurity or prospective presence (Muraoka, 1987:43). The rendering of the participle as it is found in the Masoretic Text as a participle + □ in the Peshitta occurs often. The translator used this combination to express the idea of the future, prospective present and surety of fulfilment in the same way as the English construction 'be going to' + infinitive (Muraoka, 1987:43).

The Vulgate reads *Deus autem rex noster ante saecula: operatus est salute in medio terrae* ('But God is our King before ages: he hath wrought salvation in the midst of the earth'). The Septuagint reads ὁ δὲ θεὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν πρὸ αἰῶνος, εἰργάσατο σωτηρίαν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς ('Yet God is our King from old; he worked salvation in the midst of the earth'), with the verb εἰργάσατο (aorist indic middle 3 sing ἐργάζομαι 'to work/labour'). The Targum reads עביד פורקנא בגו ארעא ואלהא מלכא דשכינת קודשיה מלקדמין ('Yet God is the King whose holy Shekinah has from of old been working deliverance in the midst of the land'), with the verb עביד (peal ptc עבד). This is in agreement with the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate renders the participle as a perfect of the verb *operor operari* and the Septuagint also uses a finite verb.

Each one of the translations renders the Hebrew participle in a way that makes sense in the different languages.

5.6.3 A participle as a noun in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:3b

The Masoretic Text has the following:

כִּי קִנֵּאתִי בַּהוֹלְלִים

(NIV: 'For I envied the arrogant').

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□ ̈□□□ □□□□ □□□

(For I was jealous of the boastful/arrogant).

The Peshitta renders the participle with preposition plus definite article, that is בַּהוֹלְלִים (prep + def art הַ + qal act ptc masc pl הלל ‘be confused, deluded, be infatuated, make fool of’), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is □□□□□ (noun masc pl □□□). The Hebrew verb is not well known; hence the Peshitta renders it as a noun.

The Vulgate reads *quia zelavi super iniquis* (‘Because I had a zeal on occasion of the wicked’), with an adjective for the Hebrew participle (*iniquus*). The Septuagint has ὅτι ἐζήλωσα ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνόμοις[48] (‘for I was envious of the lawless’), also using an adjective (ἄνομος). The Targum reads ארום טננית מתלעביא בעידן (‘For I was envious of those who mocked’). It uses a participle like the Masoretic Text (מתלעביא).

5.6.4 A participle as an imperfect in a relative construction with □ in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 81:11a

The Masoretic Text reads the following:

אָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הַמַּעַלְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

(NIV: ‘I am the Lord your God, who brought you up out of Egypt’).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□
□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□

(‘I, I am the Lord your God, who brought you up from the land of Egypt’).

The Peshitta renders a participle with suffix and the article in a relative construction, namely הַמַּעַלְךָ (hiph ptc + suff 2 masc sing עלה ‘bring up, lead up’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect with suffix plus relative particle □, namely □□□□□□ (rel □ + aphel imperf 2 masc sing □□□ ‘to make ascend’, ‘to raise up’, ‘to offer/sacrifice’). The Peshitta has a good translation for the Hebrew construction in the Masoretic Text.

The Vulgate reads *Ego enim sum Dominus Deus tuus, qui eduxi te de terra Egypti. Dilata os tuum, et implebo illu* (‘For I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt: open thy

[48] The English translation of the Greek 73:3b is from Rahlfs (1979a).

mouth wide, and I will fill it'), with the verb *eduxi*, the perfect indicative active first person singular of *educo educare* ('to bring up') in a relative sentence.

The Septuagint reads as follows:

ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὁ ἀναγαγών σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
πλάτυνον τὸ στόμα σου, καὶ πληρώσω αὐτό

('I am the Lord your God, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt. Open your mouth wide, and I will fill it').

The verb ἀναγαγών is the aorist participle active nominative masculine singular of ἀνάγω.

The Targum has the following:

אנא יהוה אלהך דאסיקית יתכון מארעא דמצרים אפתי פומך בפתגמי אוריתא
ואמלי יתה מכל טבתא

('I am the Lord your God, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt; open wide your mouth with the words of the law, and I will fill it with all good things').

The verb is the conjunction דאסיקית plus the aphel participle of סלק ('to bring/lift up'). All the versions have a good idiomatic translation of the Hebrew construction.

5.6.5 A participle as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 76:7

The Masoretic Text has the following:

מִגַּעֲרָתְךָ אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב | נִרְדָּם וְרֶכֶב וָסוּס

(NIV: 'At your rebuke, O God of Jacob, both horse and chariot lie still [snore/fell in deep sleep]').

The Peshitta reads

□□□·□ □□□·□ □□□ □□□□ □□
□□□□□□ □□□□

('At your rebuke, O God of Jacob, the horsemen of the chariots fell asleep').

The Peshitta renders the participle, namely נִרְדָּם (niph ptc masc sing רדם 'to snore, be in deep sleep, lie stupefied'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect, namely □□□ (peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to sleep, fall asleep'). The Peshitta renders this participle in singular as a perfect plural,

because it renders the subject in the plural. The Peshitta translator probably read the Hebrew participle as a perfect in an unvocalised Hebrew text.

The Vulgate reads *Ab increpatione tua, Deus Jacob, dormitaverunt qui ascenderunt equos* ('At thy rebuke, O God of Jacob, they have all slumbered that mounted on horseback'), with the verb *dormitaverunt*, the perfect indicative active third person plural of *dormito dormitare*. The Septuagint reads ἀπὸ ἐπιτιμήσεώς σου, ὁ θεὸς Ιακωβ, ἐνύσταξαν οἱ ἐπιβεβηκότες τοὺς ἵππους ('At thy rebuke, O God of Jacob, both rider and horse lay stunned'), with the verb ἐνύσταξαν, the aorist indicative active third person plural of νυστάζω. The Targum reads ממזופיתך אלהא דיעקב דמכון ארתכין ופרשין איתעקרו ('At your rebuke, O God of Jacob, they go to sleep; and chariots and riders are hamstrung'), with the verb דמכון (peal perf 3 masc pl דמך 'to go to sleep').

It is quite possible that all the versions read the Hebrew as a perfect in an unvocalised Hebrew *Vorlage*.

5.6.6 A participle as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 78:4b

The Masoretic Text has the following:

לֹא נְכַחֵד מִבְּנֵיהֶם לְדוֹר אַחֲרוֹן מְסַפְּרִים תְּהִלּוֹת יְהוָה

וְעֻזּוֹ וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה

(NIV: 'We will not hide them from their children; we will tell the next generation the praiseworthy deeds of the Lord, his power, and the wonders that he has done').

The Peshitta reads the following:

□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□
□□ □□□¨□□□ □□
□□□□ □□¨□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□¨□□ □□□□
□□□□□

('We will not hide from their children, but tell to the coming generation the glorious deeds of the Lord, and his might, and the wonders that he has done').

The Peshitta renders the participle, that is מְסַפְּרִים (piel ptc masc pl ספר ‘to declare, tell’), in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect, that is □□□□□ (ethpaal imperf 1 c pl □□□ ‘to declare, tell’).

The Vulgate reads *Non sunt occultata a filiis eorum in generatione altera, narrantes laudes Domini et virtutes ejus, et mirabilia ejus quae fecit* (‘They have not been hidden from their children, in another generation. Declaring the praises of the Lord, and his powers, and his wonders which he hath done’), with the verb *narrantes*, a present participle of *narro narrare* ('to tell').

The Targum reads the following:

לא נכסי מבניהון לדר בתראי משתעיין תושבחתא דיהוה ועושניה ופרישוותיה
די עבד

(‘We will not hide them from their children, telling the next generation the praises of the Lord and his strength, and his wonderful deeds that he has performed’).

The verb משתעיין is an ethpaal participle of the verb שׁעי.

The Septuagint also uses a participle, namely ἀπαγγέλλοντες, the present participle active of ἀπαγγέλλω:

οὐκ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν εἰς γενεὰν ἑτέραν ἀπαγγέλλοντες τὰς αἰνέσεις τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὰς δυναστείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ, ἃ ἐποίησεν[49]

(‘They were not hidden from their children for a single generation, as they kept telling of the praises of the Lord and of his sovereignty, and of the wonders that he did’).

In this instance, the three other versions follow the Masoretic Text in using a participle.

5.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text

5.7.1 Infinitive construct as an infinitive in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 76:10c

The Masoretic Text reads the following:

[49] The English translation of the Greek Psalm 78:4b is from Rahlfs (1979c).

בְּקוּם לַמִּשְׁפָּט אֱלֹהִים | לְהוֹשִׁיעַ כָּל עַנְוֵי אֶרֶץ סֶלָה

(NIV: 'When you, O God, rose up to judge, to save all the afflicted of the land. *Selah*').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□ □□¨□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

('When you, O God, rose up to judgment and to save all the afflicted/humble of the earth').

The Peshitta renders the infinitive construct with preposition, namely לְ, לְהוֹשִׁיעַ (prep ל + hiph inf constr יׁשע 'to save, rescue'), in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus □ plus an infinitive, namely □□□□□□ (waw + □ + peal inf □□□ 'to save, rescue'). In this instance, the Peshitta adds the waw, which is not present in the Masoretic Text, thus coordinating this infinitive with the previous one.

The Vulgate reads *cum exsurgeret injudicium Deus, ut salvos faceret omnes mansuetos terrae* ('When God arose in judgment, to save all the meek of the earth'), with the verb *faceret*, the imperfect subjunctive active third person singular of *facio facere* ('to make', amongst others). The infinitive of the Hebrew is correctly rendered as a final clause in the Latin. The Septuagint reads ἐν τῷ ἀναστῆναι εἰς κρίσιν τὸν θεὸν τοῦ σῶσαι πάντας τοὺς πραεῖς τῆς γῆς διάψαλμα ('When God arose to establish judgment to save all the oppressed of the earth'), with the verb σῶσαι, the aorist infinitive active of σώζω/σῴζω. The Targum reads מן ידהון כל עינוותני ארעא לעלמין: אמרין צדיקיא יקום לדינא עם רשיעיא אלהא למפרק ('The righteous say, "Let God arise for judgment with the wicked, to deliver from their hands all the meek of the land." For ever'), with the verb למפרק (prep ל + peal inf פרק).

Only the Vulgate does not follow the infinitive of the Masoretic Text, but uses a more idiomatic Latin construction.

5.7.2 Infinitive construct as a construction with □ (relative or otherwise) in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:20a

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ | אֲדֹנָי בָּעִיר צַלְמָם תִּבְזֶה

(NIV: 'As a dream when one awakes, so when you arise, O Lord, you will despise them as fantasies')/('They are like a dream after one wakes up. O Lord, when you awake you will despise them').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□
□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

('[Like one who awakes when he sees a dream, O Lord in the calling [or in the city] you treat their image with contempt').

The Peshitta renders the infinitive construct with the preposition, namely מִן, מֵהָקִיץ (prep מִן + hiph inf constr קוּץ/קיץ 'to be awake'), in the Masoretic Text as a participle plus □, namely □□□□□□□ (□ + ethpeel part masc sing □□□ ('to be awake').

The Vulgate reads *Velut somnium surgentium, Domine, in civitate tua imaginem ipsorum ad nihilum rediges* ('As the dream of them that awake, O Lord; so in thy city thou shalt bring their image to nothing'), with the verb *surgentium*, the present participle active plural of *surgo surgere*. The Septuagint reads ὡσεὶ ἐνύπνιον ἐξεγειρομένου, κύριε, ἐν τῇ πόλει σου τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτῶν ἐξουδενώσεις ('They are like a dream when one awakes, on awaking you despise their phantoms), with the verb ἐξεγειρομένου (pres part pass/part middle masc sing ἐξεγείρω).

The Targum has the following:

היך חילמא מן גבר דמיתער יהוה ליום דינא רבא באתעריתהון מן בית קבורתהון
ברגז דמותהון תבסר

('As a dream from a drunken man who awakens, O Lord, at the day of the great judgment when they awake from their graves, with anger you will despise their image').

The verb is דמיתער, an ethpeel participle singular of עיר.

In this instance, the Masoretic Text has an infinitive construct plus preposition, which is rendered by the Peshitta, the Vulgate, the Targum and the Septuagint as a participle.

5.7.3 Infinitive construct as a noun in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:20b

The Masoretic Text has the following:

כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ | אֲדֹנָי בָּעִיר צַלְמָם תִּבְזֶה

(NIV: 'As a dream when one awakes, so when you arise, O Lord, you will despise them as fantasies')/('They are like a dream after one wakes up. O Lord, when you awake you will despise them').

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□
□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

('[They are] like one who awakes when he sees a dream. O Lord in a town you treat their image with contempt').

The Peshitta renders the infinitive construct with the preposition, namely בְּ, בָּעִיר (prep בְּ + hiph inf constr עוּר 'in awaking'), in the Masoretic Text as a noun, that is □□□□□□ (prep □ + noun fem sing □□□□□□ 'city'/'field'). The Peshitta retains the word order of the Masoretic Text. It is significant to bear in mind that the Peshitta translator had an unvocalised Hebrew text before him. The verb עִיר in the Hebrew creates confusion as it has the same consonants as the Hebrew noun for 'city'. When combined with the preposition בְּ plus the definite article הַ (בָּעִיר), it will translate as 'in the city'. The Peshitta interprets this verb as the noun 'city' (It could also be from the word "calling", "cockcrow" which would be in line with the Masoretic Text. It is probable, however, that the Peshitta follows the Septuagint in reading "city". This verb (בָּעִיר) is the contracted form of בְּהָעִיר (hiph inf constr + בְּ temporal) of the root עוּר 'to raise oneself or awake') (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:149; Kraus, 1993:84; Tate, 1990:229). Hence the footnote proposes that בְּהָעִיר is equal or the same as בָּעִיר, or should perhaps be read as בְּעוּרְךָ if compared to the Septuagint, which reads 'awakening'. Syriac interprets it as the word for □□□□□□ (בָּעִיר 'a city') and translates it as such.

The Vulgate reads *quasi somnium evigilantis Domine in civitate tua imaginem eorum ad nihilum rediges* ('As the dream of them that awake, O Lord; so in thy city thou shalt bring their image to nothing'). The Vulgate also renders the Hebrew verb as the noun for 'city'. The Targum renders it as the verb 'who awakens'.

In this instance, the Masoretic Text has an infinitive construct, which both the Targum and the Septuagint render as a verb. The Peshitta and the Vulgate render the verb in Hebrew as a noun, with a different understanding of the Hebrew word.

5.7.4 Infinitive construct as □□ plus perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 81:6b

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

עֵדוּת בִּיהוֹסֵף שָׂמוֹ בְּצֵאתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

(NIV: 'He established it as a statute for Joseph when he went out against [the land of] Egypt').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□

('He established it as a statute for Joseph when he went out against the land of Egypt').

The Peshitta renders the infinitive construct with the preposition בְּ, namely בְּצֵאתוֹ (prep בְּ + qal inf constr + suff 3 masc sing יצא 'come out, come forth'), in the Masoretic Text as a perfect preceded by □□, namely □□□ (peal perf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to go/come out']. The Peshitta in this instance uses □□ to render the Hebrew preposition בְּ. This is an idiomatic rendering in the Peshitta.

The Vulgate reads *Testimonium in Joseph posuit illud, cum exiret de terra Egypti* ('He ordained it for a testimony in Joseph, when he came out of the land of Egypt'), with the verb *exiret*, the imperfect subjunctive active third person singular of *exeo exire* ('to go out; march out'). The Septuagint has μαρτύριον ἐν τῷ Ιωσηφ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ('He made him a solemn charge in Joseph, when he went out from the land of Egypt), with the infinitive construction ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν (aorist inf active of ἐξέρχομαι).

The Targum has the following:

סהדותא. על יהוסף שויה דלא קריב לאתת ריבוניה ביה ביומא נפיק מבית אסירי
ושלית בכל ארעא דמצרים

('He gave testimony concerning Joseph that he did not draw near to the wife of his master: in the day when he came out of prison and ruled over the land of Egypt').

The Targum has an expansive translation. It renders the infinitival construction of the Masoretic Text as ביומא נפיק, that is as a participle.

In this case, the Masoretic Text has an infinitive construct with the preposition בְּ and the Peshitta renders it as the combination of □□ plus perfect. The same Hebrew is rendered by the Vulgate as an imperfect subjunctive. The Septuagint has an aorist subjunctive active, while the Targum has a participle.

5.8 No verb constructs in the Masoretic Text

5.8.1 No verb as a finite verb in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 73:18c

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

אַךְ בַּחֲלָקוֹת תָּשִׁית לָמוֹ | הִפַּלְתָּם לְמַשּׁוּאוֹת

(NIV: 'Surely you place them on slippery ground; you cast them down to ruin').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□

('Surely you place them on slippery ground and you throw them when they were haughty').

The Peshitta renders the Hebrew noun מַשּׁוּאוֹת plus the preposition לְ, that is לְמַשּׁוּאוֹת meaning 'ruin', as an imperfect verb, namely □□□□□□□□ (ethpeel imperf 3 masc pl □□□, 'to be haughty'). The Hebrew has a rare noun; thus the Peshitta renders it as a verb with a meaning close to the root of the Hebrew noun used in the Masoretic Text, but it sees it as *nun sin aleph* (נשׂא) in Hebrew. The unvocalised Hebrew text complicates the case further. This indicates a clear case of misinterpreting the Hebrew.

The Vulgate reads *Verumtamen propter dolos posuisti eis; dejecisti eos dum allevarentur* ('But indeed for deceits thou hast put it to them: when they were lifted up thou hast cast them down'), with the verb *dejecisti*, the perfect indicative active second person singular of *deicio deicere* ('to throw down'). The Septuagint has πλὴν διὰ τὰς δολιότητας ἔθου αὐτοῖς, κατέβαλες αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ἐπαρθῆναι ('But on account of their deceitfulness you set for them; you brought them down when they were raised up), with the verb ἐπαρθῆναι, the aorist infinitive passive of ἐπαίρω. The Targum reads ברם בקבליא שויתא להון רמיתנון לשוותא ('But on account of their

deceitfulness you set for them; you brought them down when they were raised up), with the verb רמיתנון, the peal perfect third person masculine plural of רמי/רמה (‘to throw/place’).

In this case, the Masoretic Text has a noun with preposition ל, which the Peshitta renders as an imperfect, while both the Vulgate and the Targum render it as a perfect and the Septuagint as an aorist infinitive. It is quite clear that all the versions have a problem understanding the Hebrew.

5.8.2 No verb as a participle in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 74:3b

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

הָרִימָה פְעָמֶיךָ לְמַשֵּׁאוֹת נֶצַח

(NIV: ‘Turn your steps towards these everlasting ruins’).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□ □□ □□□ּ□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□

(‘Raise your servants against those who raises themselves against your power’).

The Peshitta renders the noun with the preposition ל, namely לְמַשֵּׁאוֹת (noun fem sing משׂואה ‘deception’/’ruin’), in the Masoretic Text as a verb in a participle form, namely □□□□□□ (ethpaal part masc pl □□□ ‘those who raised themselves against your power’). The Peshitta in this instance probably sees a form of the verb נשׂא in the Hebrew; hence it renders this noun as a verb. The Peshitta does not read the same as the Masoretic Text; it also deviates with regard to the first noun in the sentence.

The Vulgate reads *Leva manus tuas in superbias eorum in finem* (‘Lift up thy hands against their pride unto the end’), with the noun *superbia.* The Septuagint reads ἔπαρον τὰς χεῖράς σου ἐπὶ τὰς ὑπερηφανίας αὐτῶν εἰς τέλος (‘Raise your hands totally against their acts of pride), with the noun ὑπερηφανίας (noun gen fem sing ὑπερηφανία). The Targum has למשווח אומיא לעלמין אריס אסתורך (‘Lift up your steps to destroy the nations for ever). It also regards the problematic word as a verb, namely למשווח, an infinitive of the verb שוח.

In this case, the Masoretic Text has a noun and the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as such, while the Peshitta renders it as participle and the Targum as an infinitive.

5.8.3 No verb as an infinitive in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 76:10b

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

בְּקוּם לַמִּשְׁפָּט אֱלֹהִים | לְהוֹשִׁיעַ כָּל עַנְוֵי אֶרֶץ סֶלָה

(NIV: 'When you, O God, rose up to judge, to save all the afflicted of the land. *Selah*').

The Peshitta has:

□□□□□ □□¨□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□
□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

('When you, O God, rose up to judgment and save all the afflicted/humble of the earth').

The Peshitta renders the noun לַמִּשְׁפָּט (prep לְ + def art הַ + noun masc sing מִשְׁפָּט 'legal decision' > 'justice, lawsuit') in the Masoretic Text as the preposition לְ plus an infinitive, namely □□□□ (prep □ + peal inf of verb □□□). Aramaic does not have the cognate noun for 'judgment' as in Hebrew; hence the verb □□□ is used to translate 'judgment' (*mishpat*). The Peshitta adds a verb not found in the Masoretic Text, but uses it to render the noun in the Masoretic Text.

The Vulgate reads *cum exsurgeret in judicium Deus, ut salvos faceret omnes mansuetos terrae* ('When God arose in judgment, to save all the meek of the earth') rendering the noun as a noun. The Septuagint reads ἐν τῷ ἀναστῆναι εἰς κρίσιν τὸν θεὸν τοῦ σῶσαι πάντας τοὺς πραεῖς τῆς γῆς διάψαλμα ('When God arose to establish judgment to save all the oppressed of the earth'), with a noun for the Hebrew noun. The Targum reads למפרק מן ידהון כל עינוותני ארעא לעלמין: אמרין צדיקיא יקום לדינא עם רשיעיא אלהא ('The righteous say, "Let God arise for judgment with the wicked, to deliver from their hands all the meek of the land." For ever'), with a noun for the Hebrew noun.

Only the Peshitta deviates from the noun in the Masoretic Text.

5.8.4 No verb as an imperfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 88:16d

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta read as follows respectively:

עָנִי אֲנִי וְגוֹעַ מִנֹּעַר | נָשָׂאתִי אֵמֶיךָ אָפוּנָה

(NIV: 'From my youth I have been afflicted and close to death; I have suffered your terrors and am in despair');

□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□

('I am poor and unable from my youth, I am elevated and I am spread out and I am shocked').

In this instance, the Peshitta has an extra verb, □□□□□ (conj + aphel imperf 2 masc sing □□□ 'to be dazed, amazed, shocked, confounded" which has no correspondence in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta does not translate 'your terrors'. This will receive further attention in Chapter 6,[50] since the whole verse (88:16) requires more attention. The Septuagint translates 'your terrors' as in the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate also translates 'your terrors', following the Hebrew. The Vulgate has *pauper ego et aerumnosus ab adulescentia portavi furorem tuum et conturbatus sum* ('I am poor, and in labours from my youth: and being exalted have been humbled and troubled'). The Targum also has 'your terror'.

In this case all the versions including the Peshitta follow the Masoretic Text.

5.8.5 No verb as a perfect in the Peshitta and its rendering in the other versions

Psalm 89:35c

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta read as follows respectively:

לֹא אֲחַלֵּל בְּרִיתִי | וּמוֹצָא שְׂפָתַי לֹא אֲשַׁנֶּה

(NIV: 'I will not violate my covenant or alter what my lips have uttered');

□□□□□ □□ □□□□ּ□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□ □□□□

('I will not despise my covenant and everything that went out from my lips I will not change').

[50] See 6.3.5 Additions (Carbajosa, 2008:38–42) (p. 422).

The Peshitta renders the noun in a construct state, that is וּמוֹצָא (noun masc sing in construct state מֹצָא/מוֹצָא ‘what comes out [of lips, mouth]’) in the Masoretic Text as perfect plus a relative particle ☐, that is ☐☐☐☐ (rel ☐ + peal perf 3 masc sing ☐☐☐ ‘to go out’). The Peshitta uses ☐ to render the conjunction in the Masoretic Text. This is a good idiomatic translation.

The Vulgate reads *neque profanabo testamentum meum: et quae procedunt de labiis meis non faciam irrita* (‘Neither will I profane my covenant: and the words that proceed from my mouth I will not make void’), with the verb *procedunt*, the present indicative active third person plural of *procedo procedere*. The Septuagint reads οὐδὲ μὴ βεβηλώσω τὴν διαθήκην μου καὶ τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα διὰ τῶν χειλέων μου οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσω (‘Nor will I violate my covenant, or set aside the words that went forth from my lips’), with the verb ἐκπορευόμενα, the present participle passive/middle plural of ἐκπορεύομαι. The Targum reads קיימי ומפקנות סיפותי לא אשני לא אפים (‘I will not violate my covenant, or change what has gone forth from my lips’), with the noun מפקנות for the Hebrew noun. The Septuagint and the Vulgate follow the same route as the Peshitta.

5.9 Texts with text-critical issues

In this section, not all the text-critical problems in Psalms 73–89 will be treated, but only those that are related to the verbs and that are indicated in the introduction of this chapter. They are the examples of text-critical issues that have been indicated in various instances in Chapter 4 and are important for this study.

Psalm 73:2

The Masoretic Text has the following:

כְּאַ֭יִן שִׁפְכָה [שֻׁפְכוּ קרי] אֲשֻׁרָי

וַאֲנִי כִּמְעַט נטוי [נָטָיוּ קרי] רַגְלָי

(NIV: ‘But as for me, my feet had almost slipped; I had nearly lost my foothold’).

The Peshitta reads as follows:

☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

☐☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

('But for me, for a short while my feet deviated, and my going was almost poured out').

The Vulgate has *Mei autem pene moti sunt pedes, pene effuse sunt gressus mei* ('But as for me, my feet were almost shaken; my steps nearly slipped'). The Septuagint has ἐμοῦ δὲ παρὰ μικρὸν ἐσαλεύθησαν οἱ πόδες, παρ᾽ ὀλίγον ἐξεχύθη τὰ διαβήματά μου ('But as for me, my feet were almost shaken; my steps nearly slipped'). The Targum has ריגלי כלמא דאזדעזעא איסתוורי ואנא כזעיר אתמוטטא ('But as for me, my feet almost stumbled, my steps had nearly been shaken').

In Psalm 73:2, there are two verbs that have a typical Kethib/Qere issue.

The first of these verbs is נָטוּי**.** The footnote of the BHS reads 'l c Q mlt Mss Vrs נָטָיוּ; K נָטוּי.' The BHS proposes that the Qere should be read נָטָיוּ, the qal perfect third person plural, of which רַגְלָי is the subject. The Kethib has a qal passive participle of the same verb. The verb שֻׁפְכֵה should be read with the Qere as שֻׁפְכוּ, the pual perfect third person plural or qal passive, 'having been poured out', with אֲשֻׁרָי as the subject (Hossfeld and Zenger, 2005:223). The Kethib reads שֻׁפְכָה, the third person feminine singular, and it understands 'steps' as a collective concept (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:223). According to Briggs and Briggs (1907:148), it is most probable that the Masoretic Text interprets רַגְלָי as the singular and אֲשֻׁרָי as the plural. If this is indeed the case, it would mean that the Kethib is correct in both cases.

The Syriac renders this Hebrew verb, נָטָיוּ, as ܗܘ̈ܐ ܕܗ̈ܘ̈ܝܢ, which is a combination of a participle and the perfect verb ܗܘܐ ('to be'). The Peshitta has an ethpeel participle feminine plural of the verb ܙܠܠ ('to deviate') plus a peal perfect third person feminine plural of ܗܘܐ ('to be'). The Syriac uses a participle plus enclitic ܗܘܐ ('to be') to indicate an ongoing, repeated or habitual action in the past (Muraoka, 1987:46; Nöldeke, 1966: 197). The Syriac also uses the feminine plural as the subject ('feet'), as body parts are feminine. The second verb is ܡܙ̈ܙ̈ܠ̈ܢ, the ethpeel participle masculine plural of ܙܠܠ ('to be poured') plus ܗ̈ܘ̈ܝܢ, the peal perfect third person femine plural of ܗܘܐ ('to be').

The Vulgate has the verbs *moti sunt* (perf part pass *moveo movere* + the present indic act 3 pl of *sum esse*) and *effuse sunt* (perf part pass *effundo effundere* + present indic 3 pl of *sum* esse). The Septuagint renders the Hebrew verb as ἐσαλεύθησαν (aorist indic pass 3 masc pl σαλεύω 'to

shake') and ἐξεχύθη (aorist indic pass 3 sing ἐκχέω), while the Targum employs the use of אתמוטטא (ethpeel perf 3 pl of מוט + דאזדעזעא, conj + quadriliteral perf 3 pl זוע).

In this instance, the versions all support the reading of the Qere, as indicated by BHS. In the first instance, the Hebrew would then have had a perfect. This is rendered in the Peshitta as a participle and a perfect of *hwy*.[51] The same is true of the second verb.

There are two more examples of a perfect in the Masoretic Text rendered as the perfect of □□ ·· □ plus participle.[52] The Septuagint uses two aoristi, the Vulgate two perfects and the Targum two perfects.

Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:222–223) prefer the Kethib, but the versions all support the Qere. In this case, the Masoretic Text has two perfect verbs, a construction that is followed by both the Vulgate and the Targum. The Peshitta in some instances renders the perfect in the Masoretic Text as a combination of the perfect of □□ ·· □ plus a participle. As could be expected, the Peshitta in this case renders each of these two these verbs as a participle plus the perfect of *hwy*. In the Syriac language, the combination of a participle plus the perfect of □□ ·· □ is used to render a simple perfect (e.g. 'he wrote') or an on-going, repeated or habitual action in the past (e.g. 'they were selling'; Muraoka, 1987:45–46, par 70–71; Nöldeke, 1966:197–198, par 263). The Septuagint has both these verbs as aorist indicative active.

Psalm 73:6a-a

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have the following respectively:

יַעֲטָף שִׁית חָמָס

('Violence covers them as a garment');

□□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□□

('and they are covered with their iniquity and sin').

The Vulgate reads *operti sunt iniquitate et impietate sua* ('they are covered with their iniquity and their wickedness') The Septuagint has περιεβάλοντο ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν[53] ('They

[51] See 4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle (p. 121).
[52] See 4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle (p. 121).
[53] The English translation of the Greek Ps 73:6a is from Rahlfs (1979b).

clothed themselves with injustice and their impiety'). The Targum has לכך כן עטרתנון גיוותנותא ('Therefore pride has crowned them with the crown').

The footnote a-a in BHS is about יַעֲטָף־שִׁית חָמָס, which is the qal imperfect third person masculine singular of עטף ('to cover, hide') plus the noun masculine masc singular in construct state שִׁית ('garment'/'clothing') plus the noun masculine singular of חָמָס ('violence'). In this instance, the Targum has a quite different reading, which does not help: לכך כן/proposal: בגין כן.

The footnote a-a in BHS reads 'Vrs alit; l frt עָטַף pro ' et cj ח' c שִׁית.' It says that the versions differ from the Masoretic Text. It seems as if the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint was different from the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic Text. Eventually, the Masoretic Text can be retained. It is true that the versions differ from the Masoretic Text, but except for the Targum, one can still compare the rendering of the verb in the different versions. The Peshitta renders the verb as an imperfect, agreeing with the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate has a perfect and the Septuagint an aorist. The latter two support the proposal of BHS. If the Masoretic Text is retained, which has an imperfect יַעֲטָף, it means the Peshitta with □□□□□□ (ethpaal imperf 3 masc sing □□□) renders an imperfect as an imperfect, as in Chapter 4.[54]

Psalm 73:7

Psalm 73:7 reads as follows in the Masoretic Text:

יָצָא מֵחֵלֶב עֵינֵמוֹ עָבְרוּ מַשְׂכִּיּוֹת לֵבָב

(NRSV: 'Their eyes swell out with fatness; their hearts overflow with follies'/NIV: 'From their callous hearts comes iniquity, the evil conceits of their minds know no limits').

The NRSV reading is preferred, with the verb עָבְרוּ (qal perf 3 c pl עבר).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□

('And their iniquity went out like fat and they acted according to the thought of the heart').

The verb is □□□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 c pl □□□ 'to do').

[54] 4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw (p. 155).

The Vulgate has *Prodiit quasi ex adipe iniquitas eorum; transierunt in affectum cordis* ('Their iniquity hath come forth, as it were from fatness: they have passed into the affection of the heart'), with the verb *transierunt* (perf indic act 3 pl of *transeo transire*). The Septuagint reads ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἐκ στέατος ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν, διήλθοσαν εἰς διάθεσιν καρδίας ('Their eyes swell out with fatness, their hearts overflow with follies'), with the verb διήλθοσαν (aorist indic act 3 pl διέρχομαι). The Targum has שנא מן שמנא פרצופיהון עברו חוטביהון חורת ליבא ('Their face has changed with fatness; their designs that cover the heart have overflowed'), with the verb עברו (peal perf 3 c pl עבר).

BHS footnote 73:7b deals with the verb עָֽבְרוּ (the Peshitta reads *wʿbdw et operati sunt*). It says that the Peshitta has a verb with □ for the Hebrew ר. The Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text; however, the other three ancient versions agree with the Masoretic Text, so that the reading of the Masoretic Text may be retained. The two consonants of the Hebrew and the Syriac can be confused with each other. There could already have been an error in the translation of the Peshitta. In this instance, it is only the Peshitta that deviates and reads differently from the Masoretic Text as far as the root of the verb is concerned. It renders a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw, as in Chapter 4.[55]

Psalm 73:9

The Masoretic Text reads תְּהַלֵּךְ (qal imperf 3 c pl הלך). The footnote reads 'l frt תְּהַלֵּךְ (Piel Imperfect 3rd person c. plural of הלך'. The footnote proposes that it should perhaps read 'piel תְּהַלֵּךְ' rather than 'qal'. The Peshitta has □□□□ (pael ptc fem sing □□□). The Hebrew form is irregular and hence the BHS wants to change it to a piel. This is only a change in the vocalisation of the consonantal text. It is significant also that with regard to the second line of the verse, the Syriac uses a pael participle masculine singular for the verb תְּהַלֵּךְ (qal imperf masc sing). The Vulgate reads *transivit* (perf indic act 3 sing *transeo transire*), while the Septuagint has διῆλθεν (aorist indic act 3 sing διέρχομαι). The Targum renders it as מצלהבא (quadriliteral part צלהב).

The verb is rendered as a participle by the Syriac for an imperfect in the Masoretic Text, which is used for a general truth. The Peshitta has a pael participle, seeing the Masoretic Text as a piel. In

[55] 4.1.1.5 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 126).

this instance, the Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a participle.[56] The Septuagint, the Targum and the Vulgate do not help to resolve the issue, as their translations are related to the unvocalised text. The Peshitta has a pael, supporting the proposal of BHS. Whatever the case may be, the Peshitta renders the imperfect as a participle.

Psalm 73:10

The Masoretic Text has לָכֵן יֵשִׁיב [יָשׁוּב קרי] עַמּוֹ הֲלֹם | וּמֵי מָלֵא יִמָּצוּ לָמוֹ ('Therefore their people turn to them and drink up waters in abundance'), with the verbs יֵשִׁיב (qal imperf 3 masc sing שׁוּב) and יִמָּצוּ (niph imperf 3 masc pl מצה).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□

('Therefore my people will return here and they will completely find them').

The Peshitta has the verbs □□□□□ (peal imperf 3 masc sing □□□) and □□□□□□ (aphel imperf 3 masc pl □□□).

The Vulgate reads *Ideo convertetur populous meus hic, et dies pleni invenientur in eis* ('Therefore will my people return here and full days shall be found in them'), with the verb *convertetur* (future indic pass 3 sing *converto convertere*) and *invenientur* (future indic pass 3 pl of *invenio invenire*). The Septuagint reads διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστρέψει ὁ λαός μου ἐνταῦθα, καὶ ἡμέραι πλήρεις εὑρεθήσονται αὐτοῖς ('Therefore my people will return here, and full days will accrue to them'), with the verb ἐπιστρέψει (future indic act 3 sing ἐπιστρέφω). The second verb is εὑρεθήσονται (future indic pass 3 pl εὑρίσκω).

The Targum has the following:

בכן תאוב על עמיא דיהוה למלכותהון וימחונון במרזופין
ודמעין סגיעין מחתין להון

('Therefore he is returning for the sake of the people of the Lord, and they shall strike them with hammers and cause them many tears to run down').

It has the verbs תאוב (peal ptc sing תוב) and מחתין (aphel ptc pl נחת).

[56] See 4.2.1.3 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle (p. 158) for a similar use.

This verse is the most difficult verse in the whole psalm to analyse, interpret and understand (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:148; Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner, 2014:590; Tate, 1990:228), but the analysis above may shed light on the problem. With regard to 10a (יָשִׁיב), the Masoretic Text has the qal imperfect third person masculine singular of שׁוּב. The Masoretic Text and many ancient versions read the Qere, while the footnote refers to the Kethib יָשִׁיב (hiph imperf 3 masc sing שׁוּב 'to return)'. The Qere is a better reading, so it is better to retain the Masoretic Text as it is (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:223; Tate, 1990:229). The Kethib would make better sense if this were about the restoration of God's people from exile back to Jerusalem; in that case, the Kethib should be followed. The Peshitta follows the Qere. It is also followed by the Vulgate. The Targum has a participle of the peal, also agreeing with the Qere. The Greek also follows it.

In this instance, the versions support the Qere. The Peshitta has an imperfect, like the Masoretic Text. The Septuagint and the Vulgate have verbs indicating the future. These are the expected translations of the Masoretic imperfect.

The second footnote is related to וּמֵי מָלֵא יִמָּצוּ ('and [the] waters of abundance or/and water in abundance'). מָלֵא ('full') assumes the position of a noun: 'water in abundance' (Hengstenberg, 1946:406; Tate, 1990:229)). The footnote proposes the following reading: וּמְלֵיהֶם יָמֹצוּ 'and their utterance/word is pressed out' (conj + noun in constr state + suff 3 masc pl מְלֵה) + יָמֹצוּ (qal imperf 3 masc pl מצץ/ מצה), as the BHS proposes. Following Tate (1990:229), the 'waters of abundance' is to be read as a metaphor for prosperity as in 'my cup runs over' in Psalm 23:5, as well as in Psalm 73:35. The second verb in this verse 10b is יִמָּצוּ (niph imperf 3 masc pl מצה 'to squeeze out, drain', 'to sip'). The Peshitta has it as □□□□□□ (aphel imperf 3 masc pl □□□).

The Hebrew verb is very strange and the rendering of the Peshitta is quite different from it. The verb means 'to be pressed out' in Hebrew, while the verb 'to be able', 'to find' is used in Syriac. Though Syriac is different from Hebrew, the same tense is kept to harmonise the text. In both verbs, the Syriac keeps the imperfect as found in the Masoretic Text to maintain agreement.

The Vulgate has this verb as *invenientur* (future indic pass 3 pl of *invenio invenire*), while the Septuagint has this second verb as εὑρεθήσονται (future indic pass 3 pl εὑρίσκω). The Targum reads מחתין (aphel ptc נחת). The Masoretic Text has an imperfect, which the Peshitta renders it as

such. Both the Vulgate and the Septuagint render it as the future indicative passive. According to Briggs and Briggs (1907:148), the Peshitta reads the verb as מצא ‘to find’ and not as מצה for its translation. The conclusion can be made that when it is known what the Peshitta does, it is also known that the Vulgate and the Septuagint do the same. Then the emendation is not necessary.

In this instance, the Peshitta renders both the imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text as imperfects without waw, as could be expected.[57] Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:223) accept the proposal of BHS.

Psalm 73:15–16

The Masoretic Text has the following:

(15) אִם אָמַרְתִּי אֲסַפְּרָה כְמוֹ | הִנֵּה דוֹר בָּנֶיךָ בָּגָדְתִּי

(16) וָאֲחַשְׁבָה לָדַעַת זֹאת | עָמָל הִיא [הוּא קרי] בְעֵינָי

A literal translation of verse 15 is the following: ‘If I say, I will speak, in this way, behold, a generation of your sons, I would deceive.’ An idiomatic translation could be: ‘If I say I will speak in this way/manner, behold, I would deceive/betray (not be true to) a generation of your sons.’ The footnote relates to the verb בָּגָדְתִּי (qal perf 1 c sing בגד). The Septuagint Manuscripts has second person singular.

A literal translation of verse 16 is the following: ‘And I thought, to know, this, painful, it (was), in my eyes.’ An idiomatic translation could be: ‘And I thought to know this. It was painful in my eyes.’ The critical problem relates to the verb וָאֲחַשְׁבָה (waw cons + piel imperf 1 c sing חשׁב). The footnote in BHS reads ‘mlt Mss Edd ’וַ’, that is many manuscripts read a waw copulative, not a waw consecutive. Both lines of this verse are problematic and not easy to render (cf Briggs & Briggs, 1907; Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner, 2014:586; Tate, 1990:229).

The structure of the sentence in the Masoretic Text is a protasis (‘if’) followed by an apodosis, which continues in verse 16. The sentence structure of the apodosis is important: the apodosis is the second (‘then’) part of a condition (‘if’–‘then’). The apodosis is the consecutive main clause that follows the conditional sub-ordinate clause or protasis (the ‘if’ part) of this condition. The

[57] See 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143) for a similar use.

protasis is the first ('if') part of a condition, a subordinate, conditional clause (Hebrew) (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Kroeze, 1999:353).

The Peshitta has the following:

15 □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□

16 □□□□□□ □□ □□□□

[15] ('If I say, I will speak [make/do], in this way / manner');

[16] ('It will be iniquity in my eyes)/(it was a wearisome thing in my eyes') (see Tate, 1990:229).

The Vulgate has the following:

[15] *Si dicebam: Narrabo sic; ecce nationem filiorum tuorum reprobavi* ('If I said: I will speak thus; behold I should condemn the generation of thy children'), with the verb *reprobavi* (perf indic act 1 sing *reprobo reprobare*);

[16] *Existimabam ut cognoscerem hoc; labor est ante me* ('I studied that I might know this thing, it is a labour in my sight'), with the verb *existimabam* (imperf indic act 1 sing of *existimo existimare*).

The Septuagint has the following:

[15] εἰ ἔλεγον Διηγήσομαι οὕτως, ἰδοὺ τῇ γενεᾷ τῶν υἱῶν σου ἠσυνθέτηκα ('If I had said, "I will speak thus," I would have been untrue to the generation of thy children'), with the verb ἠσυνθέτηκα (perf indic act 1 sing ἀσυνθετέω).

[16] καὶ ὑπέλαβον τοῦ γνῶναι τοῦτο κόπος ἐστὶν ἐναντίον μου ('But when I thought how to understand this, it seemed to me a wearisome task'), with the verb ὑπέλαβον (aorist indic act 1 sing ὑπολαμβάνω).

The Targum has the following:

[15] אין אמרית אישתעי דמכמתהון הא על דר בנייך ארשעי ('If I had said, "I will speak as they do," behold, I would have acted wickedly against the generation of your children'), with the verb ארשעי (aphel perf 1 sing רשׁע).

[16] וחשבית למידע ית דא ליעות הוא בעיני (‘So I thought how to know this, [but] it was a vain labor in my sight’), with the verb וחשבית (conj + peal imperf 1 sing חשׁב).

The Peshitta omits the last part of verse 15 and the first part of verse 16. This results into simplification by the Peshitta of what is found in the Hebrew. The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw at the beginning of verse 15 as a perfect without waw, as in Chapter 4.[58]

Psalm 73:20

Following Kraus (1993:73), this verse is disfigured and not easy to read or understand.

The Masoretic Text reads כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ | אֲדֹנָי בָּעִיר צַלְמָם תִּבְזֶה (NIV: ‘As a dream when one awakes, so when you arise, O Lord, you will despise them as fantasies’), with the verbs מֵהָקִיץ (prep מִן + hiph inf constr קוּץ/קיץ), בָּעִיר (prep בְּ + עִיר + inf cons + עוּר, omitting the prefix of the hiphil infinitive) and תִּבְזֶה (qal imperf 2 masc sing of בזה).

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□
□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

(‘[They are] like one who awakes when he sees a dream. O Lord in the city [*kerita*] (or in the calling) you treat their image with contempt’).

The verbs are □□□□□□□ (ethpeel part masc sing □□□ + prep □ + □□□□□□, noun fem sing □□□□□ ‘village, town, city’) and □□□□ (peal imperf 2 masc sing □□□).

The Vulgate reads *Velut somnium surgentium, Domine, in civitate tua imaginem ipsorum ad nihilum rediges* (‘As the dream of them that awake, O Lord; so in thy city thou shalt bring their image to nothing’), with *surgentium* (present part act pl of *surgo surgere*) and *in civitate tua* (prep + noun fem sing of *civitas* + adj fem sing) and *rediges* (future indic act 2 sing of *redigo redigere*). The Septuagint reads ὡσεὶ ἐνύπνιον ἐξεγειρομένου, κύριε, ἐν τῇ πόλει σου τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτῶν ἐξουδενώσεις (‘They are like a dream when one awakes, in the city you despise their phantoms’), with ἐξεγειρομένου (present part middle/pass of ἐξεγείρω), ἐν τῇ πόλει (prep + art + noun dative fem sing πόλις ‘city’) and ἐξουδενώσεις (future indic act 2 sing ἐξουδενόω ‘to set a naught’).

[58] See 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

The Targum reads as follows:

היך חילמא מן גבר דמיתער יהוה ליום דינא רבא באתעריתהון מן בית קבורתהון ברגז דמותהון תבסר

('As a dream from a drunken man who awakens, O Lord, at the day of the great judgment when they awake from their graves, with anger you will despise their image').

The verbs are דמיתער (conj + ethpeel ptc עיר), באתעריתהון (prep + ethpeel inf pl עיר) and תבסר (peal imperf 2 masc sing בסר).

Footnote 73:20a relates to the verb מֵהָקִיץ (prep מִן + hiph inf constr קוּץ/קיץ). The footnote reads 'the Septuagint (Symmachus, Jerome and Targum), ἐξεγειρομένου (present ptc middle/pass of ἐξεγείρω), refer to the Peshitta.' It is probable that the Septuagint and the Peshitta had a different *Vorlage*, with a participle and not an infinitive. Otherwise, this is an example of an infinitive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle. It has to be remembered that the Peshitta does not often use the infinitive with prepositions other than □ .[59]

The verb עִיר in Hebrew creates confusion, for it has the same consonants as the Hebrew word for 'city'. Here it is used with the preposition בְּ plus the definite article הַ (בָּעִיר) and it will translate as 'in the city'. The Peshitta sees this verb as the noun for 'city'. The verb (בָּעִיר) is the contracted form of בְּהָעִיר (hiph inf constr + בְּ temporal) of the root עוּר ('to raise oneself or awake') (see Briggs & Briggs, 1907:149; Kraus, 1993:84; Tate, 1990:229). Hence the footnote proposes that בְּהָעִיר is equal or the same as בָּעִיר. or perhaps/probably (*Vel fortasse)* reads בְּעוּרְךָ compared to the Septuagint, which reads 'awakening'. Syriac reads it as the word for 'a city' (בָּעִיר), and translates it as such (□□□□□□).

The footnote to 73:20c relates to תִּבְזֶה (qal imperf 2 masc sing בזה). There is a proposal to change it to the first person plural. The third verb, תִּבְזֶה (qal imperf 2 masc sing בזה), in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta and the Targum, while both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as the future indicative active (Tate, 1990:229–230). All the versions have a second person form, so that the proposal of BHS does not have any support in the versions.

[59] See 4.7.2 Infinitive construct rendered as a construct with □ (relative or otherwise) (p. 254).

The rendering of an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text as a participle in the Peshitta is a newly discovered rendering not dealt with previously; it has been identified because of text-critical problems. However, it could also be that the Peshitta had a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. A rendering of a perfect in the Masoretic Text as a noun in the Peshitta is a common characteristic of the Peshitta,[60] as well as the rendering of an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw in the Peshitta.[61]

Psalm 73:24

The Masoretic Text reads בַּעֲצָתְךָ תַנְחֵנִי | וְאַחַר כָּבוֹד תִּקָּחֵנִי (NIV: 'You guide me with your counsel, and afterwards you will take me into glory'), with the verb תַנְחֵנִי (hiph imperf 2 masc sing + suff 1 c sing נחה).

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□□□□

('By your thoughts console me and afterwards lead me into glory').

The verb is □□□□□□ (pael imptv masc sing + suff 1 sing □□□ 'to comfort').

The Vulgate reads *Tenuisti manum dexteram meam, et in voluntate tua deduxisti me, et cumgloria suscepisti me* ('Thou hast held me by my right hand; and by thy will thou hast conducted me, and with thy glory thou hast received me'), with *deduxisti* (perf indic act 2 sing *deduco deducere)*. The Septuagint reads ἐν τῇ βουλῇ σου ὡδήγησάς με καὶ μετὰ δόξης προσελάβου με ('Thou dost guide me with thy counsel, and afterward thou wilt receive me to glory'), with the verb ὡδήγησάς (aorist indic act 2 ὁδηγέω). The Targum has שלים איקרים דאמרת עלי לאייתאה תסבנני במלכתך תדבריני ובתר ('You lead me with your counsel in this world, and after the glory that you said you would bring upon me is complete, you will receive me'), with תדבריני (pael imperf 2 masc + suff 1 sing דבר).

The footnote in 73:24a relates to תַנְחֵנִי, which reads 'Peshitta reads *bj'jnj* = תְּנַחֲמַנִי.' The Hebrew has תַנְחֵנִי (hiph imperf 2 masc sing + suff 1 c sing נחה 'to guide'), whereas the Peshitta has □□□□□□ (pael imptv masc sing + suff 1 sing □□□ 'to comfort'). According to the text-

[60] See 4.1.1.4 Perfect verb without waw rendered as no verb (p. 124).
[61] See 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143).

critical note, the Peshitta reads 'bj'jnj = תְּנַחֲמֵנִי.' The later verb is the piel imperfect second person singular plus suffix first person common singular, and נחם translates as 'console me'.

The interesting aspect is the imperfect in the Masoretic Text translated as an imperative in the Peshitta. The Septuagint renders it as an aorist indicative active, the Targum as an imperfect and the Vulgate as a perfect. In this case, the Masoretic Text has the imperfect without waw which the Peshitta renders as an imperative.[62] The Peshitta probably had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* with a מ.

Psalm 73:28

This verse in the Masoretic Text is difficult in all aspects and thus difficult to compare with the other versions. It reads as follows:

וַאֲנִי קִרְבַת אֱלֹהִים לִי טוֹב

שַׁתִּי בַאדֹנָי יְהוִה מַחְסִי לְסַפֵּר כָּל מַלְאָכוֹתֶיךָ

('But for me it is good to be near God; I have made the Lord God my refuge, that I may tell of all your works').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□ □□□
□□··□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□

('As for me I desired to approach God/to be close to the Lord. Good for me is your name. Lord you are my confidence so that I may tell all your wonders').

Examining both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta, it has to be concluded that the first part of this verse is freely translated by the Peshitta.

The Vulgate reads *Mihi autem adhaerere Deo bonum est; ponere in Domino Deo spem meam: ut annuntiem omnes praedicationes tuas in portis filiae Sion* ('But it is good for me to adhere to my God, to put my hope in the Lord God: That I may declare all thy praises, in the gates of the daughter of Sion'), with *adhaerere*, the present indicative passive second person singular of *adhaereo*.

The Septuagint reads ἐμοὶ δὲ τὸ προσκολλᾶσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἀγαθόν ἐστιν, τίθεσθαι ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ τὴν ἐλπίδα μου τοὺ ἐξαγγεῖλαι πάσας τὰς αἰνέσεις σου ἐν ταῖς πύλαις τῆς

[62] 4.2.1.8 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative (p. 180).

θυγατρὸς Σιων (‘But for me it is good to be near God; I have made the Lord God my refuge, that I may tell of all thy wor*k*s’), with the verb προσκολλᾶσθαι is the present infinitive either middle or passive of προσκολλάω.

The Targum has the following:

ואנא לְמיקרב ביהוה לי טב שוית ביהוה אלהים רוחצני למישתעיא לצדיקיא כולהון
פיקודי שליחותך

(‘But as for me, it is good to be near God; I have placed my trust in the Lord, that I may recount to the righteous all the precepts of your message’).

The verb is לְמיקרב, the preposition ל plus the peal infinitive of קרב.

In Ps 73, a number of examples of simplification of rare Hebrew words are found.

In verse 28, the Hebrew has something like ‘and’/‘but for me, the closeness to the Lord is good for me’. The NIV has ‘But as for me, God’s presence is all I need. I have made the sovereign LORD my shelter, as I declare all the things you have done.’ The Peshitta has ‘I desired to approach the Lord. Good for me is your name. Lord you are my confidence so that I may tell all your wonders.’ The first two verbs in the Peshitta are not found in the Hebrew, namely □□□□ (peal perf 1 sing □□□ ‘to delight’ /to take pleasure’) and □□□□□□ (rel □ + ethpaal imperf 1 c sing □□□). This part of the verse may therefore be translated with a bit more detail: ‘As for me, I desired to approach the Lord (to be close to the Lord).’

Verse 28a in the Septuagint has the verb τὸ προσκολλᾶσθαι (pres inf middle/pass προσκολλάω ‘to be near’), which may be the same as דבק (‘to stick/cling/cleave’). The footnote in the BHS proposes to read ‘קִרְבָתְךָ (Noun fem sing + suff 2 masc sing קרב your nearness or near to you)’. Following Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:223), ‘nearness of God’ is either the objective or subjunctive genitive.

The Masoretic Text has a noun that the Peshitta renders as a perfect, while the Targum renders it as an infinitive. The Septuagint renders it as the present infinitive, while the Vulgate renders it as the present future indicative. All the versions render the noun in the Masoretic Text as a verb. In

this instance, the Peshitta renders a noun in the Masoretic Text as two verbs, the second linked to the first by □.[63]

Psalm 74:5

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

יִוָּדַע כְּמֵבִיא לְמָעְלָה | בְּסָבָךְ עֵץ קַרְדֻּמּוֹת

(NIV: 'They behaved like men wielding axes to cut through a thicket of trees').

The verb is יִוָּדַע (niph imperf 3 masc sing ידע).

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□ּ□□□ □□ּ□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□

(‘And she/I know(s) like one raising upwards like a forest of trees with axes’).

The verb is □□□□□ (conj □ + peal perf 3 masc sing □□□ ‘to know, discern’).

The Vulgate has *et non cognoverunt sicut in exitu super summum. Quasi in silva lignorum securibus* (‘And they knew not both in the going out and on the highest top. As with axes in a wood of trees), with the verb *cognoverunt* (perf indic act 3 pl *cognosco cognoscere*). The Septuagint reads ὡς εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον ὑπεράνω (‘As though into the entrance above’). The Septuagint does not render the verb in the Masoretic Text.

The Targum has the following:

יצליף בקורנסא היך גבר דמרים ידיה בסביך קיסיא למקטע בכולביא

(‘He strikes with a hammer like a man who raises his hand in a thicket of trees to cut with axe’).

The verb is יצליף (peal imperf 3 masc sing צלף).

The footnote in the BHS proposes that it should read יְגֻדְּעוּ (piel imperf 3 masc pl גדע ‘to cut off/break into pieces’) instead of יִוָּדַע (niph imperf 3 masc sing ידע ‘it is known’/ ‘to make oneself known’). The verse literally translates as ‘He is known, as one bringing in, on high, against the thick trees, axes’, which idiomatically will be, ‘He is known as one bringing axes in on high, against the thick trees’. This is difficult to follow and it has probably been corrupted during earlier

[63] For a similar rendering of these verbs, refer to 4.8.5 No verb rendered as a perfect verb (p. 271) and 4.8.4 No verb rendered as an imperfect verb (p. 270) respectively.

transmission; hence the proposal (Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner, 2014:595, point 6; Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:240).

The New International Version translates this verse as 'they behaved like men wielding axes to cut through a thicket of trees.' The translation follows the proposal because it makes sense. Both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta use the same verb with the meaning 'to know' (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:153; Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:240; Tate, 1990:242). However, the Masoretic Text has a niphal third person masculine singular, while the Peshitta has a perfect first person common singular. Regarding the rendering of the NEB, Tate (1990:242) attests that its translators read יִוָּדַע as יְדָעוּ from גדע ('to hew/cut down'), thus following the proposal or יְדָעוּ/יִדְעוּ from the root דעה ('to raze/burn'; cf Tate, 1990:242). Indeed, the text as in the Masoretic Text is difficult, but it is to be retained.

In this instance as well, the Peshitta renders the imperfect verb without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect with waw.[64] The Septuagint does not render this verb, not helping in this regard. The Targum renders this verb as an imperfect following the Masoretic Text, while the Vulgate has it as a perfect. The Peshitta and the Vulgate both retain the root of the verb as in the Masoretic Text, but with different subjects. In the end, Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:239) give a good translation of the Masoretic Text: 'It looked as it does when they lift up their axes in the thicket of the forest.' The Peshitta translates it as follows: 'I knew as one who raises upwards, like a forest of wood, with axes.' The Targum supports the proposal of BHS. In this instance, the verse is problematic. The Peshitta uses the same verb, but in the peal and first person, in an attempt to make sense. It translates an imperfect as a perfect.[65]

Psalm 74:8

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have respectively the following:

אָמְרוּ בְלִבָּם נִינָם יָחַד | שָׂרְפוּ כָל מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל בָּאָרֶץ

(NIV: "They said in their hearts, 'We will crush them completely!' They burned every place where God was worshipped in the land");

[64] 4.2.1.5 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 172).
[65] 4.2.1.5 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 172).

□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□·□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□

('They said in their hearts, "we will destroy them together" and we will destroy all of them, the festival days/the festivals of God from the earth/land').

The Vulgate reads *Dixerunt in corde suo cognatio eorum simul: Quiescere faciamus omnes dies festos Dei a terra* ('They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together: Let us abolish all the festival days of God from the land'), with *cognatio*, the noun feminine singular of *cognatio* for the Hebrew נִינָם, and *quiescere*, the present subjunctive active second person singular of *quiesco*, plus *faciamus*, the present subjunctive active first person plural of *facio facere*. The Septuagint reads εἶπαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν ἡ συγγένεια αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό Δεῦτε καὶ κατακαύσωμεν πάσας τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ('They said in their heart – the clan of them together –, "Come and let us burn all the feasts of God from off the land"'), with συγγένεια, the noun feminine singular of συγγένεια for the Hebrew נִינָם, and κατακαύσωμεν, the aorist subjunctive active first person plural of κατακαίω. The Targum has דאלהא בארעא אמרו בלבהון בניהון כחדא אוקידו אבהתהון כל מערעיא ('Their sons say in their heart together," Their fathers have burned all the meeting places of God in the land"', with אוקידו, the aphel imperfect third person masculine plural of יקד.

There are two verbs in the Masoretic Text that are directly affected by the text-critical problem and both will receive attention. The first verb in the Masoretic Text is very problematic and was not known to the translator of the Peshitta. The Masoretic Text has נִינָם (qal imperf 1 c pl ינה + suff 3 masc pl), which the Peshitta translates according to the context as □□□□□ (rel □ + aphel imperf 1 c pl □□□ 'to put an end to, commit to death, destroy'). It is not quite clear why the Peshitta translator translated the verb שָׂרְפוּ 'to burn' as □□□□□. With the exception of the waw, it is the same verb as the first.

At the beginning of the second line, the Peshitta adds the waw, which is not found in the Hebrew (Masoretic Text), and that is typical Syriac style. The Peshitta repeats the verb □□□□ ('to destroy') and does not follow the Hebrew, which has the verb שָׂרְפוּ ('to burn'). From here onwards, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text. According to the footnote, the Septuagint and Peshitta read or indicate the reading וְנִשְׂרֹף (waw cons + qal imperf 1 c pl שׂרף 'and we will burn')

instead of שָׂרְפוּ (qal perf 3 c pl שׂרף ‘to burn’) (Tate, 1990:243). The proposal fits into the context much better, since the enemy is speaking. It is also the view of Kraus (1993:96) that the verb וְנִשְׂרַף should be used here. Though the Hebrew uses a difficult word here, it needs to be retained with the change of the person, namely the first person plural for the third person plural.

The perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect plus waw in the Peshitta.[66] The Septuagint and the Vulgate do not understand the verb נִימָם and render it as a noun. The Targum uses the verb ‘to burn’, as in the second part of the verse, but the translation is quite different. The Peshitta renders the imperfect of נִימָם as an imperfect,[67] and the perfect with waw as an imperfect with waw.[68] Probably, it sees the waw as a perfect with waw consecutive and renders it accordingly.

Psalm 75:4

The Masoretic Text has נָמֹגִים אֶרֶץ וְכָל יֹשְׁבֶיהָ | אָנֹכִי תִכַּנְתִּי עַמּוּדֶיהָ סֶּלָה (NIV: ‘When the earth and all its people quake, it is I who hold its pillars firm’[69]), with the verb תִכַּנְתִּי (piel perf 1 c sing תכן). The Peshitta reads □□ ̈□□□□□ □□□□ □□□. □□□□ □□□□□ □□ ̈□□□□ □□□□□□ (‘The earth and all its inhabitants are humbled. It is you who hold its pillars firm’), with the verb □□□□ (pael perf 2 masc sing □□□). The Vulgate has *Liquefacta est terra et omnes qui habitant in ea: ego confirmavi columnas ejus* (‘The earth is melted, and all that dwell therein: I have established the pillars thereof’), with the verb *confirmavi* (perf indic act 1 sing *confirmo confirmare*). The Septuagint reads ἐτάκη ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐγὼ ἐστερέωσα τοὺς στύλους αὐτῆς. Διάψαλμα (‘The earth melted and all its inhabitants; it was I who firmed up its pillars. Interlude on strings/musical interlude’), with the verb ἐστερέωσα (aorist indic act 1 sing ἐστερεόω). The Targum reads לעלמין מיתמססין דיירי ארעא וכל יתבהא אנא אתקינית עמודהא (‘The earth and all its inhabitants melt away; it is I who has established its pillars forever’), with the verb אתקינית (aphel perf 1 c sing תקן).

[66] 4.1.1.5 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 126).
[67] 4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw (p. 155).
[68] 4.1.3.1 Perfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 137).
[69] The English text is from the *New International Version* (Bible, 1984).

According to the footnote, the Peshitta changes the first person common singular in the Masoretic Text to second person masculine singular. Only the Peshitta has this suggestion, but it has no support from other ancient versions, as they rather follow the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders a perfect without waw as a perfect without waw, in both instances with the corresponding personal pronoun before the verb.[70] It is unclear why the Peshitta changes the person of the verb.

Psalm 75:5

The Masoretic Text has אָמַרְתִּי (qal perf 1 c sing אמר), while the Peshitta reads □□□□ (peal perf 2 masc sing □□□). The Vulgate reads *dixi* (perf indic act 1 sing *dico dicere*), while the Septuagint has εἶπα (aorist indic act 1 sing εἶπον). The Targum reads אמרית (peal perf 1 c sing אמר). In this case, all the versions except the Peshitta follow the Masoretic Text; thus the Peshitta does not have the support of the other ancient versions and it is not necessary to change the text.

In both 75:4c and 75:5a, the Syriac changes the first person common singular in the Masoretic Text to second person masculine singular. The Peshitta changes the first person found in the Masoretic Text to the second person masculine singular to keep the same sequence in the second verse, where God is addressed. The Masoretic Text uses the first person common singular (אָנֹכִי) in both verses and the Peshitta does the same (□□, masc sing).

In this instance, the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a perfect without waw in the Peshitta;[71] the other versions do likewise. The differences are not the result of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but they are different readings of the same unvocalised Hebrew text.

Psalm 75:7

The Masoretic Text reads הָרִים (hiph inf constr רוּם 'to lift up'), while the Peshitta has □ ̈□□□□ (rel □ + noun masc sing □ ̈□□□). In this regard, the Peshitta renders an infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text as a noun. One would expect this rendering to be an example in 4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun (p. 265), but it is not the case. The Vulgate reads *montibus*, the noun plural (ablative) of *mons*, while the Septuagint has ὀρέων, the noun neuter plural of ὄρος. The Targum reads טורייא, the noun plural of טור.

[70] 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).
[71] 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

הָרִים as found in the Masoretic Text can be described in two ways, namely it can be analysed as the hiphil infinitive construct רוּם (‘to lift up’) or as a noun masculine plural הַר (‘mountains’). Another difficulty that the translator met with is that these two forms are identical. What made matters worse, was the unvocalised Hebrew text before the translator. The footnote reading is equal to a hiphil infinitive construction of רום (the versions are different), which is omitted in the Codex Vaticanus. The internal evidence also gives support, since the root of the verb רוּם is found throughout this psalm (verses 5, 6, 8 and 11) (Tate, 1990:257). According to Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:253), the difficult Masoretic Text is easily understood and mainly supported in the context of neighbouring psalms, which are differentiated by the specific theology of the divine name (74:7, 10, 18, 21; 76:2).

The problem is the result of the different interpretations of the same unvocalised Hebrew text and not a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Here it is quite clear that the versions read the word as the word for ‘mountain’, which is just a different interpretation of the same Hebrew consonants. One cannot use this example to say anything about the translation of the infinitive, because the versions do not read it as an infinitive. It also cannot be ascribed to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or to a different translation technique; the reason is rather a different interpretation of the unvocalised Hebrew text.

Psalm 76:6

The Masoretic Text has the following

אָשְׁתּוֹלְלוּ אַבִּירֵי לֵב נָמוּ שְׁנָתָם | וְלֹא מָצְאוּ כָל אַנְשֵׁי חַיִל יְדֵיהֶם

(‘Valiant men lie plundered, they sleep their last sleep; not one of the warriors can lift his hands’).

The verbs are אָשְׁתּוֹלְלוּ (hitpoel perf 3 c pl שׁלל ‘to be plundered’), נָמוּ (qal perf 3 c pl נום ‘fall asleep/slumber’) and מָצְאוּ (qal perf 3 c pl מצא ‘to find’).

The Peshitta has the following:

ܓܒܪ̈ ܕܠܒܐ ܫܠܝܠܘ ܢܡܘ ܫܢܬܗܘܢ
ܘܟܠ ܓܒܪ̈ ܚܝܠ ܐܝܕܝܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܫܟܚܘ

(‘All the stout-hearted were shaken and the mighty warriors slept their sleep, and they did not find their hands’).

The verbs are □□□□□□ (etdeleg: ethpeel perf 3 masc pl □□□ ('to be shaken or disturbed'), □□□□□ (waw conj + peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to sleep') and □□□□□ (affix perf 3 c pl □□□ 'to find').

The Vulgate has *turbati sunt omnes inspientes corde. Dormierunt somnum suum, et nihil invenerunt omnes viri divitiarum in minibus suis* ('All the foolish of heart were troubled. They have slept their sleep; and all the men of riches have found nothing in their hands'), with *turbati sunt* (perf pass 3 pl *turbo*), *dormierunt* (perfect indic 3 pl *dormio dormire*) and *invenerunt* (perf indic 3 person plural *invenio invenire*).

The Septuagint reads ἐταράχθησαν πάντες οἱ ἀσύνετοι τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὕπνωσαν ὕπνον αὐτῶν καὶ οὐχ εὗρον οὐδὲν πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ πλούτου ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν ('All the stupid in heart were troubled; they slept their sleep; all the men of wealth found nothing with their hands), with the verb ἐταράχθησαν (aorist indic act 3 pl ταρὰσσω), ὕπνωσαν (aorist indic act 3 pl ὑπνόω) and εὗρον (aorist indic act 3 pl εὑρἰσκω).

The Targum has the following:

אשלחו מעלויהון זיני קרבא גיברי ליבא איתנמנמו בשינתהון ולא ספיקו כל גברי
חילא למיחד זינהון בידיהון

('They cut off the weapons of war from them; the stout-hearted sank into their sleep; none of the men of valor had sufficient [strength] to hold their weapons in their hands').

The verbs are אשלחו (aphel perf 3 masc pl שלח), איתנמנמו (quadriliteral perf 3 pl נמנם) and ספיקו (pael perf 3 masc pl of ספק).

Psalm 76:6a

The verb אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ, which is the hithpoel perfect third person masculine plural of שׁלל ('to plunder/spoil') appears only here in the Masoretic Text (Tate, 1990:262). This is a *hapax legomenon* with a form different from what is expected, namely the third person masculine plural יִשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ. It is possible that the א as prefix to the verb אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ in the Masoretic Text is a scribal error that occurred during copying or transmission. According to Tate (1990:262), the א in the Masoretic Text is either a scribal error or the Aramaic form (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:169). The Peshitta renders this

uncommon Hebrew verb אֶשְׁתּוֹלְלוּ by using a more common verb □□□□□□, which is an ethpeel perfect third person masculine plural of □□□, ('to be shaken' or 'to be disturbed').

Whatever the case may be the Peshitta renders a perfect without waw as a perfect without waw to maintain agreement in tense, gender and number between itself and the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta translates this uncommon verb according to context, since its root is not found in Syriac. In this case, the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered in the Peshitta as a perfect without waw.[72]

Psalm 76:11

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have the following respectively:

כִּי חֲמַת אָדָם תּוֹדֶךָּ | שְׁאֵרִית חֵמוֹת תַּחְגֹּר

('Surely your wrath against men brings you praise, and the survivors of your wrath are restrained');

□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□

('Because the understanding of a man praises you and the remainder of his passion remove anger').

The Vulgate reads *Quoniam cogitation hominis confitebitur tibi, et reliquiae cogitationis diem festum agent tibi* ('For the thought of man shall give praise to thee: and the remainders of the thought shall keep holiday to thee'). The Septuagint has ὅτι ἐνθύμιον ἀνθρώπου ἐξομολογήσεταί σοι, καὶ ἐγκατάλειμμα ἐνθυμίου ἑορτάσει σοι ('For human thought will acknowledge you, and a remnant of thought will celebrate you').

The Targum reads as follows:

כד אנת רגז על עמד אנת מרחים עליהון והינון יודון לשמך ושארא דריתחיא
דאיתיירו לך מן רוגזא די רגיזתא תזרין לחבלא עמיא {ת״א} ארום כד יתקוף רוגזך על עמך
יתובון ויודון לשמך ואנת תאיב מן רוגזא ברם על שאר עמיא מני רוגזא תזרין

('When your anger is hot against your people, they shall praise your name, and will turn away from your anger; but against the residue of the nations you will gird yourself with the weapons of your anger').

This verse in the Masoretic Text has two verbs that are directly affected by text-critical problems and they will both receive some attention here. The first verb is תּוֹדֶךָּ (hiph imperf 3 fem sing + suff

[72] 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

2 masc sing ידה) and is rendered as □□□□ (aphel imperf 3 fem sing □□□ 'to praise, to thank') (Sokoloff, 2009:563), with the suffix of the Masoretic Text rendered as the preposition □ plus suffix by the Peshitta. The Vulgate has *confitebitur* (future indic pass 3 person sing *confiteor confiteri*), while the Septuagint reads ἐξομολογήσεταί (future indic middle 3 sing ἐξομολογέομαι). The Targum has יודון (aphel imperf 3 fem sing ידי/ידה).

For the second verb, the Masoretic Text reads תַּחְגֹּר (qal imperf 2 masc sing חגר 'to put on a belt', 'to make ready, buckle on, get ready'), while the Peshitta has □□□□ (aphel imperf 2 masc sing □□□ ('to make bright'). The Vulgate has *agent* (future indic act 3 pl *ago*), while the Septuagint has ἑορτάσει (future indic act 3 singular ἑορτάζω). The Targum has יודון (aphel imperf 3 fem sing ידי/ידה) and יתקוף (peal imperf 3 fem plural תקף).

The footnote regarding the first verb (76:11b) proposes תּוֹרַד; for the second verb (76:11e) the Septuagint has ἑορτάσει σοι, which is the same as תָּחָגֵּךְ. In this case, the Peshitta renders both imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text as imperfects without waw as could be expected.[73] In the case of the first verb, all the versions have a corresponding verb, with the suffix of the Hebrew verb rendered as a personal pronoun. This construct argues against the proposal of a different reading by BHS. In the case of the second verb, only the Septuagint has a different reading. It probably reads the final ר of the verb as a כ, making it the verb הגה, with suffix second person masculine singular. Since the Peshitta agrees with the Masoretic Text, the conclusion is that it had the same *Vorlage*.

Psalm 77:2

The Masoretic Text has the following:

קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְאֶצְעָקָה | קוֹלִי אֶל אֱלֹהִים וְהַאֲזִין אֵלָי

(NIV: 'I cried out to God for help; I cried out to God to hear me').

The verb is וְאֶצְעָקָה (waw cop + qal cohortative 1 c sing צעק 'to call for help, cry out, raise a cry of wailing').

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

[73] 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143).

('With my voice, I cried/called to God. And he heard me and my voice I raised to him and he answered me').

The verb is □□□□ (peal perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to cry').

The Vulgate has '*Voce mea ad Dominum clamavi; voce mea ad Deum, et intendit mihi* ('I cried to the Lord with my voice; to God with my voice, and he gave ear to me'), with the verb *clamavi* (perf indic act 1 sing *clamo clamare*). The Septuagint reads Φωνῇ μου πρὸς κύριον ἐκέκραξα, φωνή μου πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ προσέσχεν μοι ('With my voice I cried to the Lord, with my voice to God, and he paid attention to me'), with the verb ἐκέκραξα (aorist indic act 1 sing κράζω). The Targum has קלי קדם יהוה ואקביל קלי קדם אלהא אצית מימרי ('I cry aloud before God; I cry aloud before God, that he may listen to my word'), with the verb ואקביל (conj + pael perfect 1 plural קבל).

The Masoretic Text reads וְאֶצְעָקָ֑ד (waw cop + qal cohortative 1 c sing צעק 'to call for help, cry out, raise a cry of wailing'), while the footnote states a Hebrew manuscript and the Septuagint and Peshitta do not have the waw. Here the Peshitta renders the cohortative in the Masoretic Text as the perfect.[74] The Targum has the waw and uses an imperfect. The other versions render as a perfect.

The above verse provides an example where the Peshitta adds some words in order to make the Hebrew as found in the Masoretic Text clearer and easier to understand. In this verse, the Peshitta adds verb 2b, namely, □□□□□□ (conj □+ peal perf 3 masc sing + suff 1 sing □□□ 'to listen') and also adds verb 2c, namely □□□□□□ (conj + □ aphel perf 3 fem sing □□ 'to raise, to go up'). In 2d, namely וַתַּאֲזֶן the Masoretic Text uses a general verb ('to give ear or listen', while the Peshitta employs the use of a specific verb ('to answer'). The Peshitta translates according to sense and thus does not follow the grammar as found in the Hebrew. The addition of the two verbs by the Peshitta and the use of the verb in (2d), which is different in meaning but correct in sense, contribute to the translation technique. It is possible that the translator of the Peshitta regarded the waw before the cohortative as a waw consecutive and thus rendered it as a perfect. This is also possible for the Septuagint and the Vulgate.[75]

[74] 4.5.2 Cohortative rendered as a perfect verb (p. 225).
[75] 4.5.2 Cohortative rendered as a perfect verb (p. 225).

Psalm 77:3

The Masoretic Text reads

בְּיוֹם צָרָתִי אֲדֹנָי דָּרָשְׁתִּי | יָדִי לַיְלָה נִגְּרָה וְלֹא תָפוּג מֵאֲנָה הִנָּחֵם נַפְשִׁי

(NIV: 'When I was in distress, I sought the Lord; at night I stretched out untiring hands and my soul refused to be comforted').

The verb is נִגְּרָה (niph perf 3 fem sing נגר).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

('In the day of my trouble/distress I seek the Lord and his hand stretched out to me in the night but there is no comforter for my soul'), with the verb □□□□□□ (peal perf 3 fem sing □□□ 'to draw, pull out' + suff 1 sing).

The Vulgate has *In die tribulationis meae Deum exquisivi; manibus meis nocte contra eum, et non sum deceptus, Renuit consolari anima mea* ('In the days of my trouble I sought God, with my hands lifted up to him in the night, and I was not deceived. My soul refused to be comforted'). The Vulgate does not translate the verb of the Masoretic Text.

The Septuagint reads ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεώς μου τὸν θεὸν ἐξεζήτησα, ταῖς χερσίν μου νυκτὸς ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθην ἀπηνήνατο παρακληθῆναι ἡ ψυχή μου ('In the day of my trouble I sought God; with my hands, at night, before him, and I was not deceived; my soul refused to be comforted'). The verb is ἐναντίον (prep 'against', 'opposite', 'over', 'before'). This preposition requires a word with a *nun* in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The text of the Targum reads

ביום עקתי אולפן מן קדם יהוה תבעית שרת עלי נבואה בליליא זלגת עיני דמעתא
ולא תפוג סריבת לאיתנחמא נפשי

('In the day of my distress I sought instruction from/before the Lord; the spirit of prophecy rested upon me; in the night my eye flowed with tears, and did become faint; my soul refused to be comforted'), with the verb זלגת (peal perf 3 fem sing זלג 'to flow out').

For the Hebrew נִגְרָה as found in the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint reads ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, that is נֶגְדֹּה. (the Peshitta has ܒܩܒܠ ܗܘ). The Septuagint is not equal to the Peshitta. It reads ἐναντίον, a preposition, while the Peshitta has a verb, with the ܒ for the ר in the Hebrew. This rendering may be at the root of the problem of the similar-looking words. In this case, a scribal error during copying or transmission of the text could be the cause of the deviation and not a different Hebrew text. In Syriac, the verb ܢܓܪ means 'to last a long time' or 'to be prolonged', a totally different meaning than that of the Hebrew verb. The Syriac therefore uses a verb of which the first two consonants are the same as in Hebrew, but the last one differs from the Hebrew, a dalet (ܕ) as opposed to a resh (ܪ).

According to Tate (1990:269), the meaning of the verb נגר (niphal perf 3 masc sing) is an unusual one; the verb normally means 'pour out' as in 'pour water out'. VanGemeren (1997c:26) argues, saying, 'In the difficult Ps 77:2[3] the psalmist's hands are stretched out (lit., poured out) in a context of prayer. Since the pouring out of one's heart is combined with lifting hands in prayer in Lam 2:19, perhaps the two figures are compressed into one in Ps 77:2…' The verb נגר as found in the Masoretic Text is to be retained. Even though the Peshitta uses a verb that is different from the one used in the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta still renders a perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a perfect without waw.[76] The Vulgate has *contra eum*, more or less the same as the Septuagint.

Psalm 77:5

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

אָחַזְתָּ שְׁמֻרוֹת עֵינָי | נִפְעַמְתִּי וְלֹא אֲדַבֵּר

(NIV: 'You kept my eyes from closing; I was too troubled to speak').

It has the verb אָחַזְתָּ (qal perf 2 masc sing אחז).

The Peshitta has the following:

ܐܚܕܬ ܫܡܪ̈ܬ ܥܝܢܝ ܐܬܒܗܠܬ ܘܠܐ ܐܡܠܠ

('Dizziness took hold of me at my eyes').

[76] 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

The verb is □□□□□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to take hold, grasp, seize' + suff 1 c singular).

The Vulgate reads *Anticipaverunt vigilias oculi mei; turbatus sum, et non sum locutus* ('My eyes prevented the watchers: I was troubled, and I spoke not'), with the verb *anticipaverunt* (perf indic act 3 pl of *anticipo anticipare*). The Septuagint has προκατελάβοντο φυλακὰς οἱ ὀφθαλμοἱ μου, ἐταράχθην καὶ οὐκ ἐλάλησα ('My eyes were preoccupied with the watchers of the night; I was troubled and did not speak'), with the verb προκατελάβοντο (aorist indic middle 3 pl προκαταλαμβάνω). The Targum reads אחדתא תימורתייא דעייני איטרפית ולא אמליל ('You have taken hold of my eyelids; I am troubled and I cannot speak'), with the verb אחדתא (peal perf masc sing חדת).

It is important in this example that the Peshitta renders the perfect in the Masoretic Text as a waw plus a perfect.[77] With reference to footnote 77:5a, the Septuagint and the Peshitta interpret this verb as third person plural, while the Masoretic Text and most versions interpret the verb as second person masculine singular, with God being the subject of this verb.

In Psalm 77:5a, the Peshitta probably has 'dizziness' as subject. The Peshitta uses the plural like the Septuagint. The perfect without waw is rendered as a perfect plus waw in the Peshitta, as shown in Chapter 4.[78]

Psalm 77:7

The Masoretic Text reads

אֶזְכְּרָה נְגִינָתִי בַלָּיְלָה | עִם לְבָבִי אָשִׂיחָה וַיְחַפֵּשׂ רוּחִי

('I remembered my songs in the night. My heart mused and my spirit enquired').

The verbs are אֶזְכְּרָה (qal cohortative 1 c sing זכר) and נְגִינָתִי (noun fem sing נְגִינָה).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□

('I remembered, I thought in the night, and in my heart I thought. And my spirit enquired and I said').

[77] See 4.1.1.2 Perfect without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 113).
[78] See 4.1.1.2 Perfect without waw rendered as a perfect verb with waw (p. 113).

The verbs are analysed as follows: □□□□□□ (ethpeel perf 1 c sing □□□ ('to remember, recollect') and □□□□ (peal perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to think').

The Vulgate reads *Et meditates sum nocte cum corde meo, et exercitabar, et scopebam spiritum meum* ('And I meditated in the night with my own heart: and I was exercised and I swept my spirit'), with *meditates* (perf 1 sing *medito meditari*). The Septuagint has νυκτὸς μετὰ τῆς καρδίας μου ἠδολέσχουν, καὶ ἔσκαλλεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ('I would commune with my heart at night, and I would probe my spirit'). The Septuagint is not helping in this regard, since the verb in the Masoretic Text is not rendered here but in verse 6. The Targum reads לבבי אמליל ויבלש ניסיא מנדע רוחי אידכר תושבחתי בליליא עם הירהורי ('I remember my song in the night, with the meditations of my heart; I speak, and the knowledge of my spirit searches for miracles'), with אידכר (ethpeel perf 3 masc sing דכר).

The Peshitta renders the cohortative אֶזְכְּרָה in the Masoretic Text as a perfect.[79] It renders נְגִינָתִי (noun fem sing) in the Masoretic Text as a verb □□□□ (peal perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to think').[80] This rendering concerns the second word, which the Peshitta renders as the same verb later in the verse. Footnote 7b states the issue, namely that the Septuagint and the Peshitta render the noun in the Masoretic Text as a verb (Tate, 1990:270). The proposal is that the noun נְגִינָתִי ('my music') is changed to וְהָגִיתִי ('and I meditate'). It is possible that the Peshitta and the Septuagint had a different *Vorlage* with a verb here. The Targum following the Masoretic Text reads a noun and therefore differs from both the Septuagint and the Peshitta.

Psalm 77:12

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have the following respectively:

אזכיר [אֶזְכּוֹר קרי] מַעַלְלֵי יָהּ | כִּי אֶזְכְּרָה מִקֶּדֶם פִּלְאֶךָ

('I will meditate on all your works and consider all your mighty deeds');

□□··□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□

('I remember from before your deeds or works').

[79] See 5.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text (p. 300) for similar examples.
[80] See 4.8.5 No verb rendered as a perfect verb (p. 271) for similar examples.

The Vulgate reads *Memor fui operum Domini, quia memor ero ab initio miabilium tuorum* ('And they forgot his benefits, and his wonders that he had shown them'). The Septuagint has ἐμνήσθην τῶν ἔργων κυρίου, ὅτι μνησθήσομαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν θαυμασίων σου ('I called to mind the works of the Lord, because I will remember your wonders of old'). The Targum reads אדכר עובדי אלהא ארום אדכר מן לקדמין פרישותך ('I will recall the deeds of the Lord, yea, I will remember your wonders from the old').

The Masoretic Text reads אֶזְכּוֹר (qal imperf 1 c sing זכר 'to remember') (Qere), while the Peshitta has □□□□□□□ (rel □ + ethpeel perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to remember'). The Vulgate reads *fui* connected with the noun *memor* ('I made a memory') (perf indic act 1 sing *sum esse*, while the Septuagint has ἐμνήσθην (aorist indic pass 1 sing μιμνῄσκομαι/μιμνήσκω). The Targum reads אדכר (aphel perf 1 sing דכר 'to remember'). The Peshitta renders the imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as a combination of □ □□□ plus a perfect. It uses a combination of □ □□□, instead of a waw as would be expected.[81]

Here it is a Kethib-Qere issue in the Masoretic Text. The Qere in the text reads 'אֶזְכּוֹר' (qal imperf 1 c sing זכר ('I will remember'), while the Kethiv reads 'אַזְכִּיר' (hiph imperf 1 c sing זכר ('I will cause to remember'). According to Tate (1990:270), the Kethiv fits better into the context with the cohortative of the verb in the second line (colon), and then the translation may be as follows: 'I will commemorate/proclaim the deeds of Yahweh/yes, I will remember your wonders.' This translation avoids the repletion of the verb 'to remember' as found in the Masoretic Text and continues the complaint made in the previous verse. The reason for the repetition of 'remember' as found in the Masoretic Text is to emphasise or intensify the act of remembering. The Qere is probably better (cf Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:274; Kraus, 1993:116; NIV, 1995:651). The BHS also wants to read the Qere. This is supported by the versions, including the Peshitta. The Peshitta renders an imperfect as a perfect, as shown in Chapter 4.[82]

Psalm 78:28

The Masoretic Text and the Peshitta have the following respectively:

וַיַּפֵּל בְּקֶרֶב מַחֲנֵהוּ

[81] See discussion in 4.2.1.4 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 165).
[82] See 4.2.1.4 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 165).

('He made them come down inside their camp');

□□□□□··□□□□ □□□□□

('And they fell in their camp').

The Vulgate reads *Et ceciderunt in medio castrorum eorum* ('And they fell in the midst of their camp'). The Septuagint has καὶ ἐπέπεσον εἰς μέσον τῆς παρεμβολῆς αὐτῶν ('They fell within their camp'). The Targum has ואפיל במצע משיריתיה ('And he made them fall in the midst of his camp').

The Masoretic Text reads וַיַּפֵּל (waw cons + hiph imperf 3 masc sing נפל 'to cause to fall'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to fall'). The Vulgate reads *ceciderunt* (perf indic act 3 pl of *caedo caedere*), while the Septuagint has ἐπέπεσον (aorist indic act 3 plural ἐπιπίπτω). The Targum has ואפיל (conj + aphel imperf 3 masc sing נפל). The Peshitta renders the waw consecutive plus imperfect in the Masoretic Text as a perfect.[83]

The footnote of verse 28a in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* reads, Septuagint (Peshitta and Jerome) has καὶ ἐπέπεσον ('and they fell'), which is the same as or equals וַיִּפְּלוּ (waw cons + qal imperf 3 masc plural נפל 'to fall'). The footnote does affect the meaning: the hiphil means 'He caused (them) to fall in the middle of the camp'/'They fell in the middle of the camp.' The Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate support the footnote, while the Targum supports the text. It changes the meaning. The Peshitta could have had a different *Vorlage* with waw consecutive, which the translator rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta, as in Chapter 4.[84] The Peshitta reads a plural as opposed to the singular of the Masoretic Text, but that is brought about by a different stem formation.

Psalm 78:60

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

וַיִּטֹּשׁ מִשְׁכַּן שִׁלוֹ | אֹהֶל שָׁכַן בָּאָדָם

(NIV: 'He abandoned the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent he had set up among men').

It has the verb שָׁכַן (piel perf 3 masc sing שׁכן), which is directly affected by the text-critical problem.

The Peshitta has the following:

[83] See 4.2.2.1 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 184).
[84] See 4.2.2.2 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as perfect verb with waw (p. 187).

□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□

('He abandoned the tabernacle in Silo, the tent where he dwelled between the people').

The verb is □□□□ (rel □ + pael perf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to dwell').

The Vulgate reads *Et repulit tabernaculum Silo, tabernaculumsuum, ubi habitavit in hominibus* ('And he put away the tabernacle of Silo, his tabernacle where he dwelt among men'), with the verb *habitavit* (perf indic act 3 sing *habito habitare*). The Septuagint reads καὶ ἀπώσατο τὴν σκηνὴν Σηλωμ, σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ, οὗ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ('He rejected his tabernacle at Selo, a tent where he tented among mortals'), with the verb κατεσκήνωσεν (aorist indic act 3 sing κατασηνόω). The Targum has משכנא דשילו משכן די שרת תמן שכינתיה בגו בני נשא ושבק ('So he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tabernacle where his Shekinah dwelt among the sons of men'), with שרת (peal perf 3 m sing שרי שרה).

The Septuagint (Theodotion) κατεσκήνωσεν is equal to שָׁכַן (qal perf 3 m sing שכן 'to dwell'). This is also true of the Peshitta □□□□ and the Targum שרת. The Masoretic Text has a piel, but the translations read it as a qal. This is again a question of interpreting the unvocalised text. The Masoretic Text is to be retained (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:285g). The Peshitta renders a perfect without waw as a perfect without waw as in Chapter 4.[85]

Psalm 78:63

The Masoretic Text reads בַּחוּרָיו אָכְלָה אֵשׁ | וּבְתוּלֹתָיו לֹא הוּלָּלוּ (NIV 'Fire consumed their young men, and their maidens had no wedding songs'), with the verb הוּלָּלוּ (pual perf 3 c pl הלל 'to be praised'). The Peshitta reads □□□□□ □□□□□□ ̈□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ ̈□□□□ ('Fire consumed their youths, and their maidens fainted'), with the verb □□□□□ (ethpaal perf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to be excited, aroused', 'to faint').

The Vulgate has *Juvenes eorum comedit ignis, et virgins eorum non sunt lamentatae* ('Fire consumed their young men: and their maidens were not lamented'), with the verb *lamentatae sunt* (perf pass 3 pl *lamento lamentare*). The Septuagint reads τοὺς νεανίσκους αὐτῶν

[85] See 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

κατέφαγεν πῦρ, καὶ αἱ παρθένοι αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπενθήθησαν (‘Fire devoured their young men, and their girls were not bewailed’), with the verb ἐπενθήθησαν (aorist indic pass 3 pl πενθέω). The Targum reads עולימוהי אכלת אשתא ובתולתיה לא אשתבחן (‘Fire devoured his young men, and his maidens were not praised’), with the verb אשתבחן (ethpaal perf 3 pl שבח ‘to praise’).

It is important to note that all the versions, except the Peshitta, follow the Masoretic Text with a negative before the last verb (cf Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:285h).

Following the footnote, Lucian’s recension has ἐπενθήθησαν, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaititicus read ἐπένθησαν.

In this instance, the difference between the Masoretic Text and some of the versions is related to the interpretation of the verb. The Masoretic Text reads it as a pual perfect of הלל. The versions probably regard it as a hophal perfect of ילל (‘to bewail’). The Peshitta renders a perfect without waw as a perfect without waw, as has been shown in Chapter 4.[86]

Psalm 79:7

The Masoretic Text reads כִּי אָכַל אֶת יַעֲקֹב | וְאֶת נָוֵהוּ הֵשַׁמּוּ (‘For he has devoured Jacob and they destroyed his homeland’), while the Peshitta has □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ (‘For they have devoured Jacob and destroyed his homeland or dwelling’). The Vulgate reads *quia comederunt Jacob, et locum ejus desolaverunt* (‘Because they have devoured Jacob; and have laid waste his place’). The Septuagint reads ὅτι κατέφαγον τὸν Ιακωβ καὶ τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ ἠρήμωσαν (‘For they devoured Jacob and laid waste his place’). The Targum reads ארום גמרו בית יעקב וית בית מקדשיה אצדיאו (‘For they have consumed the house of Jacob, and made desolate the house of his sanctuary’).

The Masoretic Text reads אָכַל (qal perf 3 masc sing אכל ‘to eat’), while the Peshitta has □□□□□□□ (part □ + peal perf 3 masc pl + suff 3 masc sing □□□ ‘to eat’). The Vulgate reads *comederunt* (perf act 3 pl *comedo comedere* ‘to eat’), while the Septuagint has κατέφαγον (aorist indic act 3 pl κατεσθίω ‘to eat up, devour’). The Targum reads גמרו (peal perf 3 masc pl גמר (‘to bring to an end’).

[86] See 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

Following the footnote, multiple manuscript evidence and Jeremiah 10:25 give support to the plural reading of the subject in the verb אָכְלוּ (qal perf 3 masc pl אכל) (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:199; Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner, 2014:627; Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:303b; Tate, 1990:297). The proposal has the plural, while the Masoretic Text has a singular; however, the meaning will not be affected apart from the fact that the subject is plural. The □ □□□ in the Peshitta is the translation of כִּי in Hebrew, as has often been indicated in Chapter 4.[87] The perfect is thus rendered as a perfect.

Psalm 80:17a

The Masoretic Text reads שְׂרֻפָה בָאֵשׁ כְּסוּחָה | מִגַּעֲרַת פָּנֶיךָ יֹאבֵדוּ (NIV: 'Your vine is cut down, it is burned with fire; at your rebuke your people perish'), with שְׂרֻפָה (qal pass part fem sing שׂרף 'to burn') and כְּסוּחָה (qal pass part fem sing כסח 'cut down'). The Peshitta has □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ (□□□□ 'He burned with fire her punishments, and from the rebuke of your anger they perished'), with □□□□ (afeel perf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to burn up') and □□□□ (noun masc sing plus suffix 3 fem sing □□□□□□ 'pardon, remission of punishment').

The Vulgate reads *Incensa igni et suffossa, ab increpatione vultus tui peribunt* ('Things set on fire and dug down shall perish at the rebuke of thy countenance'), with i*ncensa* (perf pass part *incendo incendere*) and *suffossa* (perf part pass sing *suffodio suffodere*) and *peribunt* (future indic act 3 pl *pereo perire*). The Septuagint reads ἐμπεπυρισμένη πυρὶ καὶ ἀνεσκαμμένη ἀπὸ ἐπιτιμήσεως τοῦ προσώπου σου ἀπολοῦνται ('Bunt with fire and dug up it was; at the rebuke of your countenance they will perish'), with ἐμπεπυρισμένη (perf part pass sing ἐμπεπυρίζω) and ἀνεσκἀνεσκμμένη (perf part pass sing ἀνἀνεσκάπτω). The Targum reads דמן קדמך ייבדון מתוקדא בנורא ומופרכא ממזופיתא ('It is burned with fire, and it is parched; they perish at the rebuke that is from before you'), with מתוקדא (ettaphal part sing יקד), and ומופרכא (conj + aphel part sing of פרך).

With regard to שְׂרֻפָה, the Septuagint, the Targum and the Vulgate have a participle, following the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta, which renders it as a perfect that could also be an imperative, is the

[87] See 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

exception.[88] Concerning the second verb, כְּסוּחָה, the Septuagint, the Targum and the Vulgate render it as a participle as found in the Masoretic Text. The exception is once again the Peshitta, which renders it as a noun.[89] It important to note that the second verb in the Masoretic Text means 'to cut down', while the verb has the meaning 'to pardon or forgive' in the Peshitta.

The footnote regarding the first verb proposes שְׂרָפֶהָ, while it proposes כְּסָחוּהָ for the second verb. Furthermore, the footnote proposes שְׂרָפֶהָ and כְּסָחוּהָ for the two verbs, making them third person masculine plural with suffix third person feminine singular (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:310j). Accepting the proposal, the verbs would be the perfect third person masculine plural with suffix third person feminine singular. These proposals have no support in the versions.

Psalm 81:6

The Masoretic Text reads as follows:

עֵדוּת בִּיהוֹסֵף שָׂמוֹ בְּצֵאתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

שְׂפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֶשְׁמָע

(NIV: 'He established it as a statute for Joseph when he went out against Egypt, where I heard a language I did not understand').

The verbs are יָדַעְתִּי (qal perf 1 c sing ידע 'to know') and אֶשְׁמָע (qal imperf 1 c sing שׁמע 'to hear, listen').

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□
□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□

('He made it a decree for Joseph when (he) went out to the land of Egypt, where he heard a language he did not understand').

The verbs are □□□ □□□ (peal ptc masc sing □□□ 'to know') + □□□ (peal perf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to be, was') and □□□ (peal ptc masc sing □□□ 'to hear, listen').

[88] This rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as a perfect in the Peshitta has been dealt with in 4.6.5 Participle rendered as perfect verb (p. 243).
[89] The rendering of a participle in the Masoretic Text as a noun by the Peshitta has been dealt with in 4.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun (p. 237).

The Vulgate reads *Testimonium in Joseph posuit illud, cum exiret de terra Aegypt; linguam quam non noverat, audivit* ('He ordained it for a testimony in Joseph, when he came out of the land of Egypt: he heard a tongue which he knew not'), with *noverat* (pluperfect indic act 3 sing of *nosco noscere*) and *audivit* (perf indic act 3 sing of *audio audire*).

The Septuagint has μαρτύριον ἐν τῷ Ιωσηφ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου γλῶσσαν, ἣν οὐκ ἔγνω, ἤκουσεν ('He made him a solemn charge in Joseph, when he went out from the land of Egypt. He heard a tongue he did not know'), with ἔγνω (aorist indic act 3 sing γινώσκω/γιγνώσκω) and (aorist indic act 3 sing ἀκούω).

The Targum has

סהדותא על יהוסף שויה דלא קריב לאתת ריבוניה ביה ביומא נפיק מבית אסירי
ושליט בכל ארעא דמצרים ספתא דלא חכימית אליפית שמעית

('He gave testimony concerning Joseph that he did not draw near to the wife of his master: in the day when he came out of prison and ruled over the land of Egypt, I learned and heard a language I did not know').

The verbs are חכימית (peal perf of חכם), אליפית (pael perf of אלף and peal perf of שׁמע).

In this instance, the Masoretic Text has the verbs in the first person, a perfect followed by an imperfect. The Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate have third person singular forms, while the Targum follows the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders the perfect of the Masoretic Text as a perfect of □ □ □ plus the participle and the imperfect as a participle. The Targum translates both as perfects, while the Septuagint and the Vulgate use forms indicating the past tense. In this instance, the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate may have had a different *Vorlage*.[90,91]

Psalm 81:9

The Masoretic Text reads שְׁמַע עַמִּי וְאָעִידָה בָּךְ | יִשְׂרָאֵל אִם תִּשְׁמַע לִי ('Hear, O my people, and I will warn you-if you would but listen to me, O Israel!'), with שְׁמַע (qal imptv 2 masc sing שׁמע (to hear,

[90] For the rendering of the Peshitta of a perfect without waw as a perfect of □ □ □ plus participle, see 4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □ □ □ plus participle (p. 121).

[91] For the rendering of an imperfect without waw as a participle, see 4.2.1.3 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle (p. 158).

to listen), no verb, וְאָעִידָה (conj + hiph cohortative imperf 1 c sing עוד ‘to call someone to witness, be/serve as a witness, assure’) and תִּשְׁמַע (qal imperf 2 masc sing שׁמע ‘to listen, hear’ + לִי).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□ □□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□

(‘Hear, O my people, and I will speak with Israel, I will testify against you if you would but listen to me’).

The verbs rendered are □□□ (peal imptv 2 masc sing □□□ ‘to hear, to listen’), □□□□□. (conj + pael imperf 1 c sing □□□ ‘to speak’), □□□□ (peal/pael imperf 1 c sing □□□ ‘to testify or to bear witness’) and □□□□□□ (peal imperf 2 masc sing + pronoun 1 c sing □□□ ‘to listen, hear’) + suffix for לִי in the Masoretic Text.

The Vulgate reads *Audi, populous meus, et contestabor te, Israël, si audieris me*, (‘Hear, O my people, and I will testify to thee: O Israel, if thou wilt hearken to me’), with *audi* (present imptv act 2 sing *audio audire ‘to hear or ‘listen’*) and *contestabor* (future indic pass 1 sing of *contestor contestari* ‘to appeal to the gods that [w/ut]’, ‘call to witness’), no verb, and *audieris* (perf indic act 2 sing *audio audire* ‘to hear, listen’). The Septuagint reads ἄκουσον, λαός μου, καὶ διαμαρτύρομαί σοι Ισραηλ, ἐὰν ἀκούσῃς μου (‘Hear, O my people, and I will admonish you; O Israel, if you would but hear me!’), with ἄκουσον (aorist imptv act 2 sing ἀκούω), no verb, διαμαρτύρομαί (present indic pass 1 sing διαμαρτύρομαι), and ἀκούσῃς (aorist subj act 2 sing ἀκούω). The Targum reads שמעו עמי ואסהיד בכול ישראל אם תקביל למימרי (‘Hear, O my people, and I will admonish you! O Israel, if only you would listen to my Memra!’), with שמעו (peal imptv 2 masc pl שׁמע, no verb, ואסהיד (aphel imperf 1 c sing סהד) and תקביל (pael imperf 2 masc sing of קבל).

Analysing this verse leads to the conclusion that the Peshitta has added an extra verb, which is absent in the Masoretic Text. Due to this addition, the Peshitta has a different word order. It adds a verb in the first line and moves the second verb found in the Masoretic Text to the second half of the verse. The Peshitta does not have the support of the other versions; instead, they follow and support the Masoretic Text. Consequently, only the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text and has no support from the Septuagint, the Vulgate or the Targum. It is only the Peshitta that also uses the suffix for the Hebrew לִי. The Peshitta renders the imperative as an imperative, the

cohortative as an imperfect and the imperfect without waw as an imperfect without waw .[92] The additional verb is also an imperfect, fitting into the pattern of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 81:13

The Masoretic Text reads וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ בִּשְׁרִירוּת לִבָּם | יֵלְכוּ בְּמוֹעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם (NIV: 'So I gave them [him] over to their stubborn hearts to follow their own devices'), with וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ (waw cons + piel imperf 1 c sing + suff 3 masc sing שׁלח 'to let go, let loose, let free', literally 'And I send him away') and יֵלְכוּ (qal impf 3 masc pl הלך).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□

('They went according to the will of their hearts and after the wishes of their souls').

In the Peshitta rendering, the verb at the beginning of the Masoretic Text is omitted and the second verb is moved to the beginning of the verse (□□□□ peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to make go, walk').

The Vulgate reads *et dimisi illos secundum desideria cordis eorum ibunt in adinventionibus suis*,[93] ('So I let them go according to the desires of their heart: they shall walk in their own inventions'). The Septuagint has καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, πορεύσονται ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν ('So I sent them away in accordance with the practices of their hearts; they shall walk in their practices'), with ἐξαπέστειλα (aorist indic act 1 sing ἐξαποστὲλλω. The Targum reads ותריכתיה בהירהורי לבהון אזלו במלכת רישעהון ('So I drove him out in the imaginations of their hearts, [and] they walked in their own wicked counsels'), with ותריכתיה conjunction + pael imperf 1 sing תרך.

Following the footnote, there is some manuscript evidence that supports וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהֶם ('them') rather than וָאֲשַׁלְּחֵהוּ ('him'), though 'him' is collective as in the Masoretic Text (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:320 f; Tate, 1990:320). The Peshitta omits the first verb and translates only the second one,

[92] See 4.3.1 Imperative rendered as an imperative (p. 203), 4.5.1 Cohortative rendered as an imperfect verb (p. 220) and 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143).
[93] The Latin text of Ps 81:13 is from Bible (1969, 2007).

but this rendering is not supported by the other ancient versions. The Peshitta renders the second verb in the Masoretic Text, which is a qal imperfect without waw as a peal perfect without waw.[94] The first verb omitted in the Masoretic Text is a new characteristic that has not been treated earlier. The Peshitta condenses the Hebrew, but this technique or rendering is probably not related to a different *Vorlage.*

Psalm 84:8

The Masoretic Text reads יֵלְכוּ מֵחַיִל אֶל חָיִל | יֵרָאֶה אֶל אֱלֹהִים בְּצִיּוֹן ('They go from strength to strength till each appears before God in Zion, with יֵרָאֶה (niph imperf 3 masc sing ראה 'to appear, become visible'). The Peshitta reads ܢܗܠܟܘܢ ܡܢ ܚܝܠܐ ܠܚܝܠܐ ܘܢܬܚܙܐ ܩܕܡ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܕܐܠ̈ܗܐ ܒܨܝܘܢ ('They go from strength to strength and appear before God of gods in Zion'), with ܘܢܬܚܙܐ (conj + ethpeel imperf 3 masc sing ܚܙܐ 'to see').

The Vulgate has *Etenim benedictionem dabit legislator; ibunt de virtute in virtutem: videbitur Deus deorum in Sion* ('For the lawgiver shall give a blessing, they shall go from virtue to virtue: the God of gods shall be seen in Sion'), with *videbitur* (future indic pass 3 sing *video videre*). The Septuagint reads πορεύσονται ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν, ὀφθήσεται ὁ θεὸς τῶν θεῶν ἐν Σιων ('They will go from strength to strength; the God of gods will appear in Sion'), with ὀφθήσεται (future indic pass 3 sing ὁράω).

The Targum has the following:

אזלין צדיקיא מן בית מקדשא לבית מדרשיא יתחמי ליעות אוריתא דילהון קדם
יהוה די שכינתיה שריא בציון

('The righteous go from the house of the sanctuary to the house of study; their labor in the Law is seen before the Lord, whose Shekinah dwells in Zion'), with שריא (peal imperf 3 masc sing שרי).

Following the footnote, יֵרָאֶה (niph imperf 3 masc sing ראה 'to appear, become visible'), should probably read יֵרָאוּ (qal imperf 3 masc pl ראה 'to see') (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:349L; Tate (1990:354). There is no support for this proposal in the versions as they all read the verb of the

[94] 4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw (p. 155).

Masoretic Text as a niphal. The Peshitta translated the imperfect without waw as an imperfect without waw, as in Chapter 4.[95]

Psalm 86:11

The Masoretic Text reads הוֹרֵנִי יְהוָה דַּרְכֶּךָ אֲהַלֵּךְ בַּאֲמִתֶּךָ | יַחֵד לְבָבִי לְיִרְאָה שְׁמֶךָ (NIV: 'Teach me your way, O Lord, and I will walk in your truth; give me an undivided heart, that I may fear your name'), with יַחֵד (piel imptv 2 masc sing יחד 'to concentrate, unite') and לְיִרְאָה (prep לְ + qal inf constr ירא 'to fear'). The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□

('Teach me your way, O Lord, and I will walk in the truth, my heart is glad with those that fear your name').

The verbs are □□□□ (peal imperf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to be glad [to unite]') and □□□□□□ (rel □ + peal ptc masc pl □□□ 'to fear').

The Vulgate reads *Deduc me, Domine, in via tua, et ingrediar in veritate tua; laetetur cor meum, ut timeat nomen tuum* ('Conduct me, O Lord, in thy way, and I will walk in thy truth: let my heart rejoice that it may fear thy name'), with *laetetur* (present subj act 3 sing *laetor laetari* 'be fond [of], delight in, be glad/joyful/delighted/flourish [(on/in]/rejoice') and *timeat* (present subj act 3 sing *timeo timere* 'to fear').

The Septuagint has ὁδήγησόν με, κύριε, τῇ ὁδῷ σου, καὶ πορεύσομαι ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου εὐφρανθήτω ἡ καρδία μου τοῦ φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομά σου ('Guide me by your way, O Lord, and I shall walk in your truth; let my heart be glad to revere your name'), with εὐφρανθήτω (aorist imptv pass 3 sing εὐφραίνω) and φοβεῖσθαι (present inf pass φοβὲω).The Targum has שמך אליף יתי יהוה אורחתך אתהלך בקושטך יחד לבבי למידחל ('Teach me, O Lord, your way; I will walk in your truth; unite my heart to fear your name'), with יחד (pael imptv 2 masc sing יחד) and למידחל (prep ל + peal inf דחל).

[95] See 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143).

The first verb affected by the text-critical problem in the Masoretic Text is יַחֵד (piel imptv 2 masc sing יחד 'to concentrate, unite'), rendered in the Peshitta as ☐☐☐☐ (peal imperf 3 masc sing ☐☐☐ 'to be glad [to unite]'). The verb יַחֵד as used in the Masoretic Text is problematic. This is the only place where the piel of this verb occurs in the Masoretic Text. According to the footnote, some versions such as the Septuagint – and the Peshitta – reads εὐφρανθήτω, which is the same as יִחַדְּ from חדה ('to rejoice'), that is, some of the Greek manuscripts or texts read 'let my heart rejoice', thus referring to the piel imperative as employed in the Masoretic Text (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:238; Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:369; Tate, 1990:376). According to VanGemeren (1997b:433), this rare Hebrew verb occurs only three times in the Old Testament (Gen 49:6; Isa 14:20 and Ps 86:11), and every time with some kind of social association attached to it. Apart from the fact that the *hapax legomenon* makes this verse very difficult to explain, the Masoretic Text 'to unite' is preferred above the proposal 'to rejoice' (cf Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson, & Tanner, 2014:662; Kraus, 1993:180).

In this case, the imperative in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect as identified in Chapter 4, though not discussed. In this instance, the imperative in the Masoretic Text is rendered as an imperfect. Probably, the Peshitta reads the verb in the Hebrew as the qal imperfect, since the verb begins with a י. This does not suggest a different Hebrew Vorlage, but rather a different interpretation of the same unvocalised Hebrew text.

The Peshitta further renders לִירְאָה (prep לְ + qal inf constr) found in the Masoretic Text as ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (rel ☐ + peal part).[96]

Psalm 87:6

The Masoretic Text reads יְהוָה יִסְפֹּר בִּכְתוֹב עַמִּים | זֶה יֻלַּד שָׁם סֶלָה ('The Lord will write in the register of the peoples: "This one was born in Zion." Selah'), with יִסְפֹּר (qal imperf 3 masc sing ספר 'to count [up], register') and בִּכְתֹב (prep בְּ . + qal inf constr כתב 'to write').

The Peshitta reads as follows:

☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐¨☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

('The Lord will write [count] in the register [writing/script/document] of the people, this one was born there').

[96] See 4.7.2 Infinitive construct rendered as a construct with ☐ (relative or otherwise) (p. 254).

The verbs are □□□□ (peal imperf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to count') and □□□□□ (prep □ + noun masc □□□□ 'writing, script').

The Vulgate has *Dominus narrabit in scripturis populorum et principum, horum qui fuerunt in ea* ('The Lord shall tell in his writings of peoples and of princes, of them that have been in her'), with *narrabit* (future indic act 3 sing of *narro narrare*) and *scripturis* (Ablative pl noun of *scriptura*). The Septuagint reads Κύριος διηγήσεται ἐν γραφῇ λαῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων τούτων τῶν γεγενημένων ἐν αὐτῇ διάψαλμα ('The Lord will give details in his list of peoples and of rulers, namely, those that have been born in it. Interlude on strings'), with διηγήσεται (future indic middle 3 sing διηγέομαι and γραφῇ (noun fem dative sing γραφὴ). The Targum has תמן לעלמין יהוה על סיפרא די מכתבין ביה חושבן כל עלמיא דין מלין איתרבא ('The Lord has gone into a book in which are written the number of all the peoples; this king was anointed there. Forever'), with סיפרא (noun fem sing ספר) and מכתבין (aphel ptc כתב).

Concerning the first verb יִסְפֹּר (qal imperf 3 masc sing ספר 'to count [up], register'), the footnote indicates that the Septuagint reads διηγήσεται, which reads the same as יְסַפֵּר (piel imperf 3 masc sing ספר) (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:378h-h; Tate, 1990:386). The Peshitta renders an imperfect without waw in the Masoretic Text as an imperfect without waw, as has been seen in Chapter 4.[97]

In respect of the second verb, בִּכְתֹּב (prep בְּ + qal inf constr כתב 'to write'), which the Peshitta renders as □□□□□ (prep □ + noun masc □□□□ ('writing, script'), the footnote says some manuscripts and the Septuagint read ἐν γραφῇ, ἐ ἐν ἀπογραφῇ, which is the same as בִּכְתָב (refer to many manuscripts of the Targum (בכתב) and the Peshitta; see Kraus, 1993:187). The Peshitta renders an infinitive in the Masoretic Text as a noun, as has been seen in Chapter 4.[98] The Masoretic Text has the infinitive construct rendered as noun by the Peshitta, the Vulgate, the Septuagint and the Targum. In this instance, all the ancient versions agree with each other, against the Masoretic Text.

[97] See 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143)
[98] See 4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun (p. 257).

For the first verb there is again a different reading of the same consonants, but the Peshitta reads it the same way as the Masoretic Text, rendering an imperfect without waw as an imperfect without waw as indicated in Chapter 4.[99] The second one is probably a case where the *Vorlage* of the relevant versions does not have the waw vowel letter and then reads the consonants as a noun and not an infinitive.[100]

Psalm 87:7

The Masoretic Text reads וְשָׁרִים כְּחֹלְלִים | כָּל מַעְיָנַי בָּךְ (NIV: 'As they make music they will sing, "All my fountains are in you."'), with וְשָׁרִים (conj + qal act ptc masc pl שִׁיר 'to sing of, sing') and כְּחֹלְלִים (prep כְּ . + root חול, polel ptc without מ 'to dance around').

The Peshitta has the following:

ܪܒ̈ܐ ܕܒܟ ܘܟܠ ܕܡܬܟܒ̈ܫ ܒܟ

('The great ones that dwell in you and all who (that) are humbled by you').

The Peshitta renders the first word as a noun.

The Vulgate reads *Sicut laetantium omnium habitatio est in te* ('The dwelling in thee is as it were of all rejoicing'), with *laetantium* (present ptc act plural of *laetor laetari*) and *habitatio* (noun feminine singular). The Septuagint has ὡς εὐφραινομένων πάντων ἡ κατοικία ἐν σοί ('The habitation of all, when they are glad, is in you'), with εὐφραινομένων (present ptc pass masc pl εὐφραίνω). The Targum reads ואמרי שירין על חינגיא כל מיני תושבחן על קורבנא מתאמרין בגוון ('And they say, "Songs to [the music of] the pipes, all kinds of praises, are uttered over the offerings within you."'), with שירין (noun absolute state pl שיר) and חינגיא (noun masc pl חינגיא).

According to Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner (2014:665), this verse is corrupt and not easy to follow; hence several solutions have been proposed in trying to solve this difficult line. Tate (1990:387; also Kraus, 1993:185) attests to the fact that this verse is very problematic.

[99] See 4.2.1.1 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb without waw (p. 143).
[100] See 4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun (p. 257).

Note 7a indicates that few Greek and Peshitta manuscripts have וְשָׂרִים. The Peshitta renders the participle in the Masoretic Text as a noun as has been seen in the examples treated in Chapter 4.[101] This is a case of different readings of the unvocalised text (Kraus, 1993:185; Tate, 1990:387).

Note 7b indicates some manuscripts read בְּחֹלְלִים (prep בְּ + qal ptc masc pl חלל). The Peshitta renders this as a noun.[102] The verb is also used for גִּיל 'shout with joy', which is probably related to 'dancing' (Zeph 3:17 and Isa 41:16), and for רנן, also 'shout with joy' (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:242; Holladay, 1988:59, 341; Tate, 1990:387). In this instance, it is a matter of interpretation and not a different *Vorlage*.

Psalm 88:16

The Masoretic Text reads עָנִי אֲנִי וְגוֹעַ מִנֹּעַר | נָשָׂאתִי אֵמֶיךָ אָפוּנָה (NIV: 'From my youth I have been afflicted and close to death; I have suffered your terrors and am in despair'), with וְגוֹעַ (conj + qal act. ptc masc sing גוע 'to expire, breathe one's last, die'), נָשָׂאתִי (qal perf 1 c sing נשׂא 'to lift, raise [high]') and אָפוּנָה (qal imperf [cohortative] 1 c sing פּוּן). The NIV accepts the proposal of BHS for this translation.

The Peshitta reads as follows:

□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□[103]

('I am a poor person and unable from my youth to raise high, and to spread out and to become an heir').

The verbs are □□□□□ (conj + peal act ptc masc sing □□□ 'to be tired, to be unable'), □□□□□□□ (ethpeel perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to be exalted, elevated, to raise high'), □□□□□□□ (conj + ethpeel perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to be spread out, to be placed') and □□□□□ (waw + aphel imperf 2 masc sing □□□ ('to benefit'; 'to profit'; 'to become an heir').

The Vulgate has *Pauper sum ego, et in laboribus a juventute mea; exaltatus autem, humiliates sum et conturbatus* ('I am poor, and in labours from my youth: and being exalted have been humbled and troubled'). The Septuagint reads πτωχός εἰμι ἐγὼ καὶ ἐν κόποις ἐκ νεότητός μου,

[101] See 4.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun (p. 237).
[102] See 4.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun (p. 237).
[103] The English translation of Ps 88:16 is from the Leiden Peshitta (Bible, 2008).

ὑψωθεὶς δὲ ἐταπεινώθην καὶ ἐξηπορήθην (‘Poor I am and in troubles from my youth up; and after being exalted I was humbled and became perplexed’). The Targum has דחילתך טעינא עלי עניא אנא ונגיד מן טליא סוברית (‘I have been afflicted and dying since youth; I have borne your terror; it is loaded upon me’).

Note 16a: The footnote regarding וְגֻוֵעַ (conj + qal act ptc masc sing גוע) says the Septuagint (Peshitta and Jerome) has καὶ ἐν κόποις (‘and in trouble or suffering or weariness’), probably reflecting or the same as וְיָגֵעַ (conj + qal imperf 3 masc sing) (refer to Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:391m; Tate, 1990:398(16a). The Peshitta renders a participle in the Masoretic Text as a participle as could be expected.[104]

Note 16b: The footnote regarding נָשֵׂאתִי (qal perf 1 c sing נשׂא ‘to lift, raise [high]’) says the Septuagint (the Peshitta) has ὑψωθεὶς, the same as נִשֵּׂאתִי (piel perfect 1 sing נשׂא). The Peshitta renders a perfect as a perfect, but reads the unvocalised text as a piel, not a qal.

Note 16c: The footnote regarding אָפֻוֹנָה (qal imperf cohortative 1 c sing פוּן ‘to grow stiff, numb, be feeble or cold’; see Holladay, 1988:289) proposes אפוּגָה (refer to 77:3), but the Septuagint reads καὶ ἐξηπορήθην. The Hebrew verb is a *hapax legomenon* (cf Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:391n; Tate, 1990:398(16c)). The Peshitta verb for this Hebrew verb אָפֻוֹנָה is ☐☐☐☐☐ (waw + aphel imperf 2 masc sing ☐☐☐ ‘to benefit’; ‘to profit’; ‘to become an heir’). The differences in this verb may reflect a different *Vorlage* or an attempt to make sense of the difficult Hebrew of the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders וְגֻוֵעַ (conj + qal ptc act in the Masoretic Text as ☐☐☐☐☐ (conj + peal act part);[105] it further renders נָשֵׂאתִי (qal perf without waw in the Masoretic Text as ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (ethpeel perf without waw),[106] and אָפֻוֹנָה (qal imperf in the Masoretic Text as ☐☐☐☐☐ (waw + aphel imperf).[107]

Psalm 89:48

The Masoretic Text reads the following:

זְכָר אֲנִי מֶה חָלֶד

[104] See 4.6.1 Participle rendered as a participle (p. 229).

[105] See 4.6.2 Participle rendered as a participle in a relative construction with ☐ (p. 233).

[106] See 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

[107] See 4.1.1.5 Perfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb with waw (p. 126).

עַל מַה שָּׁוְא בָּרָאתָ כָל בְּנֵי אָדָם

(‘Remember how fleeting is my life. For what futility you have created all men!’).

The verb is זְכָר (qal imptv 2 masc sing + pronoun 1 c sing זכר ‘to remember, recall’).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□

(‘Remember me from the grave, so that there should not be futility you have created all men’).

The verbs are □□□□□□□□ (ethpeel imptv 2 masc sing + pron 1. c sing □□□ ‘to remember, recollect, to call to mind’).

The Vulgate reads *Memorare quae mea substantia: numquid enim vane constituisti omnes filios hominum?* (‘Remember what my substance is: for hast thou made all the children of men in vain?’), with *memorare* (present inf act of *memoro memorare*). The Septuagint reads μνήσθητι τίς μου ἡ ὑπόστασις μὴ γὰρ ματαίως ἔκτισας πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων (‘Remember what my substance is. For, surely, you did not create all mortals in vain?’), with μνήσθητι (aorist imptv pass 2 sing μιμνῄσκομαι/μιμνήσκω). The Targum has מטול מה לבטלא בריתא כל בני נשא אדכר די אנא אתבריתי מן עפרא (‘Remember that I was created from the dust, why have you created all the sons of man in vain?’), with אדכר (ethpeel imptv 2 masc sing דכר).

The footnote proposes it is probable that the Masoretic Text had the emphatic particle נָא after the imperative זְכָר, which has been lost (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:401k; Tate, 1990:412); hence the proposal adds the particle נָא to read זְכָר־נָא.

This does not provide any help regarding the translation and one cannot make any conclusion, since the note is about the particle and not the verb. The problem is the independent personal pronoun after the imperative. The Peshitta adds the pronoun to the verb, ‘remember me (from the grave’). All the versions have a problem with Masoretic Text and render the verb differently. Perhaps the Peshitta had a different *Vorlage*, or tried to make sense of a difficult text. Even if this

would the case, the Peshitta renders an imperative in the Masoretic Text as an imperative as could be expected.[108]

5.10 Summary of text-critical matters

In the previous section, an analysis has been made of the rendering of the Masoretic verbal forms in Psalms 73–89 as found in the Peshitta Psalms and in the other ancient versions. In analysing the way the verbal forms have been rendered, verbs with text-critical issues have been identified. Four groups of text-critical issues can be distinguished, namely texts related to Kethib-Qere features, different readings of the consonantal text, confusion of similar-looking consonants and examples of a possible different *Vorlage*. The texts with text-critical issues are now classified into these four groups and based on the study above, conclusions are made.

5.10.1 Texts related to Kethib-Qere features

In these instances, the aim has been to resolve the Kethib-Qere issues that directly affect the verbs in the psalms treated. In Psalm 73:2; Psalm 77:12 and Psalm 89:18b, the Peshitta supports the Qere.

5.10.2 Different readings of the consonantal text

In the psalms treated, the following indicates that the Peshitta translators interpreted the same unvocalised Hebrew *Vorlage* differently from the translators of the other versions. This is clearly seen in the following examples treated: Pss 73:9; Ps 73:6; Ps 73:20b; Ps 73:28; Ps 74:8a & Ps 74:8b; Ps 75:4; Ps 75:5; Ps 75:7; Ps 76:6; Ps 76:11; Ps 77:3; Ps 77:5; Ps 77:7; Ps 78:60; Ps 78:63; Ps 79:7; Ps 80:17a; Ps 81:9; Ps 81:13; Ps 84:8; Ps 86:11; Ps 87:6; Ps 87:7a & Ps 87:7b; Ps 88:16a; Ps 88:16b and Ps 88:16c

5.10.3 Confusion of similar looking consonants

In Psalm 73:7, the Peshitta renders the verb עבר in the Masoretic Text ending with ר as the verb □□□ with □ as the last letter. This is probably an error that occurred during copying or transmission or confusing the similar-looking consonants. Also in Ps 77:3, the Peshitta renders the

[108] See 4.3.1 Imperative rendered as an imperative (p. 203) for similar examples.

verb נָגְרָה in the Masoretic Text as *r* at the end with the verb □□□□□□, ending with □, another indication of confusing the similar-looking consonants (ר with □).

5.10.4 Possible examples of a different *Vorlage*

In some examples, the Peshitta reads the Hebrew Masoretic Text differently and deviates from it. The next chapter will deal in detail with the Peshitta Psalms *Vorlage*. The texts that possibly have a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic Text are: Ps 73:6a-a; Ps 73:15–16; Ps 73:20a; Ps 73:20c; Ps 73:24a; Ps 78:28 and Ps 81:6.

5.11 Groups

In the first part of this chapter, a study was made of how the verbal forms found in the Hebrew Masoretic Text are rendered in the Peshitta and the other ancient versions. In the previous section the texts with text-critical problems have been classified into four groups. In this section, the different renderings of the verbal forms in instances where text-critical issues were found will be classified according to the groups distinguished in the previous chapter. In a few instances, new groups can be identified.[109]

5.11.1 Perfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

5.11.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.1.1.1 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as perfect without waw in Peshitta

  Ps 73:15–16; Ps 75:4; Ps 75:5; Ps 76:6a; Ps 77:3; Ps 78:60; Ps 78:63; Ps 79:7; Ps 88:16b

- 5.11.1.1.2 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as perfect with waw in Peshitta

  Ps 77:5

[109]The rendering of the verbal forms in the Peshitta mostly agrees with the groups identified in Chapter 4, with the exception of a few new instances. The schema in Chapter 4 will therefore be followed in this section. It means the groups with the list of psalms will be chronologically arranged. The last three digits introducing the bulleted paragraphs correspond with the last three digits of the heading numbers in Chapter 4. Some of the headings will not have psalms listed under them, as examples of these instances are among the texts with text-critical issues. In such cases, the following note is made: 'No examples are given here.'

- 5.11.1.1.3 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as perfect of □ □ plus participle in Peshitta

  Ps 73:2 (twice)

- 5.11.1.1.4 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as no verb in Peshitta

  Ps 73:20b

- 5.11.1.1.5 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as imperfect with waw in Peshitta

  Pss 73:7; 74:8

- 5.11.1.1.6–5.11.1.1.8

  No examples are given here.

5.11.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text

No examples are given here.

5.11.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.1.3.1 Perfect with waw consecutive in Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect with waw in Peshitta

  Ps 74:8

- 5.11.1.3.2–5.11.1.3.3

  No examples are given here.

5.11.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

5.11.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.2.1.1 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect without waw in Peshitta

  Ps 73:10 (twice); Ps 73:20c; Ps 76:11; Ps 81:9; Ps 84:8; Ps 87:6

- 5.11.2.1.2 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as imperfect with waw in Peshitta

  Ps 73:6a-a; Ps 74:8

- 5.11.2.1.3 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as a participle in Peshitta

  Ps 73:9; Ps 81:6

- 5.11.2.1.4 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in Peshitta

  Ps 77:12; Ps 81:13

- 5.11.2.1.5 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect with waw in Peshitta

  Ps 74:5; Ps 88:16c

- 5.11.2.1.6–5.12.2.1.7

  No examples are given here.

- 5.11.2.1.8 Imperfect without waw in Masoretic Text rendered as an imperative in Peshitta

  Ps 73:24

5.11.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.2.2.1 Imperfect with waw consecutive in Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect without waw in Peshitta

  Ps 78:28

- 5.11.2.2.2 Imperfect with waw consecutive in Masoretic Text rendered as perfect with waw in Peshitta

  Ps 78:28

- 5.11.2.2.3

  No examples are given here.

5.11.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

No examples are given here.

5.11.3 Imperatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.3.1 Imperative in Masoretic Text rendered as an imperative in Peshitta

  Ps 81:9; Ps 89:48

- 5.11.3.2

  No examples are given here.

5.11.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

No examples are given here.

5.11.5 Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.5.1 Cohortative in Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in Peshitta

  Ps 81:9

- 5.11.5.2 Cohortative in Masoretic Text rendered as a perfect in Peshitta

  Ps 77:2; Ps 77:7

- 5.11.5.3

  No examples are given here.

5.11.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.6.1

  No examples are given here.

- 5.11.6.2 Participle rendered as participle in relative construction (with □) in Peshitta

  Ps 88:16a

- 5.11.6.3 Participle rendered as a noun in Peshitta

  Ps 80:17a; Ps 87:7a; Ps 87:7b

- 5.11.6.4–5.11.6.6

  No examples are given here.

5.11.7 Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.7.1 Infinitive construct in Masoretic Text rendered as an infinitive in Peshitta

  Ps 86:11

- 5.11.7.2 Infinitive construct in Masoretic Text rendered as a construction with □ (relative or otherwise) in Peshitta

  Ps 73:20a

- 5.11.7.3 Infinitive construct in Masoretic Text rendered as a noun in Peshitta

  Ps 75:7

- 5.11.7.4

  No examples are given here.

5.11.8 No verb constructs in the Masoretic Text and their rendering in the Peshitta

- 5.11.8.1–5.12.8.3, and 5.11.8.5

  No examples are given here.

- 5.11.8.4 No verb in Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in Peshitta

  Ps 73:28

5.12 New renderings not dealt with previously

5.12.1 Waw consecutive + an imperfect in the Masoretic Text rendered as a no verb construct or omitted in the Peshitta, e.g. Ps 81:13

The Peshitta in this instance omits the first verb וָאַשְׁלְחֵהוּ (waw cons + piel imperf 1 c sing) found at the beginning of the verse in the Masoretic Text and rather moves the second verb □□□□

(peal perf 3 masc sing) from the beginning of the second line to the first position of the first line of the verse and translates this verse using only this verb. The verb □□□□ in the Peshitta is the rendering of יֵלְכוּ (qal imperf 3 masc pl) in the second line of the verse in the Masoretic Text. The Syriac language does not have the root of וְאַשַּׁלְחֵהוּ as used in the Hebrew (Sokoloff, 2009:1565). This rendering is probably not related to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but rather a different interpretation of the unvocalised Hebrew or probably due to not understanding the unknown Hebrew verb.

5.12.2 Imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta, e.g. Ps 86:11

The Hebrew verb is a *hapax legomenon* and very problematic in this instance (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:238; Kraus, 1993:84, 92; Tate, 1990:376). This verb is unknown to the Peshitta and it appears only here as a piel (Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner, 2014:660). It is possible that the Peshitta reads the imperative in the Masoretic Text as the qal imperfect; hence it renders this verb as an imperfect. Although this is a new rendering of the translation (an imperative in the Masoretic Text rendered as an imperfect in the Peshitta), it does not suggest a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but rather a different interpretation of the same unvocalised Hebrew text.

The following conclusions can therefore be made concerning the translation of the Peshitta Psalter with regard to the psalms treated.[110]

i. In some instances, the differences in the translation can be ascribed to translation technique, for example Psalm 77:2. In these instances, the Peshitta adds words not found in the Masoretic Text or omits words found in the Masoretic Text with the sole aim of attempting to clarify the Masoretic Text.

ii. Other differences are the result of different interpretations of the very same unvocalised Hebrew text and same consonants, for example Psalm 76:11. In these cases, it often concerns the same consonants of the same unvocalised text or Hebrew *Vorlage* but with different vocalisation or at times the same vowels, but then read as a different word (e.g.

[110] See also Conclusions: Translation of the Peshitta Psalter with reference to Psalms 73–89 (p. 435).

Psalm 73:20). At times, the first two consonants are the same but there is a different third consonant (e.g. Psalm 73:7).

iii. Other differences are the result of the Peshitta having a different Hebrew *Vorlage* that is different from the one the Masoretic Text has, for example 73:6a-a. The Peshitta *Vorlage* will be discussed in Chapter 6 (pp. 413 ff).

5.13 Degree of agreement and disagreement between verbs as rendered by the Peshitta and these verbs as rendered by the Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum

In view of all psalms studied (Psalms 73–89), deductions are made here about the way in which the verbs as rendered in the Peshitta agree or differ from those in the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum. This will help to determine the relationship between the versions. The objective, however, is not so much to determine the relation between the Masoretic Text and the versions as to determine aspects related to the translation technique. The results obtained thus far will be examined to determine whether a common or general interpretation or different interpretations of the same unvocalised Hebrew text can be indicated, or whether a common or different Hebrew *Vorlage* was used or not.

Conclusions will be made within the schema of the verbal forms identified in the Masoretic Text: perfect, imperfect, imperative, jussive, cohortative, participle, infinitive construct, no verb as well as the treatment of texts with critical problems.

5.13.1 Perfect verbs in Masoretic Text

5.13.1.1 Perfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions

- 5.13.1.1.1. Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text > perfect without waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:9a, the verb used in the Peshitta is in agreement with the verb used in the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum.

- 5.13.1.1.2 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text > perfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:2b, all the versions use a verb that agrees with the verb all the others use. Only the Peshitta adds 'and', which is not found in the Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum.

- 5.13.1.1.3 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text > perfect of □□□ plus participle Peshitta

In Psalm 73:2b, all the versions use a verb with the same meaning; the Peshitta renders it as a combination of a participle plus perfect of □□□.

- 5.13.1.1.4 Perfect without waw in Masoretic Text > as adjective (no verb) by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:12, the Peshitta renders the verb in the Masoretic Text as an adjective. In this instance, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and Targum agree with one another rendering the verb as found in the Masoretic Text and not as an adjective like the Peshitta. The Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum support each other but stand in contrast to the Peshitta. The Peshitta does therefore not have support from other versions.

- 5.13.1.1.5 Perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text > as an imperfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:8c, the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate use a verb that agrees with the verb used by each of them, while the Targum uses a verb agreeing with the Masoretic Text. In this instance, therefore, the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate support each other but stand in contrast to the Targum.

- 5.13.1.1.6 Perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text > imperative by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:7c, the Peshitta is the only version that renders the verb in the Masoretic Text as an imperative, which does not fit into the context. In this instance, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum agree with each other in contrast to the Peshitta. It is most likely that the Peshitta regards both the first two verbs in the unvocalised Hebrew in the Masoretic Text as imperatives, which is possible in the unvocalised text. The Peshitta translator in this instance did not understand the Hebrew.

- 5.13.1.1.7 Perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text > a participle by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:3c, it is only the Peshitta that renders the verb in the Masoretic Text as a participle and it does not have any support from the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum. The Peshitta further

makes an implicit relative clause in the Masoretic Text explicit, which is not the case in other versions.

- 5.13.1.1.8 Perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text > imperfect without waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 89:3a, all the versions in this instance understand the Hebrew correctly. All retains the word order. The Peshitta uses □ □□□ before the verb, the Vulgate uses *quia*, the Septuagint uses ὅτι and the Targum uses ארום to render the Hebrew כִּי.

In Psalm 89:3c, the Peshitta renders the verb as an imperfect, while the Vulgate and the Targum render it as a perfect and the Septuagint offers it as an aorist. In this instance, the Peshitta and the Targum render this verb as the subject in first person singular, while the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as the subject in the second person masculine singular.

5.13.1.2 Perfect verbs with waw in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions

- 5.13.1.2.1 Perfect with waw copulative > perfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 80:13b, there is an agreement between the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate, but the Targum has a participle.

- 5.13.1.2.2 Perfect with waw copulative > by a participle with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 78:34d, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum have an imperfect verb, while the Peshitta has a participle with waw. The Peshitta differs from other versions and has no support.

5.13.1.3 Perfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions

- 5.13.1.3.1 Perfect with waw consecutive > as imperfect wit waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:11, the Peshitta and the Targum render the verb, which is a perfect in the Masoretic Text, as an imperfect, while the Vulgate and Septuagint render it as a perfect and aorist respectively. The Peshitta and the Targum understand the Hebrew syntax in their rendering.

- 5.13.1.3.2 Perfect with waw consecutive > as imperfect without waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 89:26a, all versions understand the Hebrew correctly in their rendering. All use the same common verb ('to put/ place/set') in this regard. The Peshitta renders this verb as an imperfect, since it probably sees this verb as not having any connection with the previous one, thus forming a completely new line. Both the Vulgate and the Septuagint render this verb as a future indicative active, while the Targum renders it as an imperfect like the Peshitta.

- 5.13.1.3.3 Perfect with waw consecutive > as a perfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:13a, both the Peshitta and the Targum renders the Hebrew verb as perfect, while both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as a verb in the future. All the versions use a common verb with the same meaning and thus agree in this regard.

5.13.2 Imperfect verbs in the Masoretic Text

5.13.2.1 Imperfect verbs without waw in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions

- 5.13.2.1.1 Imperfect without waw >as an imperfect without waw by the Peshitta

In Psalm 74:21c, although the Peshitta and the Targum render this verb as an imperfect, and the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as future, they all agree as they have a verb with the same meaning. In this instance, the versions all agree. The Semitic imperfect should normally be translated as a future in Greek and Latin.

- 5.13.2.1.2 Imperfect with waw > imperfect plus waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 75:6b, the Peshitta renders the verb as an imperfect plus waw, the Targum renders it as participle, while the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as an imperative without waw. In this instance, except for the Septuagint and the Vulgate, the versions do not agree. Only the Peshitta adds the waw connecting this verse to the previous one, but it receives no support from the other ancient versions. The Hebrew never uses the imperative for a negative command, while the Septuagint and the Vulgate do it as in this instance, both providing a good translation of the Hebrew.

- 5.13.2.1.3 Imperfect without waw > a participle by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:10a, only the Peshitta renders this verb as a participle, while both the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it as a future and the Targum as an imperfect. The ancient versions in this case have the verb with the same meaning (‘to reproach, insult or revile’).

- 5.13.2.1.4 Imperfect without waw > perfect without waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 77:3c, the Septuagint and the Vulgate render this verb as ‘to cheat or deceive’, the Peshitta renders it as ‘to keep silent/be at peace’, while the Targum renders it as ‘to become faint’. The meaning rendered by the ancient versions differs. The Peshitta does not agree with any of the ancient versions. It uses a general verb for a specific one and it adds a waw at the beginning of the new line connecting it with the previous one. The Peshitta further changes the subject ‘my hand’ to ‘his hand’, as well as the third person feminine singular of the verb to the first person singular. The whole line is a clear indication of simplification of the Hebrew. The Vulgate and the Septuagint have the same rendering and retain the word order. The Targum changes ‘my hand’ to ‘my eyes’ and thus the first part of this line reads differently and does not offer any assistance in this regard.

- 5.13.2.1.5 Imperfect without waw > perfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 80:14a, the Peshitta renders a generic translation of the *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew as it is unknown. The Peshitta and the Vulgate render this verb as a perfect, the Septuagint as an aorist and the Targum as an imperfect. They all render the verb differently as far as the meaning is concerned. The Vulgate has ‘to exterminate’, the Septuagint ‘to treat with indignity’, the Peshitta ‘to eat’ and the Targum ‘to break’. It is clear that they all tried to make sense of the unknown verb.

- 5.13.2.1.6 Imperfect without waw > perfect of □ □ □ plus participle by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:3c, the Septuagint and the Vulgate have a participle, while the Peshitta has a combination of a participle plus a perfect of □ □ □, and the Targum has an imperfect. The Peshitta with its combination of a participle plus the perfect of □ □ □ has a very good rendering of the Hebrew.

- 5.13.2.1.7 Imperfect without waw > no verb by Peshitta

In Psalm 81:13b, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Targum have this verb as a perfect, while the Septuagint has it as aorist. The Peshitta has only one verb, while the other versions retain the second verb as in Hebrew. The Peshitta does not receive support from the other versions. The Peshitta has simplified the text trying to clarify the Hebrew.

- 5.13.2.1.8 Imperfect without waw > imperative by Peshitta

In Psalms 85:7a and 85:7b, both the Peshitta and the Targum retain the rhetorical question, while the Vulgate and the Septuagint turn it into a statement, which marks the difference between the ancient versions. These versions deal differently with a rhetorical question. The Peshitta renders both imperfect verbs in Hebrew as imperatives, but both the Vulgate and the Septuagint render the first verb as a participle, which one would not expect, and both the Vulgate and the Septuagint render the second verb as a future as one would expect. The Targum renders both verbs as an imperfect as one would expect.

5.13.2.2 Imperfect verbs with waw consecutive in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by other versions

- 5.13.2.2.1 Imperfect with waw consecutive > as a perfect without waw in Peshitta

In Psalm 81:13a, the Peshitta omits the first verb in the Masoretic Text and moves the second verb to the first position in the line, thus changing the word order. It further uses two prepositional phrases subordinate to the verb. The Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum retain both verbs and the same word order as the Masoretic Text. Due to the omission of the first verb and moving the second to the first position, the Peshitta reads differently from the other ancient versions. It does not receive any support from the ancient versions for omitting the first verb or moving the second verb to first position; instead, the rendering of these versions are stand in contrast to the rendering by the Peshitta.

- 5.13.2.2.2 Imperfect with waw consecutive < as perfect with waw by Peshitta

Regarding Psalm 77:7d, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint understand the imperfect with waw consecutive and this can be deduced from their renderings. The Peshitta, the Vulgate,

the Targum and the Septuagint are slightly different from each other due to some variants present or absent in the versions. All retain the meaning of the Masoretic Text but render it differently from each other. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of the line connecting it to the previous one, but gains no support from other ancient versions for this addition.

- 5.13.2.2.3 An imperfect with waw consecutive > imperfect without waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 76:3, the Peshitta does not render the imperfect with waw consecutive as referring to the past. The Peshitta does not understand the Hebrew use of the waw consecutive plus the imperfect, while the Vulgate, the Targum and the Septuagint understand the Hebrew use of the waw consecutive plus imperfect correctly. The Peshitta further omits the waw consecutive in the Hebrew and just renders the verb without waw. The Peshitta does therefore not enjoy the support of the other ancient versions.

5.13.2.3 Imperfect verbs with waw copulative in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.2.3.1 Imperfect with waw copulative > an imperfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 86:9d, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, the Targum and the Septuagint agree and support each other. In this instance, all versions understand the Hebrew correctly. All the versions retain the waw for the waw copulative in the Hebrew. The Peshitta renders an imperfect as an imperfect as could be expected and the Targum does the same. As could be expected the Vulgate and the Septuagint render the imperfect as future indicative.

- 5.13.2.3.2 Imperfect with waw copulative > as an imperfect without waw by the Peshitta

In Psalm 86:17b, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint support each other, while the Targum is very different from them and does not offer any assistance to confirm the verbal form used in the rendering. The Peshitta renders the imperfect as a waw copulative with a combination of □ plus an imperfect rather than a waw as would be expected. The relative □ connects the verb to the previous imperative. The Targum retains the imperfect. The Septuagint renders this as an imperfect, while the Vulgate has the present indicative. The versions render the verbal form differently, but the Peshitta renders a good idiomatic translation of the Hebrew construction of an

imperative followed by imperfect with waw here, indicating the purpose of the imperative in this regard.

- 5.13.2.3.3 Imperfect with waw copulative > perfect with waw by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:8b, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint render this verb in the past (‘spoken’), while the Targum renders it as the Masoretic Text does (‘speak’). The other versions therefore agree with each other as opposed to the Targum. All the versions retain the conjunction as in the Hebrew and thus agree with each other.

- 5.13.2.3.4 Imperfect verb with waw copulative > as □ plus imperfect by Peshitta

In Ps 83:17b, only the Peshitta makes the implied subordinate construction of the Masoretic Text explicit and thus does not have the support of the other ancient versions. The Peshitta has the relative particle □ with an imperfect; this indicates that the Peshitta understands the Hebrew sequence of an imperative followed by an imperfect to indicate purpose at times. Because of this sequence, the Peshitta uses □ with an imperfect to render the imperfect with waw copulative in Hebrew. The Targum renders this verb as an imperfect. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate renders this verb as future indicative as could be expected. The Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum retain the conjunction as well. The versions agree in their rendering of the Hebrew with each other in this instance.

5.13.3 Imperatives in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.3.1 Imperative in the Masoretic Text > imperative by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:2a, all the ancient versions agree with each other and it is only the Vulgate that has an adjective before the imperative.

- 5.13.3.2 Imperative in the Masoretic Text > no verb by the Peshitta

In Psalm 82:4b, the Peshitta omits the second imperative found in the Hebrew, while the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum retain it. The omission could be the result of trying to simplify the Hebrew, since the two imperatives in Hebrew are synonyms. The Peshitta does not have the support of the ancient versions regarding the omission of the second imperative.

5.13.4 Jussives in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.4.1 Jussive in the Masoretic Text > imperfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 83:2a, the Peshitta does not understand the first part as found in Hebrew and changes the negative statement into a question and renders the word for 'silence' as 'blood'. The Vulgate, the Targum and the Septuagint understand the first part and thus do not support the Peshitta.

- 5.13.4.2 Jussive in the Masoretic Text > imperfect plus □ by Peshitta

In Psalm 85:9d, the Septuagint does not retain the negative as in the Masoretic Text, while the Peshitta and the Targum retain it. The Vulgate is very different without the negative and does not offer any help in this instance. The Peshitta uses □ to render the Hebrew ו and thus sees the last part of the verse as expressing the purpose of the imperative at the beginning of the verse. The Septuagint and the Targum do not offer support to the Peshitta in this regard.

- 5.13.4.3 Jussive in the Masoretic Text > perfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 81:16c, the Peshitta follows the Syriac language structure and syntax and thus deviates from the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate, the Targum and the Septuagint agree with each other. The Peshitta renders this jussive as perfect, because it has rendered the imperfect at the beginning as a perfect. The Peshitta does this to maintain consistency. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate read this as an imperfect and thus render it as a future as could be expected.

5.13.5 Cohortatives in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.5.1 Cohortative in the Masoretic Text > imperfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:17b, all the ancient versions agree with each other regarding the meaning in this instance. The word order is maintained. Both the Peshitta and the Targum render this verb as an imperfect, while the Vulgate renders it as a future as could be expected and the Septuagint renders it as aorist subjunctive.

- 5.13.5.2 Cohortative in Masoretic Text > perfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 77:2a, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Targum have similar renderings, but the Septuagint has added some variants not found in other versions and reads a bit differently. The Peshitta and the Vulgate render this verb as a perfect, while the Septuagint renders it as aorist and the Targum has an imperfect.

- 5.13.5.3 Cohortative in the Masoretic Text > no verb by Peshitta

In Psalm 77:12b, the Peshitta omits the second half of the verse while the Vulgate, the Targum and the Septuagint retain this part as found in the Hebrew. The other versions agree with each other but stand in contrast to the Peshitta. The Peshitta omits the second part of the verse, probably because it regards it as unnecessary or unimportant and thus avoids the repetition of the verb 'to remember'. The Peshitta is not supported the Septuagint, the Vulgate or the Targum.

5.13.6 Participles in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.6.1 Participle in the Masoretic Text > participle in the Peshitta

Psalm 74:5b in the Hebrew is very difficult to translate. The versions do not agree about the translation; each one translates it in its own way.

- 5.13.6.2 Participle in the Masoretic Text > participle in a relative construction with □ by the Peshitta

In Psalm 74:12b, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint read the same and thus agree with each other. The Targum has variants not found in the other versions. The Peshitta uses □ with the participle to indicate the idea of futurity or prospective presence and render the Hebrew correctly. Every one of the ancient languages renders the Hebrew participle according to its own structure and syntax.

- 5.13.6.3 Participle in the Masoretic Text > noun in the Peshitta

In Psalm 73:3b, the Peshitta renders the Hebrew verb as a noun. Both the Vulgate and the Septuagint render the Hebrew participle as an adjective, while the Targum renders it as a participle. The renderings of the versions differ, because the Hebrew verb in this instance is a *hapax*

legomenon and thus it is unknown. The Peshitta rendering is therefore is not supported by any of the ancient versions.

- 5.13.6.4 Participle in the Masoretic Text > imperfect in relative construction with □ by Peshitta

In Ps 81:11a, the Vulgate and the Septuagint read the same, while the Targum has the same word order with additional variants not found in another version. The Peshitta renders the participle in Hebrew as imperfect plus relative particle □, the Vulgate as a perfect, while the Septuagint and the Targum both have a participle. The Peshitta and the other ancient versions render a very good translation for the Hebrew construction in this instance.

- 5.13.6.5 Participle in the Masoretic Text > perfect by the Peshitta

In Psalm 76:7, it is quite possible that all the versions read the participle in the unvocalised Hebrew text as a perfect. It is possible that the versions interpreted the unvocalised Hebrew differently at some points.

- 5.13.6.6 Participle in the Masoretic Text > imperfect by the Peshitta

In Psalm 78:4b, the verbal forms in the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum coincide with each other but stand in contrast to the Peshitta. In this example, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum render this verb as a participle, while the Peshitta renders it as an imperfect. The Peshitta is therefore not supported by any of the ancient versions, but it is closer to the Masoretic Text than the other versions.

5.13.7Infinitive constructs in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.7.1 Infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text > an infinitive by the Peshitta

In Psalm 76:10c, the Septuagint, the Peshitta and the Targum agree with each other rendering the verb as an infinitive, while the Vulgate renders this verb as an imperfect using a more idiomatic Latin construction. The Peshitta renders in this instance an infinitive construct plus preposition לְ as an infinitive plus preposition □.

- 5.13.7.2 Infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text > as a construction with □ (relative or otherwise)

In Psalm 73:20a, the Peshitta, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum render this verb, which is an infinitive construct with preposition, as a participle and agree with each other in this regard, although the Peshitta uses the relative particle as well.

- 5.13.7.3 An infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text > noun by the Peshitta

In Psalm 73:20b, the Septuagint and the Targum render the verb as an infinitive construct, while the Peshitta and the Vulgate render it as a noun. In this regard, the Peshitta and the Vulgate understand the unvocalised Hebrew text differently. It is very possible to confuse this verb with the noun for 'city', especially in the unvocalised Hebrew text since the verb and the noun have the same consonants. In this instance, the ancient versions are divided.

- 5.13.7.4 An infinitive construct in the Masoretic Text > □ □ plus perfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 81:6b, the Peshitta the Vulgate and the Septuagint agree and retains the word order as in the Hebrew text. These versions are in agreement with each other, although the Targum has variants not found in the others and thus deviates without any support.

5.13.8 No verb constructs in the Masoretic Text: Rendering by Peshitta compared to rendering by the other versions

- 5.13.8.1 No verb in the Masoretic Text > finite verb by Peshitta

In Psalm 73:18c, all versions have difficulty in understanding the Hebrew, hence the different renderings. The noun is rendered by the Peshitta as an imperfect, both the Vulgate and the Targum render it as perfect and the Septuagint render it as an infinitive.

- 5.13.8.2 No verb in the Masoretic Text > participle by Peshitta

In Psalm 74:3b, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text. The Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum agree with each other since none has a participle and thus stand in contrast to the Peshitta. The Peshitta does not have the support from any ancient version.

- 5.13.8.3 No verb in the Masoretic Text > infinitive by the Peshitta

In Psalm 76:10b, the Peshitta has an infinitive for a noun, while the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum have a noun. The Peshitta is the only version that deviates from the Hebrew source text. The Peshitta does not have any support from the ancient versions.

- 5.13.8.4 No verb in the Masoretic Text > imperfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 88:16d, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text, while the Septuagint, the Vulgate and Targum have 'your terrors', following the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta has no support from the ancient versions.

- 5.13.8.5 No verb in the Masoretic Text > perfect by Peshitta

In Psalm 89:35c, the Peshitta the Vulgate and the Septuagint render the noun as a verb, while the Targum renders it as a noun. The Peshitta gains support in this regard from the Vulgate and the Septuagint.

5.14.6 Deductions about texts with critical issues

The texts with text-critical issues have been fully and adequately discussed in 5.9 Texts with text-critical issues (pp. 344 ff) above. The intention here is just to give a brief summary of the most important examples.

Following the footnote regarding Psalm 73:6a-a (p. 346), the versions differ from the Masoretic Text. In this case the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate seem to have had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* than the Masoretic Text. The versions indeed differ from the Masoretic Text.

In Psalm 73:7 (p. 347), the Peshitta render the verb עבר in Hebrew as □ □ □. The two consonants (□ and ר) are easily confused, which may be a scribal error that occurred during transmission. Because of switching the consonants, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text. This reading enjoys no support from the other ancient versions. The conclusion is that the reading of the Peshitta does not point to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but rather to an error in translating or transmitting the Peshitta.

In Psalm 73:10 (p. 349), an example of harmonisation is clearly visible, while Psalm 73:15–16 (p. 351) provides a clear example of simplification.

In Psalm 73:20a (p. 353), it is also possible that the Peshitta and the Septuagint had a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, with a participle and not the infinitive. It is also important that the Peshitta does not use the infinitive with other prepositions than the preposition ☐. The Hebrew verb in 73:20b (בָּעִיר) creates a lot of confusion because it looks the same as a noun for 'in the city'. Following this rendering of Psalm 73:20, in particular the three verbs in this verse, it is possible that the Peshitta had different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

In Psalm 73:24 (pp. 355 ff), it is interesting to note that the imperfect (תַּנְחֵנִי) is rendered as an imperative ☐☐☐☐☐☐, which is the same or is equal to תְּנַחֲמֵנִי. The Peshitta rendering would be of a Hebrew verb with a מ. In this instance as well, the Peshitta probably had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* that had the verb with a מ.

In Psalm 75:5 (pp. 358 ff), the Peshitta changes the first person singular in the Masoretic Text to second person masculine singular, simply to keep the same sequence as in verse 2, where God is addressed. The differences in this verse are not the result of a different *Vorlage*.

In Psalm 75:7 (p. 362), the Hebrew הָרִים can be described in two ways, one as a verb and the other as a noun. The unvocalised Hebrew text is probably one of the reasons for this complicated text. The verb in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a noun by the Peshitta, but the rendering is not to be ascribed to a different Hebrew *Vorlage,* but rather to different interpretations of the same unvocalised Hebrew text.

In Psalm 76:6a (p. 364), the verb אֻשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ is a *hapax legomenon*, which the Peshitta renders as a more common verb, namely ☐☐☐☐☐☐. What complicates the matter is that the Hebrew gives a verb with א instead of יִשְּׁתּוֹלְלוּ, which would be expected for third person masculine plural. As the verb is known, the Peshitta renders it as perfect masculine plural as found in the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 77:2 (p. 366) provides an example in which the Peshitta adds words and variants not found in the Hebrew with the intention of making it clearer and easier to understand. In this verse, the Peshitta adds the verbs ☐☐☐☐☐☐ and ☐☐☐☐☐☐, which are not in the Hebrew, and further it makes use of a specific verb ('to answer') rather than a general one ('to give ear' or 'to listen') as is the case in the Masoretic Text. In this instance, the addition of the two verbs and the

use of the last verb, which have different connotations but the same basic meaning, can be regarded as a translation technique to render the Hebrew in idiomatic Syriac.

The Peshitta in Psalm 77:7 (p. 370) has a verb for a noun in the Masoretic Text. The Targum also has a noun. The Septuagint offers no help in resolving the matter here, since the verb referred to is mentioned in verse 6. It is quite possible that the Peshitta and the Septuagint had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* here. In Psalm 78:28 (pp. 372 ff), it is also possible that the Peshitta could have had a Hebrew *Vorlage* that is different from the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic Text. It renders the imperfect with waw consecutive as a waw plus perfect, as is frequently done. However, it has the verb as a peal, whereas the Masoretic Text has a hiphil, marking a change of subject as well.

In Psalm 86:11 (p. 382), it is interesting that the Peshitta reads the Hebrew rare verb יחד (imperative) as a qal imperfect; hence it renders it as imperfect. This does not suggest a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but it is rather a different interpretation of the same unvocalised Hebrew text.

In Psalm 87:6 (p. 383), the Masoretic Text has בִּכְתֹּב (prep בְּ. + qal inf constr כתב 'to write') as a second verb, which the Peshitta renders as □□□□□ (prep □ + noun masc □□□□ 'writing, script'). This is probably a case of the *Vorlagen* of the different versions not having the vowel letter waw and reading the consonant as a noun, not an infinitive.

In Psalm 88:16 (p. 386), the Peshitta verb for the Hebrew verb אָפוּנָה is □□□□□ (waw + aphel imperf 2 masc sing □□□). The differences regarding this verb may reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or an attempt to make sense of the difficult Hebrew of the Masoretic Text.

5.15 Conclusion

To sum up, one of the most fundamental features of the Peshitta Psalter as has been seen in the psalms studied and the Peshitta as a whole is the generally accepted notion of the clarity of the translation. To attain this clarity, the Peshitta harmonises the text, for example, where the verb in the first line is a perfect or imperfect in the Masoretic Text, the Peshitta renders the second verb of the verse in the second line accordingly, as in Psalm 73:10.

The Peshitta frequently simplifies problematic and difficult Hebrew. In Psalm 73:15–16, the Peshitta omits the last part of verse 15 and omits the first part of verse 16, shortening these verses.

The Peshitta does not often use the infinitive with prepositions other than ܒ, and Psalm 73:20a provides an example.

At times, the differences between the Masoretic Text and the versions or between the versions are caused by different interpretations of the same unvocalised Hebrew consonantal text, for example בָּעִיר, which can be interpreted as a verb or a noun. The unvocalised Hebrew text does not make matters easier but complicates it further. In Psalm 73:20b, בָּעִיר occurs as a verb in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders it as a noun but gains no support from the other versions. In this instance, the difference is not because of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* but rather a different interpretation of the same Hebrew consonants of the same text (see 78:60; 78:63; 86:11; 87:7). In other instances, the Peshitta changes the subject of the verb as it appears in the Masoretic Text (e.g. Psalm 75:4, 75:5).

The Peshitta often uses the particle ܘ to link the second line of the verse to the previous one, for example in Psalms 73:28 and 75:4. In most cases, the Peshitta will add a waw not present in the Masoretic Text at the beginning of the second line to link it with the previous one, which is typical of Syriac style (Ps 74:8). The Peshitta does this also in instances where the Masoretic Text has verbs that follow one another but are not joined by a conjunction. At times, when the Masoretic Text has two different verbs in a verse, the Peshitta opts to render both as one verb or repeats the same verb twice (Ps 74:8). At times, when a verb in the Masoretic Text is repeated twice, the Peshitta avoids the repetition and renders it as one verb only. In Ps 81:9, the Peshitta renders the preposition ל with suffix first person singular as a pronoun pronominal suffix as in the verb ܬܫܡܥܢ (peal imperf 2 masc sing + pro 1 c sing ܢܝ ‘to listen, hear’). In Psalm 81:13, the Peshitta omits the first person verb in a verse and only renders the second one, but it gains no support from the other versions. The Peshitta condenses the Hebrew, but this is not because of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but rather being faithful to the Syriac syntax.

When confronted by difficult, rare words or *hapax legomena*, the Peshitta opts to simplify or omit them or rather render the translation according to sense or context, for example in Psalm 86:11. The rendering of 87:6 is not because of a Hebrew different from יחד, but rather because of a different interpretation.

For the waw consecutive or waw copulative, the Peshitta in some instances uses the conjunction waw, namely □. The combination of □ □□□ in the Peshitta is the rendering of כִּי in Hebrew.

In only a few instances, the readings in the ancient versions of these psalms can be regarded as resulting from a different *Vorlage*.

Chapter 6
The Peshitta Psalter and its Hebrew Vorlage

Introduction

It has been stated earlier that the Masoretic text is the source text against which other ancient versions are measured; it is referred to as the *textus receptus* ('received text') of Hebrew Scripture.[111] Based on this assumption, the verbal forms in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text have been compared with the verbal forms in Peshitta Psalms 73–89 with the aim of identifying variants and differences in the Syriac Psalms. The comparison between the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta was followed up by comparing the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta with other ancient versions to identify which of the variants indicate that the Peshitta probably had a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from that of the Masoretic Text (Chapter 6). In this chapter, the examples that exhibit such a possible Hebrew *Vorlage* will first be discussed.

From the research it has become clear that the variants often reveal the translation technique the Peshitta used in translating verbs. After discussing the examples that might indicate an archetype different from the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic Text, a summary will be given of the translation techniques that have come to the fore in the study up to now and how the translation technique can be used in text-criticism to attest to a *Vorlage* different from that of the Masoretic Text.

The psalms that will be discussed in this chapter are 73:6a-a, 73:15–16, 73:20a, 73:24a, 77:3, 78:28, 81:6, 87:6, 88:16 and 89:48. It has to be kept in mind that the rendering of the Peshitta was done from an unvocalised Hebrew text so that the variants could also be the result of an unvocalised text interpreted in different ways.

[111] See 1.8.1 The Masoretic Text as the hypothetical *Vorlage* of the translation of the Peshitta Psalter (p. 15) and 3.2 Textual criticism of the Old Testament (p. 61)

6.1 Examples possibly exhibiting a different Vorlage

Psalm 73:6a-a

The footnote a-a in BHS is about יַעֲטָף־שִׁית חָמָס (qal imperf 3 masc sing עטף ‘to cover, hide’ + noun masc sing in the construct state שִׁית ‘garment/clothing’) and חָמָס (noun masc sing ‘violence’).

The Masoretic Text has יַעֲטָף שִׁית חָמָס (‘Violence covers them as a garment’). The Peshitta has ܘܐܬܟܣܝ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ ܥܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܚܛܗܬܗܘܢ (‘and they are covered with their iniquity and sin’), with ܘܐܬܟܣܝ (waw conj + ethpaal imperf 3 fem pl ܟܣܐ ‘to cover, to be hidden’) + ܥܘܠܗܘܢ (noun masc plural ܥܘܠܐ ‘iniquity’) and ܘܚܛܗܬܗܘܢ (waw conj + adj pl ܚܛܝܐ ‘evil’). This tran**s**lation makes the active verb a passive in the Syriac, probably with ‘the evildoer’ as subject.

The Vulgate has *operti sunt iniquitate et impietate sua* (‘they are covered with their iniquity and their wickedness’), while the Septuagint has περιεβάλοντο ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν (‘They clothed themselves with injustice and their impiety’), and the Targum reads גיוותנותא לכך כן עטרתנון (‘Therefore they have ardoned them with pride like a crown’). In this instance, the Targum has quite a different reading that does not offer any help in this regard.

The footnote 73:6a-a in the BHS reads ‘Vrs alit; l frt עָטָף pro יׅ et cj חׅ c 'שִׁית'’, which simply means that the versions differ from the Masoretic Text. The BHS proposes a qal perfect instead of qal imperfect (Briggs & Briggs, 1907:148). In this particular instance, it seems as if the Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint had a Hebrew *Vorlage* that was different from that of the Masoretic Text. It is indeed true that the versions differ from the Masoretic Text, but one can still take note of the rendering of the verb in the different versions – except in the Targum, which is fairly different.

On the one hand, the difference could also be the result of the versions trying to simplify the difficult Hebrew text at their disposal. The Peshitta renders the verb as an imperfect, agreeing with the Masoretic Text. The Vulgate has a perfect and the Septuagint an aorist. These two renderings support the proposal of BHS. If the imperfect in the Masoretic Text is retained, the Peshitta renders

an imperfect as an imperfect, as was shown in Chapter 4.[112] Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:228) shed more light on the rendering of this verse.

On the other hand, the possible unvocalised Hebrew *Vorlage* at the disposal of the Peshitta and other ancient versions (the Septuagint and the Vulgate) could have read ויעטפו בחמסו ורשעים ('They are covered with violence and evil'). It is thus possible that the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate had a *Vorlage* that was different from the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic Text.

Psalm 73:15–16

The Masoretic Text has the following:

(15) אִם אָמַרְתִּי אֲסַפְּרָה כְמוֹ | הִנֵּה דוֹר בָּנֶיךָ בָּגָדְתִּי

(16) וָאֲחַשְׁבָה לָדַעַת זֹאת | עָמָל הִיא [הוּא קרי] בְעֵינָי

((15) Literally: 'If I say, I will speak in this way, behold, a generation of your sons, I would deceive'/ Idiomatically: 'If I say I will speak in this way/manner, behold, I would deceive/betray (not to be true to) a generation of your sons'.

(16) Literally: 'And I thought, to know, this, painful, it (was), in my eyes'/Idiomatic: 'And I thought to know this. It was painful in my eyes').

The footnote ('perhaps one should read כָּהֵם with reference to the Peshitta') to verse 15 relates to the verb בָּגָדְתִּי (qal perf 1 c sing בגד) – the Septuagint manuscripts have second person singular.

The critical problem in verse 16 relates to the verb וָאֲחַשְׁבָה (waw cons + piel imperf 1 c sing חשׁב). The footnote in the BHS reads 'mlt Mss Edd 'וַ', which implies many manuscripts and editions read a waw copulative, not a waw consecutive. Both lines of this verse are problematic and not easy to render (Briggs & Briggs, 1907; Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson & Tanner, 2014:586; Tate, 1990:229).

The Peshitta has the following:

15 ܐܢ ܐܡܪܬ ܐܓܝܕ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܗܐ ܕܪܟ ܒܢܝܟ ܒܓܕܬ

16 ܘܚܫܒܬ ܕܢܕܥ ܗܕܐ ܥܡܠ ܗܘ ܒܥܝܢܝ

[15] ('If I say, I will tell/make/do, like them';

[16] 'It will be iniquity in my eyes' or 'It was a wearisome thing in my eyes') (Tate, 1990:229).

The Peshitta condenses both verses in the Masoretic Text.

[112] See 4.2.1.2 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperfect verb plus waw (p. 155)

The Vulgate has the following:

> [15] *Si dicebam: Narrabo sic; ecce nationem filiorum tuorum reprobavi* ('If I said: I will speak thus; behold I should condemn the generation of thy children'), with the verb *reprobavi* (perf indic act 1 sing *reprobo reprobare*);
>
> [16] *Existimabam ut cognoscerem hoc; labor est ante me* ('I studied that I might know this thing, it is a labour in my sight), with the verb *existimabam* (imperf indic act 1 sing of *existimo existimare*.

The Septuagint has the following:

> [15] εἰ ἔλεγον Διηγήσομαι οὕτως, ἰδοὺ τῇ γενεᾷ τῶν υἱῶν σου ἠσυνθέτηκα ('If I had said, "I will speak thus," I would have been untrue to the generation of thy children'), with the verb ἠσυνθέτηκα (perf indic act 1 sing ἀσυνθετέω).
>
> [16] καὶ ὑπέλαβον τοῦ γνῶναι τοῦτο κόπος ἐστὶν ἐναντίον μου ('But when I thought how to understand this, it seemed to me a wearisome task'), with the verb ὑπέλαβον (aorist indic act 1 sing ὑπολαμβάνω).

The Targum reads as follows:

> [15] אין אמרית אישתעי דמכמתהון הא על דר בנייך ארשעי ('If I had said, "I will speak as they do," behold, I would have acted wickedly against the generation of your children'), with the verb ארשעי (aphel perf 1 sing רשׁע).
>
> [16] וחשבית למידע ית דא ליעות הוא בעיני ('So I thought how to know this, [but] it was a vain labor in my sight'), with the verb וחשבית (conj + peal imperf 1 sing חשׁב).

The Peshitta omits the last part of verse 15 and the first part of verse 16. This results in simplification of what is found in the Hebrew. The Peshitta renders the perfect without waw at the beginning of verse 15 as a perfect without waw, as has been shown in Chapter 4.[113]

The Peshitta condenses these verses into a shorter version than found in the Masoretic Text, probably not understanding the Hebrew or reading a different *Vorlage*.

[113] See 4.1.1.1 Perfect verb without waw rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 93).

The Peshitta *Vorlage* could have read

אם אמרתי כי עבדתי כהם עול בעיני [15–16]

('If I say that I will do like them, it will be perversity in my eyes').

In this example, the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Targum follow the Masoretic Text, while the Peshitta does not have any support from the other versions.

Although a different *Vorlage* is possible for the Peshitta, it is rather an instance of condensing, a translation technique employed by the Peshitta.

Psalm 73:20

Example: Psalm 73:20a

According to Kraus (1993:73), this verse is disfigured and not easy to read or understand. The use of the Hebrew בָּעִיר is very problematic since it can be interpreted as either a verb or a noun. In this regard, an attempt is made to decide whether a different *Vorlage* was used or whether it was just a matter of different interpretations during copying or transmission.

The Masoretic Text has כַּחֲלוֹם מֵהָקִיץ | אֲדֹנָי בָּעִיר צַלְמָם תִּבְזֶה (NIV: 'As a dream when one awakes, so when you arise, O Lord, you will despise them as fantasies'), with the verbs מֵהָקִיץ (prep מִן + hiph inf constr קוּץ/קִיץ) and בָּעִיר (prep בְּ + עִיר + inf constr + עור, omitting the prefix of the hiph inf) and תִּבְזֶה (qal imperf 2 masc sing בזה).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□
□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□

('[They are] like one who awakes when he sees a dream. O Lord in the city [kerita] you treat their image with contempt').

The verbs are □□□□□□□ (ethpeel ptc masc sing □□□), plus preposition □ + □□□□□□ (noun fem sing □□□□□ 'village, town, city') and □□□□ (peal imperf 2 masc sing □□□).

The Vulgate has *Velut somnium surgentium, Domine, in civitate tua imaginem ipsorum ad nihilum rediges* ('As the dream of them that awake, O Lord; so in thy city thou shalt bring their image to

nothing'), with *surgentium* (present ptc act pl *surgo surgere), in civitate tua* (prep + noun fem sing *civitas* + adj fem sing) and *rediges* (future indic act 2 sing of *redigo redigere)*.

The Septuagint reads ὡσεὶ ἐνύπνιον ἐξεγειρομένου, κύριε, ἐν τῇ πόλει σου τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτῶν ἐξουδενώσεις ('They are like a dream when one awakes, on awaking, O Lord, in your city you will despise their phantoms/images'), with ἐξεγειρομένου (present part middle/passive of ἐξεγείρω); ἐν τῇ πόλει (prep + art + noun dative fem sing πόλις 'city'); and ἐξουδενώσεις (future indic act 2 sing ἐξουδενόω 'to set a naught').

The Targum has the following:

היך חילמא מן גבר דמיתער יהוה ליום דינא רבא באתעריתהון מן בית קבורתהון
ברגז דמותהון תבסר

('As a dream from a drunken man who awakens, O Lord, at the day of the great judgment when they awake from their graves, with anger you will despise their image').

The verb is דמיתער (conj + ethpeel ptc עיר); באתעריתהון (prep + ethpeel inf pl עיר) and תבסר (peal imperf 2 masc sing of בסר).

The footnote 73:20a relates to the verb מֵהָקִיץ (prep מִן + hiph inf constr קוּץ קיץ). It reads 'Septuagint (Symmachus, Jerome and Targum) ἐξεγειρομένου, refer to the Peshitta'. The verb of the Septuagint is a present participle middle/passive of ἐξεγείρω. It is probable that the Septuagint and the Peshitta had a different *Vorlage*, with a participle and not an infinitive. Otherwise, this is an example of an infinitive in the Masoretic Text rendered as a participle. One has to remember that the Peshitta does not often use the infinitive with prepositions other than ☐.[114] The versions read a participle.

This would then be that a *Vorlage* had a participle and not an infinitive as in the Masoretic Text. To get a participle, the 'he' has to be taken away from מֵהָקִיץ and only מקיץ retained. In this instance, the difference in the *Vorlage* is indeed that only the 'he' is taken away.

Probably the Hebrew *Vorlage* at the disposal of the Peshitta read מקיץ.

[114] See 4.7.2 Infinitive construct rendered as a construct with ☐ (relative or otherwise) (p. 254).

Psalm 73:24

The Masoretic Text has בַּעֲצָתְךָ תַנְחֵנִי | וְאַחַר כָּבוֹד תִּקָּחֵנִי (NIV: 'You guide me with your counsel, and afterwards you will take me into glory'), with the verb תַנְחֵנִי (hiph imperf 2 masc sing + suff 1 c sing נחה). The Peshitta reads ܒܥܙܬܟ ܬܢܚܡܢܝ ܘܒܬܪ ܟܕ ܬܩܒܠܢܝ ('By your thoughts console me and afterwards lead me into your glory'), with ܬܢܚܡܢܝ (pael imperative masc sing with suff 1 sing ܢܚܡ 'to comfort').

The Vulgate reads *et in voluntate tua deduxisti me, et cumgloria suscepisti me* ('and by thy will thou hast conducted me, and with thy glory thou hast received me'), with *deduxisti* (perf indic act 2 sing of *deduco deducere*). The Septuagint has ἐν τῇ βουλῇ σου ὡδήγησάς με καὶ μετὰ δόξης προσελάβου με ('Thou dost guide me with thy counsel, and afterward thou wilt receive me to glory'), with the verb ὡδήγησάς (aorist indic act 2 ὁδηγέω). The Targum has עלי לאייתאה תסבנני במלכתך תדברינני ובתר שלים איקרים דאמרת ('You lead me with your counsel in this world, and after the glory that you said you would bring upon me is complete, you will receive me'), with תדברינני (pael imperf 2 masc + suff 1 sing דבר).

The footnote to 73:24a, which reads 'Peshitta reads bj'jnj = תְּנַחֲמֵנִי', relates to תַנְחֵנִי.

The Hebrew has תַנְחֵנִי (hiph imperf 2 masc sing + suff 1 c sing נחה 'to guide'), whereas the Peshitta has ܢܚܡܢܝ (pael imptv masc sing with suff 1 sing ܢܚܡ 'to comfort'). According to the text-critical note, the Peshitta reads 'bj'jnj = תְּנַחֲמֵנִי' (piel imperf 2 masc sing + suff 1 c sing נחם), and will translate as 'console me'.

The interesting aspect here is to see the imperfect in the Masoretic Text translated as an imperative in the Peshitta. The Septuagint renders it as an aorist indicative active, the Targum as an imperfect and the Vulgate as a perfect. In this case, the Masoretic Text has the imperfect without waw, which the Peshitta renders as an imperative.[115] The Peshitta could have had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* here, with the verb נחם.

The Hebrew *Vorlage* used to render the Peshitta probably read בעצתך תנחמני.

[115] 4.2.1.8 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as an imperative (p. 180).

Psalm 77:3c

The Masoretic Text reads יָדִי לַיְלָה נִגְּרָה וְלֹא תָפוּג (NIV: 'At night I stretched out untiring hands')/ [A more literal translation: 'At night my hand was extended and did not grow weak'], while the Peshitta has □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ ('And his hand in the night pulled me away and I did not rest'). The Peshitta renders the verb נִגְּרָה (niph perf 3 fem sing נגר 'to be fully stretched out') in the Masoretic Text as a verb □□□□□□ (peal perf 3 fem sing □□□ 'to draw, pull out/stretch out'). The perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered as a perfect without waw. The difference in this instance involves the last consonants of the two verbs, namely ר in the Masoretic Text and □ in the Peshitta.

The Vulgate has *manibus meis nocte contra eum et non sum deceptus* ('With my hands lifted up to him in the nigh, and I was not deceived'), with *contra eum* (prep + a pron masc sing for the verb used in Hebrew). The Septuagint reads ταῖς χερσίν μου νυκτὸς ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθην ('[even] with my hands by night before him, and I was not deceived'), with a preposition plus a pronoun masculine singular for the verb used in Hebrew, and in the second part of the passage, an aorist indicative passive first person common singular of ἀπατόω 'to cheat, trick'). The Targum reads בליליא זלגת עיני דמעתא ולא תפוג ('In the night my eye flowed with tears, and did not become faint'), with the verb זלגת (perf peal 3 fem sing זלג 'to flow'). The Targum is quite different from the Masoretic Text.

In this example, the Masoretic Text has a perfect without waw, which is rendered the same in the Targum, but as a perfect in the Peshitta. The Vulgate does not have a verb, but has a preposition corresponding to the Hebrew נגד. The Septuagint also has a preposition corresponding to נגד. The Peshitta does not agree with any of the ancient versions and has a verb, but with the same root as the Hebrew preposition נגד.

It is quite clear that the Septuagint, the Peshitta and the Vulgate had *Vorlagen* with ד, and not ר.

Psalm 78:28

The Masoretic Text reads וַיַּפֵּל בְּקֶרֶב מַחֲנֵהוּ ('He made them come down inside their camp'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ ·□□□□ □□□□□ ('And they fell in their camp').

The Vulgate reads *Et ceciderunt in medio castrorum eorum* ('And they fell in the midst of their camp'). The Septuagint has καὶ ἐπέπεσον εἰς μέσον τῆς παρεμβολῆς αὐτῶν ('And they fell within their camp). The Targum has ואפיל במצע משיריתיה ('And he made them fall in the midst of his camp').

The Masoretic Text reads וַיַּפֵּל (waw cons + hiph imperf 3 masc sing נפל 'to cause to fall'), while the Peshitta has □□□□□ (conj + peal perf 3 masc pl □□□ 'to fall'). The Vulgate reads *ceciderunt* (perf indic act 3 plural of *caedo caedere*), while the Septuagint has ἐπέπεσον (aorist indic act 3 pl ἐπιπίπτω). The Targum has ואפיל (conj + aphel imperf 3 masc sing נפל). The Peshitta renders the waw consecutive plus imperfect in the Masoretic Text as a perfect.[116]

The footnote as it appears in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* indicates that the Septuagint (Peshitta and Jerome) has καὶ ἐπέπεσον ('and they fell'), which is the same as or equals וַיִּפְּלוּ (waw cons + qal imperf 3 masc pl נפל 'to fall'). The footnote indicating a hiphil affects the meaning: 'He caused (them) to fall in the middle of the camp'/'They fell in the middle of the camp'. The Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate support the footnote, while the Targum supports the Hebrew text. It brings about a difference in meaning.

The Peshitta could have had a different *Vorlage* with waw consecutive plus qal imperfect rendered as a perfect with waw in the Peshitta, as has been shown in Chapter 4.[117] It reads a plural in contrast to the singular of the Masoretic Text, but that agrees with the different stem formation. The Peshitta, the Vulgate and the Septuagint also read 'their camp', not 'his camp'.

The possible Hebrew *Vorlage* that the translator of the Peshitta had at his disposal would have read ויפלו במחנהם ('and they fell in their camp').

Psalm 81:6

The Masoretic Text reads עֵדוּת בִּיהוֹסֵף שָׂמוֹ בְּצֵאתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם | שְׂפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֶשְׁמָע (NIV: 'He established it as a statute for Joseph when he went out against Egypt, where I heard a language I did not understand'), with יָדַעְתִּי (qal perf 1 c sing ידע 'to know') and אֶשְׁמָע (qal imperf 1 c sing שׁמע 'to hear, listen').

[116] See 4.2.2.1 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as a perfect verb without waw (p. 184).
[117] See 4.2.2.2 Imperfect verb with waw consecutive rendered as perfect verb with waw (p. 187).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□

('He made it a decree for Joseph, when he went out to the land of Egypt, where he heard a language he did not understand').

The verb is □□□ □□□ (peal ptc masc sing □□□ 'to know') + □□□ (peal perf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to be, was') and □□□ (peal ptc masc sing □□□ 'to hear, listen').

The Vulgate reads *Testimonium in Joseph posuit illud, cum exiret de terra AEgypt; linguam quam non noverat, audivit* ('He ordained it for a testimony in Joseph, when he came out of the land of Egypt: he heard a tongue which he knew not'), with *noverat* (pluperf indic act 3 sing of *nosco noscere*) and *audivit* (perf indic act 3 sing of *audio audire*). The Septuagint has μαρτύριον ἐν τῷ Ιωσηφ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου γλῶσσαν, ἣν οὐκ ἔγνω, ἤκουσεν ('He made him a solemn charge in Joseph, when he went out from the land of Egypt. He heard a tongue he did not know'), with ἔγνω (aorist indic act 3 sing γινώσκω/γιγνώσκω) and (aorist indic act 3 sing ἀκοὐω). The Targum has the following:

סהדותא על יהוסף שויה דלא קריב לאתת ריבוניה ביה ביומא נפיק מבית אסירי
ושליט בכל ארעא דמצרים ספתא דלא חכימית אליפית שמעית

('He gave testimony concerning Joseph, that he did not draw near to the wife of his master: in the day when he came out of prison and ruled over the land of Egypt, I learned and heard a language I did not know'), with חכימית (peal perf 1 sing חכם) and אליפית (pael perf 1 singular אלף) and שמעית (peal pf 1 sing שׁמע).

In this instance, the Masoretic Text has the verbs in the first person, a perfect followed by an imperfect. The Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate have the third person singular form, while the Targum follows the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders the perfect of the Masoretic Text as a perfect of □□□ plus the participle and the imperfect as a participle. The Targum renders both as perfects, while the Septuagint and the Vulgate use a form indicating the past tense. In this instance, the Peshitta, the Septuagint and the Vulgate could have had a different *Vorlage*.

Chapter 4 provides an example of the translation where the Peshitta renders a perfect without waw as □ preceding the combination of a perfect of □□□ plus participle.[118] Chapter 4 provides a befitting example of rendering an imperfect without waw as a participle.[119] The Septuagint renders 'Joseph' as the subject of the verse and it is followed by both the Peshitta and the Vulgate (Tate, 1990:319–320). Regarding the subject, Hossfeld and Zenger (2005:320d) indicate further that in verse 6c, as in verse7a, the Septuagint retains the third person singular, thus making 'Joseph' the subject throughout verses 6–7a (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:320d). The double change of person in the Masoretic Text is avoided in the Peshitta. Because of the *lectio difficilior*, and that it is rather important to retain the Masoretic Text (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:320d), the Targum reads very differently and does not shed any light on the problem.

The unvocalised Hebrew *Vorlage* at the disposal of the Peshitta translator probably read

שפת לא־ידע ישמע.

The Peshitta Psalms agree with the Septuagint and the Vulgate, following the Masoretic Text with slight differences, for example, changing the first person singular to third person masculine singular. The Peshitta retains the third person masculine singular throughout, avoiding the change of person in the Masoretic Text. This demonstrates the translation technique of harmonisation.

Psalm 87:6

The Masoretic Text reads יְהוָה יִסְפֹּר בִּכְתוֹב עַמִּים | זֶה יֻלַּד שָׁם סֶלָה ('The Lord will write in the register of the peoples: "This one was born there." Selah'), with יִסְפֹּר (qal imperf 3 masc sing ספר ('to count [up], register') and בִּכְתֹּב (prep בְּ. + qal inf constr כתב 'to write'). The Peshitta reads □□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□¨□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ ('The Lord will write [count] in the register [writing/script/document] of the people, this one was born there'), with □□□□ (peal imperf 3 masc sing □□□ 'to count') and □□□□□ (prep □ + noun masc □□□□ 'writing, script').

[118] See 4.1.1.3 Perfect verb rendered as a perfect of □□□ plus participle (p. 121).
[119] See 4.2.1.3 Imperfect verb without waw rendered as a participle (p. 158).

The Vulgate has *Dominus narrabit in scripturis populorum et principum, horum qui fuerunt in ea* ('The Lord shall tell in his writings of peoples and of princes, of them that have been in her'), with *narrabit* (future ind act 3 sing *narrow narrare* and *scripturis* (ablative pl noun of *scriptura*).

The Septuagint reads Κύριος διηγήσεται ἐν γραφῇ λαῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων τούτων τῶν γεγενημένων ἐν αὐτῇ διάψαλμα ('The Lord will give details in his list of peoples and of rulers, namely, those that have been born in it. Interlude on strings'), with διηγήσεται (future indic middle 3 sing διηγέομαι) and γραφῇ (noun fem dat sing of γραφὴ). The Targum has תמן לעלמין יהוה על סיפרא די מכתבין ביה חושבן כל עלמיא דין מלין איתרבא ('The Lord has gone into a book in which are written the number of all the peoples; this king was anointed there. Forever'), with סיפרא (noun fem sing ספר) and מכתבין (aphel ptc כתב).

The footnote 87:6b relates to the verb יִסְפֹּר (qal imperf 3 masc sing ספר 'to count [up], register') in the Masoretic Text. The footnote states that the Septuagint has διηγήσεται, which reads the same as יְסַפֵּר (piel imperf 3 masc sing of ספר) (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:378h-h; Tate, 1990:386). The Peshitta reads this the same as the Masoretic Text. In this case, the *Vorlage* has the same consonants but they are differently vocalised, since the original Hebrew text was unvocalised. Thus the unvocalised text could have read יספר.

The footnote 87:6c is related to the verb בִּכְתֹּב (prep בְּ. + qal inf constr כתב 'to write') as used in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta renders it as □□□□□ (prep □ + noun masc □□□□ 'writing, script'). According to the footnote, some manuscripts and the Septuagint read ἐν γραφῇ, and the fifth column of the Hexapla reads ἐν ἀπογραφῇ, which is the same as בִּכְתָב; the Targum and many manuscripts have בכתב, with reference to the Peshitta, Targum (see Kraus, 1993:187). The Peshitta renders an infinitive in the Masoretic Text as a noun, as seen in Chapter 4.[120] In this example, all the versions agree with each other but stand in contrast to the Masoretic Text; all render the infinitive verb in the Masoretic Text as a noun.

The proposed *Vorlage* probably had the same unvocalised consonants, namely בכתב. Because the *Vorlage* of the relevant versions did not have the waw vowel letter, the difference could also be the result of the versions reading the consonants as a noun, and not as an infinitive.

[120] See 4.7.3 Infinitive construct rendered as a noun (p. 257).

Psalm 88:16

The Masoretic Text reads עָנִי אֲנִי וְגוֹעַ מִנֹּעַר | נָשָׂאתִי אֵמֶיךָ אָפוּנָה (NIV: 'From my youth I have been afflicted and close to death; I have suffered your terrors and am in despair'), with וְגוֹעַ (conj + qal act ptc masc sing גוע 'to expire, breathe one's last, die'), נָשָׂאתִי (qal perf 1 c sing נשׂא 'to lift, raise [high]') and אָפוּנָה (qal imperf cohortative 1 c sing פוּן 'to be embarrassed/in despair'). The NIV accepted the proposal of BHS for this translation.

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□

('I am a poor person and tired from my youth; I am raised up, I am humble and was amazed).

The verbs are □□□□□ (conj + peal act ptc masc sing □□□ 'to be tired, to be unable'), □□□□□□□ (ethpeel perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to be exalted, raise high, elevated'), □□□□□□□ (conj + ethpaal perf 1 c sing □□□ 'to be humbled') and □□□□□ (waw + peal perfect 1 sing □□□ 'to be amazed').

The Vulgate has *Pauper sum ego, et in laboribus a juventute mea; exaltatus autem, humiliates sum et conturbatus* ('I am poor, and in labours from my youth: and being exalted have been humbled and troubled'), with *sum* (present indic act 1 *sum esse* 'to be'); *exaltatus* (perf ptc pass nom masc sing *exalto exaltare* 'to exult' 'to jump about', 'to let oneself go'); *humiliates* (perf ptc pass nominative masc sing *humilio* 'to humble') plus *sum* (present indic act 1 sing *sum esse*) and *conturbatus* (perf ptc act nom masc sing *conturbo conturbare* 'to confuse, disquiet').

The Septuagint reads πτωχός εἰμι ἐγὼ καὶ ἐν κόποις ἐκ νεότητός μου, ὑψωθεὶς δὲ ἐταπεινώθην καὶ ἐξηπορήθην ('Poor I am and in troubles from my youth up; and after being exalted I was humbled and became perplexed'), with εἰμι (present indic act 1 sing εἰμί 'to be, exist'); κόποις (noun masc pl κόπος); ὑψωθεὶς (aorist ptc pass nom masc sing ὑψόω 'to lift/raise/ elevate/ exalt'); ἐταπεινώθην (aorist indic pass 1 sing ταπεινόω); and ἐξηπορήθην (aorist indic pass 1 sing ἐξαπορέω 'to be in great doubt/doubt').

The Targum has עניא אנא ונגיד מן טליא סוברית דחילתך טעינא עלי (‘I have been afflicted and dying since youth; I have borne your terror; it is loaded upon me’), with ונגיד (conj + peal perf 1 sing נגד); סוברית (quadriliteral perf 3 masc pl סובר) and טעינא (peal perf 1 sing טעי).

Psalm 88:16a and b

Footnote 88:16a refers to וְגֻוַּעַ (conj + qal act ptc masc sing גוע) and it reads ‘The Septuagint (Peshitta, Jerome) has καὶ ἐν κόποις (“and in trouble or suffering or weariness”), probably reflecting or same as וְיָגֵעַ (adj masc sing)’ (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:391m; Tate, 1990:398(16a)). The *Vorlage* at the disposal of the Peshitta probably read ויגע.

Footnote 88:16b concerns נָשֵׂאתִי (qal perf 1 c sing נשׂא ‘to lift, raise [high]’) and it reads ‘the Septuagint (the Peshitta) ὑψωθεὶς is the same as נִשֵּׂאתִי (piel perf 1 sing נשׂא)’. The Peshitta renders a perfect as a perfect, but reads the unvocalised text as a piel, not a qal.

Thus the unvocalised text at the disposal of Peshitta read נשאתי.

Footnote 88:16d concerns אָפְוֻנָה (qal imperf cohortative 1 c sing פוּן ‘to grow stiff, numb, be feeble or cold) (Holladay, 1988:289), and it proposes אפוּגָה (‘to be weary’), refer to 77:3, but the Septuagint reads καὶ ἐξηπορήθην (‘I became perplexed’).

The differences in this verb may reflect a different *Vorlage* or an attempt to make sense of the difficult Hebrew of the Masoretic Text. A different *Vorlage* could have read אפוגה, thus deviating from the Masoretic Text, but the differences could also be ascribed to an attempt to make sense of the rare Hebrew verb. Should the last possibility be accepted, it would demonstrate the technique of simplification for the sake of clarity.

Psalm 89:48

The Masoretic Text reads זְכָר אֲנִי מֶה חָלֶד | עַל מַה שָּׁוְא בָּרָאתָ כָל בְּנֵי אָדָם (‘Remember how fleeting is my life. For what futility you have created all men!’), with זְכָר (qal imptv 2 masc sing + pron 1 c sing זכר ‘to remember, recall’) and בָּרָאתָ (qal perf 1 s of ברא).

The Peshitta has the following:

□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□

(‘Remember me from the grave, so that there should not be futility. You have created all men’).

The verb is □□□□□□□□ (ethpeel imptv 2 masc sing + pron 1 c sing □□□ ‘to remember, recollect, to call to mind’).

The Vulgate reads *Memorare quae mea substantia: numquid enim vane constituisti omnes filios hominum?* (‘Remember what my substance is: for hast thou made all the children of men in vain?’), with *memorare* (present passive imperative 2nd person singular *memoro memorare*). The Septuagint reads μνήσθητι τίς μου ἡ ὑπόστασις μὴ γὰρ ματαίως ἔκτισας πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων (‘Remember what my substance is. For, surely, you did not create all mortals in vain?’), with μνήσθητι (aorist imptv pass 2 sing (μιμνῄσκομαι/μιμνήσκω). The Targum has אדכר די אנא אתבריתי מן עפרא מטול מה לבטלא בריתא כל בני נשא (‘Remember that I was created from the dust, why have you created all the sons of man in vain?’), with אדכר (ethpeel imptv 2 masc sing דכר).

The footnote proposes it is probable that the Masoretic Text had an emphatic particle נָא after the imperative זָכָר, which has been lost (Hossfeld & Zenger, 2005:401k; Tate, 1990:412); hence the proposal adds the particle נָא to read זָכָר־נָא, although it has no vital relevance for the translations.

The problem is the independent personal pronoun after the imperative. The Peshitta adds the pronoun to the verb, ‘remember me (from the grave)’. All the versions have a problem with the Masoretic Text and render it differently.

The Peshitta possibly had a different *Vorlage*, or tried to make sense of a difficult text, by adding a suffix to the verb. The *Vorlage* would then have read זכרני (*zkrny*), that is ‘remember me’. Again the alternative to a different *Vorlage* would reveal a translation technique, an addition to simplify a difficult text for the sake of readability.

6.2 Translation technique

In as far as the translation technique of the Peshitta is concerned, Carbajosa (2016:269) attests that in order to define an original reading of the Peshitta it is vital to be aware not only of the translation technique that characterises it in general, but also of the translation techniques of each book in particular, as the books may differ in this regard. The necessity to study the translation technique of each individual book is underlined by the fact the translation is probably the product

of more than on translator. A general conclusion about the translation technique should therefore be avoided.

It has already been said that the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta is accepted to have been a Hebrew text similar to the medieval consonantal text of the Masoretic Text (Carbajosa, 2016:271). It is also accepted that it had already been stabilised in the second century AD. For this very reason, during copying and transmission, variants that had not been in the original Peshitta translation might have crept in or variants that could have been in the original translation might have been removed from the text. Errors could have crept in during transmission.

It has also been indicated that the Peshitta is mostly characterised by its quest to render a product that is very clear and readable (Carbajosa, 2016:272, 2017:96). This quest is driven by the zeal to provide a final product that is faithful to Syriac structure and Syntax. It wants to produce a version that mainly concentrates on the reader. The Peshitta translators concerned themselves with producing a final product that is in correct, clear and readable Syriac. They did not confine themselves to the source text from which they translated but focussed on the target text (Syriac). As a result, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text, for the approach of the translators led to a free translation in some instances. The history of the translation technique of the Peshitta shows that it developed from free rendering to more literal rendering from the second century up to and including the seventh century.[121] Freedom of translation comprises in this case being faithful to the meaning of the source text but expressing and rendering it according to the Syriac syntactical structure. The Syriac syntax is very flexible and the Peshitta will mostly deviate from the Hebrew word order in its quest for clearer constructions or trying to clarify the Hebrew, for example, the Peshitta makes explicit what is implicit in the Masoretic Text; this has frequently been indicated in Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff).

The following specific techniques contribute to the overall translation technique of the Peshitta: specification, accommodation, omissions, additions, changes in word order and harmonisation

[121] Following Brock, Carbajosa (2016:272, 2017:96) is of the opinion that the history of the translation technique used in the Peshitta falls into three periods according to the development of free translation technique. The first period, which lasted until the fifth century, is characterised by great freedom and an attempt to bring the text close to Syriac the reader; the second period, which encompasses the sixth century, is based on literalism; and the third period, which is the seventh century, is characterised by a continuation of literalism. (See *Free but faithful to the original text*, p. 11).

(maintaining agreement). These techniques were used by both the translator and the later scribes who made corrections (cf Carbajosa, 2016:269, 271). To this can be added that the Peshitta sometimes renders a plural in Hebrew as a singular or vice versa.

In the discussion above of the examples suggesting a different *Vorlage*, it has been shown that variants in the Peshitta suggesting a *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic Text, could reveal translation techniques of the Peshitta translator techniques. However, when witnesses do not attest to a different Vorlage, the variants are probably not the result of the translation techniques of the Peshitta, but rather different interpretations of the same Hebrew unvocalised text or additions of different vowels to the same unvocalised Hebrew consonants.

6.3 Specific translation techniques in the Peshitta Psalms

This section is a summary of the analysis of the verbal forms in Psalms 73–89 in the Masoretic Text and how they are rendered in the Peshitta. It is therefore an outline of the specific translation techniques identified in the Peshitta Psalms in relation to the Masoretic Psalms. The synopsis is given within a framework of the technique**s** described by Carbajosa (2008:73–317).

Not every example and technique is discussed, but a synopsis of the techniques discussed in the previous chapters, especially in Chapter 3 (pp. 57 ff) and Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff), is given.

6.3.1 Harmonisation (Carbajosa, 2008:104–127, 224–232; Carbajosa, 2016:269–273)

The technique of harmonisation occurs frequently in this group of psalms and it contributes to the deviation of the Peshitta Psalms from the Masoretic Text, as rightly spelled out by Carbajosa (2008:224, 2016:269, 271). In Psalm 74:9, the translator changed the first verb in the first part to be in the third person like the verb in the previous verse so as to maintain harmony. In Psalm 81:8a, the Peshitta adds variants not present in the Masoretic Text in order to maintain the sequence of the words.

Following Carbajosa (2016: 273), it is through harmonisation (and assimilation as similar devices) that some details of the source text (*Vorlage* – Masoretic Text in this case) are modified in the target text, thus linking or bringing them closer to one or several similar texts in the same chapter,

a different or another chapter or in another book in the Bible. In Psalm 81:8a, the Peshitta adds the suffix first person singular to maintain the sequence.

6.3.2 Assimilation (Carbajosa, 2008:128–135, 233–235; Carbajosa, 2016:272–273)

Just like harmonisation, assimilation also contributes to the deviation of the Peshitta Psalms from the Masoretic Text. According to Carbajosa (2008:233), some occurrences, particularly the extra-Masoretic Peshitta Psalms-Septuagint agreements, can be explained by shared assimilation. This technique is almost identical to harmonisation; the line of distinction is minimal. According to Carbajosa (2008:128, 2016:273), in the case of assimilation, it is not possible to precisely specify which text is the second text with which harmonisation takes place, since the deviation in the first text is can be related to a recurrent phrase in the same or another book of the Bible. Assimilation has to do with text which is composed of a multiplicity of texts that have the same recurrent phrase or common theme (Carbajosa, 2008:128). In this phenomenon, the Peshitta Psalms renders the strange words by the technique of assimilation, thus rendering it the same as where it was used first in the relevant book, or in other chapters or books. A befitting and clear example of this kind of assimilation as outlined by Carbajosa could not be found in the texts studied.

6.3.3 Specification (Carbajosa, 2016:269, 272–273)

The phenomenon of specification occurs frequently. It can be stated that the Peshitta Psalms has a tendency to render what is implicit in the Masoretic Text as explicit. It occurs in the following instances identified by Carbajosa (2008:30–33): (a) The Peshitta Psalms specifies the verb that the Masoretic Text leaves implicit. (b) The Peshitta Psalms specifies the existential predicate □ □ □ **,** which the Hebrew leaves implicit (e.g. Ps 74:9). (c) The Peshitta Psalms specifies the subject that is implicit in the Masoretic Text by using a personal pronoun or a noun, usually for the sake of clarity. (d) One of the most distinct and outstanding techniques of the Peshitta Psalms is the many times that it specifies the beneficiary of an action that is implicit in the Masoretic Text by making use of a pronoun. (e) Lastly, the Peshitta Psalms also has the tendency to specify the possessor by adding a possessive pronoun to a noun.

It must be noted that the opposite of specification also takes place, namely generalisation. An example of the technique of rendering a general verb in the Masoretic Text as a specific verb or a

specific verb in the Masoretic Text as a general verb is found in Psalm 73:43. In Psalm 88:15b, the Peshitta renders a specific verb ('to hide') in the Masoretic Text as a general or common verb ('to turn away'). Psalm 83:4b is an example where the Peshitta renders the specific verb וְיִתְיָעֲצוּ from the root יעץ 'to take counsel' in the Masoretic Text as a general verb □□□□□□□ from the root □□□ 'to deliberate, consult' (see chapter 4, 4.2.3.3).

In Psalm 78:23b, the Peshitta adds □ to make the implicit relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit. In Psalm 78:10b, the Peshitta makes the implicit subject in the Masoretic Text explicit.

6.3.4 Omissions (Carbajosa, 2008:65–69)

Poetic language favours repetition, particularly to ensure a specific rhythm in the composition (Carbajosa, 2008:65). However, the Peshitta Psalms does not give preference to repetition and thus avoids it. The Peshitta Psalms remains faithful to the Syriac language structure and syntax in its rendering of the Hebrew text. In Psalm 77:12b, the Peshitta does not repeat the verb אֶזְכְּרָה, since it is synonymous with the first verb at the beginning of the verse. It is possible that the translator thought it was a mistake and therefore did not render it. In Psalm 81:13b, the Peshitta moves the verb in the first position of the second line to the first position of the first line. It thus omits the first verb in the first position of the verse since this verb is not known to the Peshitta Psalms. With regard to this aspect, the Peshitta at times omits the verbs present in the Masoretic Text or renders them differently. In Psalm 73:15–16, the Peshitta omits the last part of verse 15, as well as the first part of verse 16, thus shortening the two verses. In Psalm 89:12, the Peshitta omits the suffix present in the last Hebrew verb; this rendering occurs frequently. In Psalm 74:11b, the Peshitta omits the verb כלה in the Masoretic Text and does not translate it. Here it is not clear why the translator did not translate this verb. The same is true for Psalm 81:3b. The Peshitta does not translate the Hebrew verb וּתְנוּ found in the Masoretic Text. In Psalm 82:4b, the Peshitta renders the verb in the first part, but omits the parallel verb in the second half of the verse. The Masoretic Text has two verbs in this verse. They are synonyms and omitting one could be a way of trying to simplify or clarify the Hebrew.

In conclusion it can be said the omitting verbs is a translation technique to simplify the text.

6.3.5 Additions (Carbajosa, 2008:38–42)

The Peshitta does not always render the Hebrew word for word, but remains faithful to the Syriac structure and syntax in its quest to render a clear and readable end product. Due to this approach and its freedom in rendering the Hebrew, the Peshitta adds variants not found in the Hebrew. In Psalm 89:39a, as well as in Psalm 89:52a, the Peshitta adds a suffix first person singular, which is not found in the Masoretic Text. The Peshitta adds these suffixes to refer back to David. In Psalm 89:20c, as well as in Psalm 89:50, the Peshitta adds □ to make an implicit relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit. In Psalm 77:5a, the Peshitta adds the suffix not found in the Masoretic Text and names the object of the verb. The waw here is also added for stylistic purposes. In the research on the psalms, it has been found that a verb in the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text rendered by the Peshitta as a perfect plus waw occurs 48 times, of which 14 occurrences are at the beginning of the new line. In Psalm 78:62b, the Peshitta adds the waw to the verb at the beginning of a new line, a verbal rendering that is absent from the Masoretic Text, and further it adds a preposition between the verb and the noun. To sum up, in 28 instances where the waw is not found in the Hebrew, the Peshitta adds a waw at the beginning of a new line or a section or a line connecting it to the previous one. In Psalm 74:6, the Peshitta adds a verb that is not present in the Masoretic Text. It is probable that the Peshitta does it to link this verse with the previous one, which is its way to clarify the difficult Hebrew in the Masoretic Text. In Psalms 77:7b, 81:9b and 88:16d, the Peshitta adds the verb not found in the Masoretic Text.

Additions clearly point to a specific translation technique of enhancing clarity.

6.3.6 Word order (Carbajosa, 2008:21–26)

Due to the flexibility and freedom of the Syriac language, it frequently deviates from the Hebrew text.

Many of these deviations occur in respect of the word order. Frequently, the Peshitta deviates from the Hebrew word order by being faithful to the Syriac structure and syntax in its rendering rather than following the Hebrew word order. Four techniques in this regard are observed by Carbajosa (2008:22). The first is the tendency of the Peshitta Psalms to *advance the verb to the first position*. In the psalms studied, Psalm 81:13b is a perfect example of this occurrence

(Carbajosa, 2008:22). The Peshitta omits the first verb and moves the final verb to the beginning of the verse. Peshitta Psalm 88:4a provides an example of the second technique of the Peshitta Psalms as regards word order, namely the tendency to move the subject of a verb to follow the verb. This technique occurs in instances where the Masoretic Text has a prepositional phrase between the verb and the subject. The third technique relating to the word order is that the Peshitta Psalms tends *to bring together the subject and the predicate in a nominal clause*, for example in Psalm 78:23b (Carbajosa, 2008:25). The fourth technique is that the Peshitta Psalms tends *to bring together the verb and direct object* as in Psalm 73:9a. Here the object follows a prepositional phrase in the Masoretic Text, but it follows the verb in the Peshitta (Carbajosa, 2008:25).

6.3.7 Changing the subject (not mentioned by Carbajosa)

In Psalm 88:8a, the Peshitta changes the subject and renders it differently from the Masoretic Text. In Psalm 89:20a, the Peshitta changes the subject in the Masoretic Text from second person singular to third person singular. In Psalm 75:2d, the Peshitta changes the subject from third person masculine plural in the Masoretic Text to first person plural. In Psalm 77:5a, the Peshitta changes the subject from second masculine to third masculine plural. Changing the subject by the Peshitta Psalms frequently takes place for purposes of harmonisation with the previous verb.

Changing the subject is a specific technique employed mainly to retain the sequence of previous verbs or for the sake of harmonisation with the previous verb and sometimes with a verb in the previous verse.

6.3.8 Rare or difficult words or *hapax legomena* (Carbajosa, 2008:73–86)

At times, the Peshitta deviates from the Masoretic Text as a result of rare or difficult words. These rare words are at times not translated, or they are simplified or rendered according to sense.

Carbajosa (2008:73) identifies various difficulties regarding words that the Peshitta Psalms translator had to render: *hapax legomena*, rare words or words difficult to translate. In the first two instances, the translator's challenge was that the words occurred only once or very few times and their meaning might not have been known; therefore they could have been rendered differently in the Peshitta. The translator chose a particular interpretation to be able to deliver a

translation. In some instances, the immediate context would have provided the means to assist the translator in producing a translation (Carbajosa, 2008:74). In other instances, the translator of the Peshitta Psalms rendered the *hapax legomena* on the basis of similar Hebrew roots (Carbajosa, 2008:74). Lastly, in other instances, the translator chose to omit the *hapax legomena* in the translation and not render them at all (Carbajosa, 2008:75). The problems described above frequently applied to verbs as well.

Several examples of rare or difficult words have been analysed in Chapter 4 and dealt with in more depth at the end of that chapter;[122] here only a synopsis is given.

The Peshitta in Psalm 73:3a simplifies the rare verb as it appears in the Hebrew. In Psalm 73:6a, the problem of the *hapax legomenon* is solved by translating it according to context. In Psalm 76:6a, the Peshitta uses a different verb to render the rare word in Hebrew since this word is not known. At times, the rare words are rendered according to sense and this is the case with the verb in Psalm 76:13a. In Psalm 80:14a, the Peshitta renders a generic translation for the Hebrew verb, which is a *hapax legomenon*.

In all of the instances, the differences resulting from the translation problems were not due to a different *Vorlage* but to the fact that the translator opted for a particular interpretation. The variety of specific techniques used to solve the problem of rare and difficult words are a manifestation of the free translation technique of the Peshitta.

6.3.9 Rhetorical questions (Carbajosa, 2008:27–29)

Poetry employs the use of rhetorical questions frequently and since the psalms are written in poetic form, this use is found quite often in the Hebrew psalms. The Peshitta Psalter frequently renders or converts the Hebrew rhetorical questions as assertions, affirmative or negative (Carbajosa, 2008:27). Sometimes, it renders rhetorical questions as statements (e.g. Ps 74:10a). In Psalms 85:7a and 85:7b, the Peshitta renders the rhetorical question in the Masoretic Text as a command, since it renders both verbs in the imperfect as imperatives. In Psalm 85:7, the Masoretic Text uses the interrogative particle הֲ, for which the Peshitta uses the imperative as a request. In Psalm 77:10, the Masoretic Text introduces the rhetorical question by הֲ in the first part and further

[122] See 4.9.4 Rendering of rare words (p. 286).

uses אִם in the third part, while the Peshitta uses ܐ ܐ at both the beginning of the first line and the second line to render the rhetorical question. This gives an indication that the rhetorical question is not always rendered the same. At times, the Peshitta renders a rhetorical question in the Masoretic Text as a negative statement, for example in Psalm 88:15b. Rhetorical questions are mostly rendered as corresponding statements by the Peshitta Psalms, because the Syriac does not have the Hebrew particle הֲ.

In its rendering of the rhetorical question, it is noteworthy that the technique of the Peshitta Psalms ensures that the original sense as in the Hebrew text is maintained.

6.3.10 The use of the relative particle ܕ (Carbajosa, 2008:39–42)

The relative particle ܕ is widely used in the Syriac language and it is used for various functions (Carbajosa, 2008:39; Muraoka, 1987:124). Throughout Psalms 73–89, the Peshitta frequently makes use of the relative particle ܕ to render various Hebrew constructions and to express purpose amongst others (Muraoka, 1987:16). On most occasions, the Peshitta uses the relative particle ܕ before the perfect verb ('to do') to render the relative אֲשֶׁר before the perfect verb in Hebrew ('to do'), for example in Psalms 78:4d, 78:3c, 78:5b, 78:8c, 78:9c, 78:10a; 78:13a, 78:20a, 78:21a, 78:21d, 78:22a, 78:22b, 78:24c, 78:25a, 78:26b, 78:30, 78:31a, 78:31c, 78:32a, 78:41c, 78:42a, 78:50b, 78:50c, 78:53b, 78:53d, 78:56c, 78:63a, 78:64a, 78:68b (relative as well in the Masoretic Text) and 78:69c. The Peshitta further uses ܕ to make the implicit relative construction in the Masoretic Text explicit, for example in Psalms 78:5c, 78:42b, 73:43 and 78:54b. The Peshitta Psalms will add ܕ to introduce direct speech (see Psalms 75:5c and 75:5d).

The Peshitta uses the relative particle ܕ to render various Hebrew constructions as found in the Masoretic Text and this can be viewed as a translation technique of the Peshitta translator.

6.3.11 Rendering according to sense or context: accommodation (Carbajosa, 2008:86–101)

The translation as rendered in this case is based on a clear Hebrew source text, but the deviation is driven by a quest to render a version or translation that is more harmonious with the context (Carbajosa, 2008:86). This feature is more contextually orientated than the faithful rendering of the Hebrew source. In some instances, the Peshitta renders the translation according to its

immediate context and thus does not follow the Hebrew text to the letter. In Psalm 85:3a, the Peshitta renders the translation according to sense and uses ܘ to link two nouns that are not linked in the Masoretic Text.

This specific technique is in line with the description of the Peshitta as a free translation and does not necessarily point to a different *Vorlage* of the Peshitta.

6.3.12 Free rendering

The rendering of the Hebrew text by the Peshitta is described as either literal or free (Weitzman, 1999:22–23). In Psalm 86:14b, the Peshitta renders a free translation of the Hebrew by adding a suffix pointing forward to the next noun (see Psalms 86:14c and 86:17e). In Psalm 89:41b, the Masoretic Text has a verb meaning 'to put or place or set', but the Peshitta renders it as 'to throw down or demolish'. Here the Peshitta gives a free translation by rendering the Hebrew verb plus the noun 'to ruin' as one verb 'to demolish' (Weitzman, 1999:44). The Peshitta translator freely rendered the Hebrew text by not following the grammar as in the Hebrew. The free rendering was probably the translator's solution for the difficult Hebrew that he did not understand. It is probable that when the translator could not understand the Hebrew clearly, he chose a free translation as solution.

Free translation is the overall technique and would not be indicating a different *Vorlage* in most of the cases.

6.3.13 The waw (Carbajosa, 2008:38)

Due to its poetic character, the Hebrew psalms are mostly characterised by juxtaposing the two stichs of a verse (Carbajosa, 2008:38). The Peshitta Psalms in contrast uses the copula ܘ to join or link the two and use the waw as a coordinator (also in other instances such as in Psalm 75:9d), a feature that is absent from the Masoretic Text. The addition of the ܘ by the Peshitta is not the result of a reading based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, but it is just a feature of Syriac syntactic style or it can be said it is done for stylistic purposes.

The Peshitta Psalms uses the addition of the waw at the beginning of the verse and at the beginning of the second line in the verse as it has frequently been seen in Psalms 73–89. Mostly the addition of the waw takes place without any Hebrew correspondence. The Syriac does not allow the Hebrew

use of verbs following one another without being joined together and will thus use the □ copulative for this purpose. In other instances – as in the Syriac translations of Psalms 73–89 – the □ is just used to represent the stichs in Hebrew. The Peshitta frequently adds the waw not present in the Masoretic Text for stylistic purposes, for example in Psalms 74:2b, 74:13b, 75:2d, 77:6, 77:15b and 77:16. The Peshitta adds the waw at the beginning of a new line connecting it with the previous sentence, for example in Psalms 78:40a, 78:19b, 78:57c and 78:59a. At times, the perfect without waw in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as the combination of the perfect of □□□ plus participle, which occurs seven times, for example in Psalm 73:2b. At times, the Masoretic Text presents two verbs following each other without a waw in between (יִמְצוּ יְשָׁתוּ), as in Psalm 75:9d. Syriac does not permit this construct and thus joins the two using a waw (□□□□□□ □□□□□) in its rendering.

The addition of the waw as in these instances is a stylistic feature of the Syriac language and typical of the translation technique to adapt the source text to the style of the target text. It does not suggest a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from that of the Masoretic Text.

6.3.14 'Softening' of the Hebrew verbs (Carbajosa does not mention it)

This specific technique is not explicitly mentioned by Carbajosa. The Peshitta at times 'softens' the Hebrew verbs found in the Masoretic Text, i.e. a strong Hebrew verb is rendered by a soft Syriac verb, for example in Psalm 74:10, the Hebrew verb meaning 'to reject' is rendered by the Syriac verb 'to forget'. This also occurs in Psalm 78:10b, where the Hebrew in the Masoretic Text translates as 'they refuse to go' and the Syriac translator rendered it as 'they did not want to go'.

This does not suggest the use of a different Vorlage but rather simplification of the Hebrew.

6.4 Conclusion

From the study of the differences between the Masoretic Text Psalms 73–89 and the Peshitta Psalms 73–89 with a view to identify variants that could indicate a possible Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta, two conclusions can be made.

In the first place, the variants can be the result of factors beyond the control of the Peshitta translator such as a different reading of the vocalised text as has been shown in Psalms 73:20, 77:3,

78:28, 81:6, 87:6, 88:16b and 89:48; or, in some instances, the difference can be related to translating an unknown verb, as in Psalm 88:16d.

In the second place, some variants in the Peshitta are not only absent from the Masoretic Text, but they are also not found in the other ancient witnesses. The absence of some variants could be the result of different specific translation techniques. The examples in which such variants occur are Psalms 73:6a-a, 73:15–16, 73:24 and 88:16a, thus only in a few of the psalms discussed.

From the above it is clear that the possibility of a different *Vorlage* of Book 3 of the Peshitta Psalms is minimal. This affirms that the Peshitta Psalms was translated from a proto-Masoretic, unvocalised Hebrew text that was in circulation during the second century AD (Carbajosa, 2017:93). The Peshitta was translated before the Vulgate and the Targum, of which the *Vorlagen* indicate versions with texts already much closer to the Masoretic Text (Carbajosa, 2017:93). What is also clear, even when the Peshitta renders a different reading, is that the Peshitta Psalms is more concerned with rendering a clear and readable end product; thus it focuses on the reader rather than on truthfulness to each detail of the text (Carbajosa, 2017:96).

As regards the value of translation technique in text-criticism, when a variant cannot be described as the result of a translation technique, it is probably a rendering of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. In this way, translation technique can be used in text-criticism to reconstruct the 'best' original text. Finally, the advice of Carbajosa (2016:276, 2017:96) has to be kept in mind, namely that the Peshitta Psalms may be used in textual criticism, but with great caution. This is advice that has to be heeded because of the free translation technique of the Peshitta.

Chapter 7
Conclusions and reflections

Introduction

This chapter consists of a synopsis of the research report and a conclusion.

7.1 Synopsis

In the first instance, I will give a synopsis based on the contents of all the chapters of this thesis.

7.1.1 Chapter 1

In Chapter 1 (pp. xxiii ff), the problem statement was formulated, and the background and the previous contributions by various scholars (eight of them, to be precise) were provided. The theoretical assumption was stated that the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew source (*Vorlage*) used by the Peshitta translator both reflect a similar tradition, in other words, the Peshitta used a source similar to the Masoretic Text. The aim was to test the assumption by the way the Peshitta renders the verbs in relation to the Masoretic Text. The claim further indicated that the Peshitta Psalms is a literal translation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* and that it plays an important role in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Psalms. It is indeed necessary now, at the end of this investigation, to weigh the assumptions against the research results.

The notion that the Peshitta was translated directly from a Hebrew text during the second century AD and later, independently of the Septuagint, although the influences of the Septuagint could have occurred, makes the Peshitta an important witness to the Masoretic Text. With the above in mind, the Peshitta Psalms could shed light on Old Testament textual criticism, but it has to be used with very careful consideration. When it comes to the translation technique in relation to the Peshitta, it is vital that each book has to be studied on its own merit and that one should avoid making general conclusions.

The problem statement addresses the following five key questions regarding the differences between the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta:

- How do the verbal systems of the Hebrew and the Syriac compare to each other?

- What is the translation technique of Peshitta Psalms?
- How were the verbal forms translated in the Peshitta?
- How does the translation of the Peshitta compare to the Septuagint, the Targum and the Vulgate?
- What can be deduced from the translation about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta Psalms?

The investigation was informed by the following five objectives: (1) to make a comparative study to determine the agreements and differences between the verbal systems of Hebrew and Syriac; (2) to determine the translation technique of the Peshitta Psalms; (3) to make an analytical study to determine the way in which verbal forms in the Peshitta Psalms were translated; (4) to determine through comparison with the Septuagint and the Targum the originality of the translation of the Peshitta; and (5) to make deductions from the translation about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta Psalms.

In order to adequately address the theoretical claim made in Chapter 1 through investigative and analytic study, the comparative text-critical method is the most appropriate and relevant method to achieve this goal. The comparative text-critical method was therefore used to validate the theoretical assumptions made. Translation technique and the value of the Peshitta received attention.

7.1.2 Chapter 2

In Chapter 2 (pp. 21 ff), the verbal systems of Biblical Hebrew and classical Syriac were compared, with special attention to the verbs taking into account the contributions of various scholars. The aim was not to develop a new theory in as far as the Hebrew verbal system is concerned, but rather to do an analysis of the Hebrew verbs found in the Masoretic Text and how they are rendered in the Peshitta. This chapter focused on (1) previous contributions with regard to the verbal systems of Hebrew and Syriac and (2) the use of the waw with the perfect and the waw with the imperfect in Hebrew, as well as the waw conversive, which is found in Hebrew but not in Syriac. Syriac makes use of compound constructions, which was also discussed in Chapter 2.

The Hebrew has a waw consecutive, which is absent from the Syriac language. Syriac may either make use of the conjunctive waw or use the relative particle □ in some instances to render the waw consecutive. In Biblical Hebrew, a clear distinction is made between the waw consecutive and the waw copulative, while Syriac does not have the distinction. The renderings used by the Syriac translators indicate that they usually but not always understood the Hebrew syntax.

Syriac uses compound tenses to render some Hebrew verbal forms. These were discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

Hebrew has a jussive and a cohortative, which are both absent from Syriac. The way in which the Peshitta Psalms renders these and other verbal forms was discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

7.1.3 Chapter 3

Chapter 3 (pp. 57 ff) paid attention to translation technique in general and to matters related to the translation technique of the Peshitta Psalms. Textual criticism in this investigation is seen as a tool to reconstruct the best text possible and also as a very vital tool for exegesis.

The study of translation technique and of both textual criticism and literary criticism are essential. The close bond between translation technique, literary criticism and textual criticism has been demonstrated by different studies mentioned in Chapter 3. Although each of them emphasises a different aspect, they play a unified role in this study. Different kinds of intentional or unintentional errors that could play a role in the transmission or translation of ancient texts are discussed in some detail in Chapter 3. The Septuagint, the Aramaic Targums, the Peshitta and the Vulgate are important witnesses to the Hebrew Bible and thus play a very significant role when it comes to the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. These versions contain all available relevant material from antiquity and Middle Ages including material obtained from translated works (Tov, 2012:115). These versions have different origins and each one has its transmission history, which makes them the object of textual criticism as well.

The views of Carbajosa and other scholars on the Peshitta were presented. It is indeed correct, as mentioned by Carbajosa (2017:96), that the Peshitta Psalms is mainly characterised by clarity in its quest to render not only a clear and faithful end product, but also one that is readable. Due to this aspiration, which also includes adherence to the Syriac syntax, the Peshitta Psalms deviates to

some extent from the Masoretic Text, as is demonstrated in the present research. The Peshitta Psalms is characterised by three phenomena, namely accommodation, harmonisation and assimilation.[123] These phenomena can be found at morphological, syntactic and semantic levels. The Peshitta Psalms is a vital document for textual criticism of the relationship Masoretic Text-Peshitta, but it must be used with great care.

7.1.4 Chapter 4

In Chapter 4 (pp. 90 ff), the verbs as they appear in the Masoretic Text were grouped morphologically (e.g. perfect, imperfect, etc) and were analysed in detail through a comparative study to determine how the Peshitta rendered them. Verbs that have the same rendering were grouped together and detailed deductions were made of how the Peshitta translators handled the Hebrew text at their disposal. The translation technique in relation to the Masoretic Text was determined. The verbs analysed were grouped according to the following conjugations: perfect, imperfect, imperative, jussive, cohortative, participle, infinitive construct and no verb (including adjectives and nouns.

In the table below a summary is given of the number of occurrences of the verbal forms in each of the groups discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

Verbal form	Number of occurrences
Perfect	247
Imperfect	276
Imperative	69
Jussive	11
Cohortative	18
Participle	73
Infinitive construct	27
No verb	27

[123] In Psalms 73–89 no clear examples of assimilations were identified in the Peshitta rendering of verbal forms in Psalms 73–89.

This discussion brings forth the description of the renderings of the verbs in the Masoretic Text by the Peshitta Psalms. Here the verbs in the perfect and in the imperfect occur the most. In the examples discussed, the perfect is used 247 times in the Masoretic Text. Of these, 234 occurrences are a perfect without waw. Of the perfects without waw, the Peshitta renders 165 of them as a perfect without waw and 48 as a perfect with waw. The Peshitta Psalms tends to add a waw to a verb. The addition of a waw to the perfect happens at the beginning of a verse (88:8a; 89:21), at the beginning of a new line or section in a line (73:19c; 74:2b) and between two verbs where the second one does not have a waw in the Masoretic Text (75:9d; 75:11b).

In the examples discussed, the imperfect is used 276 times. Of these, in 195 instances an imperfect without waw occurs, in 70 instances an imperfect with waw consecutive and 11 times an imperfect with waw copulative. As regards the 195 occurrences of an imperfect without waw, the Peshitta renders this verbal form as an imperfect without waw in 93 instances, as a perfect without waw in 41 instances and as a participle in 33 instances. Of the 70 instances of an imperfect with waw consecutive, the Peshitta uses a perfect with waw 39 times, a perfect without waw 30 times and an imperfect without waw once. The imperfect with waw copulative occurs only eleven times in these Psalms. Five of them are rendered as an imperfect plus waw and four as a perfect without a waw.

In the examples discussed, the imperative is used 69 times. Of these, 65 are rendered as an imperative. In the examples discussed in Chapter 4, the jussive is used 11 times. The Peshitta renders it 7 times as imperfect, 3 times as an imperfect plus □ and as a perfect once. In all cases where the Masoretic Text uses a jussive after the negative particle אַל, the Peshitta renders the verbal form as an imperfect after the negative particle □ □.

In the examples in Chapter 4, the cohortative is used 18 times. Of these, in 11 occurrences the cohortative is rendered as an imperfect, in 6 occurrences as perfects and once as no verb by the Peshitta.

In the examples as discussed in Chapter 4, the participle is used 73 times. Of these, a participle is rendered as a participle in 23 occurrences by the Peshitta, 12 times as a participle with a relative

construct □, 23 times as a noun, once as an imperfect with a relative construction □, 12 times as a perfect and 2 times as an imperfect.

In the examples discussed in Chapter 4, the infinitive construct is used 27 times. An infinitive construct is rendered by the Peshitta as an infinitive in 13 instances. Seven times a construction with □, is used, 6 times a noun and once □ □ plus perfect. The infinitive construct plus לְ in the Masoretic Text is rendered by the Peshitta as an infinitive construct plus □ and this is normal. The Peshitta in other instances renders the verb in the Masoretic Text as a noun with the same root (Ps 77:11c). In Psalm 73:8c, the Peshitta renders a rare noun in the Masoretic Text as a verb with a meaning close to it.

In the majority of instances, the word order as it appears in the Masoretic Text is retained. The change in the word order was discovered to be the result of normalising the word order in the Syriac or to comply with the Syriac syntax.

Only in a few instances there is a possibility of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

7.1.5 Chapter 5

In Chapter 5 (pp. 297), the Masoretic Text and the other ancient versions were compared. Attention was first paid to instances of deviation of the Peshitta from the Masoretic Text. Furthermore, an example of each as had been discovered in Chapter 4 was given and discussed. The verbs with text-critical problems were treated to determine whether the differences were the result of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, the translation technique or a different interpretation of the same Hebrew consonants.

After analysing the texts with text-critical problems as they appear in the Masoretic Text, especially those related to the verbs treated in Psalms 73–89, deductions could be made with regard to the translations by the Peshitta Psalms: first, about the kind of text-critical issues and second, about the groups as identified in the first part of Chapter 5 in relation to Chapter 4. With regard to text-critical issues, examples were identified showing Kethib-Qere issues, examples suggesting a different reading of the consonantal text, and examples showing confusion of similar looking consonants. A few examples of a possible different Hebrew *Vorlage* were found.

As regards the different groups distinguished in Chapter 4, the examples discussed in Chapter 5 usually agree with the way these groups were described in Chapter 4. Only a few instances in which the Hebrew verbs are rendered differently by the Peshitta were discovered, such as in Psalms 81:13 and 86:11. These and other examples were discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

Conclusions: Translation of the Peshitta Psalter with reference to Psalms 73–89

One can therefore conclude as follows concerning the translation of the Peshitta Psalter with regard to the psalms treated:

i. In some instances, the differences in the translation can be ascribed to translation technique, for example Psalm 77:2. In these instances, the Peshitta adds words not found in the Masoretic Text or omits words found in the Masoretic Text with the aim of clarifying the Masoretic Text or using idiomatic Syriac.

ii. Other differences are the results of different interpretations of the very same unvocalised Hebrew word but the same consonants, for example in 76:11. In these cases, a word may often have the consonants as a word in the unvocalised text or Hebrew *Vorlage*, but then it may have different vowels or at times the same vowels and read as a different word (e.g. Psalm 73:20). At times, the first two consonants are the same but the third consonant is a different one (e.g. Psalm 73:7).

iii. Other differences occur because the Peshitta has a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic Text, for example Psalm 73:6a-a.

The most fundamental feature and generally accepted notion about the Peshitta Psalms and the Peshitta as a whole, namely the clarity of the translation, has been confirmed by the Psalms treated. In other instances, the Peshitta harmonises the text. An example is found when the verb in the first line is a perfect or an imperfect in the Masoretic Text the Peshitta renders the second verb in the second line accordingly. The Peshitta frequently simplifies problematic and difficult Hebrew. The Peshitta does not often use the infinitive with other prepositions than □.

At times, the differences between the Masoretic Text and the versions or between the versions are caused by different interpretations of the same unvocalised Hebrew consonants.

When confronted by difficult, rare words or *hapax legomena*, the Peshitta opts to simplify or omit them or rather render the translation according to sense or context.

For the waw consecutive or waw copulative, the Peshitta in some instances uses the conjunction waw and in others the □. The combination of □ □□□ in the Peshitta is the translation of כִּי in Hebrew.

In only a few instances, readings in the ancient versions of these Psalms can be regarded as resulting from a different *Vorlage*.

7.1.6 Chapter 6

In Chapter 6 (pp. 413 ff), the issue of a different *Vorlage* is discussed. During the investigation it became clear that the possibility of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is minimal, for example in Psalms 73:24a and 78:28.

In as far as the translation technique of the Peshitta is concerned, it is vital to be aware of the translation techniques that characterise it in general and each book in particular, as the books may differ in this regard. Based on the premise that the Peshitta is not the product of a single translator, the translation technique of each individual book must be studied to avoid making a general conclusion. The *Vorlage* of the Peshitta was a Hebrew text of the proto-Masoretic type. It was already stabilised in the second century AD and was similar to the medieval consonantal text of the Masoretic Text.

Characterised by freedom of the translation means the Peshitta remained faithful to the meaning of the source text but expressed and rendered it faithfully to the Syriac structure. Syriac syntax is very flexible and the Peshitta will mostly deviate from the Hebrew word order in its quest for clearer constructions or trying to clarify the Hebrew. An example is that the Peshitta makes explicit what is implicit in the Masoretic Text and this has been seen frequently in Chapter 4.

The following techniques characterise the Peshitta in general: specification, accommodation, omissions, additions, changes in word order and harmonisation (maintaining agreement). Both the translator and later scribes who made corrections implemented these techniques. In some instances, the Hebrew verb is softened in the translation. An example is found in Psalm 74:10, where the Hebrew verb meaning ‘to reject’ is translated by the Syriac verb ‘to forget’. This

euphemistic translation also occurs in Psalm 78:10b, where the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text reads ‘they refuse to go’ and the Syriac translator renders it as ‘they did not want to go’.

There are also examples of a change in subject. In Psalm 89:20a, the Peshitta changes the subject in the Masoretic Text from second person singular to third person singular. In Psalm 75:2d, the Peshitta changes the subject from third person masculine plural in the Masoretic Text to first person plural. In Psalm 77:5a, the Peshitta changes the subject from second masculine to third masculine plural. The change of the subject by the Peshitta Psalms is frequently for the sake of harmonisation with the previous verb. This happens mainly to maintain the sequence or harmonisation with the previous verb and at times with a verb in the previous verse.

These last two techniques are not mentioned by Carbajosa in his study.

7.2 Conclusion

In conclusion, the Peshitta Psalms used a proto-Masoretic text. The evidence for a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is very minimal. Deviations are mostly the result of a different interpretation of the same Hebrew consonants, of not understanding the Hebrew, or can be attributed to translation technique.

7.3 Further research

Further fields of study are the following:

- Study of the use particles in isolation or in combination
- Study of nouns as employed by the Peshitta translator
- Study of Syriac word order (verbal system)

Bibliography

Adair, J.R. 1997. "Literal" and "free" translations: a proposal for a more descriptive terminology. *Journal of Northwest Semitic languages*, 23(1):181–209.

Adair, J.R. 2000. An inductive method for reconstructing the biblical text: illustrated by an analysis of 1 Samuel 3. Stellenbosch: Department of Ancient Studies, US. (Journal of Northwest Semitic languages monograph series, 2).

Aejmelaeus, A. 1993. On the trail of the Septuagint translators. Kampen: Pharos.

Aejmelaeus, A. 2007. On the trail of the Septuagint translators: collected essays. Leuven: Peeters.

Aitken, J.K. 2015. Psalms. (*In* Aitken, J.K., *ed*. T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint. London: Bloomsbury. pp. 320–334).

Alexander, P. S. 1985. The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the delivery of the Targum. (*In* Emerton, J. A., *ed*. Congress Volume: Salamanca 1983. *Vetus Testamentum. Supplement,* 36:14-28. Leiden: Brill).

Alter, R. 2007. The Book of Psalms: a translation with commentary. New York: Norton.

Anderson, G. W. 1970. Canon and non-canonical. (*In* Ackroyd, P.R., *ed*. The Cambridge history of the Bible. Cambridge: Edinburgh. pp. 113–158).

Baethgen, F. 1878. Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peshitta. Kiel: Universität Kiel. (Disputats).

Baethgen, F. 1882. Der textkritische Werth der alten Übersetzungen zu den Psalmen. *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, 8:405–459, 593–667.

Barnes, W.E. 1901. On the influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 2:186–197.

Bate, J. 1751. An Hebrew grammar: formed on the usage of the words of the inspired writers being an attempt to make the learning of Hebrew easy. London: s.n.

Bauer, H. 1910. Die Tempora im Semitischen: ihre Entstehung und Ausgetaltung in den Einzelsprachen. *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, 8(i): 5–19.

Beckam, J.C. 2007. Williams Hebrew Syntax. 3rd ed. Rev. and expanded. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Berg, J.F. 1895. The influence of the Septuagint upon the Peschitta Psalter. New York: Columbia University. (PhD – Columbia University, New York). https://archive.org/details/influencelxxonpeschitapsalter Date of access: 7 August 2018.

Bible. 1969, 2007. Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem. (Ps 82:2). Hrsg. R. Weber & R. Gryson. 5. überarbeitet Ausg. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Bible. 1984. The Holy Bible: New international version. (Ps 75:3). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Bible. 2003. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: SESB version. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Bible. 2005. The NET Bible: a new approach to translation, thoroughly documented with 60,932 notes by the translators and editors. Richardson: Biblical Studies Press.

Bible. 2008. Leiden Peshitta. Leiden: Peshitta Institute.

Briggs, C.A. & Briggs, E.G. 1907. A critical and exegetical commentary on the Book of Psalms. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. (International critical commentary).

Brockelman, C. 1951. Syrische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Literature, Chrestomathie und Glossar von Carl Brockelman. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

Brotzman, E.R. 1994. Old Testament textual criticism: a practical introduction. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Brotzman, E.R. & Tully, E.J. 2016. Old Testament textual criticism: a practical introduction. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Carbajosa, I. 2008. The character of the Syriac version of Psalms: a study of Psalms 90–150 in the Peshitta. Leiden: Brill.

Carbajosa, I. 2016. Peshitta. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1A. Leiden: Brill. pp. 111–222).

Carbajosa, I. 2017. Peshitta. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 93–98).

Collins English dictionary. 2018. https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/render Date of access: 15 August 2018.

Cook, J. 1988. The composition of the Peshitta version of the Old Testament: Pentateuch. (*In* Dirksen, P.B. & Mulder, M.J., *eds*. The Peshitta: its early text and history: papers read at the Peshitta Symposuim held at Leiden 30–31 August 1985. pp. 147–168).

Cox, C. 2017. Septuagint. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 175–181).

Davidson, A.B. 1962. An introductory Hebrew grammar with progressive exercises in reading, writing and pointing. 25th ed. Edinburg: T&T Clark.

Declaissé-Walford, N., Jacobson, R.A. & Tanner, B.L. 2014. The Book of Psalms. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dickie, M.M. 2017. Post hexaplaric Greek translations. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Volume 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 103–104).

Dines, J.M. 2004. The Septuagint. New York: T&T Clark.

Dirksen, P.B. 1992. The Peshitta and the textual criticism of the Old Testament. *Vetus Testamentum*, 42(1):376–390, Jan.

Driver, G.R. 1936. Problems of the Hebrew verbal system. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Eriksson, J.-E. 1989. The hymns of David interpreted in Syriac: a study of translation technique in the First Book of the Psalms (Ps 1–41) in the Peshitta. (Unpublished thesis – Uppsala: University of Uppsala).

Fischer, A.A. 2014. The text of the Old Testament: an introduction to the Biblia Hebraica. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Flint, P.W. 2007. 11QPsb and the 11QPsa-Psalter. (*In* Burnett, J.S., Bellinger, W.H., Jr. & Tucker, W.D, Jr., *eds*. Diachronic and synchronic: reading the Psalms in real time. Proceedings of the Baylor symposium on the Book of Psalms. New York: Clark. pp. 157–166).

Gentry, P.J. 2016. Pre-hexaplaric translation, hexapla, post-hexaplaric translations. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1A. Leiden: Brill. pp. 211–235).

Gesenius, J.H.W., Kautzsch, E. & Cowley, A.E. 1910. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch. 2nd English ed., rev. in accordance with the 28th German ed. 1909 by A.E. Cowley; with a facsimile of the Siloam inscription by J. Euting, and a table of alphabets by M. Lidzbarski. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gordon, R.P. 2006. Hebrew Bible and ancient versions: selected essays of Robert P. Gordon. Burlington: Ashgate

Graves, M. 2016. Vulgate. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., eds. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1A. Leiden: Brill. pp. 278–289).

Greenberg, G. 2002. Translation technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah. Leiden: Brill.

Greenlee, J.H. 1989. Introduction to New Testament textual criticism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hengstenberg, E.W. 1946. Commentary on the Psalms. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Holladay, W.L. 1988. A concise Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament. Leiden: Brill.

Hossfeld, F.-L & Zenger, E. 2005. Psalm 2. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Jenni, E. 1968. Das Hebräische Piʿel. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag.

Johns, A.F. 1972. A short grammar of Biblical Aramaic. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press.

Joosten, J. 2005. A Septuagintal translation technique in the minor prophets. (*In* Martinez, F.G. & Vervenne, M., *eds*. Interpreting translation: studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in honour of Johan Lust. Leuven: University Press. pp. 217–223).

Joosten, J. 2012. The verbal system of Biblical Hebrew: a new synthesis elaborated on the basis of classical prose. Jerusalem: Simor.

Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W. 1958. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: Brill.

Koster, M.D. 1993. Peshitta revisited: a reassessment of it value as a version. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 38(2):235–268

Kraus, H.-J. 1993. Psalms 60–150. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. (Continental commentary).

Lambdin, T.O. 1973. Introduction to Biblical Hebrew. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Lemmelijn, B. 2001. Two methodological trails in recent studies on the translation technique of the Septuagint. (*In* Sollamo, R. & Sipilä, S., *eds*. Helsinki perspectives on the translation technique of the Septuagint. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. pp. 43–64).

Lettinga, J.P. 1976. Grammatica van het Bijbels Hebreeus. Leiden: Brill.

Lund, J. A. 1988. The influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta: a re-evaluation of criteria in light of comparative study of the versions in Genesis and Psalms. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Dissertation – PhD).

Lund, J.A. 1995. Grecisms in the Peshitta Psalms. (*In* Dirksen, P.B. & Van der Kooij, A., *eds*. The Peshitta as a translation: papers read at the II Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden, 19–21 August 1993. Leiden: Brill).

Lust, J. 1986a. Second thoughts on David and Goliath. (*In* Barthelemy, D., Gooding, D.W., Lust, J. & Tov, E., *eds*. The story of David and Goliath: textual and literary criticism. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. pp. 87–91).

Lust, J. 1986b. The use of textual witnesses for the establishment of the text: the shorter and longer texts of Ezekiel. (*In* Lust, J., *ed*. Ezekiel and his book: textual and literary criticism and their interrelation. Leuven: Brill. pp. 153–167).

Maori, Y. 1995. Methodologyical criteria for distinguishing between variant Vorlage and exegesis in the Peshitta. (*In* Dirksen, P.B. & Van der Kooij, A., *eds*. The Peshitta as a translation: papers read at the II Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden 19–21 August 1993. Leiden: Brill. pp. 103–120).

McFall, L. 1982. The enigma of the Hebrew verbal system: solutions from Ewald to the present. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Molina, L. & Albir, A.H. 2002. Translation technique revisited: a dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta*, 47(4):498-512.

Mulder, M.J. 1988. Some remarks on the Peshitta translation of the book of Ezekiel. (*In* Dirksen, P.B. & Mulder, M.J., *eds*. The Peshitta: its early text and history: papers read at the Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden 30–31 August 1985. Leiden: Brill. pp. 169–182).

Moscati, S. 1964. An introduction to the Semitic Languages: phonology and morphology. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Muraoka, T. 1987. Classical Syriac for Hebraists. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Muraoka, T. 1997. Classical Syriac: a basic grammar with a chrestomathy. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Mushayabasa, G. 2008. Translation technique in Peshitta Ezekiel 8–11 and its value for the text of Ezekiel. (Potchefstroom: NWU – Dissertation MA).

Mushayabasa, G. 2014. Translation technique in the Peshitta to Ezekiel 1–24: a frame semantics approach. Leiden: Brill.

Nöldeke, T. 1966. Kurzgefasste Syrische grammatika. Darmastadt: Wissenschaftliche Butchgesellschaft.

Oppenheim, B. 1891. Die syrische Übersetzung des fünften Buches der Psalmen (Psalm 107–150) und ihr Verhältnis zu dem massoretisschen Texte und älteren Übersetzungen, namentlich den LXX. Targ. Leipzig.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2018. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/render?q=render Date of access: 15 August 2018.

Payne Smith, R. 1903. A compendious Syriac dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D.D. Ed. by J. Payne Smith (Mrs Margoliouth). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rahlfs, A., *ed*. 1979a. Psalmi cum odis Vol. X, Ps 72:3a. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Rahlfs, A., *ed*. 1979b. Psalmi cum odis. .Vol. X, Ps 72:6b. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Rahlfs, A., *ed*. 1979c. Psalmi cum odis. Vol. X, Ps 77:4a-d. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Robinson, T.H. 1962. Paradigms and exercises in Syriac Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rowlands, E.R. 1939. A critical study of the Peshitta Text of Psalms, Books III and IV (Pss. 73–106) in relation to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint version. (Unpublished study; Bangor).

Salvesen, A. 1998. Origen's Hexapla and fragments. Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th–3rd August 1994. Tubigen: Mohr Siebeck.

Sanders, J. 1981. Text and canon: Old Testament and New. (*In* Casetti, P., Barthélememy, D., Keel, O. & Schenker, A., *eds*. Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. pp. 373–394).

Sanders, J.A. 1993. Masorah. (*In* Metzger, B.M & Coogan, M.D. The Oxford companion to the Bible. New York: Oxford).

Sasson, I. 2017. Arabic translation. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 110–114).

Smith, J. 2017. Septuagint. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 82–88).

Sokoloff, M. 2009. A Syriac Lexicon: a translation from the Latin. Correction, expansion, and update of C. Brockelmaan's Lexicon Syriacum. Winona Lake: Eiesenbrauns.

Stec, D.M. 2004. The Targum of Psalms. Translated, with a critical introduction, apparatus and notes. Minnesota: Liturgical Press.

Stec, D. 2017. Targum. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 88–93).

Strawn, B.A. 2017a. (Proto) Masoretic Texts and Ancient Text close to MT. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Volume 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 42–60).

Strawn, B.A. 2017b. Textual history of Psalms. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1C. Leiden: Brill. pp. 5–23).

Tate, M.E. 1990. Psalms 51–100. Dallas: Word Books. (Word biblical commentary, vol. 20).

Ter Haar Romeny, R.B. 1995. Techniques of translation and transmission in the earliest text forms of the Syriac version of Genesis. (*In* Dirksen, P.B. & Van der Kooij, A. The Peshitta as a translation: papers read at the 2nd Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden, 19–21 August 1991. Leiden: Brill. pp. 177–185).

Terrien, S. 2003. The Psalms: strophic structure and theological commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

Thacker, T.W. 1954. The relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian verbsl systems. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tov, E. 1987. The nature and study of the translation technique of the LXX in the past and present. (*In* Cox, C.E., *ed*. International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 6th Congress, Jerusalem. Atlanta. pp. 337–359).

Tov, E. 1992. Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Tov, E. 1997. The text-critical use of the Septuagint in biblical research. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Simor.

Tov, E. 1999. The Greek and the Hebrew Bible: collected essays on the Septuagint. Leiden: Brill.

Tov, E. 2001. Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress press.

Tov, E. 2012. Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. 3rd ed. rev. & expanded. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Tov, E. 2016a. Septuagint. (*In* Lange, A. & Tov, E., *eds*. The Hebrew Bible. Vol. 1A. Leiden: Brill. pp. 191–211).

Van der Kooij, A. 1988. On the significance of MS 5b1 for Peshitta Genesis. (*In* Dirksen, P.B. & Mulder, M.J. The Peshitta: its early text and history. Papers read at the Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden 30–31 August 1985. Leiden: Brill. pp. 183–199).

Van der Lugt, P. 2006. Cantos and strophes in biblical Hebrew poetry with special reference to the first book of the Psalter. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Lugt, P. 2010. Cantos and strophes in biblical Hebrew poetry 2: Psalms 42–89. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., Naude, J.A. & Kroeze, J.H. 1999. A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

VanGemeren, W.A. 1997a. New International dictionary of Old Testament theology. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

VanGemeren, W.A. 1997b. New International dictionary of Old Testament theology. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

VanGemeren, W.A. 1997c. New International dictionary of Old Testament theology. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

VanGemeren, W.A. 1997d. New International dictionary of Old Testament theology. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Van Rooy, H.F. 1990. Hebreeuse sintaksis. Potchefstroom: PU vir CHO.

Van Rooy, H.F. 2005. The Psalms in Early Syriac tradition. Leiden: Brill.

Van Rooy, H.F. 2007. Agreement between the Septuagint and the Peshitta versus the Masoretic Text in Ezekiel: some important examples. Paper published in the proceedings of the Septuagint Symposium Leuven, 2008. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters.

Vogel, A. 1951. Studien zum Peschitta-Psalter: besonders im Hinblick auf sein Verhältnis zu Septuagint. *Biblica* 32:32–56, 198–231, 336–363, 481–502.

Waltke, B.K. 1989. Aims of textual criticism. *The Westminister Theological Journal*, 51(1):93–108.

Waltke, B.K. & O'Connor, M. 1990. An introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Weber, R. & Gryson, R. 1969. Biblia Sacra iuxta: Vulgatam version. 5th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Weitzman, M.P. 1999. The Syriac version of the Old Testament: an introduction. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, P.J. .2001. Studies in the syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings. Leiden: Brill.

Williams, R.J. 1976. Hebrew Syntax: an outline. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wolters, A.L. 1999. The text of the Old Testament. (*In* Baker, D.W. & Arnold, B.T., *eds*. The face of the Old Testament studies: a survey of contemporary approaches. Grand Rapids: Baker. pp. 19–37).

Würthwein, E. 1988. The text of the Old Testament: an introduction to the Biblia Hebraica. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Würthwein, E. 1995. The text of the Old Testament: an introduction to the Biblia Hebraica. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Zimmerli, W. 1979. Ezekiel 1: a commentary on the book of the Prophet Ezekiel, chapters 1–24. Philadelphia: Fortress press.

Zimmermann, F. 1940. The text of Psalms in the Pesshitta. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 41:44–46.

Zipor, M.A. 2002. Towards an annotated English translation of the Peshitta. *Journal of Northwest Semitic languages*, 28(2):63-82.