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THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The eighteen poems which make up the Psalms of Solomon are Jewish pseudepigrapha from the first century, B.C.E. The earliest surviving reference to the Psalms of Solomon comes from the fifth century C.E., where they are included in the list of the contents of Codex Alexandrinus. The end of the codex, where the Psalms of Solomon would have been, is missing. That the Psalms of Solomon were included in Codex Alexandrinus indicates, at least in this one instance, some relationship to the canonical tradition. The manuscripts continued to be copied and preserved in some communities, for at various times they are included in lists as antilegomena, pseudepigrapha, and apocrypha. The Greek translations are preserved, in whole or in part, in eleven manuscripts dating from the tenth to the sixteenth century C.E., and the Syriac translations are found in five manuscripts dating from the seventh century (for the source known as S) to the sixteenth century C.E.

1 The dating is primarily on the basis of alleged allusions to events, both national and international, in the time period in the Psalms of Solomon. The descriptions of the foreign conqueror mentioned in Psalm 2 seem best to fit Pompey who invaded Palestine in 63 B.C.E. For a fuller treatment of the date of the Psalms and the possibility that stages of editorial activity may have taken place, see Wright, 1985: 640–641.


3 Depending on whether S, a marginal note on a 7th century manuscript of the Hymns of Severus, is indeed a manuscript. See the discussion of this fragment at the beginning of the discussion of Psalm Three.

4 For a detailed description of the Greek and Syriac manuscripts see Trafton (1985, 5–9) and for the Greek texts see Wright’s forthcoming volume on the Psalms of Solomon.
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The primary importance of the Psalms of Solomon, however, is the light they shed on the historical and theological situation in this first century, B.C.E.

... [the] Psalms of Solomon preserve one of the most detailed messianic expectations in the immediate pre-Christian centuries. The title, 'Messiah,' ... is given shape and dimension in these psalms as they describe the person of the Messiah and the character of his government in the age to come. There is more substance to the ideas concerning the Messiah in the Psalms of Solomon than any other extant Jewish writing."

If the psalms are from the first century B.C.E., as most scholars believe, on the occasion of the invasion by the Romans under Pompey in 63 B.C.E., then the theological response in the psalms is important for studying the development of the issues of theodicy, eschatology, the suffering of the righteous, the concepts of life after death, and the person and position of the expected Messiah.

The Original Language of the Psalms of Solomon

A. The Languages of Jewish Pseudepigrapha:

A survey of current discussion in pseudopigraphical literature demonstrates a general consensus that much of the Judaeo-Christian non-canonical literature (extant in various languages in manuscripts dating from the second century B.C.E. to the ninth century C.E.), including the Psalms of Solomon, must have been written originally in a Semitic language (most frequently considered to be Hebrew). The following extended list of quotations from scholars contributing to Charlesworth’s *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (1985) demonstrates the extent of this consensus:

---

5 Wright, 1985: 643.
(1) Knibb (1985: 146) noted concerning the “Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah” that

So far as the Martyrdom [of Isaiah] is concerned, there is good evidence for the view that it was composed in Hebrew. . . . The Hebrew Martyrdom of Isaiah was translated into Greek, and, as we have seen, a fragment of the Greek translation has survived.

(2) Wintermute (1985: 43–44) expressed the opinion concerning “Jubilees” that

There is no longer any reason to doubt that Jubilees was originally written in Hebrew. Nevertheless, there was still considerable latitude for debate until the discovery of fragments of the Hebrew text at both Qumran and Masada . . . . Consequently, it is generally maintained that the text was written in Hebrew.

(3) Isaac (1985: 7) asserted concerning “1 Enoch” (Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch) that

Some scholars believe that the original language of 1 Enoch is Hebrew; others, however, think it is Aramaic; still others contend that the book, like Daniel was composed partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic. . . . Moreover Halévy’s argument that portions of the Ethiopic text derived ultimately from a Hebrew original has not been disproved.

(4) Charlesworth (1985: 473–474) stated concerning the “Treatise of Shem” that

The original language seems to be Semitic since there are abundant Semiticism that appear to be original and personal names are defined according to the Semitic alphabet . . . . it is impossible to discern whether the original language is Hebrew or Aramaic (Syriac).

(5) Charlesworth (1985: 626) similarly stated concerning the “Prayer of Manesseh” that

The scholarly stature of the specialists who favor a Semitic original, the lack of a detailed examination of the question by proponents of either a Greek or a Semitic original, and the cavalier treatment of the Syriac version(s) by almost all scholars should warn against concluding with some authors that the issue is closed and the original language is Greek. While the notes to the following translation demonstrate that the Syriac version sometimes preserves a more reliable tradition, and while I tend to favor slightly a Semitic original, three factors preclude certainty . . . .
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(6) Priest (1985: 920) wrote concerning the “Testament of Moses” that

Most of the first editors and translators assumed that the original language [of the Testament of Moses] was indeed Greek. Further investigation, however, indicates the Greek was, in all probability, a translation of a Semitic original . . . . but there remains a question as to whether the original was Aramaic or Hebrew. Certainty is not possible, but the balance of probability leans toward Hebrew.

(7) Johnson (1985: 251) noted concerning the “Life of Adam and Eve” that

Although no Hebrew text is extant, it is most probable that there did exist an original Hebrew document or documents from which the Apocalypse and Vita were translated, the Greek directly from the Hebrew and the Latin directly either from the Hebrew or from the Greek.

(8) Harrington (1985: 298–299) expressed the opinion concerning “Pseudo–Philo” that

In an 1898 article that introduced Pseudo–Philo to the scholarly world [“An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria, JQR 10: 277–332], Leon Cohn argued that the Latin text is a translation from the Greek and that underlying the Greek there must have been a Hebrew original . . . . For example, the phrase in victoria (9:3) or ad victoria (12:6) can be traced to the Hebrew idiom lnesuḥ, “forever, everlasting,” but the root nsh in Aramaic is not used in this sense . . . . There we are led to conclude that Hebrew, rather than Aramaic, is the original language of Pseudo–Philo.

(9) Anderson (1985: 94) asserted concerning “2 Enoch” (Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch) that

The text abounds in Semitisms . . . . It is theoretically possible that the book, or at least parts of it, came directly from Hebrew into Slavonic . . . . An original Semitic composition can still be suspected; but after two stages of translation through Greek to Slavonic, it is not now possible to tell how much written material in a Semitic language might lie behind portions of the text which still have Semitisms, let alone to determine which Semitic language it might have been.

(10) Metzger (1985: 520) stated concerning “The Fourth Book of Ezra” that
There remain, however, many other phenomena that suggest a Semitic original lying behind the lost Greek text. Several scholars have argued that it was Aramaic. On the other hand, the presence of instances of notable Hebraisms (such as the infinitive absolute construction) has lead most modern scholars to postulate a Hebrew original underlying the Greek.

(11) Hare (1985: 380) wrote concerning “The Lives of the Prophets” that

It is believed by many that The Lives of the Prophets was originally written in one of the Semitic languages. A few scholars have proposed that the original language was Syriac, but this position has won few supporters. More widespread is the view, vigorously defended by C. C. Torrey, that the book was composed in Hebrew.

(12) Robinson (1985: 414) concluded concerning “4 Baruch” that

Several early scholars, particularly R. H. Charles and those influenced by him, maintained that the original language of 4 Baruch was Greek. Since the time of Charles, however, scholars have generally come to favor the hypothesis of a Semitic original for the work.

(13) Charlesworth (1985: 726) noted concerning the “Odes of Solomon” that

Some scholars have thought that the original language [of the Odes of Solomon] is Greek, others that it is Hebrew. It is probable that they were composed in Syriac (or Aram.). . . . Most importantly, the attractive quality if the extant Syriac is indicative that Syriac is probably the original language.

(14) Rubinkiewicz (1985: 682) asserted concerning the “Apocalypse of Abraham” that

A thorough investigation of the original language of the Apocalypse of Abraham has never been undertaken . . . . The Slavonic text of the Apocalypse of Abraham contains several Hebrew names . . . . The parallelism of the verses reflect Semitic thought. The positive instead of a comparative betrays a Semitic original . . . . The syntax of the temporal phrases reflects the Hebrew original of our apocalypse . . . . The foregoing suggests that the Apocalypse of Abraham was written in a Semitic language, probably Hebrew.
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(15) Klijn (1985: 616) conjectured concerning “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch that

The Greek version, most of which is lost, appears to have been translated from Hebrew. An original Hebrew should be accepted because of the many parallels between 2 Baruch and other Jewish literature composed in Hebrew or Aramaic. In some cases the Syriac text is intelligible only after translating it into Hebrew. Finally, a translation of the Syriac text into Hebrew restores a play on words apparently contained in the original.

(16) Charlesworth (1985: 444) concluded concerning the “History of the Rechabites” that

The Syriac version [of the History of the Rechabites] . . . may well have been translated from a Greek text, but some of it may go back to an earlier, Semitic source . . . . Some sections appear to have been composed in Greek, others indicate possible translation from a Semitic text, which could be the original language of the earliest portions.

(17) Alexander (1985: 225) stated concerning the “3 Enoch” (Hebrew Apocalypse of Enoch) that

3 Enoch is written in Hebrew. . . . There is no reason to suppose that the work has been translated into Hebrew from another language, such as Aramaic, in which some Merkabah traditions were written down.

(18) Zervos (1985: 756) concluded that the “Apocalypse of Daniel” was written in Greek, but recognized that

The case for Semitic sources for parts of the apocalyptic section (chs. 8–14) would have to be built on such slight evidence as the occurrence of the odd Semitic place name Gouzēth (9:7) . . . . and the Semiticism “sons of men” (14:5) . . . . the most that can be said is only that these three examples — Gouzēth in 9:7 [= Goza, a river or channel in Babylon], ‘sons of men’ in 14:5, and the three letters on the forehead of the Antichrist in manuscript B (9:25) — could conceivably be faint traces of an earlier, possibly Semitic, source or sources that underlie the whole or parts of the apocalyptic section of the Apocalypse of Daniel.

(19) And most significantly for the purpose of the current study, Wright (1985: 640) expressed the following opinions concerning the “Psalms of Solomon”
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The Psalms of Solomon, according to the majority of scholars, were composed in Hebrew, very soon afterward translated into Greek, and at some later time into Syriac. . . . It is clear that the Greek is a translation. Ryle and James, and G. B. Gray (in APOT) noted features in common with other translations: translational errors from Hebrew, “Semiticisms” in the Greek, etc., . . . . our texts are indeed “translation Greek,” a phenomenon identifiably distinct from writing originally composed in Greek, even those written in conscious imitation of the Septuagint . . . . The Syriac has usually been seen as a translation from the Greek text, although there is some evidence that it was translated from a Hebrew text.

It is most interesting that scholars have often argued—without any extant Hebrew manuscripts—for Semitic Vorlagen behind the extant non–Semitic texts of a number of pseudepigraphical works which appeared in a variety of languages and in manuscripts as late as the 9th century C.E. But this conclusion is most often based on the detection of supposed “Semiticisms” in these texts, with little or no appeal to any detailed examination of the texts.

B. The Language of the Psalms of Solomon:

The current interest in the study of the Pseudepigrapha has generated renewed interest in the Psalms of Solomon, as evidenced by the work of Trafton (1985) on the Syriac psalms and the works of Wright (1985, 1996) on the Greek psalms. One of the questions re-examined in this period of renewed interest is that of the original language behind the Syriac and Greek texts. The Psalms of Solomon are thought by most scholars to have been originally composed in Hebrew and then translated into Greek, and then later into Syriac.

---

6 For a discussion of this renewal of interest see Charlesworth, 1981.

7 Viteau (1911: 192–239) provided an extended survey of scholarly opinions about psalms and the debate over their original language, commencing with David Hœschell (1614) and concluding with Rendell Harris (1909).
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Ryle and James (1891), Viteau (1911), Gray (1913), and Hann (1982), have demonstrated with considerable evidence that the Greek manuscripts of the Psalms of Solomon are “translation Greek” from a Hebrew original and have accepted the idea that the Syriac manuscripts are a translation of the Greek text of the psalms.

In the most recent focused study of the Syriac texts of the Psalms of Solomon, Trafton (1985) suggested that the psalms in the Syriac manuscripts of the Psalms of Solomon could be a translation made from a Hebrew original. Trafton’s suggestion has prompted this further investigation into the question of a Hebrew Vorlage for both the Greek and Syriac Psalms of Solomon. While Trafton made an extensive examination of the Syriac variants, his basic focus was “... not an attempt to determine the original language of the Psalms of Solomon, but rather to determine the value, if any, of the Syriac version” (1985:22). However, Trafton addressed the possibility of a Hebrew Vorlage, and concluded cautiously that (1) “Nothing has been found to call into question the scholarly consensus that the PsSol were composed in Hb, and thus, that the Gk version was translated from Hb” (187), and (2) “The quality, variety, and amount of evidence which points to a Hb Vorlage, against that which points to a Gk Vorlage, tips the balance of probability in favor of Hb.” (207).

However, one of the limitations of Trafton’s work is that he does not offer thorough philological support for his cautious conclusions that there are thirty-one places where the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts can be best explained by assuming a Hebrew Vorlage. Consequently, Trafton (1985: 195) found it necessary to concede that:

Of these thirty-one passages, eight could be explained plausibly on the basis of lost Gk readings of which the extant Gk readings are corruptions . . . , three could be explained on the basis of an inner-Sy corruption . . . , and three could be explained in terms of (mis) translation of the extant Gk readings.
For the other seventeen passages he stated, “Sy could be explained as paraphrase, free translation, guesswork, or ‘correction’ on the part of the a Sy translator using a Gk Vorlage.”

Wright (1988, 131–134) reviewed Trafton’s study and, taking seriously his reservations, concluded that while “Trafton has made a substantial contribution to research on the Psalms of Solomon . . . the Syriac cannot at the present time be proven to be a translation directly from the Hebrew . . . .” Thus, the exact nature of the relationship between the Syriac and the Greek psalms and the probability that the Syriac and the Greek were translated from a Hebrew Vorlage requires more definitive study. Consequently, the purpose of this analysis is to investigate the probability that the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts of the Psalms of Solomon can be best explained by assuming there was a Hebrew Vorlage which was read and misread differently by the Greek and the Syriac translators.

C. Possible Options for the Relationship of the Greek to the Syriac Texts:

Theoretically, at least eight different scenarios could be argued for with reference to the relationship of the Greek and Syriac textual traditions. It is possible that

(1) the psalms were composed in Hebrew and were translated into Greek, and they were subsequently translated from the Greek into Syriac. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could most likely be explained by textual variants in the Greek text tradition.

(2) the psalms were composed in Hebrew and were subsequently translated into Syriac, and from the Syriac they were then translated into Greek. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could most likely be explained by textual variants in the Syriac text tradition.
(3) the psalms were composed in Hebrew and were subsequently translated into Greek, and were then translated independently of the Greek from Hebrew into Syriac. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could not be explained by textual variants in either the Greek text tradition or the Syriac text tradition, but at times appeal would have to be made to a conjectured Hebrew Vorlage and to Hebrew and cognate lexicography.

(4) the psalms were composed in Greek, and from the original Greek they were translated into Syriac. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could most likely be explained by textual variants in the Greek text tradition.

(5) the psalms were composed in Syriac, and from the original Syriac they were translated into Greek. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could most likely be explained by textual variants in the Syriac text tradition.

(6) the psalms were composed in Aramaic and were subsequently translated into Greek, and from the Greek they were then translated into Syriac. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could probably be explained by textual variants in the Greek tradition, without making an appeal to Aramaic lexicography.

(7) the psalms were composed in Aramaic and were subsequently translated into Syriac, and from the Syriac they were then translated into Greek. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could most likely be explained by textual variants in the Syriac text tradition, without making any appeal to Aramaic lexicography.

(8) the psalms were composed in Hebrew and were subsequently translated into Greek, and the Syriac translator
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worked from both the Hebrew original and the Greek translation, depending upon the Syriac translator’s ability to understand the Hebrew and/or the Greek at any particular place. If so, the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts could not be explained simply by textual variants in the Greek text tradition, but at times appeal would have to be made to a conjectured Hebrew *Vorlage* and to Hebrew and cognate lexicography.

The working hypothesis of this study draws primarily from the third and eighth possibility listed here. The study will attempt to demonstrate that the Greek and the Syriac textual traditions of the Psalms of Solomon are derived from independent translations of a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The focus will be on those passages where the Greek and the Syriac texts differ. (When the texts are in agreement, it is impossible to tell who translated whom.) It is in the variations where the proposal for a Hebrew *Vorlage* can best be tested, and if the test of the working hypothesis demonstrates a high degree of probability, it should be relatively easy to account for the differences in the Greek and Syriac translations.

Essentially what follows in this study is (1) a corroboration of the conclusion made by Wright (above, page 6) and a number of other scholars before him (above, footnote 8) that the Greek text of the Psalms of Solomon is from a Hebrew *Vorlage*, and (2) a corroboration of Kuhn’s confident conclusion (“... daß nicht aus ḋ, sondern direkt aus ḋ übersetzt hat” [1937:8]) and Trafton’s cautious agreement that the Syriac text comes from a Hebrew *Vorlage*. In this study, all eighteen of the Psalms of Solomon are reviewed and it has

---

8 Kuhn (1937) worked with the same assumptions and presented eighteen passages which appeared to him to have been translated directly from the Hebrew, but Trafton (1985), in light of his reservations cited above, appears to have worked with the first and the eighth possibilities. On the other hand, Harris (1909, 1911), Viteau (1911), Gray (1913), Harris and Mingana (1916), Begrich (1939), and Baars (1972) worked solely with the first possibility. No one has ventured to suggest that possibilities two, four, five, six, or seven have any merit beyond being theoretical possibilities.
been demonstrated that a shared Vorlage can account for the differences between the Greek and Syriac psalms in more than 200 passages.

**Methodology**

A history of the scholarly consensus that the Greek texts of the Psalms of Solomon are translations of psalms written originally in Hebrew will not be given in this study since Viteau (1911) and Trafton (1985) have provided adequate summaries. This study provides a reconstructed Vorlage for the poetic lines which are examined. However, a full Vorlage of all the psalms has not been provided in this study since several “back translations” have already been done for the Greek text of the psalms by Franz Delitzsch (manuscript, n.d.), Frankenberg (1896), and Stein (1969–1970).

Since this study concentrates on those passages where the Greek and Syriac differ, the verses where the Syriac and the Greek are substantially the same have not be discussed unless the texts which are in agreement are unintelligible or are contextually inappropriate translations. (Passages where the Greek and the Syriac texts differ but the differences can be accounted for by appeal to inner–Greek or inner–Syriac corruptions have not been reviewed.)

This study of the Psalms of Solomon accepts the integrity of work of the most recent textual critics: Wright for the Greek text, and Baars and Trafton for the Syriac text. The writer examined those passages where a textual variant in the Greek text tradition or the Syriac textual tradition might possibly resolve the issue. But this method was seldom productive. It became necessary to translate the Greek text where it disagreed with the Syriac text into Hebrew and, likewise, to translate the Syriac text into Hebrew when it disagreed with the Greek text.

This process required the selection of one Hebrew word from a broad range of synonyms for the particular Greek or Syriac word to be reflected in the reconstructed Hebrew. The semantic range of the various synonyms had to be carefully
monitored. Once the reconstructed Hebrew schematization was in focus, it was necessary to work concurrently with the following three methods: (A) a text critical examination of the options for the proposed Hebrew Vorlage, (B) an exegetical analysis of the lexical options under review which was sensitive to the semantic range of the words, recognizing that different translators may have opted for different nuances of the same word, and (C) a philological inquiry into other options available when the first two methods proved unsuccessful.

A. The text critical examination of the reconstructed Hebrew options meant looking for

(1) possibilities of graphically similar letters being confused in a manner which could have produced translations which could account for the differences between the Greek and the Syriac texts

(2) a combination of Hebrew consonants which could have contributed to a haplography which would account for differences between the Greek and the Syriac texts

(3) a combination of Hebrew consonants which could have contributed to a dittography or the formation of doublets which would account for differences

(4) a combination of Hebrew consonants which could have contributed to a metathetic shift in a word which would account for differences

(5) a combination of Hebrew consonants which could have produced homographs in the unvocalized text which would account for differences

(6) a combination of Hebrew consonants which could have been so misdivided that the words created by a different word division would account for the differences.
B. The exegetical method used in this study focused on selecting the right definition of a word in the proposed Hebrew Vorlage which would account for the differences between the Greek and the Syriac texts. This involved

1. a review of the semantic range of all the Hebrew words which could have been read by either the Greek translator or the Syriac translator,
2. looking for occurrence of metonymy which could have produced the differences in the two translations,
3. looking for Semitic idioms which could have been rendered differently in Greek than in Syriac,
4. looking for homographs in the unvocalized text which could account for such differences as active versus passive voice,
5. looking for confusion which could occur due to scriptio plena versus scriptio defectiva.

C. The philological method, narrowly defined involved

1. checking lexical options in the cognate Semitic languages since the translators of the Greek and Syriac texts were not restricted to the vocabulary found in current Hebrew lexicons,
2. looking for archaic Hebrew and archaisms which could have gone unrecognized by the Greek and Syriac translators, i.e., looking for such items as archaic emphatic particles, double-duty prepositions, double-duty verbs, double-duty negatives, and double-duty vocatives,
3. looking for occurrence of aural similarities which could have resulted in different readings in the different Vorlagen or a different reading of the Vorlagen.

Short of the discovery of a Hebrew manuscript of the Psalms of Solomon, certainty about a Hebrew Vorlage is not possible. However, if in a significant number of passages
where the Greek and Syriac texts are different the differences can be demonstrated by the above methodology to be explained only by a Hebrew Vorlage, then the probability of a Hebrew Vorlage has been established.
CHAPTER TWO
TEXT AND COMMENTARY

Psalm One

1:1
ἐβόησα πρὸς κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι με ἐις τέλος
I cried out to the Lord when I was severely troubled.9

I called out to the Lord when I was distressed at my end.10

I cried to Yahweh in my distress at my defeat

The Syriac ὑσαὶ and the Greek ἐις τέλος are very problematic. Perles (1902: 10–12), followed by Gray (1913: 631), suggested that the ἐις τέλος translated לְמָכָה “to the chief musician” and is now dislocated from its original position as the title of the Psalm. If ἐις τέλος did not originate as a misplaced psalm title, Gray conjectured, following Ryle and James (1891:2–3) and Kittel (1900: 130), that it was probably an intensification to be translated in context as “when I was in sore distress.” Wright (1985: 651), following Viteau’s “tribulation extrême” (1911:254–255) and most other scholars, also regarded this phrase as an intensive. Trafton (1985: 24) pointed out that the Syriac does not support either of these suggestions. He noted that in Psalm 2:5, “where the idea of intensification is clear the Syriac has appropriately

——

9 All English translations of the Greek unless otherwise noted are from Wright 1985: 651–670.

10 The Syriac font was designed by R. B. Wright.

11 All English translations of the Syriac, unless otherwise noted, are from Trafton 1985: passim.
“utterly disgraced” for εἰς τέλος.” He concluded that in 1:1a “The idea of intensification fits the context best, but the origin of the Syriac remains unclear.”

However, greater clarity might come from examining alternative Hebrew words which could explain the Greek and Syriac. First, it is important to note that in the LXX εἰς τέλος or just τέλος never translates הָרֶם “later” or 호 “other, another,” which are the Hebrew cognates of גְּאָרֵשׁ (see Hatch and Redpath, 1344). This mitigates against (1) any assumption or argument that τέλος reflects a Hebrew or Syriac Vorlage having the vocable לְנָא, or (2) that the Syriac סְגִיר was a translation of a Greek τέλος instead of a Hebrew Vorlage with a stem other than לְנָא (contra Trafton, 1985: 24). Since there is no clear evidence for equating לְנָא and τέλος, it is necessary to look for another explanation.

A Hebrew Vorlage which would account for the Syriac סְגִיר and the Greek εἰς τέλος could have been a Hebrew text with either the noun הָלַךְ “end” or לְנָא “end” (see Jastrow, 1668 and 928, respectively). In the LXX εἰς (τό) τέλος frequently translates the stem הָלַךְ “to come to the end, to complete,” from which comes the noun הָלַךְ “end.” Were the Hebrew Vorlage הָלַךְ “my end” (or any other form of הָלַךְ) the corresponding stem in Syriac, סגיר, “to withhold, to restrain,” would not have matched the meaning of Hebrew הָלַךְ. However, had the Hebrew Vorlage been לְנָא, the Syriac סְגִיר “end” would be the anticipated equivalent.

Were the Hebrew Vorlage לְנָא “end” rather than הָלַךְ “end,” the corresponding Syriac homophone סגיר, which

---

12 The Hebrew Vorlage probably was neither לְנָא “end” nor הָלַךְ “end” since one would then expect the Syriac to have used the same stem, סגיר “end” or סגיר “end.” Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) initially considered לְנָא but settled on the translation הָלַךְ.

13 Syriac סְגִיר is also cognate to the Arabic أَخْرَ “the last, the end” (see Lane, 1863: 32; J. Payne Smith, 1903: 11).
means “to be glad, to sing, to be victorious,” would obviously have been an inappropriate translation given the context of distress. However, the Greek τελος and the Syriac סמך both could reflect another meaning of the Hebrew נאָה “endurance” (BDB, 664, stem I), which occurs in the expressions דלך עד נאָה “unto the end” and נאָה עד נאָה “forever, to the end.” In such a case, the translators would have missed the fact that the conjectured נאָה in the Vorlage would have been from נאָה “to win, to be victorious” (which can be designated as stem II), i.e., a niph'al participle with 1cs suffix (ניָה, with the assimilation of the נ of the stem), having the meaning “my being defeated.” This form in Hebrew would correspond to the Aramaic active pa'el “to be victorious, to overpower, to conquer” (Jastrow, 928) and the passive 'ip'el, occurring in the Targum Jerusalem of Exodus 32:18, which reads in part, “it is not the voice of men victorious in battle I hear; nor is it the voice of the feeble, defeated (יְשֵׁעָהוֹ) in battle I hear.” (Neophyti I, 213, 506).

Therefore, a proposed Hebrew Vorlage, with either a נאָה or a נאָה “end,” can explain both the Greek τελος and the Syriac סמך here. The translators independently, or dependently, chose the contextually incorrect meaning of either נאָה or נאָה, both of which in other contexts would be well translated by τελος and סמך. The נאָה or נאָה of the conjectured Vorlage should have been rendered by Greek or Syriac words for “annihilation” or “defeat.” Were the Vorlage some form of נאָה the LXX and Syriac would then reflect translations at the wrong end of the semantic range since נאָה has the semantic range of “to complete, to end, a complete end,” i.e., “annihilation.” It is easy to see how a Hebrew Vorlage with either נאָה or נאָה, rather than סמך, can account for both the Syriac and Greek readings.

The reconstructed Vorlage uses נאָה “to be defeated” since the psalmist—though defeated—was alive and able to compose a psalm. Had the poet been annihilated (לכון), the psalm would have gone unwritten.
I considered in my heart that I was full of righteousness, for I had prospered and had many children.

And I thought in my heart because I have been filled with righteousness, When I was rich and was with a multitude of children.

and I thought in my heart that I was filled with righteousness because I had prospered and became one having many children.

Trafton (1985: 25) translated the last two words of this verse, as “. . . with a multitude of children.” He commented that “the last clause in Sy is difficult. Gk means something like ‘I had become large with (or, by means of) children’ [καὶ πολλὴν γενέσθαι ἐν τέκνοις] . . . There is no obvious explanation for Sy here.”

The difference between the Greek and the Syriac and the difficulty of the Syriac may be explained by suggesting an underlying Hebrew text that may have had the consonant cluster יְנָבַבְרָה, which the Greek read as μεγάς βαρύς, “great in sons” (reading the preposition β prefixed to βαρύς). The Syriac translator, seeing the same consonant cluster, read the consonants יְנַבְרָה, “one having many sons” (the participle יְנַבְרָה in a construct chain). The lack of the preposition in the
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Syriac before “sons” argues against the Syriac being translated from the Greek. If the Greek were a translation from the Syriac, it is difficult to account for the εν. However, if both were translating from a Vorlage with the consonant cluster רַבְּכַנְנִי, it is simply a matter of recognizing two different ways of dividing the consonants. There is, admittedly, not much difference in meaning with either reading; but it is important because it indicates the probability that a Hebrew Vorlage explains the Greek and the Syriac differences.

In the reconstructed Vorlage, the seven-letter consonant cluster רַבְּכַנְנִי was divided as רַבְּכַנָּנִי, following the Syriac textual tradition. Dividing the letters as רַבְּכַנְנִי, as the Greek translator seems to have done, results in an atypical use of בּ followed by the preposition ב.

1:4b

καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν ἐως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς
And their glory to the end of the earth.

And their glory to the ends of the earth.

until the ends of the earth

The Greek has the singular “end of the earth” while the Syriac has “ends of the earth.” Trafton (1985: 26) indicated that the Syriac translator could have misread a Greek plural ἐσχάτου for the Greek singular ἐσχάτου or a Hebrew plural רַבְּכַנְנִי instead of a singular רַבְּכַנְנִי. But neither suggestion is necessary, nor is the difference “moot,” as Trafton concluded. In the LXX of Jeremiah 6:22, 25:32, 31:8 and 50:41, for example, where the Hebrew has the plural construct רַבְּכַנְנִי “ends of the earth” the LXX has ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς “the
end of the earth.”

It is most likely a case where the Syriac followed the Semitic idiom while the Greek (as in the LXX example cited) moves from the Semitic idiom to the Greek idiom. A Vorlage that had the construct plural, rather than a construct singular (like “until the end of the earth”) would explain the difference between the Greek and Syriac translation of this phrase.

In 1:6a, the Syriac has “they cursed in their prosperity,” using הַלָּע for “cursed,” while the Greek has ἐξεύβρισαν “to act insolently.” Trafton (1985: 26) agreed with Harris and Mingana (1868: 143) that this phrase is “foreign to Syriac” and judging the Syriac to be secondary, he concluded, “Nor is there any ‘obvious’ Hb reading which would account for Gk translating one way and Sy another.” However, Hatch and Redpath (1897: 1379) listed four Hebrew words which ἐξεύβρισαν translates, namely, הָלָע, הָלָע, חָלָה, and הֲלָע, the last of which means “to vilify, to curse, to despise” and approximates the idea of “acting insolently.” This equation of ἐξεύβρισαν with הֲלָע can easily explain the Syriac verb meaning “cursed.” The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text.


15 For an instance of הֲלָע being translated by δέβρις see II Samuel 19:43 (MT 19:44) “Why then do you despise us (قديرְּלָע)?”
Psalm Two

2:1a

Arrogantly the sinner broke down the strong walls with a battering ram And you did not interfere.

In his arrogance the lawless one cast down strong walls on the feast day And you did not restrain him.

The attacker in his arrogance brought down the impregnable walls with a battering ram or

The “General” in his arrogance brought down the impregnable walls with a battering ram.

Despite the differences in translation, there seems to be no real difference between the Syriac and the Greek. The Greek has ἁμαρτωλὸν “sinner” and the Syriac has לֹא, which Trafton (1985: 29) translated “lawless one,” but which has also the meaning “sinner.” Trafton (1985: 31) indicated that לֹא is represented by ἁμαρτωλὸς sixteen times in the Psalms of Solomon, suggesting that behind the Syriac and the Greek was a Hebrew Vorlage with הנל “sinner.” It is of interest to note that הנל is never translated by ἁμαρτωλὸς in the LXX. But the failure to equate הנל and ἁμαρτωλὸς in the LXX does not mean that the translator of the Psalms of Solomon could not have made the equation (it simply means the LXX is not an exhaustive collection of Greek–Hebrew equivalents).

There are, however, two other options to consider in reconstructing the Vorlage. First, since the Hebrew נשל also has the possible meaning “to attack,” the poet may have intended נשל to have this meaning here and in 1:1. This
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definition of \( \text{הנה} \) fits the context as well as “sinner” or “lawless one.” If “an attacker” had been the intent of the poet, both the Syriac and Greek translators missed the point.¹⁶

While it is possible that the Syriac and Greek agree here with each other (Greek \( \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \omega \nu \), “sinner” equals the Syriac \( \text{חָטָא} \) “lawless one”), it still seems problematic that a Roman would have been called by the very Jewish word \( \text{חָטָא} \) “sinner.” This problem may be the basis for the translation of the Syriac \( \text{חָטָא} \) as “lawless one.” Since the Septuagint does not use \( \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \omega \nu \) to translate Hebrew \( \text{עַלְוָל} \), there is no basis for insisting here in 2:1a or in 1:1 that the stem \( \text{עַלְוָל} \), if it were in the Vorlage, had to mean “sinner” rather than “attacker.”

On the other hand, the Vorlage may have had “to be in authority,” a by-form of the Arabic cognate \( \text{حِرْط} \) “to defend, to hem in (a town), to have men under one’s power” (Lane, 1865: 670; Qur’an 17: 62), which I designate as \( \text{حَامِم} \) stem II.¹⁷

The Syriac \( \text{חָטָא} \) equals the well attested \( \text{חָטָא} \) “to sin” (which can be designated \( \text{חָטָא} \) stem I), indicating that the translator did not recognize the more rare homograph \( \text{חָטָא} \) stem II “to be in authority.” The Greek translator, likewise, failed to note

¹⁶ Pope (1965: 192) argued for \( \text{עַלְוָל} \) “attack” in Job 30:13, which he translated “break up my path to destroy me; they attack with none to stay them.” See McDaniel (1983: 64–65 and 297–98) for a detailed discussion on the Arabic and Ugaritic cognates meaning “to attack.”

¹⁷ The meaning of \( \text{חָטָא} \) “to be in authority” has been proposed by McDaniel (1994) for understanding Shem Tob’s Hebrew text of Matthew at 8:9. \( \text{חָטָא} \), which Howard (1987:32–33) translated as “I am a sinful man . . . .” McDaniel argued that it seems unlikely a high Roman official would call himself a “sinner” with all the theological baggage carried with this very Jewish word. By reading \( \text{חָטָא} \) not as “man, human being” but as “chief,” a meaning attested in Arabic (Lane: 36) “he is the chief, the provost of his people”) the phrase in Matthew 8:9 would read “I am the chief / provost \( \text{חָטָא} \) of the guard (חָטָא).” On the \( \text{חָטָא} \) by-forms, see GKC § 77, especially the note “Thus from the root \( \text{חָטָא} \) there appear with the same meaning \( \text{חָטָא} \) to strike, to crush . . . .”
The Arabic cognate حَرْطَّات has also the meaning “to hem in a town” (Lane, 1865: 671), a meaning which would also be very appropriate in a Hebrew Vorlage having סָםַמ, given the fact that Pompey—after having the gates of Jerusalem opened to him by the Hycanites—hemmed in for more than three months the Temple Mount, where the Patriots had entrenched themselves, and slaughtered more than 12,000 Jews once the wall was breached. The סָם of the Vorlage could have been used with a double entendre which was missed by the translators. Since one cannot be certain as to whether the Vorlage had the stem lw[ or afj, both options are listed. If the Vorlage had lw[ there may have been a double entendre meaning “the lawless one” and “the attacker.” But if the Vorlage had afj there may have been a double entendre meaning “the one in authority” (paraphrased “the General”) and “the besieger (of Jerusalem).”

2:1b

Arrogantly the sinner broke down the strong walls
with a battering ram
and you did not interfere.

In his arrogance the lawless one cast down
strong walls on the feast day,
and you did not restrain him.

The attacker in his arrogance brought down
the impregnable walls with a battering ram

It is difficult to see how the Greek or Syriac is a translation of each other. The Greek text is supported by Josephus (Antiquities 14: 4: 2) that Pompey had “imported the machine
from Tyre.” Trafton (1985: 32) correctly noted that the difference between the Greek and Syriac “can hardly be explained as a confusion of Greek κριός with ἐφορτη,” thus an inner corruption of the Greek is not likely. Harris and Mингана (1911: I, 79) suggested that Syriac \( \text{ךֶּפֶתָו} \) “on a feast day” is a corruption of \( \text{ךֶּפֶתָו} \) “with great beams.” Trafton (1985: 32) suggested either that the “Syriac translator misread an original Hebrew בְּכִि (‘battering-ram’) as בְּכִה (‘feast days’), or, alternately, that the Greek translator misread an original בְּכִה as בְּכִי.” Trafton is correct in my opinion, and, were the Vorlage as I have proposed above, it is easy to see how the misreading could have occurred. The last two words, בְּכִי תֹּאֵל “with a battering ram brought down,” were corrupted by a dittography of the ב, resulting in an erroneous בְּכִי תֹּאֵל “with a battering ram he (sic) brought down,” which the Syriac translator read as בְּכִי תֹּאֵל “on a feast day he brought down.” The reconstructed Vorlage for this phrase follows the Greek text tradition.

\[
2:1b
\text{οὐκ ἐκὼλυσας}
\
\text{you did not interfere}
\]

\[
\text{δὲν}
\text{ךֶּפֶתָו}
\
\text{And you did not restrain {him}}
\]

\[
\text{אָלֶ֑ה לֵאָ֑֑חָ֖֑וִיָ֑֖ו}
\text{and you did not restrain him}
\]

Trafton (1985: 32) indicated that “neither Sy nor Gk has a direct object,” but he rightly restored “{him}” in his translation. A Hebrew Vorlage with בְּכִי תֹּאֵל from the root בְּכִי תֹּאֵל “to restrain, to reproach, to denounce” with the 3ms verbal suffix, (like the בְּכִי תֹּאֵל of Leviticus 27:24 “he acquired him”) meaning “he restrained him” could explain the lack of a direct object in the Greek and the Syriac. The ב of the suffix בְּכִי was read as the ב of the stem and the ה of the בְּכִי was read as the conjunction. The first word of 2:3 in Syriac begins with the
2:2b
κατεπατώσαν ἐν ὑποδήμασιν αὐτῶν ἐν ὑπερθυμία
they arrogantly trampled (it) with their sandals
μικη οἱ οἱ ὄρκοι οἱ σαρακόντες
and they were trampling (it) with their shoes in arrogance
καὶ δικαίως καὶ δικαίως ἔτσι
and with their boots in arrogance they trampled (it).18

Again, neither the Greek or the Syriac has a direct object. A Hebrew Vorlage that contained דָּבַשׁ (דָּבַשׁ) “to trample” (as in Isaiah 16:4, דָּבַשׁ מַעֲלַיָּה מַעֲלַיָּה “and he who tramples under foot [italics added] has vanished from the land”) would not require a direct object and, therefore, neither the Syriac or the Greek would necessarily have one. The Syriac translator did not choose the root שָׁמָר (שָׁמָר) “to tread (dances), to beat the ground (in dancing),” the Syriac synonym of רָכִּס (“to tread”), because of the military overtones of 2:2a which שָׁמָר would not

18 Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.), Frankenberge (1896: 66), and Stein (1969: 438) also used שָׁמָר for “trample,” but none used רָכִּס for “boot,” all three having instead the noun הַשַּׁלֶּשׁ.
reflect. Instead the translator chose the synonym מָשַׁלְתֶּם, using the participle plural מָשַׁלְתֶּם, “(they) were trampling.”

A military nuance may also be suggested for the Vorlage by using בָּלַע “shoe.” This noun appears in Isaiah 9:4, בָּלַע תָּבוּא, which the RSV translated “for every boot (בֶּשֶׁת) of the trampling warrior (בָּלַע לְשׁוֹן הָעָד) in battle tumult, and every garment rolled in blood,” which depicts a military scene like that in Psalms of Solomon 2. An explicit military nuance, which is suggested by the Syriac מָשַׁלְתֶּם, in 2:2a is not evident in the Greek text.

The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek and Syriac texts. Hebrew בֶּשֶׁת “boot,” which is the word of choice for the footwear mentioned, is the cognate of Syriac מָשַׁלְתֶּם “sandal” (from the root מָשַׁלְתֶּם).

2:4a

ἐνεκεν τούτων εἶπεν

because of these things he said

בֵּיהוָה מָשַׁלְתֶּם

on account of this he said

בֵּיהוָה דִּבְרֵם

on account of these things he said

The Syriac has the singular מָשַׁלְתֶּם while the Greek has the plural τούτων. If the Hebrew Vorlage had the phrase בֵּיהוָה דִּבְרֵם, it would have been indeterminate enough to allow either a singular or a plural translation. If this were the case, the Greek read בֵּיהוָה דִּבְרֵם as a plural and the Syriac read it as a singular. The translation of the Vorlage uses the plural “these,” despite the Syriac singular, since (1) the Syriac text of 2:3 indicates that there were two acts of defilement by the “sons of Jerusalem,” and (2) the Greek has the plural τούτων.

2:4a

ἀπορρίψατε αὐτὰ ἅπαν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ

remove them far from me

בֵּיהוָה אֲחֹז אָחָז אֲחֹז אָחָז

remove them and cast them away from me
The word order is different between Greek and Syriac here. The Syriac has verb, verb, direct object, and suffixed preposition; but the Greek has verb, direct object, adverb and preposition plus pronoun. Trafton suggested that ἀσερίζεις “to be removed far away” could be a translation of μακρᾶν (if the Syriac were derived from the Greek), or the Hebrew Vorlage could simply have had two verbs. If the Vorlage had two words, it is problematic why the Greek, generally quite literal, does not have two verbs. A solution comes from assuming a Hebrew Vorlage with infinitive absolute and a finite verb. The Greek translation rendered the infinitive absolute by an adverb μακρᾶν “far” (the equivalent of קָרָה), and the Syriac translation opted to translate it as the imperative ἀσερίζεις “remove.”

2:4b
οὐκ ἐυδοκεῖν αὐτοῖς (Wright: 1995)¹⁹
they are not sweet-smelling
καὶ ἦν ἀνέστησεν
and he did not establish with them
καὶ ἔδειξεν
and he did not prosper them (i.e., the sons of Jerusalem)

The Greek manuscripts are divided here between some form of ἐυδοκέω “to be fragrant, to be sweet-smelling” and ἐυδοκεῖν “to be pleased in, to take delight in.” It is possible that the change to

---

¹⁹ Rahlfs reading is οὐκ ἐυδοκεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς, but it is not the basis for Wright’s translation. None of the Greek manuscripts of the Psalms of Solomon read ἐυδοκεῖν. Rahlfs indicated that this reading follows the suggestions of von Gebhardt (1868, 1895), Hilgenfeld (1868), and Wellhausen (1924).

²⁰ Contra Stein (1969: 438) and Frankenberg (1896: 67) who translated this as אלִיתַנ (using הָנִית, “to be pleased with”), and Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) who used the synonym רָאָה.
The range of meaning of ἐυδόκεω includes “to be favored, to prosper” (Liddell and Scott [1940: 710]), meanings which are not far from the Syriac ḫḏr “to establish.” The Syriac could then be a translation of ἐυδόκεω, or the Greek could be a translation of the Syriac. But the suggestion of Harris and Mingana (1868: 89) that ḫḏr is a “rough” translation of ἐυδόκεω is most unlikely since the range of meanings for the words do not overlap.

A better possibility is to reconstruct a Hebrew Vorlage that explains the difference between the Greek and the Syriac. Kuhn (1937: 9–10) suggested that ḫḏr and ἐυδόκεω are perhaps independent translations of an original Hebrew יָשָׁל “he did not prosper them.” But this retroversion does not solve the problem if the Greek were ἐυδόκεω. Therefore, my reconstruction uses the stem יָשָׁל “to setup, to establish, to remedy, to improve,” the same stem that the Syriac translator used.

If the verb were a participle with a preformative ב and the verbal suffix ב “them” (= בְּנֵּבֶד), it would be easy to see how the Greek translator could have read the noun בְּנֵּבֶד “sweet-smelling ones” rather than בְּנֵּבֶד “establishing them,” reflecting a confusion or a ḫ and a ב. 22

2:5 (G), 2:4b (S)

τὸ κάλλος τῆς δόξης αὐτῆς the beauty of his glory23

---

21 Mss 260, 149, 471, 606 have ἐυδόκεω. Mss 655 and 659 have ἐνεδοκέω (apparently some form of ἐν + ἐυδόκεω) and the others have ἐυδόκεω, as in Wright’s text cited above.

22 The root בְּנֵּבֶד, “sweet” is well attested in Hebrew (Job 24:20, 21:33; Proverbs 9:17; Exodus15:25; and Psalm 55:15).

23 Rahlfs read τὸ κάλλος τῆς δόξης αὐτῆς “the beauty of her glory.”
PSALM TWO

The issues in this poetic line are of gender and whose “glory,” is being referred to. Trafton opted for the variant with the suffix usercontent “her” in Syriac ms 10hl. Rahlfs also read with three manuscripts αὐτής “her.” Syriac manuscripts, other than 10hl, have the masculine suffix usercontent, and eight of the Greek manuscripts have the masculine αὐτóς. If the pronominal element were masculine, the reference about who or what was not being established could have any of the preceding masculine singular nouns mentioned in verses 2:1–4, starting with the ἄμαρτωλόν in 2:1. Since “God” is mentioned in the next phrase of 2:5, the pronoun cannot refer to him (unless one were to argue for an Aramaic–style anticipatory pronoun). If the pronoun was originally αὐτής, the reference must have been to [the feminine] Jerusalem.)

In deciding which of these alternative readings was original, we could accept the feminine usercontent reading of Syriac ms 10hl,

---

24 Trafton is following the Syriac manuscript 10hl here which has a variant with the diacritical point that makes usercontent feminine (see Robinson, 1949: 24). This enabled him to see “her” as Jerusalem, clarifying verse 6 where reference is made to “her sons and her daughters.”

25 Perhaps “glory” refers to Jerusalem, i.e., Jerusalem’s being his (God’s) glory. See Ginzberg’s (1968: vol. 5, 417) discussion of the story in Orehot Zaddikim of Moses’ visiting the heavens where the angels, after reading in the Torah about the third day of creation, “chant the glory of Jerusalem.”

26 Wright (1985: 652) made the pronoun refer to God by interpreting “his glory” to be a reference to either the Temple, to a theophany, or to the swl (sic, MT יָ֣שָׁן) “the draperies” or “tapestries” of the Temple.

27 See the discussion, above, on 2:1.
although it is not supported by the majority of the Greek manuscripts. But it needs to be noted that, if the Syriac was translated before the 4th century C.E., the Syriac would have been ambiguous for it was only after this that diacritical marks were added to the Syriac text. Or we could follow the eight Greek manuscripts (as did Franz Delitzsch [n.d., ad loc.], who translated כְּבָדָה and the Syriac ms 16hl and read “his,” referring to the “one with authority” (i.e., “the General”), an option which fits the context.

The primary meaning of the Syriac ṭaḥ is “to be beautiful, fair, lovely” (a cognate to the Hebrew נָשָה). It is easy to see the preference for “her” here. However, a Hebrew Vorlage can be restored which could favor the reading “his.” Mendenhall (1973: 163) noted that Hebrew נָשָה could also be a cognate of Akkadian šapiru “governor, or someone in authority” (analogous to the Arabic حرُط “to be in authority,” discussed above). The place name Qiryat–Sofer, commonly understood to be “the city of the scribe” (assuming the interchange of כ and ו) is better understood to be the “city of the šapiru = governor.” In support of this interpretation he referred to Judges 5:14, יִרְמָוֹן לֶשֶׁם חֹסֶם “and from Zebulun those who bear the marshal’s staff” (RSV, italics added).

---

28 See Roberts (1951:225), noting especially his statement that

. . . it has been shown that the vocalization and pointing of the Hebrew text is indebted, in part at least, to the first pointing of the Syriac Scriptures. Here we note that the influence was mutual, for Syriac vocalization, too, was developed to a large extent under the tradition of textual transmission among the Jews . . . . The Jacobite Massorah is to be found in the Peshitta revision of Jacob of Edessa (about A.D. 705) and in the Auzar Raze of bar-Hebraeus, 1278.

The issue of number depending on the use of the sehame and the ambiguity of the text before its use, comes up in the following passages of the Psalms of Solomon: 2:4, 6; 3:7,8; 4:4, 9, 23; 5:11; 6:5; 9:3, 6, 7; 10:3; 11:2; 12:1; 13:4, 9; 14:2,3; 16:2; 17:14, 26; 18:1

29 See von Soden (1981: 1172–1173) for the meaning of šapiru “Beamter, König, Gebietskommissar, or Flusskommandant.”
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If רָעָל “ruler” (= šapiru) were in the Hebrew Vorlage it could be a reference to Aristobulus II who was dethroned by Pompey. If so, the pronominal “his” would be preferable. Consequently, the Vorlage is best represented by the Greek manuscripts and Syriac ms 16hl. It has been reconstructed as רָעָל בְּבוֹרֶל “the ruler in his glory.”

2:5–6a (G), 2:4b–6a (S)

εἰσοδευσάμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡττημόθη· ἐώς εἰς τέλος
οἱ νόι καὶ οἱ θυγατέρες ἐν αἰχμαλώσει πονηρᾷ
[the beauty of his glory] was despised before God
it was completely disgraced.

The sons and the daughters (were) in harsh captivity,

It was despised before the Lord
It was utterly disgraced.

Her sons and her daughters were in bitter captivity.

[the ruler] was despised before God, he was utterly ashamed;
his sons and his daughters were in harsh captivity.

The problem in these two verses continues to be the issue of gender in the translation of the Greek and the suffixes in the Syriac. Since Syriac has no neuter, the use of “it” in Trafton’s translation is somewhat misleading. The verb יָנָה has the 3ms suffix “his” and יָנָה has either the 3fs or 2ms suffix. These latter two forms are alike in Syriac and both seem odd in this context. The Greek is also ambiguous for εἰσοδευσάμενος and ἡττημόθη are 3c aorist passive indicatives, and thus could be either masculine or feminine. In 2:6, the Greek (except for mss 253, 655

30 The preposition ב of רָעָל בְּבוֹרֶל was apparently lost by haplography.
and 659) does not have possessive pronouns, but it does have definite articles. The Syriac in 2:6 does not have the definite emphatic state but it has the seyame to indicate “her.” At least one Syriac manuscript, 16hl, omits the seyame and thus is masculine. The system of diacriticals did not come into existence prior to the 4th century C.E. Singular and plural forms in any text prior to that time would have been ambiguous. The reconstructed Vorlage carries through with the masculine, with the antecedent of “his” being the “ruler” of Jerusalem who was not established (probably Aristobulus).

2:6b

And upon their neck was placed the sealed yoke of the nations.

Upon their neck was placed a yoke with chains on the forearms.

The Greek and the Syriac are notably different here. Ryle and James (1891: 12) refer to this as a passage of “great obscurity,” but Trafton (1985: 35) said that “. . . Gk is very difficult . . . Sy, on the other hand, makes excellent sense.” Trafton’s translation, “And upon their neck was placed the sealed yoke of the nations,” does not produce an image any more clear than the Greek. What is a “sealed yoke of the nations”? The expression does not occur in the Hebrew Bible. Trafton conjectured that the Syriac may represent an attempt to clarify a corrupt Greek text or that the Syriac rightly translated some Hebrew text and the Greek is corruption of that

31 Unlike Hebrew and Arabic, Aramaic, including Syriac, does not have a prefixed definite article but makes extensive use of a suffixed for the “emphatic state.”

32 This applies also to 2:38 and 2:39 where there are differences in number (rather than gender) between the Greek and the Syriac texts.
Hebrew text. In my opinion, the Syriac and the Greek are both corruptions of the Hebrew Vorlage given above. The Vorlage, as reconstructed, has על על twice. However, the second עַל is not the preposition “upon, about” but the noun “yoke” (well attested in Hebrew) which the Syriac translated as קָוַה “yoke.”

The Syriac and the Greek translators misread the suggested original בִּמְלָחָה “chains” as בְּמֵלָחָה “seal.” Hebrew תָּנְחַמְתָּנָה occurs in Ezekiel 19:4, “and they brought him [i.e., a lion symbolizing Judah’s fallen king] in chains to the land of Egypt”; and this is followed in 19:9 by, יַנֵּחַמְתָּנָה יהוה יְמִקֵּדָשָׁתָה יְגִלֵּל, “he [Judah’s fallen king] was put in a cage in chains and brought to the king of Babylon.”

In our text, whereas the Syriac and Greek read בגאָפַת as the preposition ב and a plural of גאָפַת “people, nations,” I read as the plural of the noun גאָפַת “forearm. While גאָפַת “forearm” does not appear in Biblical Hebrew, the noun is well attested in other Hebrew texts (Jastrow 1950: 75) and in cognate Semitic languages. It survives in modern Israeli Hebrew (see Ben Yehuda and Weinstein, 1964: 11).

Wright’s translation of ἐπιστήμων ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν as “spectacle before the nations,” differs from Trafton’s (1985: 35) “with a badge among the nations,” but Wright correctly picked up the nuance of being “conspicuous” or “notorious” (see Liddell and Scott, 1940: 656). The Syriac and the Greek are misreadings of על תְּנִיאַתָה שֵׁם עַל בְּהֵדָתָה בַּמְלָחָה, and both missed the meaning of this line. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the word order of the Syriac text, but it differs from the Syriac in the understanding of two of the four nouns.

2:8

ἀπέστρεψεν γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἐλέους αὐτῶν νέον καὶ πρεσβύτην

for he turned away his face from their mercy;
(from) young and old

---

33 See Delitzsch, 1920: 110, § 106b, for examples of the confusion of נ and נ.”
See Delitzsch (1920: 120, §132e) for the misreading of מְרַדְּהֵם as מְרוֹדֵם. He noted, for example, Nehemiah 2:1, where מְרַדְּהֵם and מְרוֹדֵם were confused, and Psalm 141:10, where מְרַדְּהֵם was confused with מְרוֹדֵם. Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) paraphrased מְרוֹדֵם as מְרוֹדֵם.
misread as דָּעַש (reflecting the very common confusion of ו and י)\textsuperscript{35} would easily explain the Syriac “me.” Consequently, the reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text in this poetic line.

2:9 (G), 2:10 (S)

καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐβαρυθμήσεν

and the heavens were weighed down

and heaven was angered greatly.

and the heavens were exceedingly angry

As the differences between the translations of Wright and Trafton point to a Greek Vorlage, the difference between the Syriac text and the Greek text point to a Hebrew Vorlage. The Syriac ḫūṣḥat ʁəṣ ʁəmḥırə rejoice preserved the poetic parallelism with “the earth despised them” of the next line. Wright translated ἐβαρυθμήσεν, an aorist active indicative 3s, as the passive “(they) were weighed down.” However, the translation of ἐβαρυθμήσεν ought to be active”—something like “the heavens loathed” (see Liddell and Scott [1940: 312]), or “(they) weighed down,” or “(they) oppressed” or “(they) wearied”—and ought to parallel “the earth despised them.” The Greek also lacks a parallel to the intensifying adverb of the Syriac ḫūṣḥat “greatly.”

There are several possibilities for a Vorlage which can explain these differences. First, the Hebrew Vorlage could have had the verb סMahon “to treat violently,” which the Syriac translator read as מִשָּׁם, “to be or become warm.” Taking מִשָּׁם as a synonym of דָּעַש “to be hot, to be angry, to be wrathful,” it was rendered by the verb as ḫūṣḥir. Even if the Greek ἐβαρυθμήσεν reflected this meaning, it would not explain the Syriac’s intensifying adverb ḫūṣḥat “greatly” or the lack of parallel modifier in the Greek.

\textsuperscript{35} Delitzsch (1920: 103–105) has two pages listing passages where this confusion has been noted.
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Second, the apparent difference in English between “it angered” and “it weighed down” may not have been in the Greek. In Liddell and Scott (1940: 312) ἐβαρύθημεν has the definition “to be indignant,” which, while not an exact match with “anger,” is not too distant a nuance. Indeed, ἐβαρύθημεν in Numbers 16:15 translates Hebrew ה weblog (for which the RSV has “anger”).

A Hebrew Vorlage with the verb “to be angry” in the intensive p'ēl could explain the intensifying adverb of the Syriac. The difference between the qal and the p'ēl would be obvious only in a pointed text. The verb ה Latin, “to be vexed, angry,” (attested in the p'ēl in I Samuel 1:6 and Deuteronomy 32:21) could be read as ה ל, an intensive p'ēl the Syriac translator represented with the intensive הַיֹּתֵר. If the Greek read ל ל, there would have been no need for an adverb of intensity. Consequently, while it is tempting when reconstructing the Vorlage to follow the Syriac and have an adverb like הַיֹּתֵר “greatly” in the text — and one would have to explain its loss in Greek—I am opting for the intensifying p'ēl ל which may be rendered by a verb and an adverb.

2:10 (G), 2:12 (S)

καὶ γινώσκεται ἡ γῆ and the earth shall know
καὶ γινώσκεται ἡ γῆ and in order that the earth might know.

that the earth might know.

One difference between the Greek and Syriac in this phrase is evident in Wright’s and Trafton’s translations. The Greek has the future and the Syriac has the imperfect. Trafton (1985: 36) argued rightly that no errors need be posited, but he did not deal with the Ἁ of the Syriac other than to observe “... neither is there an obvious Hb reading which would explain its presence.” However, a bit more can be said.
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The Greek future γνῶσται can simply be a translation of an imperfect in the Hebrew Vorlage. The issue of the Syriac particle 党工委 remains. It is not necessary to posit as Gray (1913: 632) did that the Greek translator missed the sense of the waw–consecutive of an original Hebrew text 36 to explain either the tense of the Greek or the lack of some representation in Greek of the particle. The党工委 has many more meanings and uses than simply as the copula, some of which correspond to meanings of the particle 党工委 in Syriac (see BDB 251–254). The Syriac translator and the Greek translator did not reflect in their translations of this verse the other nuances of the党工委.

2:13a (G), 2:14b (S)
καὶ θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ βεβηλοῦν
and the daughters of Jerusalem were available to all 37

and the daughters of Jerusalem were defiled

and the daughters of Jerusalem, (were) the ones defiled

The Greek βεβηλοῦν means “to be profaned, to be defiled, to be unholy, to be polluted.” The Greek βέβηλοι is an adjective, but the Syriac has a verb, an ‘ethpe’el perfect. Consequently, even though the Greek and Syriac texts express the idea of defilement, they are not easily explained as being a translation of each other. However, if the Hebrew Vorlage had a participle, it would be well within attested translation patterns that the Syriac translated the participle by a perfect and the Greek translated it by an adjective. Thus, while the difference in meaning between the Greek and the Syriac

36 While there are uses of the waw–consecutive in the Hebrew Psalter, they are relatively rare and one should assume that they are as rare in this late poetry as in the Psalter. An examination and comparison of the poetry at Qumran might be helpful in determining the likelihood of the waw–consecutive in late poetry.

37 Wright’s translation of βεβηλοῦν appears to be derived from the context of the next line, “... they defiled themselves with improper intercourse.” It is unusual in a translation that most often is fairly literal.
in this line is minimal, their morphological difference supports the argument that there was an original Hebrew Vorlage common to both.

2:13b (G), 2:15a (S)

\[\text{όν αὐτὰς ἐμαύωσαν αὐτὰς ἐν φυρμῷ ἀναμείξεως} \]

because they defiled themselves with improper intercourse

\[\text{σαλών ὁμοίως, αὐρατοὶ ἑαυτοὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς} \]

because they defiled themselves with a mingling of intemperance

\[\text{καὶ ἡ ἐν κακῷ ἐμίσθωσεν μετὰ ἐμαυώθη} \]

because they defiled themselves with a mixture of appetite(s)

Wright translated \(\text{φυρμῷ ἀναμείξεως} \) as “improper intercourse,” following Gray’s (1913:632) “unnatural intercourse” and Ryle and James’ (1891:17) “unclean intercourse.” Greek \(\text{φυρμῷ} \) primarily has the meaning of “confusion, mixture, disorder” and is not attested elsewhere with any sexual connotation (Liddell and Scott 1940:1962–1963). Although \(\text{ἀναμείξεως} \) carries primarily the sense of “mingling, admixture,” it has a secondary sense of “promiscuity” (attested in Herodotus and Galenus) and the verb \(\text{ἀναμίσγο} \) was used in medical contexts with the meaning “to have intercourse,” while the verb \(\text{ἀναμείγνυμι} \) was used for “social intercourse” (Liddell and Scott, 1940:112–113). Since the Greek \(\text{φυρμῷ ἀναμείξεως} \) literally means “in a mixture of mingling,” it need not have explicit sexual nuance in this non–medical text.

The Syriac \(\text{σαλών “intemperance” (from the root: \text{αὐξ “to range, to rove, to indulge in debauchery”}) may have sexual connotations including “wantonly, lasciviously, im temperately.” This mitigates against the Greek text being a translation of the Syriac text (or vice versa) since the Syriac has this more explicit \(\text{σαλών} \) which the Greek does not replicate. It is difficult to decide on a Vorlage since the Greek appears to be a doublet for the Syriac \(\text{σαλών “mingling, making (social) contact, mixing.”} \) with no apparent equivalent for the Syriac \(\text{σαλών, unless it} \)
be like the occasional use of the adverb ἀναμείξει “promiscuously,” attested in Herodotus and Galenus.

2:19a (G), 2:20 (S)

ἀνείδοσαν γὰρ ἑθνη Ιερουσαλήμ ἐν καταπατήσει

for the Gentiles insulted Jerusalem, trampling (her) down

κατάπατσατο τινὰς ἐν Ιερουσαλήμ

for the nations reviled Jerusalem in their wickedness

καταπατήσατο τινῶν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ

for the nations were reproaching Jerusalem in their violence

The Greek and the Syriac differ in the last part of the line where the Greek has καταπατήσει “trampling under foot, trampling down,” whereas the Syriac has καταπατάτω “in their wickedness.” Trafton (1985: 38) cited two possibilities: the Syriac καταπατάτω could be a corruption of καταπατάτω “with their trampling” (i.e., a confusion of κ and τ), or the Greek translator misread a Hebrew Vorlage that had ר(jPanel “in their wickedness” as ב(jPanel “in their trampling” (i.e., confusing a ב and τ, along with the loss of an ה).

A third possibility is more likely, namely, there was a confusion between the Hebrew verbs ל(jPanel “to treat violently, to wrong (someone)” and ל(jPanel “to trample,” reflecting the confusion of a ה and a ת. The δ guint “wickedness” could be a translation of ל(jPanel, and the καταπατήσει “trampling down” would be a translation of ל(jPanel. This latter stem best accounts for the Syriac and Greek textual differences and is used in the Vorlage above. But either ל(jPanel or ל(jPanel could have been in the Vorlage, and thus, either the

38 See Delitzsch (1920: 116) where he cited Ewald’s emendation of I Samuel 13:6 as an example. The Hebrew text has the men of Israel hiding (among other places) in the ב(jPanel, “the briars” or “brambles.” Unless the men of Israel were “Br’er Rabbits” at home in the “Briar Patch.” (see Jeremiah 5:29) it is an unlikely place to hide. Ewald, on the basis of I Samuel 14:11, where the MT has the men of Israel coming ב(jPanel “from the holes,” also suggested reading ל(jPanel instead of ל(jPanel in I Samuel 13:6.
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Syriac translator or the Greek translator could be responsible for the misreading.

2:19b (G), 2:20b (S)
κατεστάθη τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης
he dragged her beauty down from the throne of glory
κατεστάθη τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης
and her beauty was cut down from the throne of his glory

κατεστάθη τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης

and he [God] brought down her ruler
from the throne of his glory

Here, as in 2:5, we once again have τεαν, reflecting a Hebrew Vorlage which must have had רַבֶּשׁ meaning “ruler” not “beauty.” Mendenhall’s (1973: 163) recognition that, in light of Akkadian šapiru “governor,” the place name Qiryat–Sofer means “city of the governor” (rather than “city of the scribe”) is also very suggestive for this verse, since two of the Syriac manuscripts (16hl and 10hl) have מִלַּא “her book.” Compared to the Greek κάλλο “beauty,” the Syriac מִלַּא is the more difficult and preferred reading. The Greek κάλλο cannot be the source of the Syriac מִלַּא. Consequently, we have additional strong support for a Hebrew Vorlage underlying this psalm. A Hebrew original with רַבֶּשׁ “governor” could also have been read as רַבֶּשׁ “beauty” or as רַבֶּשׁ (= רַבֶּשׁ “book”). This ambiguity would explain the Greek κάλλο and the Syriac מִלַּא, as well as the מִלַּא of Syriac mss. 16hl and 10hl. Neither the Greek or the Syriac traditions recognized the now rare, but contextually more probable, meaning of רַבֶּשׁ “ruler.”

39 The Syriac has the Greek loan word σαοιθ (= δρόνου). A cognate of the Hebrew סָדוֹת “throne” was not available in Syriac because the stem כָּדָה means “to pile up, to amass.” See the discussion below on Traflon’s (1985: 48) arguments on 2:36 that the use of Greek loan words in Syriac does not mean that the Syriac is a translation of the Greek.

40 See my discussion above on 2:5 and footnote 20.
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The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text in reading the verb as an active perfect, in contrast to the passive of the Syriac; and "her ruler" is taken to be the direct object. The Vorlage probably had הָלַבֹּל "his glory," as reflected in the Syriac text, but a simple metathesis of the ו of וָלַבֹּל produced the plene spelling, לֶבֶל, reflected in the Greek text.

2:20 (G), 2:21 (S)

περιεξόμενον σάκκον ἀντὶ ἐνδύματος εὐπρεπείας
σχοινίον περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς ἀντὶ στεφάνου

she put on sackcloth instead of beautiful clothes,
a rope around her head instead of a crown.

and she was clothed in sackcloth in place of clothing of beauty,
and a rope was placed upon her head in place of a crown

and she girded herself in sackcloth instead of royal clothing
and a rope upon her head instead of a crown

The Greek aorist active middle indicative περιεξόμενον "she put on" and the Syriac simple passive ἐθάνατο "she was clothed" are not likely to be translations of each other. The difference could be accounted for by a Vorlage with יָתֹפְה, which the Greek translator read (or had in the Vorlage) as a hiphil verb with an affixed conjunction meaning "and she put on." But the Syriac translator read (or had in his Vorlage) יְתֹפְה as "she was clothed," a passive (hophal) form of the verb resulting from the metathesis of the ו of יָתֹפְה.

Once again, as in 2:5 and in the discussion immediately above, it is most likely that a Hebrew Vorlage with מָלַבָּה "to govern, to rule" lies behind these Greek and Syriac lines. "Royal clothing (מָלַבָּה)" would be the synonymous parallel of the "crown" in the next line, providing the parallelism one expects in this psalm. Neither the Syriac or Greek translator recognized מָלַבָּה meaning "to govern, to rule." The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text.
in its use of active verbs because of the active verbs in the next verse in both the Greek and the Syriac.

2:21 (G), 2:22 (S)

περιέλατο μίτραν δόξης
she took off the wreath of glory

σφαλματιζότας τὸ θεῖον δόξαν
she took off from herself the brightness of glory

she took off the wreath of glory

The Greek text has μίτραν δόξης “the wreath of glory,” while the Syriac has σφαλματιζότας τὸ θεῖον δόξαν “the brightness of glory.” This difference suggests a confusion in the Vorlage of ἥν or ἰδιῶ “wreath, crown” (BDB, 267; Jastrow, 396) with ἀρ “shining, splendor” (Jastrow, 392). The Greek correctly read ἰδιῶ  and translated it with μίτραν “crown,” whereas the Syriac read ἀρ “shining,” instead of ἰδιῶ, and translated it with σφαλματιζότας.

2:21b (G), 2:23 (S)

ἐν ἀτμιώτικτὸ κῦκλος αὐτής ἀπερρίφη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
in dishonor her beauty was thrown to the ground

ἐν ἀτμιώτικτῳ κύκλῳ αὐτῆς ἀπερρίφη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
in disgrace her beauty was cast upon the ground

her ruler was cast down in shame to the ground

Again, as in 2:5 (S 2:4), 2:20 (S 2:21) and 2:19b (S 2:20b) the now rare noun ἰδιῶ “ruler” of the Hebrew Vorlage was misunderstood as the homograph ἰδιῶ “beauty.” A full discussion has been provided above.

41 See Delitzsch (1920: 111§109) for other examples of the misreading of ἰδιῶ with ἀρ or ἰδιῶ.
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2:23 (G), 2:25 (S)
οτι ενεπαιξαν και ουκ έφεισαντο
εν οργη και θυμω μετα μηνισεως;
for they ridiculed (her) and did not refrain
in anger and vicious rage
because they mocked unsparingly
in anger and in rebuke
for they mocked and did not hold back
their anger and reproach

In 2: 23, the Greek has three words for “anger,” οργη, θυμω
and μηνισεως; whereas the Syriac has only two matching words,
ςκολειον “anger” and የት “rebuke.” The Greek could be a
triplet, such as are common in the Lucianic recension of the
Septuagint.42 Conversely, the Syriac could have omitted a word in
its translation from its Vorlage, whether it was Hebrew or Greek.

If the Greek translator missed the idiomatic expression of
ςκολειον “anger” and የት “rebuke,” it would be easy to
account for the Greek οργη και θυμω “anger and rage.” Together or separatelyςκολειον and የት mean “anger” and are translated in the LXX by θυμως (Liddell and Scott 1940: 660).

The Syriac translator would certainly have understood the
idiomaticςκολειον, and he rightly rendered it as βςκολειον “anger.”
The Greek μηνισεως “wrath, revenge” and the Syriac የት “rebuke, reproof, censure” may well be a translation of a Vorlage
having ይ יחסי “shame, scorn.” However, since the Syriac ያLewis,

42 For a discussion on the Lucianic recension, see Roberts (1951: 142–43).

43 Note the use ofςκολειον in Exodus 11:8; I Samuel 20:34; II Chronicles
25:10; and Isaiah 7:4.
unlike Hebrew הַנַּעַרְךָ, means “to mix, to mingle,” it was not the verb of choice in Syriac to translate הַנַּעַרְךָ. While μηνίσεως and μὴ ἀναστήσατε are not an exact match, each has a semantic range with overlapping nuances. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text which rightly understood the Hebrew idiom.

2:24 (G), 2:27 (S)

οὐκ ἔν χεὶλει ἐποίησαν ἀλλ’ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ψυχῆς
for they have not done it in zeal, but in emotional passion

for it was not in zeal that they did (this),
(but) in the desire of the soul

for it was indeed in zeal they did (this)
and in emotional passion

The negatives אָלָה and οὐκ are surprising and do not fit the context of this passage. Wright (1985: 653) recognized the difficulty of the negative οὐκ in the poetic line and suggested that ἐν χεὶλει ἐποίησαν “they acted in zeal” was the “zeal of the Lord” executed by Gentiles acting as God’s agent. If this were the case, one would expect the pronoun “your” to be suffixed to the noun “zeal.” But in this case, the οὐκ indicates that they had acted outside of their commission to be the “zeal of the Lord.”

The negatives in the Greek and Syriac could possibly reflect a Hebrew Vorlage with an emphatic lamed. The emphatic lamed frequently survives as a prefixed ל, but more often it is a נְ (which should have been vocalized נְ). It went unrecognized by the Masoretes who always read the נְ as the negative particle נָ. The presence of the emphatic lamed in classical Hebrew (as well as in other cognate languages) has been widely recognized. At issue here is how late the emphatic lamed appears. Dahood has argued convincingly for the presence of the emphatic lamed in many of the canonical Psalms (22:29, 25:14, 31:3, 69:1, 69: 23,
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85:10, 89:19, 109:16), some of which could well be post-exilic psalms. While not all scholars are convinced by all of Dahood’s proposals, at least several of these are widely acknowledged to be instances where the emphatic lamed is present. 44 McDaniel (1968: 206–208) demonstrated the use of the emphatic lamed into the exilic period 45

The emphatic lamed may have been used in the Hebrew text of Sirach 29:7, which reads, πολλοὶ οὐ χάριν ποιημένος ἀπέστρεψαν ἄδωρεάν εὐλαβήσθησαν. 46 But the negative οὐ does not fit the context, giving credibility to the textual variant οὐν “therefore.” 47 But the Hebrew Vorlage of this poetic line may well have had the emphatic lamed, lying hidden behind the οὐ and the οὐν. If so, Sirach 29:7, with the emphatic lamed, would have to be translated, “because of such wickedness, indeed, many have


45 In addition to its occurrence in Lamentations 4:3, as proposed by Israel Eitan in American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 45 (1928) 202, McDaniel illustrates its occurrence twice more in 3:37–38, "Verily, the Lord has ordained it! Verily from the mouth of the most High goes forth good and bad" [italics added]. See also Hillers (1972: 58), who agreed with McDaniel’s proposals.

46 If, on the basis of Sirach’s description of the High Priest Simon II (219–196 B.C.E.), the book Sirach can be dated between 200–180 B.C.E., it may be possible to push the use of the emphatic lamed to at least this date. The RSV opted for the variant reading variant οὐν and translated, “because of such wickedness, therefore, [italics added] many have refused to lend; they have been afraid of being defrauded needlessly.” The NRSV opted for the negative οὐ and translated, “many refused to lend, not [italics added] because of meanness, but from fear of being defrauded needlessly.”

47 See Ziegler 1965: 261.
refused to lend”. The Hebrew Vorlage of Psalms of Solomon 2:24a, as reconstructed, may add support for finding the emphatic lamed as late as the turn of the era. It would permit the following translation of 2:24a, “for it was indeed in zealouslyness they did (this).”

2:25b (G), 2:29 (S)

tou eiπειν την υπερηφανιαν του δρακοντος εν ατιμία
to declare dishonorable the arrogance of the dragon

καταπτησθαι την ατιμιαν

to cast down the pride of the dragon in disgrace

Mεσολογγιαν των δοκεων

casting down the pride of the dragon in disgrace

The Greek has the difficult του eiπειν “to declare [dishonorable]” the pride of the dragon; whereas the Syriac has כמות “to cast down” the pride of the dragon. Trafton (1985: 42–44) discussed the proposed solutions which assume a corruption:

(1) in the Greek tradition (requiring the emendation of eiπειν to eiκειν “to give up” or τρεπειν “to turn” or ταπελνον “to humble” or μπαπειν “to toss about, to throw”),

---

48 The emphatic lamed may be attested in New Testament times. The fourteenth century Hebrew text of the Gospel of Matthew found in the Evan Bohan of Shem Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut (which has been published by Howard [1987, and republished in 1995]) may well contain elements from the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew referred to by the church fathers. Matthew 19:22 in the Shem Tob text has a very dubious negative particle, which would be better read as an emphatic lamed. The text has, שֶׁהַיֶּהָ בָּא כָּרֹכְשָׁה יְרֵאָה וָיֵהָ לָסָּמִים הַמְּוָרָה מִלְךָ לְךָ, which Howard translated as “It came to pass when the young man heard he went away (angry) because he did not [italics added] have much property.” Given the context of the statement and the next line of 19:22 where Jesus spoke about “how hard it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven,” the negative שֶׁהַיֶּהָ is very problematic. However, were the lamed recognized as an emphatic lamed, the verse would mean, “It came to pass when the young man heard he went away because he indeed had a great deal of property.” This interpretation exactly fits the context of the story.
After evaluating the various proposals, Trafton argued for the Vorlage of ms 16hl as possibly being a “direct translation of the Hebrew” and having “the best claim to being original.” But in a footnote he stated, “It is unclear what Hebrew word could also have given rise to the reading τοῦ ἐνεπέλυν...”

I agree with Trafton that the Syriac provides the clue, rather than the Greek, and propose the following solution. The Vorlage may have had מָדַל “casting down,” which was (mis)understood by the Greek translator as having the same meaning as מָדַל מַשָל “one speaking proverbs.” The Greek τοῦ ἐνεπέλυν would then be quite appropriate. However, מָדַל (scriptio defectiva for מָדַל מַשָל) could also be the hiph‘il participle of מַדַל “to cast down,” and was so read by the Syriac translator. Thus, the Syriac serves as the basis for the reconstructed Vorlage.

2:26b (G), 2:30a (S)

ἐκκεκευτημένου ἐπὶ τῶν ὅρεων Αἰγύπτου
pierced on the mountains of Egypt

when he was slain among the mountains of Egypt

The Greek ἐκκεκευτημένου “pierced” does not match the Syriac מָכַס “slain.” Trafton (1985: 45) noted that the Syriac would be an “unusual” translation” of the Greek. A Vorlage with either מַכַּס “smitten” or מַכַּס (the niph‘al of מָכַס) “pierced” might have caused the different translations of the Greek and the Syriac.
The Psalms of Solomon

Of these two words, it is more likely that הָרִים was original and that the כ was missed by the Syriac rather than that assuming the Greek added it. This reconstruction follows the Greek and would account for the Greek “pierced” and the Syriac “slain.”

Another difficulty in this verse is the Greek and the Syriac reference to “the mountains of Egypt.” First, there are no mountains in Lower Egypt or in the delta. Secondly, the tradition about Pompey’s death is that, after losing a decisive battle to Caesar, he was murdered upon arriving in Egypt by the ruling aristocracy there. John Morrison (1995, oral communication) suggested that the Vorlage read בִּרְמָה (scriptio defectiva for בְּרִים “nobles,” referring to the ruling party who murdered Pompey) rather than בִּרְמָה “mountains.” In light of the tradition given by Plutarch, I find Morrison’s suggestion convincing. It is also possible that the Vorlage of both the Greek and the Syriac texts already contained this reading. In this instance, neither the Greek or the Syriac texts reflect the reconstructed Vorlage which assumes that the original text read בִּרְמָה “nobles.”

2:26b (G), 2:30b (S)

ὑπὲρ ἐλάχιστον ἐξουσιωμένου ἐπί γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης
more despised than the smallest thing on earth or sea

---

49 Less likely, one could reconstruct a Vorlage having the hopšal הָרִים “he was put to death,” which became the Syriac “slain” and Greek “pierced” (assuming the translator knew how Pompey died).

50 Plutarch in The Lives of Noble Grecians and Romans described Pompey’s death at the hands of Achillas, Septimus, Salvius, a centurion, and three or four other soldiers who went out in a fishing boat to his galley to “greet” him. Pompey got into the fishing boat where the conspirators murdered him with swords. The Greek “pierced” can thus be explained by this account but not the “mountains of Egypt.” Gray (1913: 633) noted that Dio Cassius (42: 3–5) stated that Pompey was slain πρὸς τῷ Κασσίου ὀρέι, i.e., Mons Cassius which was near Pelusium. One cannot fail to notice that Κασσίου ὀρέι comes close to Hebrew שַׁמְרוֹן “the mountains of Cush” or סאַלע “the nobles of Cush,” with שַׁמְרוֹן being a synonym or metonym for Egypt.)
and more than the least (he was) being despised upon the land and upon the sea

he was disgraced by a few men on the land and on the sea

It is difficult to see how either the Syriac or the Greek could be a literal translation of the other. Rahlfs’s edition has ὑπὲρ ἐλάχιστον, an emendation which was first proposed by Geiger (1871: 82) and became widely accepted. The preposition ὑπὲρ followed by an accusative ἐλάχιστον gives the sense “more than the smallest.” However, none of the Greek manuscripts of Psalms of Solomon have ἐλάχιστον. All have ὑπὲρ ἐλάχιστον, the preposition followed by a genitive, meaning “on behalf of the smallest.” Greek ὑπὲρ followed by a genitive cannot mean “more than” (Liddell and Scott 1940: 1857–1858). Wright’s translation, “more despised than the smallest thing,” reflects the emendation to ὑπὲρ ἐλάχιστον. The proposed Vorlage eliminates the need to emend the Greek text.

Plutarch’s account of Pompey’s death has some of Pompey’s enemies standing on the shore awaiting his arrival, as well as other enemies in a small fishing boat that had come to take him from his galley to the shore. The phrase ἐν οἰκον μὴν ἐν θάλασσῃ “on land and sea” may well refer to the two contingents of Pompey’s enemies who greeted him. The meaning of ὑπὲρ could be “on behalf of,” but ὑπὲρ also translates the Hebrew prepositions יָבִי “to” and בְּ “in.” In this poetic line, ὑπὲρ most likely translates the preposition בְּ. The Greek ἐλάχιστον “small, short, meanest, littlest” overlaps the semantic range of יָבִי “little,” but it misses the sense of “few” which יָבִי conveys (as in Isaiah 16:14 and 24:6).

The choice of יָבִי “he was disgraced” reflects what happened to Pompey’s body after his death. Wright (1985: 653, note e2)

---

51 See, for example, Ryle and James (1891: 25), von Gebhardt (1895: 74), and Kittel (1900: 133).
commented on the disgrace: “The worst indignity at death was to fail to have a proper burial (Ps 79:3; 2Kgs 9:10; Jer 22:19). Pompey’s decapitated and decomposing body was burned on a pyre of driftwood.”

The Greek and the Syriac traditions failed to understand the Hebrew Vorlage at this point, and both translations are slightly askew for this verse. The proposed Hebrew Vorlage explains the variants in both traditions and eliminates the necessity of emending the Greek text against all the manuscript evidence.

2:27 (G), 2:31 (S)

τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ διαφέρομεν ἐπὶ κυμάτων
his body was carried about on the waves

but his body, when it was going upon the waves

καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Πομπή 
and his corpse was going upon the waves

This is one passage where the Greek and the Syriac agree but a Hebrew Vorlage could provide an explanation of the variants in the Greek manuscripts. Mss 149, 260, 471, 606 have διαφέρομεν “rotting” rather than διαφέρομεν “carried about.” These manuscripts are all in the 260 family in the stemma and could simply be an internal Greek corruption of διαφέρομεν to διαφθαρμενον. However, a Vorlage with בָּבְר “to draw near, to bring near (hiph'il),” as proposed above, would suggest not only that Pompey’s body was carried on the waves, but the waves were moving the body toward the shore. Manuscripts having διαφθαρμενον “rotting” evidently (mis)read בַּבְר as בַּבְר, reflecting a metathesis

52 The disgrace that goes with not being buried is also evident in Greek thought. In Sophocles’ drama Antigone, Antigone risked her life to give a proper burial to her brother, Polynieces — after Creon had forbidden his burial — because the gods demanded a burial for all.
of the ἁ and the ἅ. The reading of ἡ δὲ as ἡ δὲ would have some impact upon the formation of a stemma for the Psalms of Solomon, suggesting an independent translation of a Hebrew Vorlage behind mss 149, 260, 471, and 606.

2:29b (G), 2:33b (S)

καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω ὅτι ὁ θεὸς μέγας
and he did not understand that it is God who is great

καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω ὅτι ὁ θεὸς μέγας
and he did not know that the Lord is God

καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω ὅτι ὁ θεὸς μέγας
and he did not know that YHWH is God

The Syriac καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω ὅτι ὁ θεὸς μέγας and the Greek ὁ θεὸς μέγας cannot be translations of each other. Syriac could well have read a Vorlage with לא ידוע and translated “the Lord is God.” The Greek translator read the Vorlage as “God (= YHWH) is great,” understanding לא as “great” (in the sense of power and strength [see (BDB): 42–43]), a meaning found in Ezekiel 31:11, לא ידוע נבון לא ידוע לא ידוע לא ידוע “mighty one of the nations” and in Job 41:7 לא ידוע לא ידוע לא ידוע “mighty men.”

Aside from the divine name, the Syriac is the equivalent of the proposed Vorlage, retaining the sense of the original Hebrew.

2:31b (G), 2:35a (S)

καὶ κομίζων ὑπερφάνους εἰς ἀπώλειαν αἰώνος
but putting to sleep the arrogant for eternal destruction

καὶ κομίζων ὑπερφάνους εἰς ἀπώλειαν αἰώνος
but putting to sleep the arrogant for eternal destruction

and is causing the proud to sleep not for a time but forever

καὶ κομίζων ὑπερφάνους εἰς ἀπώλειαν αἰώνος
and he will put to sleep the arrogant for eternal destruction

53 Other passages where לא has been understood having this meaning are Ezekiel 17:13, II Kings 24:15, Genesis 31:29, Proverbs 3:27, and Nehemiah 5:5.
Translators and commentators have proposed emending the Greek and the Syriac texts to move away from the motif of “sleeping.” However, there is no need to emend the Greek or the Syriac since the “to sleep” in the pēl has the meaning “to sleep the sleep of death”—as in Daniel 12:2, "and many of those sleeping in the ground of dust will awake.” It appears to be a euphemism for death, like the English usage of “putting a pet to sleep.” The Greek and the Syriac translators understood the Hebrew verb to be the pēl, with its overtones of death.

The Syriac phrase “not for a time but for ever” and the Greek phrase “for eternal destruction” cannot be translations of each other. A Vorlage which could account for the difference could have been literally, “for a destruction eternal.” But the Syriac seems to have a doublet for the in its Vorlage, namely “for ever” and “but” (= “but”). If so, this would be an example of a doublet due to an aural error. Moreover, if “destruction” were in the Vorlage, it would appear that the Syriac text read the noun as the phrase which would have been another aural error (confusing the syllable [.. i.th] with [.. e.th]), as well as a scribal error wherein the initial of was dropped.

The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text tradition since it points to the more poetic 2 + 2 metrical line, compared to rather prosaic wording suggested by the Syriac: “brought down, lowered, brought low.”

---

54 Fritzche (1871: 572), followed by Hilgenfeld (1871: 389) and Pick (1883: 788), emended to “bringing.”

55 Harris and Mingana (1916: 89) wanted to emend to “brought down, lowered, brought low.”
The Greek lacks an equivalent of the Syriac מָלֵךְ "all," but this is not unusual in translating from Hebrew to Greek. The phrase "under all the heavens" appears seven times in the Hebrew scriptures (Genesis 7:19; Deuteronomy 2:25, 4:19; Job 28:24, 37:3, 41:3; and Daniel 9:12), and only once in the LXX is the מָלֵךְ translated (Job 37:3 has ὑποκάτω παντὸς [ὅλον] τοῦ οὐρανοῦ for מָלֵךְ מְלָאָךְ). The Syriac translated the phrase literally, while the Greek moved to the idiom "under heaven," which dropped the Hebrew plural, as well. The Syriac supports the proposed Vorlage.

The presence of the Greek loan word ἀσχήμα (ἀσχήμα) "form" in the Syriac does not fit the context in this verse and is problematic. Trafton (1985: 48) noted correctly that the ἀσχήμα cannot be used as evidence that the Syriac is a translation from the Greek since the Greek has ἑπιστήμη "understanding," not ἀσχήμα. Additional support for Trafton comes from Jastrow (1950: 94) where מְלָאָךְ is noted as a loan word in Aramaic as
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well, appearing in the Targum of Proverbs 7:10, where it translates the Hebrew תַּכָּלָה “planning, simulation.” This loanword also appears as a feminine noun in Targum Yerushalmi in Genesis 31:14 and Numbers 32:25, meaning “consent, agreement.” The use of ṣaḥḫa in the Targums, which certainly did not come from a Greek source, supports the position that the presence of ṣaḥḫa in a Syriac text does not mean the Syriac text must be derived from a Greek source. The use of the word here still remains problematic in light of the context, but it is not proof of its being translated from some other Greek text.

The use of ṣaḥḫa in Aramaic and Syriac is not a basis for assuming that the Hebrew Vorlage of 2:33a used the word. The Greek ἐπιστήμη “understanding” and the Syriac מְסִים “form” suggest that the Vorlage had כְּפַלּוֹ “confidence” (as in Job 4:6; Psalm 78:7, 85:9; and Proverbs 3:26) which was misread by the Syriac and Greek translators (or the scribes producing their Vorlagen) as כְּפַלּוֹ “to be prudent” (BDB, 698, 968). The ἐπιστήμη would well translate כְּפַלּוֹ “prudence, insight” and the Syriac מְסִים “form” would well translate כְּפַלּוֹ when read in light of its Arabic cognate ʃāk “the shape, form, or figure of a thing” (Lane, 1872: 1587). The context of 2:33a is much like Job 4:6, "Is not your fear of God your confidence, and the integrity of your ways your hope?” (RSV, italics added). The conflation of כְּפַלּוֹ and מְסִים in Job 4:6 provided the clues for the reconstructed Vorlage given above.

Psalm Three

The Syriac of 3:1–6, where the Syriac S source (a marginal note in the Hymns of Severus which survives only in these verses) differs from the Syriac mss 10hl and 16hl, has some interesting variants. Trafton (1981: 74, 381, 387; 1985: 240–241) noted that

---

56 See Brooks (1911: vol. 7, 726) for his account of his discovery of this Syriac fragment of the Psalms of Solomon.
in the first five verses (10 text lines) S disagrees twenty times with mss 10hl and 16hl. He concluded:

Thus, the difference might be explained on the assumption that the scribe wrote the verses from memory, with the result that what looks like a different textual tradition is really the product of a reasonably accurate, but not photographic, memory.

Another explanation can be offered, namely, that S was an independent translation of the original Hebrew. Of the three variants examined next, two address inner–Syriac differences which can be better understood in the light of an underlying Hebrew, and one of the inner–Syriac variants (in 3:4a) suggests the translator may have been reading a different Vorlage.

3:1

why do you sleep, soul, and do not praise the Lord

why do you sleep, O my soul, and do not bless the Lord

why do you sleep, O my soul, and you are not drawing near to the Lord

why do you sleep, O my soul, and not bless the Lord

Mss 10hl and 16hl have the feminine participle (ending with suffix) of “to bless,” in agreement with the Greek “praise,” and Syriac S has the participle of “to draw near, to approach” and the 2fs pronoun . The differences could be an inner–Syriac confusion of and and the loss of the of the S. But it is more likely that the

55 In basic agreement with Stein (410). Compare Frankenberg’s (69).
of the S source is a free rendering of a Vorlage, with the root here having the meaning “to ingratiate one’s self.” This nuance would parallel the use of the root ābrā in Arabic (Lane 1885: 2506), where means “he advanced himself in the favor of God,” and the noun (قْرَأَ) “offering” was considered the equivalent of prayer (“the divinely appointed act of prayer is the قْرَأَ to God of every pious person”).

Mss 16hl and 10hl and S have . . . “my soul and . . .” and the Greek has ψυχή καὶ . . . “soul and . . .,” the latter lacking a pronominal element corresponding to the 1cs suffix in the Syriac. A simple case of haplography evidently occurred in the Greek translator’s reading a Vorlage in which نَعْمَة يَلَوَّنَهُ had been corrupted to نعمة يلولن with the subsequent loss of one of the two ُ’s. As a result, the Greek has no pronominal element as do the Syriac manuscripts. In this instance the Syriac has preserved the Hebrew Vorlage while the Greek has not.

3:1b–3:2a (G), 3:2 (S)

ψάλατε τῷ θεῷ τῷ αἰνετῷ . . . ψάλλε
sing a new song to God . . . sing

ψάλσε
sing a new hymn to God

nop τῷ ἔκθεν ἔκθεν λαλάλα . . . Φιλάρ
sing a new song to God . . . sing

The Greek plural imperative ψάλατε coming between the singular “my soul” (in 3:1) and the singular “a glad heart” (in 3:2b)—which are the only possible subjects for the verb—is very problematic. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms. Of the suggestions made, the least likely ones are the ones of Viteau (1911:267) who simply emended it to the singular ψάλλε and Ryle and James (1891:30–31) who attributed it to poetic license or the unconscious adoption of the language of the canonical psalms.

See Wright 1985: 654, note b.
recognizing the misreading of an original singular יִדְרֵי נְאֻיָּה in the Vorlage as the plural יִדְרֵי נְאָיָה, another example of the widely attested confusion of יִדְרֵי and יִדְרֵי (see Delitzsch, 1920: p 103 § 103). Frankenberg (1896: 69) and Stein (1969: 440) used the singular יִדְרֵי in agreement with Ryle and James, although Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) used the plural יִדְרֵי. The Syriac rightly reflects a singular that must have been in the Vorlage, but the Greek probably retains the two synonymous imperatives. The reconstructed Vorlage attempts to restore alliteration as well as synonymous parallelism.

3:2a
καὶ γρηγόρησον ἐπὶ τὴν γρηγόρησιν αὐτοῦ
and be aware of how he is aware of you

and be excited in his excitement

and rejoice with his Watchers

Wright (1985: 654), commenting on this difficult passage, indicates that “The Greek and the Syriac are obscure to the point of unintelligibility.” The Greek γρηγόρησον ἐπὶ τὴν γρηγόρησιν αὐτοῦ means literally “keep watching for his watching” or “be awake in his wakefulness,” and the Syriac רֶדֶנָה means “to be awake.” None of the explanations of the commentators (see Trafton, 1985:52–53) are convincing. The best proposals are those of Ryle and James (1891: 31) who thought there was a confusion of רֶדֶנָה and רֶדֶנָה “to shout,” Trafton’s conclusion that the Vorlage contained a hithpolel of רֶדֶנָה “to be excited,” which became in the Syriac the ‟ethpa‘al of רֶדֶנָה, is the more tenable.

Trafton noted that the Greek translator missed this nuance in his use of γρηγόρησον, “to be awake” resulting in an “unintelligible reading.” But his translation, “be excited in his excitement,” does not fit the context any better than “to be awake.” Moreover the
Syriac has the *ettaph‘al*, a passive causative (“he was made to be awake”), rather than an *ethpe‘al*, a simple passive (“he was awakened”).

The nuance of *תָּשָׁה* required for this context cannot be the exercise of spiritual gifts, as in the Peshitta of II Timothy 1:6, “I remind you to stir [תְּשַׁה] up the gift of God which is in you,” or a metaphor for being alive, as in I Thessalonians 5:10, “whether we wake [תָּשָׁה] or sleep, we shall be with him.” Rather, the nuance is to be found with the use of אֲדוֹנִי “the Watchers” in Daniel 4:13, 23 [MT 4:10, 20], יָגְנֵי נָשִׁים יָגְנֵי נָשִׁים (which is rendered in Aquila and Symmachus as ἐγρήγορος). The “Watchers” or “the wakeful ones” (i.e., those who by nature never need to sleep) of Daniel 4 are identified in I Enoch 71:17 as the *cherubim*, the *seraphim*, and the *ophanim* who—without sleep—guard the Divine and endlessly sing his praises. The “Watchers” or “the wakeful ones” (i.e., those who by nature never need to sleep) of Daniel 4 are identified in I Enoch 71:17 as the *cherubim*, the *seraphim*, and the *ophanim* who—without sleep—guard the Divine and endlessly sing his praises.

59 It is only this interpretation which does justice to the אֲדוֹנִי of γρηγόρησιν אֲדוֹנִי, recognizing that אֲדוֹנִי which was translated as γρηγόρησιν would have been better translated as ἐγρήγορος. In the previous poetic line the poet questioned “why do you sleep, O my soul.” Therefore, it seems unlikely that the poet shifted after only one verse to a concern about God’s staying awake.

The Syriac *מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה* can be parsed as a feminine collective noun (see GKC § 122s) with an affixed preposition and a 3ms suffix, which would have to be translated “with his Watchers.” Since the context has אֲדוֹנִי and מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה, the nuance מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה is not “to be excited” but “to rejoice, to exult” (as in Job 31:29, where מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה occurs in synonymous parallelism with מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה “to rejoice”). Contextually, the Greek and the Syriac require a *Vorlage* with מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה.

59 For other passages dealing with the אֲדוֹנִי see I Enoch 1:5, 12:2–3, 14:1, 20:1, 40:2, 61:12, II Enoch 18:1–8, and perhaps Psalm 121.

60 The stem תָּשָׁה could also mean “chaff, fine dust, smoke” or “blindness” ◊. Payne Smith, 1967: 407), but these meanings are contextually unlikely.

61 Trafton cited Job 31:29 as an example of מָלוֹא·תּוֹדָה with the meaning of “to be excited,” but the key to its meaning is in the parallel “to rejoice.”
but translators in both traditions missed the nuance of “the Watchers.” The anticipated use of parallelism in poetry supports the parallel imperatives in the Greek text tradition. The psalmist is exhorting himself to “rejoice with the Watchers” who never sleep but rejoice before God continually “to remember the Lord always” (3:1).

3:3b
καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα Κυρίου
and proving the Lord’s judgements right
καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα Κυρίου
and in righteousness the judgements of the Lord
καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα Κυρίου
and (the righteous one) was vindicated
by the judgements of the Lord
καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα Κυρίου

The problems in this poetic line are the use of the abstract noun καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα Κυρίου “righteousness” in Syriac and the ambiguity of the Greek δικαίωσε which can be either a dative of δικαίωσε, or a 3s indicative future of δικαίωσε, or, as suggested by Ryle and James (1891: 32), a corruption of the 3pl present δικαίωσε. Ryle and James translated “and justify the judgements of the Lord [with thanksgiving],” and Trafton preferred “and declare righteous the judgements of the Lord.”

If the suggestions of Ryle and James or Trafton are accepted, a theological problem arises, namely, the idea that members of the faith community were called upon to pass judgement on God’s righteousness. The phrase καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα Κυρίου does not appear elsewhere in the LXX. The uniqueness of the phrase in biblical literature and the uniqueness of the theological concept raise suspicions about its integrity. The suspicions are diminished when a Vorlage with ἡ ἀμανία (scriptio defectiva) “to justify, to vindicate” is recognized as a misreading of an original ἡ ἀμανία “to be justified, to be vindicated,” i.e., the misreading of a niph’al as a hiph’il reflecting the confusion of an I and a J (see Delitzsch, 1920: 116 §123c).
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The preposition מ of מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה has no parallel in the Greek text, rendering it also suspect. Were the preposition transposed as a prefix to מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה “his judgements,” coupled with the reading of the niphal מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה, a more traditional theological statement would appear, namely, the members of the faith community “were vindicated by the judgements of the Lord.” The misreading in the Vorlage of מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה instead of מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה is reflected in the Syriac which read the ה of מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה as the definite article rather than the hiphil מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה. The reason why “the whole verse is difficult,” to quote Trafton (1985: 53), is because neither Greek or Syriac had an accurate Vorlage. The original Hebrew מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה, must have been corrupted before the two traditions emerged.

3:4a

οὐκ ὀλιγοφρῆσει δίκαιος παιδευόμενος ὑπὸ κυρίου

the righteous does not lightly esteem discipline from the Lord

καὶ ὁ δικαίος ὁ παιδευόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου (16hl and 10hl)

the righteous one who is chastened by the Lord will not disregard {him}

καὶ ὁ δικαίος ὁ παιδευόμενος (S)

the righteous one who is chastened by the Lord will not be faint-hearted

לَا יִפְדִּחוֹן רְצוֹר מְרַכָּבָה

the righteous one who is chastened by the Lord will not be faint-hearted

Mss 16hl and 10hl have רְצוֹר נִפְדִּיחַ “to disregard,” which corresponds to the Greek, while S has the phrase רְצוֹר וַתָּמֵא “lacking courage” (Jennings, 1926: 67, 1 Thessalonians 5:14). This difference reflects a confusion in the reading at some point in the Hebrew tradition of מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה “to delay, to disregard” and מְשָׁמֵרָה מִיְּמָנָה “to be faint, to grow dim”—a simple misreading of the graphically similar
The Hebrew מ may be a by-form of the Syriac cognate "to disregard." The scribe or translator behind S may have misread his Vorlage, or he may have had a Vorlage with מ instead of מ, resulting from an earlier misreading in the tradition.

3:5

προσέκοψεν ο δίκαιος καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν τὸν κύριον ἐπέσεν καὶ ἀποβλέπει τί ποιήσει αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς

The righteous stumbles and proves the Lord right; he falls and watches for what God will do about him.

The unusual statements in the English translations of the Syriac and the Greek, that the sinner vindicates God, is probably rooted in a misreading of the hithpa'el הָדַעֲלָה instead of the hiphil הָדַעַל (scriptio plena הָדַעַל) in the Vorlage, as in 3:3b. Although the Greek ἐδικαίωσεν could be translated "to justify oneself," the accusative τὸν κύριον, making God the recipient of the action, would indicate that the Vorlage was read as a hiphil.

The "to wait for, to look for, to expect; to lie in wait" of 16הל and 10הל has a different semantic range than ἀποβλέπω "to look after, to look away, to pay attention," suggesting that neither the Greek nor the Syriac is a translation of the other. The Syriac S source has "to look, to behold, to gaze," and as Trafton (1985: 54) noted, it could be a translation of or a correction to
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The differences between תֶּלֶת, תֶּלֶת, and תֶּלֶת could all be rooted in a Vorlage having לֵלֶת, the semantic range of which includes “to look, to pay attention to, to expect.”

3:6b (G), 3:7b (S)

αὐλίζεται ἐν ὁσιῳ δικαιῳ

visit the house of the righteous

lodges in the house of the righteous

dwelling in the house of the righteous

The use of the present active indicative in Greek for what appears in the Syriac as a active participle is a widely attested variation. The difference between the Syriac passive participle and the present active indicative is another matter. The Syriac passive participle נָלַח “was lodged” and the Greek αὐλίζεται “lodges” can be derived from a Vorlage with לֵלֶת, the plural participle of לֵלֶת “to lodge.”\(^{63}\) The scriptio plene לֵלֶת was misread by the Syriac as the passive participle לֵלֶת, another occurrence of the frequent confusion of ב and כ (see Delitzsch, 1920: 103 § 103). The compound subject of the Vorlage would permit either a singular or plural verbal element. Even though the Greek has the singular verb, its use of the active is the more probable reading.

3:7 (G), 3:8 (S)

ἐπισκέπτεται διὰ παντὸς τῶν ὁσιῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ δικαῖος

the righteous constantly searches his house

for he always inspects the house of the righteous one

the righteous one continually inspects his house

\(^{63}\) The passive participle of לֵלֶת follows a pattern of לָלֶת “circumcised” and לָלֶת “scattered.”
Greek differs from Syriac in that it is the “righteous” one who searches his own house, whereas in the Syriac it is God (literally “he” = God) who searches the house of the righteous. Trafton proposed that the Hebrew Vorlage was "his house [the direct object] the righteous one [the subject]," which the Syriac translator misread. This is quite plausible if מַלְאָךְ was read as an Aramaism, with the 1 being understood as an anticipatory 3ms suffix, “the house of him (who is) the righteous one.” The Greek seems preferable in this phrase.

3:10 (G), 3:13 (S)

επεσεν ὅτι παντρόν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ

he falls—his fall is serious—

he fell and because his fall was evil

כ הเทพ מצלת

indeed, his fallen body was stinking


The versification of Greek 3:10 and 11, as well as the versification of Syriac 3:12–13, has contributed to the misunderstanding of these poetic lines. The Greek επεσεν “he falls” and the Syriac מַלְאָךְ “he fell” are the last word in their respective lines, not the first word of a new line. The Vorlage, no doubt, had מַלְאָךְ, but it was incorrectly read as a qal (לָאָךְ) in both traditions. It should have been read as a niph'al (לָאָךְ). The preceding poetic line would have read “He added sin upon sin to/in his life and he was felled/overthrown.” The Greek ὅτι and the Syriac מַלְאָךְ begin what was once a new poetic line which probably had the meaning, “(and) because his carcass stinks, he surely will not rise.”

The clues pointing to a Vorlage with this meaning are (1) πτῶμα “a fall, a ruin, a corpse” (Liddell and Scott 1940: 1549); (2) מָצַלְתָּה “ruin, overthrow, carcass” (BDB 658); and יָשָׁבוּ “evil” a

---

64 The niph'al of לָאָךְ is not listed in BDB; but it is cited by Jastrow (1950: 924).
homograph of its Jewish Aramaic cognate שָׁבָכ “bad, wrong, ill, sick” (Jastrow, 167). Considering these clauses in reverse order, it must be noted that שֵׁבַכ is from the root שֵׁבַכ (medial ש = medial נ), which corresponds to the Hebrew שָׁבָכ “to have a bad smell, to stink, to decay” (BDB, 92; Jastrow, 195). Therefore a Vorlage with שָׁבָכ could mean either “to be evil” or “to give off an odor (from decaying).” Similarly, a Vorlage with שָׁבָכ could be read in two different ways: שָׁבָכ could be “a ruin, an overthrow” or “a carcass,” as in Judges 14:8, “he turned aside to see the carcass of the lion (יִרְאוֹ אֶל הַלֵּיָה),” Moreover, Greek πτώμα “fall, misfortune, calamity” may also mean “a fallen body, a corpse.”

Even the subordinate conjunctions ὅτι and ἀλλὰ, which support the reconstruction of a Vorlage with שָׁבָכ, permit other interpretations since שָׁבָכ can also mean “for, because” or “surely.” Therefore, a Vorlage which read שָׁבָכ could have been translated “(and) because his fall was bad” or, equally, “indeed, his fallen body stinks.” The poet’s choice of the word in the original Hebrew could have intentionally carried this double meaning. It was not just a matter of a “bad fall” from which the sinner might recover, it was a permanent fall. If the sinner’s corpse is already smelling, the poet concluded: οὐκ ἀναστήρεται ἡ ραμ “he will not arise!”

Although Psalm 3 is not usually considered a historical psalm, it has some similarities to Psalm 2, particularly if the above reconstruction of a Hebrew Vorlage for verse 10 is correct. The “stinking, fallen body” called to mind the image found in Psalm 2:27 where Pompey’s headless body was carried about on the waves. Indeed, the placement of this Psalm following Psalm Two may be because of this verse and that identification.

3:12b (G), 3:26b (S)
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτῶν . . . ὡκ ἐκλείψει ἔτι and their life . . . and it shall never end

---

65 On the emphatic יְזֹ, see Dahood and Penar, 1970: 400.
PSALM FOUR

and their lives (plural) ... and it will not perish ever again

and their life ... and will never end

The debate with this poetic line has centered on the unusual singular verb in Syriac, used with a plural subject. Harris and Mingana (1868: 106–107) argued that the singular verb is a literal translation of ἐκλέιψει, but Trafton (1985: 57), citing GKC (462, § 145) and Nöldeke (1904: 255) has demonstrated that although it is unusual there are numerous examples in Hebrew, and at least one example in Syriac, of a singular verb with a plural subject. One example in Hebrew not cited in GKC is Genesis 47:28, “the years of his life was (יְהֹוָּ֥ם יָּבֹא) a hundred and forty-seven years.” The singular of 47:28 should be retained as lectio difficilior even though, as noted in BHS, the Samaritan text, Syriac and the Targums read or translate this as though it were the plural יְהֹוָּ֥ם יָּבֹא. Similarly, the Syriac, independent of the Greek, singular verb, may have read a Vorlage with וְאָלָּאָ כלֹּה הָיוָּם...

Psalm Four

4:1

ינא תי סע בֶּבֶתל הקֶהֶּאֶה יָנִּי סְעָדוּּוּ סְעָדוּּוּ סְעָדוּּוּ סְעָדוּּוּ סְעָדוּּוּ סְעָדוּּוּ

why are you sitting in the council of the devout, you profaner

לָמָּה הָלָּאָּּ לָהָּּּ בּוּדּוּּ הָשִּׁרוּּ

why do you sit, O wicked man, in the council of the righteous

לָמָּה הָלָּּּּ הָלָּּּּ הָלָּּּּ הָלָּּּּ הָלָּּּּ הָלָּּּּ הָלָּּּּ H

why, O profane one, are you sitting in the council of the righteous?
The Greek βέβηλε and Syriac  kullanımı are not translations of each other. Both could translate a Vorlage with the stem lixir “to profane.” Although Syriac has the stem lixir, its meaning “to purify” is the opposite of the Hebrew lixir.66 The root lixir would be an alternative for a Vorlage with lixir, but its meaning in the Syriac differs from that of Hebrew lixir. In Syriac it has the meaning “to paganize, to turn aside to idolatry, to apostatize,” whereas the Hebrew is less specific, meaning “to pollute (the land)” and in Isaiah 9:16 it occurs as a synonym of lixir (lixir ) “for everyone is godless and an evil doer.” However, since lixir is translated by βέβηλε in Ezekiel 21:3067 and occurs as a synonym of lixir (the cognate of the Syriac  이루 ) used in 4:1 it has been chosen for the Vorlage here.

Similarly, the Greek οἰσίς and the Syriac  이루 cannot be translations of each other, but both would be adequate translations of a Vorlage with lixir “(loving) kindness” (Liddell and Scott, 1018). In contrast to Hebrew, Aramaic lixir, including Syriac, means “to revile, to scorn, to reproach” (J. Payne Smith, 150; Jastrow, 486). Hebrew lixir occurs in Syriac and Aramaic as a loanword, but ordinarily Syriac uses 稙 ) as in Hosea 10:12 where lixir occurs in parallelism with lixir. In both instances, the Greek and the Syriac chose contextually different words within the semantic range of the proposed Hebrew Vorlage.

4:3b

ἐν ποικιλίᾳ ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐν ἁκρασίαις
in a variety of sins and intemperance

of a multitude of intemperance of sinners

66 The Syriac and the Arabic take the root meaning “inclination” and direct it away from evil, whereas the Hebrew makes the inclination towards evil. See BDB, 337.

67 is translated καὶ σὺ βέβηλε ἄνομε ἀφηγούμενος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
The Greek πολλαία “manifold” and the Syriac سَيْفٌ “many” could be translations of each other or accurate translations of a Vorlage having רְבַּעַת, but ἁμαρτίων καὶ ἐν ἀκρασίαις and سَيْفٌ cannot be translations of each other, even if the ἁμαρτωλῶν in mss 253, 655, and 659 was original since it agrees with the Syriac سَيْفٌ. The Greek genitive ἁμαρτίων / ἁμαρτωλῶν and the Syriac particle من suggests a construct chain in the Vorlage, but a simple reversal of the order of the two or three bound nouns does not bring the Greek and Syriac into conformity. The difference can mostly likely be explained by a haplography of a Vorlage which read ברב רשاعة הוללות ופשעים שטונים “a wide variety of intemperate cruelty and crazy crimes.” The.twילה “cruelty,” which can be read as a singular abstract noun or a feminine plural noun of.twילה, would account for the ἁμαρτίων / ἁμαρτωλῶν variants in the Greek. The Greek Vorlage or translator read only ברב רשاعة הוללות “wide variety of intemperate cruelty,” whereas the Syriac translator read only ברב הוללות ופשעים “with a multitude of intemperances and sinners.” The graphic similarity of.twילה and.twילה in the poetic line could have been the reason for the haplography.

4:4a
οἱ ὀφθαλμοί αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γυναῖκα ἀνευ διαστολῆς
his eyes are on every woman indiscriminately
حسبين، مكل مكل فهمت
his eyes are upon every woman without modesty
mayın على كل امرأة بيل تلأ
his eyes are upon every woman without restraint

The Greek ἀνευ διαστολῆς and the Syriac سَيْفٌ cannot be translations of each other. Commentators have argued for a Vorlage with either מדבר “speaking rashly” (Geiger, 1871) or בֵּלַי פִּרְשַׁה “unlawfully” (Frankenberg, 1896: 70) or בֶּלַי פִּרְשַׁה שֶׁכִּי מָלַא הַבּוֹלֶה “for he filled the pool” (Frankenberg, 1896: 70).

However, if the Vorlage had the stem ܐܠܟ “to restrain (the eyes)” (Jastrow, 641, citing the Targum of Isaiah 33:15), it would provide the basis for the Greek and the Syriac translations. Since final ܝ stems can also be attested as final ܬ stems or final ܘ stems, the root ܐܠܟ could have been written as ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ or ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ. If so, there could have been a confusion of ܬ and ܘ (Delitzsch, 1920: 116, §122), and the ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ resulting from the confusion would have had the meaning “to be restrained, to be put to shame, to be embarrassed.” Moreover, ܐܠܟ and ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ could be by-forms of each other.68 A Vorlage as proposed above with ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ explains both the Greek and the Syriac texts of this phrase.

4:5a

 ámbρτάει ὁ όχι ὄρμενος

he sins as if no one saw

正如他無法

as if unseen

כמיה יראתי ודיברא

he sins as if no one sees

The Syriac lacks an equivalent for ámbρτάει, leading Trafton (1985: 62) to conclude that an ܐܠܟ must have dropped out of the text. In support of Trafton it may be noted that the next line in the Vorlage probably had ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ “to speak rashly, thoughtlessly.” If so, the Vorlage of these two lines would have included the words ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ “sinning speaking.” Given this consonant cluster it is easy

68 McDaniel (1983: 232) has recognized the existence of the by-forms ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ and ܒܠܐ ܡܪܝܢܐ in Judges 5:22.
to see how a haplography occurred wherein the אֵּך was lost under the influence of the אֶ to of the אֶ to.

4:5b

έν συνταγῇ κακίας

of illicit affairs

in an evil scheme

with evil plans

Trafton (1985: 62) and Wright (1985: 655) had difficulty with the Greek συνταγῇ “an order, a command, a preconceived signal, at an appointed time” (Liddell and Scott, 1724), which occurs in Judges 20:38 and II Esdras 10:14. Trafton’s translation of έν συνταγῇ κακίας as “in an evil command (or, contract)” missed the nuance of συνταγῇ “appointed time.” Wright’s “evil arrangements” and “affair”—suggesting an illicit rendezvous—indirectly picked up the idea of an appointed time. The Vorlage could have been one of the following:

(1) για “appointed time” (as in Judges 20:38), or
(2) ποιεῖν “to devise, to purpose” (used for “evil purpose” in Genesis), or
(3) προετοιμάζει “a plan” (used in a bad sense in Psalm 140:9).

The difference between για or ποιεῖν is a matter of the well attested confusion of μ and π (Delitzsch, 1920: 117–118, §128 a–b). The Syriac read the Vorlage as (3) προετοιμάζει “a plan” and the Greek took the meaning to be (1) για “an appointed time.” The context, in my opinion, requires (2) ποιεῖν “to devise, to purpose (evil).”

4:5b(G), 4:6b(S)

eiς πᾶσαν οἰκίαν έν ίλαρωτιτι ώς άκακος

every house as though innocent
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καὶ τῶν ἰδιούς ἐν ἁπάσῃ ἡμέρᾳ
as one in whom there is no evil

בכלה הבט חציר תאם

into every house as one without evil

Although this is a case where the Greek or the Syriac could be translations of each other, they could be a translation of a Vorlage with "without iniquity" (as in Jeremiah 5:21, Jonah 1:6 and Psalm 104:25). If so, the Greek opted to translate the compound "בכלה הבט תאם" with a single word, whereas the Syriac opted for an idiomatic compound phrase.

4:6a(G), 4:7a(S)

tοὺς ἐν ὑποκρίσει ζωντας μετὰ ὑσίων
from the devout those who live in hypocrisy

those who judge with partiality . . . with the upright man

the ones judging, lifting up the face
against the righteous one

The Greek and the Syriac are quite different in this passage and cannot be translations of each other. The difference between them are the ζωντας “living ones” and the דינים “judging ones,” which probably reflects a misreading of a Vorlage having נון “judging ones” (scriptio defectiva for דינים) wherein the initial ד was confused with a מ, reading it as מון “the living ones.” The error in reading seems to have made by the Greek translator or it was already in his exemplar. The Syriac has a doublet in this verse,

69 Delitzsch (1920: p116 § 123+) cited the misreading of a מ and a ד, although he does not list the confusion of מ and ד. Since a מ and a ד have been confused a confusion of a מ and ד would not be unusual. A poorly aligned ד could also have been misread as מ.
reflecting a *Vorlage* with מָרָה and מְרֵי—unless the Syriac translator created the doublet himself. The doublet is the מָרָה in 4:7a and the מְרֵי in 4:7b, with מְרֵי corresponding to Greek ζῶν τας in 4:6a [= Syriac 4:7a]. In either case, the (mis)reading of מָרָה and מְרֵי reflects the well attested confusion of י and ה (see Delitzsch, 1920: 111–112 § 110-c).

The μετὰ could mean “against” (BAG, 510, s.v. 3a) rather than “with,” especially if it is derived from a *Vorlage* with מָלַל that can mean “against” as well as “with” (BDB, 767, s.v. 1c). The verse is best translated, with the *Vorlage* in mind, “May God remove those who judge, lifting their face against the upright man for (causing) the wasting of his body and the impoverishment of his life.”

4:7(G), 4:8a (S)

τὰ ἑργα ἄνθρωπῳ ἄνθρωπαρέσκων
the deeds of those who try to impress people

τὰ ἑργα νιντροπίτικων
the deeds of those who please men

*the deeds of the ones showing partiality*

The Greek ἄνθρωπων is not reflected in the Syriac which simply has the demonstrative pronoun נוּן. It appears that a *Vorlage* with the participle מְרֵי “lifting” was represented differently in the Greek and the Syriac. The Greek used ἄνθρωπων to reflect the participle and the Syriac simply used the demonstrative pronoun נוּן. Both could be considered correct translations of

---

70 One needs to be careful in following Trafton’s translation of what he calls, “two lines in antithetical parallelism: ‘but God remove those who judge with partiality, but he (i.e., God) lives with the upright man in the corruption of his (i.e., the upright man’s) flesh and in the poverty of his (i.e., the upright man’s) life.’” The idea that God lives with the upright man in the corruption of his flesh and in his poverty would be a novel theological statement. One would need more evidence to support the idea that the “he” of “he lives” refers to God.
the Vorlage which has as in Deuteronomy 10:17 with the sense of “to show partiality.”

4:8a (G), 4:9b (S)
ἐν τῷ ἑξαίρεσθαι ἀμαρτωλῶν
when sinners are driven out

when the wicked are removed

when the wicked are taken away

The Greek ἑν τῷ and the Syriac כ could possibly be a translation of each other, but they are more likely to be different translations from a Vorlage in which there was a confusion of כ “in” and כ “when, as.” The confusion of כ and כ is widely attested (Delitzsch, 1920: 110, § 108–9).

4:8b (G), 4:10 (S)
λαλοῦντα νόμον μετὰ δόλου
who deceitfully quote the Law

who speaks the law with deceit

the one speaking the Law with deceit

The use of the Greek loanword in the Syriac כ cannot be used as an argument for the Syriac translation being derived from the Greek. Jastrow (905, 913) cited νόμος as a commonly used noun in Hebrew and in Aramaic texts which definitely were not based upon Greek originals.

4:9b (G), 4:11b (S)
διαλύσαι σοφίαν ἄλληλοι
destroys the wisdom of others

the wisdom of each one
The Greek ἀλλήλων “of one another” could be a translation of a Vorlage having ἄλλος ἀλλ’ ἄλλος “each other” (BDB, 36), which the translator treated as the equivalent of the idiomatic ἀλήθεια “a man and his neighbor” (which Geiger [1871: 115] thought was in the Vorlage and should have been translated τοῦ πλουσίου). The Syriac יְשׁוֹב יְשׁוֹב could also be a translation of יְשׁוֹב יְשׁוֹב, which is also the equivalent of יְשׁוֹב יְשׁוֹב “a man and his neighbor.” However, as suggested by the Syriac, it is more likely that the Vorlage had simply יְשׁוֹב יְשׁוֹב or יְשׁוֹב יְשׁוֹב “one by one,” as in Isaiah 27:12. Earlier emendations based on the assumption of an inner-Greek corruption of ἀλλήλων to ἀγγέλων, λαλῶν, ἀκάκων, or the like (reviewed by Trafton, 1985: 65), seem gratuitous.72

4:10a (G), 4:12a (S)

οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ παραλογισμοί

his words are deceitful

דְרֵבָּר מְרוֹמָה

his words are deceitful

The difference between the Greek παραλογισμοί “deceitful” and the Syriac כַּסָּע “counsel” is probably rooted in a confusion of a ד and a ד in a Vorlage having either כַּסָּע ד to imagine, to devise, to think” or כַּסָּע ד “to deceive” (BDB, 198, 941). The confusion of ד and ד is widely attested (Delitzsch, 1920:

71 Note GKC §123 for a list of texts which repeat one or more words to express the idea of “all” or “every.”

72 If the reduplicated יְשׁוֹב or יְשׁוֹב is a case of dittography, the יְשׁוֹב could be a reverence to “the wisdom of men” as in I Corinthians 2:5.
105–107, §104–105) and has already been noted above. The context requires a negative nuance to the noun, supporting the Greek text and the assumption that its Vorlage had ἀναμένῃ. Consequently, the Syriac translator must have added the negative modifier αὐτοῖς, which was not in his Vorlage, since the verb ἔστη without a modifier would have a very positive meaning.

4:10b (G), 4:13a (S)

οὐκ ἀπέστη ἐως ἐνίκησεν σκορπίσαι ὡς ἐν ὄρφανι

he did not stop until he succeeded

in scattering (them) as orphans

καὶ ἦν μὴ πέραν ἐν ὄρφανι

and he did not depart until

he scattered (them) among death

καὶ ἦν μὴ πέραν ἐν ὄρφανι

he did not cease until he scattered (them)

like those brought to grief

The Greek ἀπέστη “cease” is read as ἀνείπτη “stand up” in mss 149, 260, 471, and 206, a difference which is not likely to be due to graphic or aural similarity of the π and the v. The Syriac text has the stem ἐπο “to depart, to withdrawal, to cease” (J. Payne Smith, 464). All three readings can be derived from a Vorlage having the root ἔπο “to stand,” which may also have the meaning “to stand still, to cease (moving), to cease (an action).”\(^{73}\)

Liddell and Scott (1940: 1176) give νικάω the meaning “to succeed” only for this passage in the Psalms of Solomon, and this definition has been adopted by Wright (1985: 656). Elsewhere, νικάω has the meaning “to conquer, to prevail, to win,” which would make it the equivalent of Hebrew נצל (stem l), discussed

---

above with reference to the εἰς τελος in Psalm 1:1, meaning in the qal “to win” and in the niph’al “to be defeated.”

The Greek σκορπίζω “to distribute, to scatter, to disburse” (Liddell and Scott, 1614) is the equivalent of מָּזַז (stem II) meaning “to scatter, to sprinkle” (BDB, 664). Since the Syriac has no equivalent for וּקְוָו, one can conclude that the Greek ἐνίκησεν σκορπίσαι “he succeeded to scatter” is a doublet for the מָּזַז in the Vorlage i.e., ἐνίκησεν = מָּז (stem I) and σκορπίσαι = מָּז (stem II). Given this coincidence of equivalents for מָּזז, the presence of a doublet in the Greek seems more likely than the loss of a word in the Syriac text tradition.

The Greek ὁς ἐν ὀρφανία “as an orphan” and the Syriac מְדָה “house of death, in death” are not translations of each other. Both can be derived from a Vorlage having the hoph’al participle of מָּה “to be in pain, to grieve” (BDB, 1063; Jastrow, 1651). The plural participle with the preposition ב or ב would have been written מַלְמַרְמַר or מַלְמַרְמִיר, which closely approximates the qal stative participle of the stem מָּה “to die,” and which with the preposition ב or ב would have been written מַלְמַרְמַר “among the dead” or מַלְמַרְמִיר “like the dead” The Greek read מַלְמַר and the Syriac read מַלְמַר.

4:12a (G), 4:15a (S)

ἐπλήσθη ἐν παρανομία ἐν ταῦτῃ
he is satiated with lawless action at one (place)

רָאָה וַיְהַעֲלָה
and he was filled with this lawlessness

וֹמַלָא בַה נוֹל

and he was full of contemptuous lawlessness

---

74 McDaniel (1994 lecture) noted that the difficult saying of Jesus in Matthew 8:21 “let the dead bury the dead,” could reflect a misunderstanding of a written text of Jesus’ words, “let the ones who are grief stricken (כְּפַרְפַּר) bury the dead.” There is no aural similarity between מְדָה (møtwím) and מָּז (mêtím), consequently it would have to be a misreading of a written tradition.
Wright’s translation of ἐν ταύτῃ as “at one (place)” instead of “in this” reflects the difficulty of the demonstrative pronoun in the context of this poetic line. Trafon (1985: 67) summarized the numerous proposed emendations for ἐν ταύτῃ (ἐν ἀυλῇ, ἐν ὀίκῳ, ἐν κοίτῃ, ἐν δαίμονι, ἐν ἐντατῇ, and ἐνταῦθα), the proposed Hebrew Vorlage of Ryle and James (ךתֶּנ), and suggested several possibilities of his own. While many of the suggestions are inventive, even ingenious, none are convincing. It is, however, possible to construct a Vorlage which does explain the Greek and the Syriac and it is the Greek, with the preposition ἐν, which rightly retains the clue to the original Vorlage.

It might well be that the demonstrative pronoun was not in the original Hebrew Vorlage since חצב could be a homograph of the feminine noun חצב “contempt” (BDB, 100) when written scriptio defectiva as חצב. The Syriac read it as the demonstrative pronoun חצב. The Greek also took it as the pronoun but retained the ב which is represented by the ἐν, but the Greek translator did not recognize חצב as the defective spelling of חצב, and thus missed the meaning “contempt.” Neither the Greek or the Syriac has fully captured the meaning of the suggested Vorlage, “contemptuous lawlessness.”

4:12b (G), 4:15b (S)
ἐν λόγοις ἀναπτέρωσεως
with agitating words
(literally: “words that give wings”)

שוֹתָמָהּ שֶּׁתָמָה
with words which put to flight

בּוֹרְפֵי הָאָבָרִים
with words of destruction

The Greek and the Syriac agree, but neither the Greek λόγοις ἀναπτέρωσεως “words that give wings” nor the Syriac שֶּׁתָמָהוֹ and שֶּׁתָמָהוֹ “words which put to flight” fit within the context of anticipated destruction in this verse. A Vorlage with a hiphil of
Hebrew דַּבָּא “to destroy, to put to death” (BDB, 2) was probably misread by both the Greek and the Syriac as רְבָּא “to fly, to move pinions” (BDB, 7, as in Job 39:29). The hiphil participle form מַדַּבָּא was misread as מַרְבִּיא by both the Greek and the Syriac.

4:14a (G), 4:15–16 (S)
γένοιτο κύριε ἡ μερίς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ
Lord, let his part be in disgrace
ἔσται ποτέ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄτιμα
in all these things may it be, O Lord
Lord, let his portion be in disgrace

The Greek ἡ μερίς has no counterpart in Syriac. In the LXX, μερίς translates twenty-two Hebrew words (Hatch–Redpath, 911). In light of Job 27:13, “This is the portion (הָלָלָה) of the wicked with God and the heritage that oppressors receive from God,” the Vorlage probably had הָלָלָה “a portion, a share.” The Greek ἡ μερίς correctly translates הָלָלָה which was for some reason omitted by the Syriac translator. Job 27:13–23 makes a good commentary for these verses in the Psalms of Solomon (4:16–23).

4:18 (G), 4:20 (S)
ἐν μονώσει ἀτεκνιάσας τὸ γῆρας αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀνάληψιν
may his old age be in lonely childlessness until his removal
κατ’ ἑαυτὸν ἔναλησαν ἀντίστοιχον
and from his offspring may each make war with him
θυρωρὸς σφαίρης ὕπερ παπαρᾶ
may his old age be bereft (of children)
from his children not one will bury him
The differences between the Greek and the Syriac translations in this poetic line are greater than other differences encountered thus far. This is the first place where Frankenberg (1896: 71) felt forced to do only a partial translation: “... biểu ...” The translations share the idea of loneliness but they express it in entirely different ways. Since they cannot be a translation of each other, and there is no apparent common Vorlage to account for all their differences, the Syriac and Greek can best be read as sequential lines, reflecting the loss of some text of the Vorlage in both traditions. Combining the Syriac and the Greek, the original Hebrew must have meant “may he be bereft of children in his old age until his removal (by death), so that not one from his children will bury him.”

The Syriac has no equivalent for τὸ γῆρας αὐτόν “his old age” which is likely to have been הָעִבְרָנ in the Vorlage. The Greek ἐν μονώσει ἀτεκνίας “in lonely childlessness” is a phrase lacking a verb (which is supplied by Wright’s addition of “may he be”). Although the verb is lacking in Greek, the verb ἁλάν “to be bereaved (of children)” or ἄναρ “to be stripped (of children)” could have been in the Vorlage. With either verb, “the children” is implicit in the Hebrew word, and the Greek ἐν μονώσει ἀτεκνίας could reflect either verb and not require an additional word for μονώσε.\textsuperscript{75}

The Greek εἰς ἀνάληψιν, which has no corresponding element in the Syriac translation, is most likely to be from a Vorlage having הָעָרֹן. The nuance of הָעָרֹן found in Isaiah 53:8 (“he was taken away [הָעָרֹן]... who considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living”) fits perfectly the context of this verse which has its hint of death.

Shifting to the Syriac text, the verb ḫfr, which has no equivalent element in the Greek translation, has been translated by Trafton (1985: 69) as the aphel מלח “he makes war with him.”

\textsuperscript{75} See הָעָרֹן in Leviticus 20:20–21 and Jeremiah 22:30. Compare Arabic تکلم in Lane (1863: 345b–c).
Opting for this meaning, Trafton disagreed with Harris and Mingana (1868: 92) who restored the א from ms 10hl. Since it is more likely that א dropped out of ms 16hl rather than being added to 10hl, it is best to retain the א and assume the presence of the ס in the Hebrew Vorlage.

In agreement with Trafton, the phrase מָאנָסָא א, read as the pa‘el “he will not carry him,” does not fit the context. If the Vorlage read יִשְׁרִיבָה א “he will not bury him” (by a metathesis of the נ and ב) instead of יִשְׁרִיבָה א “he will not carry him,” the phrase would fit the context of this poetic line perfectly since the motif of non-burial is one of many ancient curse formulae. Hillers (1964: 68–69) cited several of the Assyrian Esarhaddon treaty curses where non-burial is mentioned, including, “May his corpse drop and have no one to bury it” and “I let the jackals (or, vultures) eat the corpses of their warriors by not burying them.” Close parallels to the curse of non-burial are also attested in Deuteronomy 28:26, I Samuel 17:43–46, and Jeremiah 34:20, among others. If this restoration of the Vorlage proves to be correct, Psalms of Solomon 4:18a can be added to the list of non-burial curses.

All elements of the Greek and the Syriac, including the א, should be retained and by reading the Syriac following the Greek a meaningful line becomes apparent. If the sequential reading of the Greek and Syriac texts is correct and the reconstructed Vorlage approximates the original Hebrew, the poet was actually praying that the profane, wicked man would experience the death of his offspring and thus in his own time be faced with the ignominy of death without burial.

4:20b (G), 4:23b (S)
καὶ ἐσκόρπισαν ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ
and greedily scattered (them)
.רכסב ח, מֵתָפָס
and they scattered him in desire
Wright has supplied the direct object “them” which is lacking in the Greek text. The Syriac text has a singular “him” although the context does require the plural “them.” It is difficult to explain the absence of the direct object in the Greek, unless it is a case of haplography resulting from the graphic similarity of the final ב followed by the preposition ב.76 This confusion apparently occurs again in 5:1 of the Psalms of Solomon, which will be discussed below. In the case of the Syriac it could be due to a misreading of a ב (3ms object suffix) instead of a ב.

4:24 (G), 4:28 (S)

ἐξάραι ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ποιοῦντας
ἐν ὑπερφανίᾳ πᾶσαν ἁδικίαν
may God banish those who arrogantly
commit all (kinds of) unrighteousness

גְּדֹא הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל כָּל נוֹשָׂא חָמַס בָאָרָא
God destroyed all those
who do injustice in pride

may God destroy all those who do injustice in pride

The issue in this poetic line is the Greek ἐξάρα “may he banish” and the Syriac גְּדֹא “he destroyed.” There is a difference in tense as well as meaning. A Vorlage with the stem גְּדֹא “to oppress, to suppress, to maltreat” (BDB, 413) would have been ambiguous since גְּדֹא (3ms perfect) and גְּדֹא (3ms imperfect, like גְּדֹא and גְּדֹא) are consonantal homographs. The semantic range of גְּדֹא could include ἐξάρα and גְּדֹא. The Greek optative reflects the גְּדֹא; read as a jussive, and the Syriac reflects the perfect גְּדֹא.

76 See Delitzsch, 1920: 113, § 114+.
The position of the noun אֲלֵילָה “all” was positioned differently in the Vorlage of the Greek and the Syriac. The Vorlage of the former had כל הפשעים “all kinds of violence/ injustice,” but the latter read כל מראות “all the ones doing.” The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text on this point.

**Psalm Five**

5:1a  
κύρει ὁ θεός αἰνεῖσθαι τῷ ὄνομαί σου  
*O Lord God, I will joyfully praise your name*

5:2a  
κύρει ὁ θεός Παρθένε τῷ ὄνομαί σου  
*O Lord God in joy I will praise your name*

The Greek has κύρει ὁ θεός “Lord God” while the Syriac has the suffixed אָלָה הַלָּה יָהוָה “O Lord, my God.” The Syriac reflects a Hebrew Vorlage having יָהוָה אָלָהוּ and the Greek reflects one with אָלָהוּ יָהוָה. The above proposed Vorlage explains the difference as a simple haplography with the well attested confusion of the graphically similar final ב of יָהוָה with the initial ב of אָלָהוּ (see Delitzsch, 1920: 113, § 114 a–c). The Greek is to be preferred in this poetic line.

5:6a (G), 5:8a (S)  
μὴ βαρύνεται τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς  
*do not weigh down your hand on us*

do not let your hand delay from us  
*do not weigh down your hand on us*
The clues for the difference between the Greek μὴ βαρύνεσθε “do not weigh down” and the Syriac, ṭదฤ.do “do not delay” are not to be found by looking for an inner Greek corruption of βαρύνεσθε “to weigh down, to oppress, to depress, to disable” and βαρύνεσθα “to slow down, to delay, to loiter,” as Harris (1911: 41) proposed, followed by Begrich (1939: 137–38). Kuhn’s proposal (1937: 19) that an inner Syriac corruption of ṭదฤ.do (= Hebrew ידבכ יתא) was first misread as ṭదฤ.do, and again misread ṭمواد.do, is not convincing. Nor is Ryle and James’ proposal (1891: 56) for a Vorlage having ירח יתא יתשא (in light of Job 33:7 and Psalm 32:4).77 Trafton’s (1985: 75) reworking of Kuhn’s argument is as complex as that of Harris, suggesting the following sequence of misreadings: the original ועא לא יתא יתשא was correctly translated as ועא לא יתא יתשא, but the יתשא was corrupted to יתשא, and יתשא was lengthened to יתשא. Moreover, the preposition ניא was changed to ניא to go with the new verb יתשא.

An easier and more convincing explanation can be made by recognizing that the proposed Vorlage could have had the verb ירח “to remain, to linger” (as in Psalm 101:7, “no one who utters lies shall continue ירח in my presence”), i.e., reading ירח יתשא לא יתא יתשא “let not your hand linger.” But the stem ירח was read by the Greek translator as the verb יתשא “to weigh, to measure.” The ירח יתשא לא יתא of the Vorlage was read as ירח יתשא לא יתא.79 Thus, the difference was either haplography (the יתשא became simply יתח) or dittography (the יתח became יתא). Contextually, the proposed Vorlage of the

---

77 Note Job 14:21, where יתא יתשא = בָּאְרוּנָש “honor.”

78 See II Kings 12:12 for יתח being used for the weighing and measuring of silver.

79 Another possibility is that a Vorlage with ירח “to be heavy in spirit, to faint, be dim or dull,” which became בָּאְרוּנָש in the Greek, was read as יתח by the Syriac, i.e. a confusion of יתח and ירח (see Delitzsch, 1920: 114, § 115a). Since יתח is not attested elsewhere with יתח, this suggestion must be offered with all due caution.
Greek tradition is preferable, meaning there was an error of haplography in the Syriac tradition.

5:6b (G), 5:8b (S)

ίνα μὴ δὲ ἄναγκῃ, ἀμάρτωμεν
lest under duress we sin

lest we be overpower that we might sin

Contrary to the argument of Harris and Mingana, (1868: 94) who regarded the Syriac here as a “paraphrase” of the Greek, the Greek ἄναγκῃ “necessity, compulsion, distress” and the Syriac "to be subdued, to be overcome, to be tyrannized” cannot be translations of each other. If the Hebrew Vorlage had "force, unwillingness, necessity,” (Jastrow, 666) (which would explain the Greek text) and ἐπαλλήλων was read as "to subdue, to overpower” by the Syriac translator (reflecting a confusion of ב and ב and a confusion of ב and ב, or vise versa, ב and ב), it would account for the difference between the Greek and the Syriac. Even though the Vorlage above has ב, because both ב and ב fit the context, there is no way to determine which would have been in the original Hebrew.

5:7a (G), 5:9a (S)

καὶ ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἀφεξόμεθα
even if you do not restore us we will not stay away

See Delitzsch, 1920: 120 § 131 for the confusion of ב and ב in Nehemiah 4:11 and 112 § 111 for the confusion of ב and ב.

Note the confusion of ב and ב in Trafton (1985: 67, note 50) where ב and ב occurs along with ב in מַעַלְתָה בָּהָה.
and do not turn your face from us lest . . .

and do not remove your face from us

Trafton’s reconstruction of the Vorlage as קֵינְלָא לֹא קָנָה “do not turn your face” (which uses the cognate of the Syriac and a direct object) may be correct, although one would expect קֹנָה plus the jussive for the negative imperative in Hebrew. Some caution needs to be exercised, though, since the verbs generally used in Hebrew for “to turn the face” are שָרָה, לָמָּב, טָבְרוּ. Hebrew קֹנָה occurs in Jeremiah 30:6 ( ¶ וְלֹא קֹנָה כִּי לְיַלְדֵּךְ לְיָמֵי צָרָי “(why) has every face turned pale?”) and II Kings 21:13 ( ¶ וְתַעֲבֹר כַּמְלָא כְּסֹא נֶפֶשׁ “wiping it [a dish] and turning it upside down”), but with a different construction and nuance. Trafton translated the first word of 5:9b, אֲד, as “lest,” but it could simply be the equivalent of the Greek “for we will not . . . .” Therefore, the clues for the differences in Syriac and Greek are to be found (1) in the Greek καὶ εἰκάν “even if,” which is lacking in Syriac, and (2) the Syriac has קֵינְלָא “your face,” which is lacking in Greek. A retroversion of καὶ εἰκάν to Hebrew would equal תַּעֲבֹר or רֵעַ, and the retroversion of קֵינְלָא “your face” into Hebrew would be תַּעֲבֹר יָבְלָא.

Given these readings, the Vorlage may have had קֹנָה אֲד, which equals the Syriac. But the Greek translator apparently read רֵעַ or his Vorlage had a metathesis of the ר and the א rather than קֹנָה and missed the sense of “your face.” This mitigated against translating or retaining the תַּעֲבֹר which became unintelligible in this changed context. The Syriac אֲד “lest” translates the “double duty” אֲד of 5:6b.

5:12a (G), 5:14a (S)
καὶ σὺ ἑπακούσῃ ὅτι τίς χρήστος καὶ ἑπείκης ἀλλ᾿ ἢ σὺ
and you will listen. For who is good and kind but you

καὶ σὺ ἑπακούσῃ ὅτι τίς χρήστος καὶ ἑπείκης ἀλλ᾿ ἢ σὺ
and you will answer him because you are kind and gentle
Trafton appeals to manuscript 16hl* beginning with Psalm 2:4 but failed to identify it in his discussion of extant manuscript evidence of the Psalms of Solomon (1985:6–7).

As Hatch and Redpath (1954: 45) include הָנָה ("he answered") among the words translated by ὀροῦ “to listen,” the crux in the Syriac and Greek of this poetic line is not the ἐπικούρος “you will listen” versus the ἔφραν “you will answer him” but the difference between ὅτι “because” and ὅτι "for who is." This difference reflects a dittography in the translation by the Greek translator, or in his Vorlage, of the particle ב and the subsequent confusion of α and β, i.e., the ב was duplicated to ב, and this senseless word was given meaning by changing it to the question, ב ב "for who (is).” The Vorlage follows the Syriac rather than the Greek for this poetic line.

5:12b (G), 5:14b (S)
εὐφρανάις ψυχήν ταπεινοῦ
making the humble person happy

and his soul will be satisfied

satisfying the appetite of the one afflicted (from fasting)

The Greek εὐφρανάις and the Syriac מַסֵּכָה cannot be accurate translations of each other. Trafton (1985: 77) noted the difference in the Syriac tradition where ms 16hl has a 3fs מַסֵּכָה “(the soul) will be satisfied,” whereas manuscript 16hl* reads it as a 3fs or a 2ms imperfect מַסֵּכָה “you will satisfy (his soul).” He suggested that there may have been a misreading of an original לְתַם מַסֵּכָה, but this is less likely since it requires a confusion of α and β as

82 Trafton appeals to manuscript 16hl* beginning with Psalm 2:4 but failed to identify it in his discussion of extant manuscript evidence of the Psalms of Solomon (1985:6–7).
well as an ו and a ע. However, Trafton’s calling attention to the prayer of the “hungry man” mentioned in 5:12 points the interpreter in the right direction. The Greek ψυχήν and the Syriac מַסֵּא certainly suggest that מַסֵּא was in the Vorlage. The collocation of מַסֵּא “soul” and מַטַּבַּל “to satisfy, to satiate” would suggest that the nuance of מַסֵּא probably retains the meaning of “appetite, emotions, passions” (Gordon, 1965: 446; BDB, 660). The poet may have intended the very physical “satisfying the appetite” of a hungry man rather than some spiritual satisfaction of a soul.

The Greek ταπεινωμένη is definitely not just a contextual translation controlled by the ψυχήν “soul” rather than מַסֵּא “appetite.” The collocation of ψυχής and τεταπεινωμένη in Isaiah 58:10 (ἰδώς πεινώντι τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ ψυχῆς σου καὶ ψυχήν τεταπεινωμένην, “if you pour yourself out for the hungry and satisfy the desire of the afflicted . . .”), coupled with the מַסֵּא מַסֵּא in Leviticus 16:29 and 23:27 (פָּסַח יְצָר וְיָדַע לִבּוֹ = LXX ταπεινώσετε τάς ψυχάς ὑμῶν, “you shall afflict yourselves”) strengthens the integrity of the Greek text and its Vorlage. The phrase מַסֵּא מַסֵּא in the context of the Day of Atonement had clear connotations of fasting (being primarily a prohibition against eating, but perhaps also requiring sexual abstinence and cessation of work).

The Syriac translator, or the scribe producing the Vorlage, misread מַסֵּא מַסֵּא as מַסֵּא מַסֵּא (the מַסֵּא mistaken for מַסֵּא). The

83 See above, note 59, and on the confusion of ע and ו, along with numerous examples of the confusion of ו and ע, see Delitzsch (1920: 113, § 114–115).

84 Note Proverbs 23:2 and Ecclesiastes 6:7 where KJV rendered מַסֵּא by “appetite.” The archaic meaning of מַסֵּא “throat” survives in Habakkuk 2:5, “he opened wide his throat (מַסֵּא) as Sheol” (KJV “who enlargeth his desire as hell”).

85 Liddell and Scott, 1757 s.v. definition 4, noted that ταπεινώσεως had the meaning of “denying, abasing, humbling oneself,” particularly with fasting which parallels the way מַסֵּא מַסֵּא is used as a synonym for מַסָּכָה מַסָּכָה “fasting” or מַסָּכָה מַסָּכָה “not eat bread” (II Samuel 12:17).

86 Note the confusion of ו and ו cited by Delitzsch (1920: 119, § 131).
erroneous "making glad the soul of the humble," and Wright (1985: 657) provided "making the humble person happy.

Consequently, it appears that the Greek provides the clearest clues for reconstructing the Vorlage. However, modern translators of the Greek missed the contextual nuance of tapeinou. In light of the reference to hunger in 5:10b and God’s feeding kings and rulers in 5:11a, the focus probably remains on the theme of God’s satisfying the appetite of the hungry, especially those who out of piety are hungry from fasting.

5:13a (G), 5:15b (S)

καὶ ἐὰν δευτερῶση ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ
καὶ τούτῳ διαμάσεις

and if (it comes) a second time
without complaint, this is remarkable

καὶ ἐὰν δευτερῶση ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ
καὶ τούτῳ διαμάσεις

and if the one who gives again does not grumble,
this also is wonderful

καὶ ἐὰν δευτερῶση ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ
καὶ τούτῳ διαμάσεις

and if he would repeat giving without grumbling,
then this would be remarkable

The Greek aorist optative δευτερῶση plus the conditional ἐὰν ("if he would repeat") and the Syriac imperfect ḫnu̇a, plus the conditional ḫa ("and if he would repeat"), could be translations of each other or of a Vorlage having ūnān “and if he would repeat.” The additional infinitive in the Syriac, ḫa, “to give,” which has no corresponding element in the Greek, would point to a Vorlage with ūnān “and if he would repeat to give.” However, the Greek δευτερῶση could be a one word equivalent of ūnān, in which case the Syriac text would provided the best clue for reconstructing the Vorlage.

Gray (1913: 638) read “making glad the soul of the humble,” and Wright (1985: 657) provided “making the humble person happy.”
The Greek *aorist* optative 2s ἀσμάσειας was correctly translated by Ryle and James (1891: 59) as “thou wouldst marvel,” and Trafton (1985: 78) offered “you would wonder at this.” But other translations actually paraphrase to avoid the difficulty of the second person. The Syriac has the noun סְתָּמָה “wonder,” presumably going back to a Vorlage with סְתָּמָה or סְתָּמָה. Either of these words could account for the difference between the Greek having a verb and the Syriac having a noun since the difficulty is with the prefix rather than the stem. Following the conditional כי “if,” one would expect a ה “then” + imperfect in the apodosis. This would suggest an original סְתָּמָה “then you would wonder.”

In the Syriac tradition the ה of סְתָּמָה (or סְתָּמָה) was evidently read as the definite article ה affixed to the noun, whereas in the Greek tradition the ה was read as the 2ms verb prefix ה. Contextually, the second person would have to be addressed to God, but it is most unlikely that the poet wanted to tell God that he (God) would be amazed by a second act of human charity. Therefore, the Syriac text is preferable for reconstructing a Vorlage which would account for the differences in the text traditions.

5:14b (G), 5:16b (S)
καὶ οὗ ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς ἐπὶ σέ οὐ φεισεται ἐν δόματι
and the one whose hope is in you will not be lacking gifts

καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς σέ ἐπὶ σέ οὐ φεισεται ἐν δόματι
and there is no hope towards you

which will be sparing with gifts

---

88 Gray (1913: 639) translated “even that is marvelous” and Wright (1985: 657) rendered it “this is remarkable.”

89 If the stem were שָׁמַר, there may have been confusion of שָׁמַר and שָׁמַר, i.e., a dittography or haplography of the ש. On the confusion of ש and ש which is analogous to the confusion of ש and ש, see Delitzsch, 1920: 121 §132.
The Greek tradition is inconsistent in that mss 253, 655, and 659 read the negative οὐκ instead of the relative οὗ. The negative οὐ in the first phrase of the Syriac has no corresponding negative particle in the majority of the Greek manuscripts, and the negative οὗ in the second half of this line has no corresponding negative in the Syriac. The first of these differences between the Syriac and the majority of the Greek manuscripts could be accounted for by assuming the Syriac translator used one of the three manuscripts having οὐκ (or a manuscript in the same recension). Otherwise, if the Syriac were translating from the Greek one would have to assume the Syriac translator in this case failed to distinguish the difference between smooth breathing and rough breathing, as well as the absence of the κ of the negative particle coming before a vowel. Of the twenty occurrences of οὐ (either the negative particle or the relative) there is no other example of the Syriac translator confusing the οὗ and the οὐ. Of the sixty-five occurrences of οὗ, οὗ and οὐκ, there is no similar confusion. The differences between the Syriac and the Greek requires a more reasonable explanation.

The differences are best accounted for by positing a Vorlage which began with מ or מ. Hebrew מ has four possible meanings, the most common of which is its being the particle of non-existence, מ “is not,” and the least common meaning being “whence.” Other meanings are listed in the lexicons under the root מ “trouble, sorrow, oppression, falsehood” (BDB, 19; Jastrow, 29–27). The Arabic cognate of מ is the medial ḫ, meaning either “to be present” or “to be fatigued, to be tired” (Lane, 1863: 138).

90 Of the forty-five times οὐκ appears in the Psalms of Solomon, it is missing twice (in 3:1 in ms 253* and in 17:5 in ms 769) and in 4:21 the κ was lost through haplography following an inversion of καὶ οὐκ to οὗ καὶ.
THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON

A Vorlage with יְהַשָּׁה or יְהַנָּה, or יְהִי could have been understood as the active participle יְהַשָּׁה or יְהַנָּה meaning “being tired” or “being present.” The Greek ὐμικώμα means the latter definition, i.e., יְהַנָּה “being present,” whereas the Syriac ḫal equals the very common יְהַנָּה “is not.” Given the context which speaks of distress and hunger, the poet probably intended the יְהַשָּׁה or יְהַנָּה to have the meaning “being tired, being fatigued.”

Once the Syriac understood the יְהַשָּׁה or יְהַנָּה in its Vorlage to be the negative particle יְהַנָּה, the negative particle in the second half of the line, which would have matched the Greek ὐμικώμα “he will not be lacking,” would have produced a contradictory statement. Consequently, its second negative (יְהַנָּה . . . יְהַנָּה) dropped out of the Hebrew translation.

5:16a (G), 5:18 (S)

μακάριος οὐ μνημονεύει ὁ θεὸς
ἐν συμμετρίᾳ αὐταρκείᾳ

happy is (the person) whom God remembers
with a moderate sufficiency

בlessed is the one (to) whom Yahweh appoints
a measure of sufficiency

The Greek αὐταρκεία “sufficiency” and the Syriac ḫaṣṣanım “sufficiency” (found as the first word of Syriac 5:19) could be translations of each other or of a Vorlage having יְהַנָּה. But the Syriac ḫaṣṣanım and the Greek συμμετρία cannot be translations of each other. The Greek συμμετρία “measured, due portion” (Wright’s “moderate”) points to the stem יְהַנָּה in the Vorlage, and

91 See GKC § 72” and the example cited of the active participle יְהַנָּה, with the vowel letter י, for the anticipated usual participle יְהַנָּה without the vowel letter.
the Syriac [ ho telei “poverty” points to the noun [ hal, meaning “reduction to poverty” (BDB, 557; Jastrow, 741, 773). Were [ mar written scriptio defectiva as [ hal it closely resembles hal b. Therefore, the difference in the two translations appears to be an error in the Syriac of reading a [ for a מ, an error well attested elsewhere. The Syriac Vorlage must have been: . . “blessed is the one whom God has appointed for poverty. His sufficiency . . .” The reading of “sufficiency” with the next verse must have come after the misreading of the מ for a מ, since “poverty of sufficiency” would have produced an oxymoron.

The [ mmon and, mh vgh could reflect translations of מ “to remember” or [ ḫ “to remember (I Samuel 15:2, KJV), to appoint” (Nehemiah 7:1). The reconstructed Vorlage uses מ ḫ since the divine appointments rather than divine memory seems to be the issue addressed by the poet.

5:17a (G), 5:20a (S)

ίκανον τὸ μετρόν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ
moderate (wealth) is adequate – with righteousness

advantageous is poverty with righteousness

the portion will be rightly equal

Trafton (1985: 80) has correctly noted that ” would not be a normal translation of ικανός.” If the Vorlage had the root מ “to be equal, fit, worthy, adequate, suitable” (BDB, 1000) its semantic range would be broad enough to include מ and ικανός “adequate.” The Syriac has been consistent in reading מ here as in the preceding verse instead of מ המ “portion.” But the Greek μετρόν “within measure” would be a good translation of מ.

---

92 See Delitzsch, 1920: 116 §120ö.
Psalm Six

6:1a

μακάριος ἄνηρ οὗ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ
ἐτοίμη επικαλέσασθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου

happy is the man whose heart
is ready to call on the name of the Lord

blessed is the man whose heart is prepared
to call upon the name of the Lord

The reconstructed Vorlage could have been the same as the back translations of Frankenberg (1896:72) and Stein (1969: 445): ὁ ἀγαθός ἄνηρ ἐστιν ὁ ὄνομα κυρίου ἄνω τοῦ ἄνθρωπος “happy is the man whose heart is ready to call on the name of the Lord.” (Franz Delitzsch [n.d., ad loc.] differed slightly, ending with νομισματίζουσας ἀνείποιεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.) The Greek έτοίμη and the Syriac ܐܐ ܚܒܐ ܒܢܝܐ ܕܐܐ ܒܢܝܐ “to establish, to make, to prepare.” But the stem ܕ+ܐ makes the Hebrew cognate לְמַעְרָא “to prepare” the more likely option. The Greek έτοίμη translates לְמַעְרָא in Deuteronomy 32:35 and Esther 3:14 and 8:13 (noting that έτοίμη more frequently translates לְמַעְרָא). Using the stem לְמַעְרָא would restore paronomasia and alliteration. If the ܐܐ ܚܒܐ ܒܢܝܐ ܕܐܐ ܒܢܝܐ and the επικαλέσασθαι “to call upon the name of the Lord” are retroverted to לְמַעְרָא ḫבַּא and לְמַעְרָא “to entreat Yahweh,” they bring together in the poetic line לְמַעְרָא and לְמַעְרָא. The verb לְמַעְרָא usually takes the preposition ל or לְ followed by the name הָיוֹדֵע. The Syriac ܐܐ ܚܒܐ ܒ نط and the Greek τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου “the name of the Lord” may be a poetic or pious circumlocution for the holy name הָיוֹדֵע.
PSALM SIX

6:2a (G), 6:3a (S)

his ways are directed by the Lord

and his ways are made straight before the Lord

his ways are made ‘perfectly straight’ by the Lord

Trafton (1985: 82) noted that “before” never corresponds to ὑπὸ “by” in the Psalms of Solomon and suggested that could be secondary. But the difference is probably due to differences in the Vorlage. The clue for the Vorlage comes from Ezekiel 1:9, 1:12, and 10:22, all of which have the phrase אָלָלָל וְשַׁלְלַל “each of them moved straight ahead.” The Vorlage of 6:2a could have been דִּבְרֵי מִדְרֶשֶׁי אֶלֹהִים מְשַׂרְצֶיהָ וְשַׁלְלַל “his ways are made ‘perfectly straight’ by the Lord.” If so, the Syriac must have read הָיָהוּ מְשַׂרְצֶיהָ וְשַׁלְלַל “his ways are made straight by the Lord” accurately reflects the probable Vorlage and the Syriac misread the Hebrew.

6:3a (G), 6:4–6:5a (S)

his soul will not be disturbed by the vision of evil dreams

and his evil vision in the night will not be disturbed because he is his; and his soul . . .
The Greek and Syriac in this poetic line share many words in common (soul, vision, dreams, bad, and disturb) but it would be difficult to explain how they could be a translation of each other. By listing the Hebrew equivalents of the shared words of the Syriac and the Greek, the following word cluster appears: לילה ולילה ומלוע ומלוע. If the Vorlage approximated this cluster then it becomes obvious that the differences between the Syriac and the Greek are rooted in different understandings of the Hebrew syntax. If the first word in the list could be vocalized as מָלֻּעַ, then the phrase מָלֻּעַ מִלְפַלָּת מָלֻּעַ “from the vision of a dream” could have been read as a construct chain with an intervening preposition ב,93 with the modifier בֹּדֶה לילה “bad” coming after the bound noun and its modifier לילה “night.” If this were the Vorlage, the Greek took the feminine מַלְוָעָה “his soul” to be the subject of the verb, but the Syriac took the feminine מָלֻּעַ “vision” to be the subject of מָלַע “it will disturb” and made the וְמַלְוָעָה the subject of the verb in the next sentence.

The Syriac lacks a corresponding word for εἰναὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ “vision, dream”; and the Greek lacks a word corresponding to מָלַע “in the night.” In light of Genesis 20:3, 31:24, I Kings 3:5, and IV Ezra 13:1, one could expect a reference to a dream in the Vorlage to be לילה ולילה מָלַע “in a night dream.” If so, the Greek lacked the לילה, and the Syriac lacked the מָלַע. Trafton also noted (1985: 83) that the Greek lacks a match for the מַלְוָעָה מָלַע מַלְוָעָה “because he is his.” This difference could come from a misreading of מָלַע “in a dream” as מָלַע מָלַע “as he (is) to him,” reflecting in the Syriac tradition a confusion of ב and ב, plus a misreading of ב as ב. The misread ב was taken to be the pronoun ב, and the וְמַלָע was read as the poetic equivalent of ב ול “to him.”94

93 Compare the הַלֵּךְ הַלֵּךְ הַלֵּךְ הַלֵּךְ “the ones walking along the road” of Judges 5:10.

94 Compare the Qere / Kethib of Jeremiah 29:23 where הַלֵּךְ הַלֵּךְ appears for הַלֵּךְ הַלֵּךְ. Note BDB, 510 where ולא is cited as meaning “to him” or “to them.”
6:3b (G), 6:5a (S)

έν διαβάσει ποταμών
in the crossing of rivers

מְדַבָּּבָּבָּבָּב in the (crossing) of a river

Indeed, in the crossing of rivers

The emendation of Baars (1972: 10) of מְדַבָּּבָּבָּב to מְדַבָּּבָּב in ms 16hl is an obviously convincing correction (the “making of a river” is contextually unlikely). But given the frequent confusion of ו and ת in Hebrew, one ought not to conclude that the מְדַבָּּבָּב (“in the making”) for מְדַבָּּב (“in the crossing”) error was necessarily an inner-Syriac misreading of the ת as a ת. The misreading was probably already in a Vorlage in which a ת and a ת were confused, with the Syriac מְדַבָּּב being a very literal translation of the lectio difficilior לֶבַךְ “to make” rather than לֶבַךְ “to cross.”

6:4a (G), 6:6a (S)

ἐξανέστη ἐξ ὑπνοῦ αὐτοῦ
he gets up from his sleep

נָסְקָה for he rose from his sleep

Indeed, he arose from his sleep

The Greek does not have the particle ὅτι corresponding to the Syriac מְדַבָּּב “because” which would suggest that the Hebrew Vorlage used by the Syriac translator had the particle מְדַבָּּב. If the Vorlage did indeed have מְדַבָּּב, it could have been the emphatic מְדַבָּּב, well attested in Biblical Psalms.95 If so, the Greek translator omitted the emphasis, and the Syriac translator mistook it as the homographic

95 See Blommerde (1969: 30) and Dahood and Penar (1970: 402–405) for a discussion of the emphatic particle מְדַבָּּב and a list of occurrence.
causative particle. (A similar difference occurs in 7:2, discussed below.)

6:5a (G), 6:7b (S)

καὶ ἐδέηθη τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου
he prays to the Lord

καὶ ἐβιβάσετο τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου
and he petitioned the face of the Lord

The Syriac limitless means literally “from before his faces of the Lord.” This cumbersome expression is probably a doublet. Just two words express a similar idea in Psalm 105:5 (and elsewhere), ἔρχονται πρός σάς “seek his presence.” The ἔρχονται could be a translation of דַלְלָה ‘from before” (BDB, 817, section 5), and the יִכְבֻּר could be the translation of יָנַע “his face.” The Greek τοῦ προσώπου supports reading יִכְבֻּר in the reconstructed Vorlage.

Psalm Seven

7:1

μὴ ἀποσκευάσῃς ἀφ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς
do not move away from us, O God

μὴ ἀπεξελθῇς ἀπὸν θεοῦ ὁ θεὸς
do not remove your dwelling place from us, O God

The Syriac means literally “thy dwelling place” has no corresponding element in the Greek text. Although Trafton (1985: 85) suggested that the Greek and Syriac reflect the same idea, it must be noted that the Greek speaks of personal presence but the Syriac speaks of a place. If the Vorlage had the Shekinah, the divine presence,” it would become obvious how the two translations
emerged. The Greek went with the Shekinah, the divine presence, but the Syriac took הָלָלְתָּן in its more literal sense, “royal residence” ([Jastrow, 1573]).

7:2

μὴ πατησάτω ὡς ποὺς αὐτῶν

do not let their feet trample

οὐχ θετήσῃ ἀπόθεσα

that their foot might not trample upon

כִּי לֹא הָרִים יְנִילֶה

that their feet not trample

The א “that” prefixed to the negative particle, אָל, is not reflected in the Greek. This is a difference which approximates the one discussed above with reference to 6:4a (G) where the Greek does not have the particle ὅτι corresponding to the Syriac אָל “because.” In 6:4a it was suggested that the Syriac Vorlage had the particle אָל. But here in 7:2b, it appears that the Syriac Vorlage also used אָל to express purpose (BDB, 471). The aorist in the Greek, ὅτι ἀπεφώνω· ἀντικατασκοντος, and the perfect in Syriac (חָמָל לַלְשׁוֹן) with which the verse begins would require a perfect tense in the Vorlage indicating the enemy’s having been “forced back” (in battle). The aorist and the perfect tense support the reading of the Syriac that the action of the second verb was a statement of fact (that they would/could not again trample) rather than a wish expressed by a jussive/optative. The Greek may have had a אָל in its Vorlage, but if so, it was taken to be an emphatic rather than a causative particle and was left untranslated, as in 6:4a.96

7:3

σὺ έν θελήματί σου παἰδεύον ήμᾶς

discipline us as you wish

96 Liddell and Scott (2031, section I, 2.) noted the use of ὁθεῖο in the context of military action.
A Vorlage with יֵכֶּ֣לְנָ֣ה “chasten us” could easily have been misread as יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה “chastened me,” given the common confusion of י and ק. Trafton (1985: 85) concurred with Harris and Mingana (1868: 95) and Baars (1972: 11) in emending יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה “chasten me” to יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה “chasten us”. Given the graphic dissimilarity of יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה and יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה, compared to יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה and יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה, it is more likely that the error occurred in the Hebrew Vorlage rather than in the Syriac tradition. The difference between “according to” in the Vorlage and אָנַּה or אָנַּה assumes a confusion of ק and כ, discussed above.

7:4

εἴναν γὰρ ἀποστείλεις θάνατον σὺ
ἐντελῆ αὐτῷ περὶ ἡμῶν
for if you send death (himself)
you would give him (special) instructions about us

ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπάρχουσαν ἤτοι ἡ δόγματος
for if you send death you set it over us

ἐν ἀνθρώποις γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐνεργήματι
for if you send Death you would command him

for our sake (to pass over us)

In the LXX ἔτελεσθαι “to command” translates יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה “to command” about 400 times; consequently, there is good reason to suppose that יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה may reflect a Vorlage with יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה. This lends support to the suggestion of Harris and Mingana (1868: 95) that the Syriac אָנַּה “set” should be emended to the participle אָנַּה “commanding.”

There are definitely overtones of Exodus 12:12–30 in this poetic line. If the περὶ ἡμῶν and the ἐντελῆ “about us, concerning us” are a translation of יֵכֶלְנָ֣ה “for us, on our account” (i.e., the
compound preposition ב plus יברל, the choice of יברל which also means “to cross over” is suggestive of רכזב “to pass over.” It seems as if the poet is using a double entendre to say that when (the angel of) Death is dispatched, Death will be commanded “for the sake of” (ברל) the righteous “to pass over” (ברל) them. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the fuller Greek text and the English translation of the Vorlage includes a parenthetical addition to reflect that double entendre.

7:6b(G), 7:6a (S)
καὶ οὐκ ἀρκεῖ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔθνος
and the gentile will not overcome us
and the nations will not be able to overpower us

and the gentile will not overcome us
and the nations will not be able to overpower us

The Greek lacks anything corresponding to נ לחם “they will find.” Trafton (1985: 85) similarly omitted the translation of נ לחם, although he included it in his discussion of the verse. The Syriac root לחם “to find” can also mean “to be able,” occurring with this meaning as a participle in Matthew 3:9 ( לחם) in both the Peshitta and the Old Syriac and as a feminine noun ( לחם) in Mark 10:27. In light of the semantic range of לחם, it is most likely that נ לחם “they will be able” and קלאלחילא וילל “they will be able to prevail.” The Greek translator, or his Vorlage, treated the נלחם as a doublet or a dittography and translated it simply as ἀρκεῖος.

97 In this respect, לחם parallels the usage of נלחם “to find” which also has the meaning “to be able” in Lev 12:8 (-exclusive נלחם “if she not be able to bring”), 25:28 (-exclusive נלחם “if she not be able to restore”), and Psalm 76:6 (exclusive נלחם “not able to use their hands”).
The Greek ὑπερασπιστής ἡμῶν “or shield” and the Syriac ملاً لاعلاً “our power” cannot be accurate translations of each other, but both could be correct translations of a Vorlage with הֹלְךָ לָעֱלָה (scriptio defectiva). The stem כל appears as the noun לָעֱלָה “shield” and as the noun לֶאֱלָה “the ruler, the one having mastery” (BDB, 1020). The Syriac כל reflects the לֶאֱלָה (or לָעֱלָה) and the Greek ὑπερασπιστής reflects the לָעֱלָה.

Trafton (1985: 86) has convincingly demonstrated in light of the way the γένος of the New Testament is translated into Syriac (which renders it by the loanword כלאים or by כלאים “kin,” or כלאים “generation,” or כלאים “from,” or כלאים “kind, species”) that כלאים “seed” is not a likely a translation of γένος. He rightly concluded that “... both כלאים and γένος could be independent translations of an original Hb כלאים.”

---

102

7:8b (G), 7:8b (S)

καὶ οὐκ ἀπώσῃ
and you will not reject (them)

καὶ οὐκ ἀράχη
and you will not lead it astray

and you will not reject (them)

The Syriac, בָּשַׁל “lead astray” and the Greek ἀπώση “drive away, reject” cannot be accurate translations of each other. But, as Trafton (1985: 87) noted, both verbs could be correct translations of a Vorlage with בָּשַׁל, “. . . since the hiph il of בָּשַׁל ‘move away’ can mean both ‘drive away’ and ‘lead astray’.”

The Syriac is lacking a verse corresponding to 7:9 of the Greek text for reasons which are not apparent. (The omission of a Syriac verse at 5:20b, corresponding to the Greek 5:17b, may, as Trafton [1985: 80] proposed be due to a parablepsis.)

7:10b (G), 7:9b (S)

εἰς ἡμέραν ἐν ὧν ἐπηγγέλω αὐτοῖς
on the day when you promised (it) to them

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ᾧ ἐτοιμάσατε
for the day which is prepared for them

for the day you promised to them

The Greek ἐπηγγέλω “promised” and the Syriac כַּמַּה “prepared” cannot be translations of each other. In the LXX ἐπηγγέλειν translates רָשָׁה “to say,” which has no graphic similarity to כַּמַּה “to prepare,” the cognate of כַּמַּה. However, כַּמַּה “to bind” may have the meaning “to prepare,” as in I Kings 18:44, “go up, say unto Ahab, ‘prepare thy chariot’” and get thee down . . . ” (KJV). In Leviticus Rabbah 22, כַּמַּה is used with the sense of

99 KJV “thy chariot” is an addition base on the LXX reading τὸ ἀρμα σου.
obligation: “had not the Lord bound himself by an oath” (Jastrow, 98). The ideas of obligation and promise do overlap. The Greek ἐπαιγγέλειν (= יִרְשָׁלִים) carries the positive connotations the context requires, whereas the expression “the day prepared for them” found in the Syriac carries negative connotations of apocalyptic gloom. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text.

Psalm Eight

8:1

τὸ ὄους μου φωνήν

my ear heard

my ears heard

The difference between the Greek and the Hebrew in this phrase is the dual/plural יָאָרִים “my ears” and the singular τὸ ὄους μου “my ear.” The Syriac system of designating a plural by two dots over the word is relatively late (before the pointing was added the singular/plural difference would not be obvious). The difference between יָאָרִים and τὸ ὄους μου could also be due to the homographs of “my ear” (יָאָרִים = יִרְשָׁלִים) and “my ears” (יָאָרִים = יִרְשָׁלִים) in the Hebrew Vorlage. In the unpointed text of the Vorlage there would be no way to tell the difference between a singular and a dual/plural except by the number used by the verb, in which case it would be either יָאָרִים or יָאָרִים, a difference of י or י in the Hebrew Vorlage. Given the well attested confusion of י and י (Delitzsch, 1920: 114 § 116; 116, §123), the difference could have originated in the Vorlage. Since ears generally are referred to by the dual in Semitic idiom, the Syriac is more likely to reflect the Vorlage.100 The plural of the Syriac text of the manuscripts could

---

100 See below the discussion on יָאָרִים and יִרְשָׁלִים in 8:26.
not be a translation of the Greek singular, but both could be translations of the above proposed Vorlage.

8:1b

8:1b

Φωνὴν σάλπιγγος
the blast of the trumpet

מלך
and the sound of war

חירום קָרָה [כרה]
and the sound [of war-like tumult]
of tearing down (the wall)

The Greek σάλπιγγος “of the trumpet” and the Syriac כָּרָה “war” cannot be translations of each other. Trafton (1985: 90) suggested there was a confusion in the Vorlage of מִלָּה “horn” and קָרָה “war.” However, although Delitzsch (1920: 117, §127b) cited several examples of the confusion of כ and כ, he listed no examples of the final כ being confused with כ or כ. The graphic dissimilarity of the final כ and the כ mitigates against this solution.

Two more likely explanations could account for the difference in this poetic line. First, the Vorlage may have had the word כָּרָה “tumult,” especially the war-like tumult which appears in Job 15:24 with the meaning of “attack.” The Arabic cognate (Lane 1885, 2596b–c) provides an excellent example: "אֲנִיקוּר עַל עַמּוֹ "the enemy poured down on them.” If the root כָּרָה was in the Vorlage, the Syriac translator focused on the war itself כָּרָה, whereas the Greek translator focused on the sounds of battle, specifically on the trumpet signals.

Second, the Vorlage could have had the root כָּרָה כָּרָה “to tear down (walls)” (BDB, 903; Jastrow, 1427 “to burst forth”), which

---

101 Gesenius and Robinson, 1888: s.v. See Pope, 1965: 111, “Distress and anguish overwhelm him like a king set for attack.” Pope referred to the Arabic cognate, but he did not cite Lane’s lexicon.
is attested in Isaiah 22:5, “for the Lord God of hosts has a day of tumult and trampling and confusion in the valley of vision, a battering down of walls (םייקנָקָרּוּ) and a shouting to the mountains.” Although the stem appears in Isaiah 22:5 in the pilpel participle, it could occur in the qal participle, probably with or without the direct object דַּלְכַּל “wall.” The phrase הָעָשָׁה הָרֹאָה “the sound of demolishing (walls)" of the Vorlage was apparently misread by the Syriac translator as בָּלֶכַל “the sound of war,” and the Greek translator must have misread בָּלֶכַל “the sound of a horn”

If the Vorlage originally read the alliterative בָּלֶכַל בָּלֶכַל “the sound of tearing down the wall,” the בָּלֶכַל “wall” was dropped through haplography with the verb בָּלֶכַל. Since the context permits reading either בָּלֶכַל or בָּלֶכַל, both have been included in the reconstructed Vorlage. One should not be mislead by the Syriac אבר "war" in assuming that the Hebrew Vorlage would have been בָּלֶכַל. The Syriac אבר “to become weak” is not a cognate of Hebrew בָּלֶכַל “tumult,” therefore אבר would be a satisfactory translation of בָּלֶכַל.

8:2a

ως ανέμου πόλλου σφόδρα
as of a violent storm

אָסָנָא רַחְמָא רְמָא
like a strong and great wind

ךָרְחַמִּי נְדֹלָלָה כָּבֵי
like a great and mighty wind

Aside from the presence or absence of the Syriac conjunction א, the Syriac אָסָנָא רַחְמָא רְמָא “strong and great” and the

---

102 The confusion of ב and כ would be analogous to the confusion of ב and כ, cited by Delitzsch (1920: 119, § 131). Examples of the confusion of כ and final כ have also been cited by Delitzsch (1920: 112, § 111) in the textual variants of Joshua 19:29 and in Psalm 18:33 compared to II Samuel 22:33.
Greek πολλοῦ σφόδρα “very great” could be translations of each other or of a Vorlage with נָרָא “great” and מָשָׁי “mighty.” The Syriac has two adjectives, whereas the Greek has an adjective and an adverb, a difference which points to independent translations of a Hebrew Vorlage. In the LXX σφόδρα was used to translate נָרָא, but it is unlikely that נָרָא was in the original phrase since there is no verb in the comparison. However, the use of the adverb σφόδρα in the Greek suggests that the translator may have read נָרָא as a verb as well as a noun. Although the verb נָרָא / נָרָי is attested in Hebrew, it generally has the meaning “to smell, to perceive odors.” But in Arabic the cognate روح means “to be (violently) windy” (Lane, 1867: 1177). In light of the Arabic cognate, it appears that the Greek translator was uncertain whether נָרָא was a noun or verb, so both possibilities were addressed. As a noun, נָרָא was modified by πολλοῦ, and as a verb (נָרָא = רוח), it was modified by σφόδρα. Since נָרָא is normally a noun, the Vorlage has been reconstructed without the adverbial נָרָא.

8:2b

φερομένου δὲ ἐρήμου
sweeping through the wilderness

that comes upon the desert

חָפָךְ עַל הַמָּרָה
rushing upon the desert

The Greek φερομένου “moving, rushing, being borne along” and the Syriac ḫāḥ “coming,” can be explained as translations of a Vorlage with the qal feminine singular participle דַּלְתָּא. In Ezra 8:15 (נִאֲבָא עָשָּׂא נִאֲבָא יָשָּׂא עָשָּׂא וַיָּשָּׂא נִאֲבָא “I gathered them to the river that runs to Ahava”) the masculine participle דַּלְתָּא has rightly been translated “runs.” The Greek and the Syriac translations fit within the semantic range of the root דַּלְתָּא, and both would accurately represent a Vorlage with דַּלְתָּא.
Ryle and James (1891: 74–75) and Gray (1913: 640) regarded the Greek ποῦ ἄρα “where then” as a translation of an erroneous Hebrew text with סנה (Gray, סנה or סנה), which did not mean “where” but “surely,” a meaning required by the context. However, סנה with the sense of “surely” is not attested in the lexicons (BDB, 33; Jastrow, 58). Instead of סנה, it is more likely that the uncorrupted Vorlage had יַהֲלִימ “surely, indeed.” This misreading involved a confusion of סנה and סנה by the Greek and Syriac translators or—since both have the sense of “where”—in the Vorlage itself.

The proposed Vorlage above contains יַהֲלִימ “surely” and follows Ryle and James (1891: 74–75) in reading the plural “us,” as required by the context. The suffix י in Hebrew can be either י “him” or י “us.” The writer concurs with Ryle and James and others that the ποῦ ἄρα “when then” and the סנה “where then” are not a reliable reflection of the uncorrupted Vorlage.

8:5a

συνετρίβη ἦ ὁ στόμη μου ἀπὸ ἀκοής
my stomach was crushed at what I heard.

and the joints of my back were loosened at what I heard

8:5a (G), 8:3 (S)

ποῦ ἄρα κρίνει αὐτόν ὁ θεός
when then will God judge it?

where then is he judging him

surely God is judging us

103 This expression is similar to the English usage of “chills running up and down the spine.”
PSALM EIGHT

The Syriac ܐܝܪܢܝܐ ܠܠܐ ܢܝܢܐ ܠܠܐ “the vertebrae of my spine” (J. Payne Smith, 1903: 132) and the Greek ὄσφύς μου “my loins” 104 are not accurate translations of each other. They are probably translations of a Hebrew Vorlage which had any of the following words for “loins” or “the back (of the body)”: מַשְׁלֹל or רְזָר or מַרְתוֹנָה or מַשְׁלֹל. The phrase “and make their loins tremble continually” (Psalm 69:24) offers a good basis for reconstructing the verb in the Vorlage. The semantic range of מַשְׁלֹל (BDB, 588) covers the Greek συνετριβή “broken” (Liddell and Scott, 1728–1729) and the Syriac ܪܒܨܪܐ “loosened” (J. Payne Smith, 595). The phrase appears to be a rendering of מַשְׁלֹל ܠܐ ܠܠܐ “bones of my back” 105 and this retroversion has been adopted for the Vorlage. The term מַשְׁלֹל of מַשְׁלֹל ܐܐ ܠܠܐ may have contributed to the haplography by the Greek translator or in his Vorlage. 106

8:5b
παρελύθη γονατά μου
my knees were weak
מִצְמָכוֹן לִלָךְ
and my knees shook
מַשָּׁלָךְ בּרָכָה
to strike, shake
my knees were weak

The Greek παρελύθη “they were weak” and the Syriac ܠܠܐ “they shook” cannot be translations of each other, but they could be translations of a Vorlage with the stem מַשָּׁל “to be weak.” In Genesis 19:11, the LXX translated מַשָּׁל by παραλύειν, and מַשָּׁל

---

104 Wright (1985: 658) translated ὄσφύς “the lower part of the back” as “stomach.”

105 See BDB, 323 for מַשְׁלֹל, and Jastrow, 434 for מַשְׁלֹל.

106 Traf ton (1985: 92) noted the omission by homoioteleuton in the Syriac tradition of any Hebrew equivalent of the Greek ἐφοβήθη μου “my heart was afraid.” If the Hebrew equivalent were לְשָׁרָה, following Frankenberg (1896: 74) and Stein (1969: 447), the expression is attested in Deuteronomy 28:6, Psalm 27:3, 86:11, and Isaiah 35:4.
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has essentially the same meaning, “to reel, to quiver.” Psalm 109:24, “my knees are weak (וֹלֵק) from fasting” (KJV) provides a good example of the lvk being used for weak and wobbly knees. This particular nuance of הַלָּשׁ is reflected in the above proposed Vorlage and its translation.

8:7a (G), 8:7b (S)

ἀνελογισάμην τὰ κρίματα τοῦ θεοῦ

I thought about the judgements of God

and I remembered the judgements of the Lord

The Greek ἀνελογισάμην “I summed up, I calculated, I considered” and the Syriac תְּכַרֶּשׁ “I remembered” are expressions of different mental activity and are unlikely to be translations of each other. In the LXX, ἀναλογίζομαι is never used to translate the רָכַז “to remember,” which occurs over 250 times. The difference between ἀνελογισάμην and תְּכַרֶּשׁ is probably due to a misreading of the Vorlage. The Greek ἀναλογίζομαι could be a translation of Hebrew הַלָּשׁ “to devise, to consider, to purpose,” and the Syriac תְּכַרֶּשׁ is most likely a translation of its Hebrew cognate רָכַז “to remember.”

The misreading of הַלָּשׁ for רָכַז, or vice versa, reflects two well attested misreadings of graphically similar letters: the confusion of כ and כ as well as the confusion of צ and ר.

107 Hebrew הַלָּשׁ usually has negative overtones, as in Genesis 11:6, “and nothing they propose (יִשָּׂרְא) to do will be impossible for them.” But הַלָּשׁ is used with very positive overtones as well, as in Proverbs 31:16, “she considers (וֹלֵק) a field and buys it.” The LXX translated the first phrase of 31:16 as θεωρησάσας γεώργιον “she perceived the field . . . ,” with θεωρέω in this context having to do with mental perception rather than physical or spiritual perception.

108 See Delitzsch, 1920: 114, § 115b (for the confusion of כ and כ) and 119 § 131 (for the confusion of צ and ר).
The feminine noun ḥayrb “creation” is attested once in Numbers 16:30. Trafton’s (1985: 92) proposal to read an infinitive was correct — but it would have to be specifically a niphāl infinitive to account for the passive of the Syriac.

8:7a

ἀπὸ κτίσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς
since the creation of heaven and earth

which are from the time

when heaven and earth were created

since heaven and earth were created

The Greek noun κτίσεως “creation” (found elsewhere in Judith 9:12 and in 3 Maccabees 2:2, 7) and the Syriac verb ḥawμ “were created,” though they have in common the word for creation, are not likely to be a translation of each other since one would expect obvious nouns and verbs to be rendered literally. However, κτίσεως (found elsewhere in Psalm 8:7, Judith 9:12, and 3 Maccabees 3:2, 7) and ḥawμ can be accounted for by a Vorlage having ḥayrb, which can be read either as (1) the niphāl infinitive ḥawμ “were created,” with the preposition ḫ, or (2) the preposition ḫ attached to a masculine noun with the  FloatingActionButton of the definite article. Since a masculine noun ḥayrb or ḥayrb meaning “creation” is unattested elsewhere, the reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text in reading a passive infinitive. (There is no need to render the ḫ ʿest “since, from when” with the expanded wording used by Trafton, “which are from the time when.”)

109 The feminine noun ḥayrb “creation” is attested once in Numbers 16:30. Trafton’s (1985: 92) proposal to read an infinitive was correct — but it would have to be specifically a niphāl infinitive to account for the passive of the Syriac.
8:7b

I proved God right in his judgements in ages past
and I justified God in all his judgements which are from eternity

and I was justified by God in all his eternal judgements

In the discussion of the phrase καὶ δικαίωσε τὰ κρίματα κυρίου in 3:3b, it was noted that the expression does not appear elsewhere in the LXX. Here in 8:7b, as in 3:3b, the meaning of the Greek and Syriac is problematic in that it speaks of God’s being justified by members of the community. A Vorlage with the niph'al waw–consecutive qzdaxw (scriptio plena) “I was justified” was probably read as the hiph'il qzdax'w “I justified,” i.e., the misreading of significance of vowel letter ָ, taking it to be the usual sign of the i vowel of the hiph'il rather than the unusual scriptio plena for the ê vowel of the niph'al imperfect. This unusual niph'al qzdax'w must have been in the Vorlage before the separate Syriac and Greek traditions emerged.

8:8a

God exposed their sins
but God revealed their deeds

The Syriac פדאילויו “their deeds” and the Greek ἄμαρτίας αὐτῶν “their sins” cannot be translations of each other. Harris and Mingana (1868: 96), followed by Trafton (1985: 92), concluded that the problem was an inner-Syriac corruption of פדאילויו “their transgressions” to פדאילויו “their deeds.” But the
confusion could just as readily have been in the reading of a Vorlage in which “their transgressions” (Jastrow, 1038) was misread as  “their deeds.” The graphic similarity of י and י is somewhat greater than that of ר or ר (or ר and ר). In light of the αἰ παρανομία “lawlessness” in 8:9a, the preferred reading is with the Greek ἁμάρτίας αὐτῶν and the Vorlage has been reconstructed to follow it.

8:8b

 sede η γη τα κριματα του θεου τα δικαια

the whole earth knew the righteous judgements of God

και τα δικαια της χριστου ανακοινωνη

and the righteous judgements of the Lord

became known to all the earth

and the whole earth acknowledged

the righteous judgements of God

The Greek θεου “God” reflects a Vorlage with אלוהים and the Syriac  “Lord” reflects a Vorlage with יהוה, a difference which hints at a different Vorlage for each. Trafton (1985: 92) faulted Baars’ reading (1972: 12)  (possibly an’aphel of ד “to let flow, to give vent”) for אונס “it became known” and followed Harris and Mingana (1868: 96) in reading the singular אונס, even though the subject of the verb is plural.

In addition to these variants, there is also a difference between the active and the passive voice in the two traditions. This difference can also be understood by recognition of a variant in the Vorlage. The Greek εγνω reflects a Vorlage having עד, whereas the Syriac read the niph'al perfect עד, i.e., a confusion of י for ע, or vice versa. Several examples of the confusion of ר and י have already been noted, as well as the confusion of ר and י. Since the

waw–consecutive was apparently used elsewhere in this psalm, and in light of the conjunction affixed to the verb in the Syriac text, the waw–consecutive has been used in reconstructing the Vorlage.

8:9a

εν καταγαίοις κρυφίοις αἱ παρανομίαι αὐτῶν
ἐν παροργισμῷ

in secret places111 underground was their lawbreaking
provoking (him)

καταγαίοις κρυφίοις
for they were committing lawlessness
in the hiding places of the earth

in the secret subterranean places they were lawbreaking

The Greek κρυφίοις “secret places” and the Syriac ܥܠܐ ܕܬܐ “hiding places” could be translations of each other, and αἱ παρανομίαι αὐτῶν “their lawbreaking” and αἱ παρανομίαι αὐτῶν “they were being lawless” essentially equal each other. But the significant differences between the Greek and the Syriac in this poetic line preclude their being derived from each other. The Greek masculine plural adjective καταγαίοις “underground” and παροργισμῷ “provoking” are not reflected in the Syriac, nor is the Syriac ܥܠܐ ܕܬܐ “of the earth” reflected in the Greek.

The textual variant in II Kings 6:9 may provide a clue for understanding the source of καταγαίοις “underground.” The MT of 6:9 has the participle ܐܠܐ ܕܬܐ “going down,” but the LXX translated it as κεκρυπταὶ, as though its Vorlage had ܐܠܐ ܕܬܐ “hidden.” A similar confusion of the stems הַלָּלֵה (ʼ ballo) “to hide” and הַלָּלֵה “to be under” or הַלָּלֵה “to go down” could underlie the

111 Κατάγαίοις is found as a translation of בְּמֵיהָ “lower (decks)” in Genesis 6:16, and the verb κατάγειν translates eleven different words in the Septuagint, but none of them approximate in meaning or appearance the noun כַּרְדָּה “earth.”
“of the earth,” which is lacking in the Greek, it is more likely that the Vorlage had the bound nouns ריחמ ויהי נאם “lowest places of the earth” (attested in Psalm 63:10) or מנה המן “lowest places of earth” (found in Isaiah 44:23) or ריחפ ויהי מנה “the world below, the underworld” (found in Ezekiel 31:14, 16, 18). In light of these examplesエン קאגראויו כירפיוו could translate מנה מנה meaning, “in the lowest places of the earth, the hidden (ones),” which equals “in the hidden under ground (places).”

The παροργισμόν “provoking (him),” for which there is no corresponding element in the Syriac, is problematic. The verb παροργίζειν and the noun παροργισμός translate ten different Hebrew words, but none of them are graphically similar to מנה מנה or the sixteen other words used in the LXX to translate παράνομος. The closest similarity is between מנה מנה and מנה מנה, which have more of an aural similarity rather than a visual one. Therefore, it is unlikely to be an addition in the Greek due to ditto-graphy, or missing in the Syriac due to haplography. At best, it may be a doublet in the Greek text stemming from an aural error. Therefore, it is not reflected in the reconstructed Vorlage.

8:11b (G), 8:12b (S)

ὡς καὶ διότις κληρονόμου λυτρουμένου
as if there were no redeeming heir

οὐδὲ ὡς καὶ διότις κληρονόμου λυτρουμένου
as if there was not one who inherits and saves

καὶ οὐδὲ ὡς καὶ διότις κληρονόμου λυτρουμένου
as if there was neither one-who-inherits
nor one-who-redeems

Ryle and James (1891: 78–79) recognized that κληρονόμος was the equivalent of the הָנָה “the kinsman who should take on the rights and obligations of the inheritance.” However, since κληρονόμος translates לֶשֶׁת “inheritor” in Judges 18:7 and elsewhere, they concluded: “κληρονόμος λυτρουμένου are a duplicate
rendering of the same word, κληρονομοῦ representing the rightful claim of the ‘go’él, λυτροφένου his effectual act of deliverance or redemption.” They proposed a Vorlage with ἀναστήματον or simply ἀναστήματον. Trafton (1985: 93) stated his presence for ἀναστήματον. However, in view of the Syriac conjunction α, it seems best to retain all three elements, i.e., the two nouns and the conjunction (= ἀναστήματον ἀναστήματος) as reflected in the above Vorlage.

8:12a (G), 8:13a (S)

ἐπατούσαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον κυρίου
they walked on the place of sacrifice of the Lord

and they were trampling his temple

they were trampling his temple

The Greek θυσιαστήριον “place of sacrifice” and the Syriac מְסָכֶת “temple” are not literal translations of each other. But both may translate a Vorlage having מְסָכֶת “holy place.” This probability for a Vorlage with מְסָכֶת is prompted by Isaiah 63:18, which reads, “our adversaries have trampled down your sanctuary (מְסָכֶת).” In 8:11, the poet used τὰ ἁγία τοῦ θεοῦ/rometer “the sacred house / place of God.” The equivalent of מְסָכֶת “holy place” in 8:12 would be a synonymous parallel of what was probably מְסָכֶת in the Vorlage. The Syriac used the cognate of מְסָכֶת “temple” since מְסָכֶת had become the general designation of the second temple (BDB, 228, section d, noting especially the מְסָכֶת of Malachi 3:1). By using the cognate of מְסָכֶת, the Syriac had no need to specify מְסָכֶת ἀναστήματον, whereas the Greek translator needed the modifier κυρίου since θυσιαστήριον “altar” was a more generic noun in Greek than מְסָכֶת in post-exilic Hebrew.

8:12a (G), 8:13a (S)

ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας
(coming) from all kinds of uncleanness
The Greek preposition ἀπὸ “from” is odd compared to the contextually appropriate ב “in” of the Syriac. They obviously are not translations of each other. The difference can be accounted for by assuming a Vorlage with the poetic ב בם “in” which was misread as ב מן, reflecting the confusion of a ꡵ and a final ꡵ (Delitzsch, 1920: 111 § 110). Once the ꡵ was read as ꡵, creating the pre-position ב “from,” the initial ב “in” was dropped.

The difference between Greek ἀκαθαρσίας, without a pronomial modifier and Syriac Ṣōnwhā in all their defilement with the suffixed “their” probably goes back to a misreading of the original הלאירא הלאירא, “their uncleanness” as הלאירא הלאירא “unclean(ness)” written scriptio plena.

8:12b(G), 8:13b (S)
καὶ ἐν ἀφεδρῷ αἵματος
and (coming) with menstrual blood (on them)
with the blood of menstruation

The Greek ἀφεδρῷ αἵματος “the menstruation of blood” and the Syriac Ṣōnwhā “blood of menstruation” reflect the same words or idea but the word order is reversed. Kuhn (1937: 12–13) argued for a Vorlage with מדרב (following the Syriac); and Begrich preferred (1939: 149–150) מדרב (following the Greek).112 In the Septuagint, ἀφεδρῷ is used to translate מדרב “menstruous.”

112 Begrich also asserted that the Syriac translator transposed the Greek word order and the ἀφεδρῷ “dirty” (= ἀφεδρῷ) was subsequently changed to Ṣōnwhā “menstruous.”
“(menstrual) impurity” and הַזָּדִי “menstruous, unwell, faint,” a by-form of זְדִי “illness.” If the Vorlage had the stem זְדִי rather than זַלָּדִי, there would be a graphic similarity between זַלָּדִי and זָדִי. Delitzsch (1920: 127 § 145) noted the confusion of זְדִי and זַלָּדִי in Genesis 20:4 and Zephaniah 2:14. A similar confusion of זְדִי and זַלָּדִי could have occurred with זְדִי and זְדַי. If the Vorlage had read זָדִי זַלָּדִי, it could, by analogy to the זְדִי/זַלָּדִי errors, have been misread זָדִי זַלָּדִי.

In light of (a) Leviticus 22:18–22, which prohibits the sacrifice of a blemished, blind, or maimed animal having a discharge or itch, and (b) the end of the 8:13b in Syriac:  אֵלֶּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם and he made them drink a living cup that they might become drunk

“as if defiled meat,” the agenda for the poet does not seem to have been the presence of menstruants at the altar, but the sacrificing of diseased or hemorrhaging animals. Also, in Malachi 1:7, 13–14, the sacrifice of such animals is condemned.

The Greek and the Syriac texts are not very different in this line; either both misread the Vorlage or the corruption had already taken place in the Hebrew text they translated. Neither the Greek or the Syriac texts seems to be contextually appropriate. The proposed Vorlage and the translation, reflect the nuance of the condemnation of the offering of diseased or sick animals as a sacrifice.

8:14b (G), 8:15b (S)

ἐπότισεν αὐτοὺς ποτήριον ὀίνου ἄκρατον εἰς μέθην
gave them a cup of undiluted wine to make them drunk

and he made them drink a living cup

he gave them a cup of undiluted wine to make them drunk

If the Syriac were a translation of the Greek, one would expect to find in Syriac the loanword ακρατος (ἄκρατος) “unmixed, undiluted,” attested in Revelation 14:10. Trafton (1985: 94) is correct in his conclusion, “Presumably Sy originally read κυπεῖν κυπεῖν [“a cup of living wine”], the similarity of κυπεῖν and
accounting for the accidental omission of אָכַל מִלֶּדֶר in transmission.” The reconstructed Syriac, אָכַל מִלֶּדֶר, and the Greek ποτήριον οίνου ἀκράτου could be idiomatic translations of כָּלִי אֲרָר.

8:15b (G), 8:17a (S)

The Greek ἐκρίνεν τὸν πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ
he declared war against Jerusalem

הַרְצִיל הָעָם לְצָר יְרוּשָׁלָיָם
{he waged} war against Jerusalem

he prepared (for) war against Jerusalem

The Greek ἐκρίνεν “he judged” (Wright’s “he declared”) and the Syriac הָרְצִיל “and he judged” could be translations of each other, but in that case the expression “he judged war” is anomalous. Ryle and James (1891: 80–81) suggested,

But as the word מִלֶּדֶר, ‘he maketh ready’ is what we should naturally expect in the present passage, we conjecture that מִלֶּדֶר by an error of a scribe may have been changed to מִלֶּדֶר; of this error a probable instance is presented by Ezek. vii. 14 ‘They have blown the trumpet and made all ready’ which is rendered in the LXX σαλπίσατε ἐν σάλπιγγι καὶ κρίνατε [“sound the trumpet and decide”] (Sym ἐτοιμάσατε [“prepare”]; Hebrew מִלֶּדֶר [“and he prepared”]).

It is difficult to improve upon this suggestion, although, as Trafton (1985: 95) noted, “most scholars have attempted to make sense out of the text as it stands.”

8:16a (G), 8:18a (S)

ἀπῆμυτσαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς
the leaders of the country met him

113 See Delitzsch (1920: 119 § 131) for examples of the confusion of ד and ת.
and the judges of the land met him
the leaders of the country met him

Trafton (1985: 95) rightfully proposed, in light of the Greek ἀρχοντές “rulers,” that the Syriac ملٍٔ was a corruption of ملٍٔ “rulers.” This error may have occurred under the influence of the erroneous ملة, discussed immediately above. Although Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.), Frankenberg (1896: 74) and Stein (1969: 448) opted for ملٍٔ in their back-translations, the probable Syriac ملٍٔ has been the basis for the ملٍٔ in the reconstructed Vorlage.

8:16b (G), 8:18b (S)

ἔπευκτην ἢ ὁδὸς σου
may your way be blessed

كرتاء
your way will be established

كرتاء
your way will be established

In Jeremiah 20:14 the phrase מלٍٔ “let it not be blessed” appears in the LXX as μὴ ἐστῶ ἔπευκτην “let it not be longed for,” and this is the basis for Gray’s translating ἔπευκτή here in 8:16 as “be blessed” (1913: 641). However, since the Syriac has the verb كرتاء “will be established,” it may well be that ملٍٔ was not in the Vorlage of either text tradition. (It is obvious that they are not a translation of each other.) If the Syriac Vorlage had the stem كرتاء meaning “to be established” (as in I Samuel 24:21, “the kingdom of Israel will be established . . .”) it would be graphically similar to the stem كرتاء “to look eagerly for, to long
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for †114 which was normally translated in the LXX by ἐπευκτη. The Greek translator thus read ἐπευκτη as ἡλα. This difference corresponds exactly to the well known variant of Genesis 1:9, where the MT "unto one place" was rendered in the LXX as εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς "into the collections"—as in 1:10, where the LXX has συστήματα for MT ἃλα "a mass, a collection" (BDB, 876).115

Of the three options (1) ἐπευκτη = βρών "blessed be," (2) ὑπαίθρη = ἑπάρ "it will be established," or (3) ἡλα "to be longed for, to look eagerly for," the reference in 8:17 to "grading the rough roads before his coming" lends support for assuming the Vorlage had the stem ἡλα with its physical nuances.

8:20a (G), 8:23a (S)

καὶ πᾶν σοφὸν ἐν βουλή
and every (man) wise in counsel

because (he was) wise in counsel

and every (man) wise in counsel

The Greek πᾶν “all” and the Syriac מַהֲלָה “because” are not translations of each other. Instead, they reflect the confusion of a ἃ and a ἦ in the Vorlage, i.e., the Greek must have been translating from a text with ἃ, but the Syriac translator read the ἄ as ἦ. A similar confusion of ἃ and ἧ is found in the parallel texts of I Kings 5:25 (RSV 5:11) and II Chronicles 2:9 (RSV 2:10). In Kings, the text speaks of שָׁרוֹם אַלָּחַ פֹּר חָוֹם מָלָלְהלָו לְהוּא "twenty thousand cors of wheat as food for his household,"116 but in

114 See Delitzsch (1920: 118 § 129°) for examples of the confusion of ἃ and ἦ.

115 For numerous other examples of the confusion of ἃ and ἦ, see Delitzsch, 1920: 118 § 129°.

116 The variants in the Greek tradition suggest other Hebrew texts had ἄ or
Chronicles it reads, נְכוּנָה כָּלָה פָּרָה הָיוָה מֶטֶם לְעַבְרֵךְ “twenty thousand cors of crushed wheat for your servants.” The difference between מֶטֶם “food” and מֶטֶם “crushed” is strikingly similar to the כָּל Мы / כל variant under review. The context of the psalm and the traditions of Josephus (Antiquities 14.4.2) support the plural of the Greek text tradition.

8:22b (G), 8:26 (S)
ēmīanav ἱεροσαλημ
they defiled Jerusalem
and Jerusalem defiled

The difficulty in this phrase, whether the verb should be singular or plural, is identical to the one discussed above in reference to 8:1 as to whether the Vorlage had לֶשֶנָה or לֶשֶנָה. The confusion of כ and כ is clearly attested in Obadiah 1, where כל should be read for כל. The suggestion of Trafton (1985: 96), in disagreement with Begrich (1939: 136–137), that the Syriac goes back to a Hebrew Vorlage in which an original כָּל was corrupted to כִּפָּה is attractive and has been adopted in reconstructing the Vorlage.

8:25a (G) 8:30 (S)
ἰδοὺ δὴ ὁ θεός ἐδείξας ἡμῖν τὸ κρίμα σου
ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου
see, now, God, you have shown us how you rightly judge
behold, you, O God have shown us your righteousness

or כִּפָּה. For other examples of the confusion of כ and כ, see Delitzsch, 1920: 115, §119a.

117 For other examples of the confusion of כ and כ, see Delitzsch, 1920: 116, §123a.
The initial difference between the Greek and Syriac is that of δὴ “now” and ἀνείρε “you.” If the δὴ is a translation of יָדָה and the ἀνείρε is a translation of יָדָה, it may well be that the traditions reflect an aural error, indicative of the fact that the psalm had a oral history and that the voiced laryngal fricative ת had lost its unique quality and coalesced with unvoiced glottal plosive ב.

The synonymous parallelism in Psalm 9:9, "Indeed, he judges the world in righteousness and he judges the people with equity," reflects the quasi-parallelism of the Psalms of Solomon 8:24–25: “. . . who judges the whole earth in his righteousness,” which is followed by “. . . your judgement in your righteousness.” It is perhaps a mere coincidence, but the Syriac text of Psalm 9:9 differs from the MT in that it has no verb corresponding to יָדָה — just as the Syriac Psalms of Solomon 8:30 (Greek 8:25) lacks a noun corresponding to τὸ κρίμα (= יָדָה). Perhaps יָדָה was misread as יָדָה, which then dropped from the text when it was adjacent with the יָדָה of יָדָה.

The יָדָה in the reconstructed Vorlage can be read as a participle or a noun followed by an adverbial accusative, which restores (or creates) an alliterative phrase, “your judging rightly.”

Psalm Nine

9:2

ἐν πνεύμα ζοφεὶ ἤ διασπορὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
the dispersion of Israel (was) among every nation

בָּנָאֵל מִדְּרֵסָתָה מְסָמָרָה מִדְּרֵסָתָה
among all the nations was the dispersion of Israel

בָּלָא דְּבָרָי רֵייוֹ וַהֲרֹדֵי יִשְֹרֵעָל
among all the nations was the dispersing of Israel

Trafton (1985: 100) noted that the Greek has ἐν πνεύμα ζοφεὶ “among every nation” as if this is different from the Syriac בָּנָאֵל מִדְּרֵסָתָה “among all the nations.” However, a Vorlage
with כל could mean either “all” or “every.” The Greek and the Syriac both would translate כל correctly. The second difference in this poetic line is the absence of any corresponding element in the Greek for the Syriac זאִמō “was.” The Greek ἐξῆλθεν suggests a Vorlage with בִּיהוּדָה, which is graphically similar to the plural participle בִּיהוּדָה “the ones who were,” which can be used with the force of the finite verb (as in Exodus 9:3, יִפְצָא בִּיהוּדָה יִתַּמְרַע “the hand of the LORD will be upon your cattle”). The proposed Vorlage suggests that the Greek, through haplography, omitted any representation of בִּיהוּדָה in its translation. Thus, the Syriac is the preferred reading and provides the basis for reconstructing the Vorlage.

9:3a (G), 9:5b (S)
ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως σου
from your knowledge

כְּלַעַפְּרָה
from your mind

כְּלַעַפְּרָה
c or your knowledge

The Greek has γνώσεως σου, “your knowledge” while the Syriac has כְּלַעַפְּרָה, “your mind.” Trafton (1985: 100) noted that כְּלַעַפְּרָה here and in verse 6 would be an “unusual translation” of γνώσεως σου.” Psalm 139:2, 17, along with Job 16:21, provide the key to the understanding the difference between the Greek and the Syriac in this phrase. Dahood (1970: 286, 296) cited Job 16:21, “can mere man argue with God, or mortal discern (ךָא בִּיהוּדָה) his thoughts (ךָא לוֹ עִלְיוֹן),” as evidence for his translation of בִּיהוּדָה as “his thoughts” in 139:2, 17 (over against the LXX and the Syriac versions which read דָּתַנְיוּ “my knowledge”). Thus, Hebrew רָאוּעַ “thought” is attested in two passages and Aramaic דָּתַנְיוּ “thought” is attested in Daniel 2:29.

The Vorlage could have had either (1) which the Greek translator misread as כְּלַעַפְּרָה “your knowledge” or understood it as
“your thoughts” [as in Psalm 139:2, 17 and Job 16:21], or רשתו (which the Syriac translator must have read as רשתו “your thought”). The difference reflects another example of the confusion of a ב and a ב. The Greek text is preferred for reconstructing the Hebrew Vorlage of this line since the semantic range of הנחוב moves in the direction of “striving, longing” rather than “knowing.”

9:4a (G), 9:7a (S)

טסה הרם וני זכיה ויושב ידמ נוח ותח נוח ותח
Our works (are) in the choosing and power of our souls

for we do {things} in freedom and in choosing of our soul

Indeed we act in freedom and in the choice of our souls

There are two differences between the Greek and the Syriac in this poetic line. First the Greek has טסה הרם וני זכיה “our works,” but the Syriac has חסב עני “we do (things).” The Greek could reflect a Vorlage with the participle בלחש זכיה “our works.” The Syriac Vorlage read either בלחש זכיה “we did (things)” or בלחש זכיה “indeed, we did (things).” The emphatic “indeed” is suggested by the Syriac ב which could reflect the preposition ב or the particle ב. What was read as a ב in the Syriac Vorlage was (mis)read as a ב in the Greek Vorlage. In the translation of the proposed Vorlage, the ב is read as an emphatic ב “indeed, surely,” which fits the context of the verse.

The second difference is between the Greek זכיה ויושב ידמ ותח “in freedom and in choosing.” The Syriac זכיה ויושב ידמ ותח “in freedom and in choosing.” The Syriac and Greek reflect the בחר “to choose,” but the Syriac בחר “in freedom” requires בחר, i.e. the preposition ב plus the substantive בחר “free, born free, nobleman” (BDB, 359). The Greek tradition read the בחר “freedom” as בחר “power.” Delitzsch (115, § 119) cited Genesis 15:18 and Isaiah 21:8 as two examples of the
confusion of a ר and a ל. Compared to the Greek, the Syriac is the contextually more appropriate reading.

9:5a (G), 9:9a (S)

ο οιων δικαιοσυνην θησαυριζει ζωην αυτω παρα κυριω

the one who does what is right saves up life

for himself with the Lord

for he who does righteousness lays up for himself

with the Lord a treasure of life

he who does righteousness lays up a treasure of life

for himself with the Lord

Trafton (1985: 102) rightly critiqued Harris’ (1911: 43) claim that the Syriac phrase ματαιματησε “cannot be a Hebrew form of speech, we are obliged to admit that the play on words is due to the ingenuity of the translator,” and proposed a Hebrew Vorlage having נושא אرزバリ נאזרו תיש לו את יהוה “laying up a treasure.” Additional support for reading נושא אرزバリ comes from the Latin Apocalypse of IV Ezra 8:54, which reads in part “... and in the end the treasures of immortality (thesaurus immortalitatis) are made manifest.” If the Syriac נושא אرزバリ “a treasure of life ... with the Lord” is thematically related, there is no reason to reject the Syriac נושא אرزバリ (equals Hebrew אرزバリ “treasure”) out of hand. Trafton’s (1985: 102) back translation approximates Franz Delitzsch’s (1970:10) back translation of Matthew 6:20, א בהתאצירה להב של ארצバリ בבורס “lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven.” Moreover, נושא אرزバリ seems to suggest something other than “saving one’s life” at the present on earth. The idea of saving one’s life here on earth is well

---

118 See Gesenius (1888: 499, 949) in his introduction to the letters ר and ל for other examples of the interchange.
attested, for example, in these passages: Psalm 6:4 “Turn, O Lord, save my life (תהלת והלאה); deliver me for the sake of thy steadfast love”; Psalm 116:4 “... O LORD, I beseech thee, deliver my soul (משה ומלוח);” Ezekiel 33:9 “if he do not turn from his way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul (תהלת והלאה);” and Jeremiah 38:2 “he shall have his life as a prize of war, and live (תהלת והלאה).”

There is no reason to conjecture that the Syriac text here is a translation of the Greek text. The Greek and the Syriac texts could actually reflect a Hebrew Vorlage which gave rise to an aural error in which there was possibly a confusion of צא and צא, even though the LXX does not use תסוע to translate צא. The Greek תסוע and the Syriac תいたら are probably based upon a tradition having צא צא. The cognate accusative before the verb, צא צא, could reflect an original infinitive absolute which preceded the verb, צא צא. In either case, a cognate accusative or an infinitive absolute, the Greek translator omitted it or it had already dropped out of the Vorlage of the Greek text. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text.

9:6b (G), 9:12b (S)

ἐν ἐξομολογήσει ἐν ἐξαγορίας
in confessing, in restoring

ἐξαγορίας
in his confession

when he confesses

Gray (1913: 642) recognized that ἐν ἐξαγορίας “in acknowledgement” is probably a doublet for the ἐν ἐξομολογήσει “in confession,” but made no conjecture whether the doublet originated in the Greek text or in a Hebrew Vorlage. Since the semantic range of ἐξαγορίας includes “to redeem, to ransom, to tell, to

119 Other examples of aural errors are discussed with reference to 8:11, 8:25a, 17:6a, and 17:13.
confess, to make known, to declare;”¹²⁰ it is possible that the phrase simply uses synonymous apposition; but the absence of any corresponding element in the Syriac for ἐν ἐξαγορίας lends support to Gray’s conjecture.

While it is possible that the Syriac text reflects a haplography of its equivalent for ἐν ἐξαγορίας, it is more likely that the Hebrew Vorlage had a doublet reflecting what was an aural uncertainty as to whether the root was ἐξίν “to acknowledge” or ἐξίν “to confess.” Since Delitzsch (1920) does not list any scribal errors involving 𐤀 and 𐤄, one must conjecture that at some point in the oral transmission that the 𐤀 and the 𐤀 were confused.¹²¹ By the time of the composition of the Psalms of Solomon, the 𐤄 (the voiced laryngal fricative) had coalesced with the 𐤀 (the unvoiced glottal plosive), as attested by the Phoenician variant spellings of 𐤀𐤀 as 𐤀𐤀 or 𐤀.¹²² But in Hebrew, where the 𐤄 was consistently retained in the spelling, in hearing the 𐤄 and 𐤀 (the unvoiced glottal fricative) could easily have been confused. Therefore, the reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text reflecting the writer’s concurrence with Gray, followed by Trafton.

9:9b (G), 9:18b (S)
καὶ οὐκ ἀπώθη ἐις τὸν αἰῶνα (Rahlfs)¹²³
καὶ οὐ καταπαυσές ἐις τὸν αἰῶνα
and it will not cease forever
and you will not cease forever

¹²⁰ Wright (1985: 661), for reasons which are not obvious, translated ἐν ἐξαγορίας as “in restoring,” a nuance not cited by (Liddell and Scott, 580).

¹²¹ For other examples which suggest errors in an oral transmission see the discussion on 8:11b, 8:25a, 16:16, and 17:13.


¹²³ Rahlfs accepted an emendation proposed by von Gebhardt which none of the Greek manuscripts supports. The second Greek line is from Wright’s (1995: 61) volume on the Psalms of Solomon.
The Greek provides three alternatives for the corresponding Syriac אֶלָּא תֵּפָסֵרִין אִלּוּ “you / she will not cease,” namely, או קָטַּפָּאִיס “you will not cease,” או קָטַּפָּאִיסָה and או קָטַּפָּאִיסִי “he will not cease.”24 Begrich (1939: 138) conjectured that קָטַּפָּאִיסָה and קָטַּפָּאִיסִי are corruptions of קָטַּפָּאִיס and that the Syriac is a translation of the corrupted קָטַּפָּאִיסָה. Trafton’s (1985:103–104) summary of opinions reflects the division of opinion on whether “you [God] will not cease” or “it [the name of God] will not cease” was original in the Greek.

Not satisfied with the three attested Greek options, von Gebhardt (1895: 78) emended או קָטַּפָּאִיס “you will not cease” to אוֹקְה אֶפְּוַה “you will not reject (us),” and Rahlfs adopted the emendation in his text. But the solution to the problem is not to be found in emending the Greek, but in recognizing that the Greek variants are due to a misunderstanding of the verb קָטַּפָּאִיס in the Hebrew Vorlage. The prefix ו could be either a 2ms or a 3fs imperfect form of the verb. The problem was not with the verb, per se, but with determining the subject of the verb. Contrary to all the evidence or arguments favoring a 2ms “you [God] will not . . .” or 3ms “it [the name] will not . . .,” the subject was most likely a 3fs קָּטַּפָּאִיס “race, descendants, family” (Jastrow, 414), used as a synonymn of the masculine σπέρμα (= בָּרֵד) in 9:9a. The phrase וּדְרוּחַיְתֶה לֵאַתַּפָּאִיס “his race shall never cease” is attested in Kilayim 32c of the Palestinian Talmud.

Consequently, the Syriac אֶלָּא תֵּפָּסֵרִין אִלּו should be translated “it [the race (f.) of Abraham] will never cease,” and the או קָטַּפָּאִיס (of mss 149, 260, 471, 606, 629, and 769) and the או קָטַּפָּאִיס (of mss 366), may also reflect the 3fs אַלָּא תֵּפָּסֵרִין or אַלָּא תֵּפָּסֵרִין (scriptio plena). For these reason, the reconstructed Vorlage uses a 3fs verb having the feminine noun

24 As in Hebrew, the Syriac 3fs and the 2ms imperfect verbs are homographs, their identification being fixed solely by context.
The Greek οὐ καταπαύσει “it will not cease” matches this reconstruction, but the “it” has as its antecedent the feminine draw, not the masculine draw. Once the correct antecedent is recognized, emendation is unnecessary.

**Psalm Ten**

10:1a

ο κύριος ἐμνήσθη ἐν ἐλεγμῷ
the Lord remembers with rebuking

who God remembered in poverty

(whom) Yahweh remembers with reproach

The Syriac “in poverty” and the Greek “with rebuking” cannot be translations of each other. Harris and Mingana (1868: 96–97) and Baars (1972: 15) recognized a metathetic error in which an original “in reproof” was mistakenly written or read as “in poverty.” The erroneous metathesis of letters has probably occured also in the Hebrew Vorlage (in 2:27, 4:18 and elsewhere). The reconstructed Vorlage, therefore, follows the Greek text.

10:1b

ἐκκυκλώθη ἀπὸ ὀδοὺ πολλαπλασίων μάστιγι
and protects from the evil way with a whip

and he restrained him with scourgings from the way of evil

The Greek “he protects” and the Syriac “he restrained him” cannot be translations of each other. Trafton (1985: 106) has rightly noted “The Gk ἐκκυκλώθη (lit. ‘he was encircled’)
PSALM TEN

is notoriously problematic.” The best suggestion to date was offered by Fritzsche (1871: 580) who proposed the emendation to ἐκκόλοθη “he was restrained,” which brought the Greek text into conformity with the Syriac.

The Greek translator read ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίας . . . πάτων as the noun with an apositional modifier (“from the way, the evil one”), whereas the Syriac read the phrase as a construct chain (“from the way of evil”). The Syriac provided the clue for the correction of the Greek text of this poetic line, and the reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text.

10:1b–2a

ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας . . . πάτων

from sin . . . (his) back

Syriac

from his sin . . . his back

Vorlage follows the Syriac text.

In 10:1c the Syriac apparently read a Vorlage having ἡματαίον “his sin” but the Greek translator read ἡματά “sin (f.)” reflecting the confusion of ἡ and ἡ. 125 In 10:2a the reader is confronted with a variant between the Syriac and the Greek involving the confusion of a 1 and a ἡ. 126 Whereas the Syriac translator read ἡματαίον “his back,” the Greek translator read ἡματά “back.” The ἡματαίον in 10:2, which has no corresponding element in the Greek, is probably a doublet of the ἡματαίον which was misread as ἡματά. 127 Both Syriac and Greek have synonymous parallelism (ἡματαίον and ἡματά in the Syriac and ἡματαίον and

125 See Delitzsch, 1920: 120, § 132a–b.
127 See Delitzsch, 1920: 120, § 132c–d.
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Contextually, the Syriac reading is preferable\textsuperscript{128} and has been used in reconstructing the \textit{Vorlage}.

10:3

\textit{ορθώσει γὰρ ὃδεν δικαίων}

for he will straighten the ways of the righteous

\textit{ἡμεῖς ἰσραήλ} ἀληθὲς

for the way of the righteous one is straight

\textit{καὶ ἔσται ἡ δικαίωσις}

for he will straighten the ways of the righteous

Trafton (1985: 107) cited Kuhn's (1937: 13) concurrence with Frankenberg (1896: 77) that the difference between the Greek \textit{ορθώσει} “he will make straight” and the Syriac \textit{חכמלב} “is straight” is due to the reading of a \textit{Vorlage} having \textit{םש}. The Greek translator read it as a \textit{pēl} causative but the Syriac translator read it as a simple \textit{qal}. The reconstructed \textit{Vorlage} concurs with the Greek translator in reading a causative, recognizing that \textit{םש} could be a \textit{hiph’îl} (\textit{scriptio defectiva}) as in Proverbs 4:25, as well as a \textit{pēl}.

10:3b

\textit{καὶ οὐ διαστρέψει ἐν παιδείᾳ}

and [God] will not bend (them) by discipline

\textit{καὶ ἐστὶν ἡ σκέτωσις}

and chastisement does not make it crooked

\textit{καὶ οὐ διαστρέψει}

and he does not bend (them) by discipline

The Greek \textit{διαστρέψει} (a simple indicative) and the Syriac \textit{חכמלט} (a causative feminine participle) are not likely to be

\textsuperscript{128} Note Wright's (1985: 661) contextual addition of “(his)” to avoid the ambiguity of the translation “the one who prepares a back for the whip . . . ,” which could be misunderstood as a reference to one who executes the whipping.
translations of each other. However, the differences between the indicative and the causative and between the present tense and the participle stem can be accounted for by a Vorlage having a consonant cluster. The Syriac translator or tradition read—due to a dittography of the T— as the feminine participle and the feminine "chastisement." Consequently, the Syriac read as the subject of the participle. But the Greek translator or tradition read the consonant cluster as , i.e., the masculine participle followed by a preposition affixed to the feminine noun , with the masculine subject of the participle being understood contextually as God.

Kuhn (1937: 13–14) reconstructed a Vorlage with , asserting:

But it is difficult to imagine that such a common verb as and the preposition would have been incomprehensible to the Syriac translator. Although Kuhn chose the verb (which was translated by in the LXX), the stem (which was translated by in the LXX), more naturally explains the preposition in the Greek text.

10:3e

καὶ τὸ ἐλεος κυρίου

and the mercy of the Lord

for the grace of Yahweh
The Greek ἐλεος “mercy” and the Syriac ܡܬܘ “sight” are obviously not translations of each other. Trafton (1985: 108) has proposed an inner Syriac confusion of 穰 “grace” and ܡܬܘ “sight,” but the graphic similarity of these two words is not nearly as close as the corresponding Hebrew 穰 “grace” and ܡܬ “sight.” Therefore, it seems more likely that the confusion was in the Hebrew Vorlage rather than originating in the Syriac text, since the confusion of � and  międzyn is well attested elsewhere in Hebrew.\footnote{See Delitzsch, 1920: 113, § 112$^4$ and 116, § 123$^5$.}

The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text since 穰 and ܡܬ are among the twelve words translated by ἐλεος.

10:5b

 hend the testimony of the Lord (is) in the ways of men
 in (his) supervision

and the testimony of the Lord is in the ways of men
 in visitation

the lawcodes of the Lord in the commandments
 (are) above the rules of man

The semantic ranges of the Greek ἐπισκοπὴ “supervision” and the Syriac ܢܝܚܐ “visitation” are such that they could well be translations of each other. However, the semantic range of ἐπισκοπὴ and ܢܝܚܐ do not offer any meaning which gives sense to this poetic line. However, if ἐπισκοπὴ and ܢܝܚܐ are translations of a Hebrew Vorlage with דְּבָרִים (scriptio defectiva = דְּבָרִים) “commandments, precepts,” the translators can be excused for translating the masculine plural דְּבָרִים “commandments” as though it were the feminine singular דְּבָרִים “visitation.”
The confusion of הָדַּקִּים and הָדַקִּים would be like the confusion of הָדַּקִּים (MT) and הָדַקִּים (with סְ, כֵּ, פְ, סְ) in II Kings 6:20.

The Greek ἐπὶ points to a Vorlage with על. The Syriac אֶלַּכֵּה and the Greek ὀδοὺς point to the noun לֹךְ “road” or לֹךְ “practice, rule, tradition.” Frankenberg (1896: 77) translated ἐπὶ ὀδοὺς ἀνθρώπων as ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων [“in the ways of man”—Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) differed only by having the definite article on אֶלַּכֵּה —and Stein (1969: 451) similarly rendered it as על הדרכי אנשיה [“in the ways of men”]. But all three seem to have misunderstood the context due to the Greek ἐπισκοπή and the Syriac אֶלַּכֵּה which reflect most likely a misreading of הָדַּקִּים “visitation” instead of הָדַּקִּים “precept” (see above) — which made the אֶלַּכֵּה of the Vorlage appear to be “the roads for visiting people,” rather than recognizing אֶלַּכֵּה as the antithetical parallel to הָדַּקִּים “the lawcodes of Yahweh.” Both the Greek and the Syriac missed the nuance of the text, and commentators to date have not been able to offer an intelligible translation. The Vorlage, as reconstructed, offers insight into the primacy of Torah for the poet.

10:8 (G), 10:9 (S)

τοῦ κυρίου ἡ σωτηρία ἐπὶ οἶκον Ἰσραήλ
eἰς εὐφροσύνην αἰώνιον

the Lord’s salvation (be) upon the house of Israel
(that they may be) happy forever

for the salvation of the Lord is upon the house of Israel
for the kingdom which is forever

for the salvation of the Lord is on the house of Israel.
Indeed, His Lordship (is) forever

The Greek εὐφροσύνη “happy” and the Syriac אֶלַּכֵּה “kingdom” cannot be translations of each other. However, they are related to each other by virtue of the fact that they may be derived
from a Vorlage having the noun דָּרָה "lordship."^130 The Greek text misread דָּרָה as דָּרָה דִּיפְנָה "exultation" (like the לָשׁוֹן הָדָע "joyful lips" in Psalm 63:6). One must postulate the abstract noun דָּרָה, unattested in Biblical Hebrew, which functioned as a synonym for דָּרָה דִּיפְנָה "kingship." The analogy to דָּרָה דִּיפְנָה is the use of דָּרָה דִּיפְנָה "lordship" in Modern Hebrew (which is not attested in Biblical Hebrew, although מִזְרוֹחַ appears frequently).

The Greek גִּיסָה and the Syriac ד could be reflected in the Vorlage by the ם prefixed to דָּרָה, but this ם is not to be read, following the Greek and Syriac texts, as the preposition "to" but read as the emphatic ב "indeed."^31 The Syriac ד "for" could reflect a Vorlage with a ב or ד. If so, the ב or ד would probably be an emphatic particle in synonymous parallelism with the emphatic ב, rather than the particle meaning "for."

Psalm Eleven

11:1

σαλπίσατε ἐν Σιὼν ἐν σάλπιγγι σημαίας

sound in Zion the signal trumpet

羕ァ(org) 串ァ 第ァ

blow in Zion on the known trumpet

sound in Zion the signal trumpet

If the Syriac יִדָּרָה יִd

If the Syriac יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִd, “known trumpet,” were יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִd, with the verb in the ‘aphel, meaning “to make known by trumpet,” the Syriac would approximate the Greek

---

^130 See BDB (931) where the plural participle is cited as a substantive meaning “rulers, potentates” and comes in parallel or in synonymous parallelism with דָּרָה דִּיפְנָה in Judges 5:3; Psalm 2:2, Proverbs 8:15, 31:4 and Habbakuk 1:10. Note also Ecclesiasticus 33:4 where דָּרָה דִּיפְנָה is in parallelism with יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִd (although the Greek hουμενοι λαου suggests יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִדָּרָה יִd “scribes of the people”).

136

**PSALM ELEVEN**

σάλπιγγι σήμασίως “signal trumpet.” But the `aphel participle is not easily mistaken for ρέ al passive participle. The clue for understanding the difference between the Greek and Syriac is provided by Numbers 10:9, נִצָּבָה בִּקְרָאתָו, “then you shall sound an alarm with the trumpets.” In the Vorlage the instrument translated “trumpet” could have been רָאוֹשׁ “ram’s horn” or פַּרְעָה “clarion” or לִזֵל “cornet,” none of which would have created problems. But it was not the instrument, itself, which was misunderstood, but the modifier of the instrument, רְאָה, usually meaning “an alarm, a war cry, a shout of joy (for a religious purpose).” This noun with the definite article, רְאָה (or scriptio defectiva רְאָה), was evidently misread by the Syriac translator as רְדַע, a hithpael perfect of the stem רָדָע. The confusion of ר and ה is well attested, as is the confusion of ר and ה.\(^1\)

\(^{132}\) See Delitzsch, 1920: 105–107, § 109\(\textsuperscript{a} \textsuperscript{b}\) and 111, §109\(\textsuperscript{a}\).

11:4 (G) 11:5 (S)

ορὴ ὑψηλὰ ἐταπεινώσασθαι εἰς ὀμαλίσμον αὐτῶς

*he flattened* high mountains into level ground for them

ἱλαρά ἔφυγεν ἀπὸ αὐτὸς

high mountains he humbled, and he made them low

*he flattened high mountains into lowlands for them*

The variant reading of ms 10hl is noteworthy in understanding the difference between the Greek and Syriac texts of this line. Whereas ms 16hl has ἔφυγεν “and he laid low, he strew flat,” ms 10hl has ἔφυγεν “and he made plain/smooth.” While this could be an inner-Syriac corruption, it could also reflect a different reading of the Vorlage. If the Greek ἐταπεινώσασθαι εἰς ὀμαλίσμον αὐτῶς came from a Vorlage reading לֹוָם לָהָם, it would appear that ms 10hl suffered a haplography of the לֹוָם of לֹוָם and the לֹוָם of לָהָם. On the other hand, both mss 16hl and 10hl evidently read
the הַלְּשָׁנָה of the Vorlage as a 3ms hiph'îl with a 3mpl object suffix, הַלְּשָׁנָה “and he made them low,” reflecting a confusion of ל and ל. The redundancy of the Syriac line is prosaic, not poetic, consequently, the Greek text appears to have retained the better reading and has been used in reconstructing the Vorlage.

11:5 (G), 11:6b (S)

οἱ δρυμοὶ ἐσκίάσαν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ παράδῳ αὐτῶν
the forest shaded them as they passed by

κυπάται δάσεις ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς
he shaded the cedars over them when they were passing by

He shaded the cedars over them when they were passing by

The Greek ms 629 has οἱ βουνοὶ “the hills” instead of οἱ δρυμοὶ “the forest,” and the Syriac has קקך “the cedars.” It is obvious that these variants are not literal translations of each other. The Greek βουνοὶ and δρυμοὶ have some graphic similarity, but the degree of similarity is hardly sufficient to be cause of the threefold difference. The differences probably stem from a Hebrew Vorlage which could have been interpreted in several different ways. The clue for understanding this poetic line and its variants is Ezekiel 31:3, which reads in part, מַעְרָבָתָא אַבְרָם בְּלֵבְךָノ יִשְֹעָל בְּלַעֲרָה מַעְרָבָתָא, “Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a forest–like shade” (ASV). The collocation of מַעְרָבָתָא “cedar” and מַעְרָבָתָא “forest–like shade” parallels the variant readings of βουνοὶ, δρυμοὶ, and קקך here in 11:5. Hebrew מַעְרָבָתָא can mean “a wooded height, a forest” (BDB, 361). The Greek δρυμοὶ focused the meaning of מַעְרָבָתָא on the “forest” element, whereas the Greek βουνοὶ focused the meaning on the element of “height.” The Syriac קקך “he shaded the cedars” is a free translation of מַעְרָבָתָא קקך “the woods shaded”

133 See Delitzsch, 1920: 115, § 119*.  
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which associated the forest–like shade with the legendary shady cedars (of Lebanon).\(^\text{134}\)

11:5b (G), 11:7 (S)

\[\begin{align*}
\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\varphi\varepsilon \xi\omicron\omega\lambda\nu \varepsilon \upsilon\omega\delta\tau\alpha\varepsilon\varsigma \alpha\nu\varphi\tau\varepsilon\iota\lambda\varepsilon\nu \alpha\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \delta\alpha\theta\sigma\varsigma

God made every fragrant tree to grow for them

\[\begin{align*}
\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\varphi\varepsilon \xi\omicron\omega\lambda\nu \varepsilon \upsilon\omega\delta\tau\alpha\varepsilon\varsigma \alpha\nu\varphi\tau\varepsilon\iota\lambda\varepsilon\nu \alpha\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \delta\alpha\theta\sigma\varsigma

and God caused every tree of sweet smell to breathe on them

\[\begin{align*}
\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\varphi\varepsilon \xi\omicron\omega\lambda\nu \varepsilon \upsilon\omega\delta\tau\alpha\varepsilon\varsigma \alpha\nu\varphi\tau\varepsilon\iota\lambda\varepsilon\nu \alpha\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \delta\alpha\theta\sigma\varsigma

and God caused every fragrant tree to give off scent for them

The Greek \(\alpha\nu\varphi\tau\varepsilon\iota\lambda\varepsilon\nu\) “to grow” and the Syriac \(\text{\`a}w\text{\`a}\) “to breathe, to give off scent” cannot be accurate translations of each other. The verb \(\alpha\nu\varphi\tau\varepsilon\iota\lambda\varepsilon\nu\) appears to be a translation of the hiph\(\text{\`a}l\) of the verb \(\pi\nu\nu\) “to rise, to go forth,” used generally for the rising of the sun, with the noun \(\pi\nu\nu\alpha\) being used for “sunrise” or “the place of the sunrise, the East.” But the noun \(\pi\nu\nu\) “one rising from the soil” (BDB, 28) is attested in Psalm 37:35 “I have seen a violent, wicked man spreading himself like a luxuriant tree in its native soil \((\pi\nu\nu \pi\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu)\)” (NAS). Since \(\alpha\nu\varphi\tau\varepsilon\iota\lambda\varepsilon\nu\) can be used for the coming forth of plants, as well as the “springing forth” of people, water, mountains, or hair, it was the appropriate word to translate \(\pi\nu\nu\) “and he caused to sprout forth.”

However, the Syriac translator or his Vorlage did not read \(\pi\nu\nu\) but \(\pi\nu\nu\) “and he caused [the cedars] to give off scent.” This reflects a confusion in the Vorlage of either the Syriac text tradition or the Greek text tradition of a \(\iota\) and a \(\iota\), a confusion which is attested in Ezekiel 47:17–19, where \(\pi\nu\nu\) appears three times instead of \(\pi\nu\nu\).

Given the fact that the poet spoke of the children of the diaspora traveling along shady roads to Jerusalem,

\(^{134}\) In addition to Ezekiel 31:3, note also Numbers 24:6, Psalm 37:35; 80:1; 92:12; and Isaiah 2:13.

\(^{135}\) See BHS for a summary of the evidence of the versions; and note Delitzsch (1920: 112, § 112') for another example of the confusion of \(\iota\) and \(\iota\) in Proverbs 8:29.
the Greek ἀνετειλεν is very difficult. It would be an appropriate verb were the poet depicting the redevelopments of the land of Israel/Judah once the diaspora Jews were resettled in the land. Consequently, the Syriac reflects a contextually more appropriate reading. Aside from the Greek ἀνετειλεν, there is no suggestion that the returnees would tarry along the way, waiting for trees to spring up or mature sufficiently to give off a scent. In the poet’s vision, as interpreted by the Syriac translator, the scent of cedar would be pleasant for the Zion bound travelers. Consequently, the reconstructed Vorlage has followed the Syriac text.136

Psalm Twelve

12:2a

ἐν ποικιλίᾳ στροφῆς οἱ λόγοι τῆς γλώσσης

ἀνδρὸς ποιητοῦ (Greek)

ἐν ποίησει διαστροφῆς οἱ λόγοι τῆς γλώσσης

ἀνδρὸς ποιητοῦ (Greek)

the words of the wicked man’s tongue

(are) twisted so many ways

for the tongue of the transgressor is

in the turning of words

the tongue of a wicked man is for ingenious twisting of words

Trafton (1985: 115) acknowledged the difficulty of this poetic line in Greek and Syriac. In Greek, mss 149, 260, 471, and 606 (= Greekb in this section) read ἐν ποίησε διαστροφῆς “in the doing of perversity” for ἐν ποικιλίᾳ στροφῆς “in diversity of turning”

136 The paronomasias in the Syriac (ܡܫܝܥ . . . ܟܢܘܝܐ), which Trafton (1985: 112–113) dealt with, appears to be secondary. It is not original to the Hebrew if the proposed reconstruction proves to be correct.
See Hatch and Redpath, 1954: 1168, for poikiliva and poivhsi in mss 253 and 336 (= Greek α in this section); and the corresponding phrase in Syriac is ḫadj; commenting, “the Sy translator correctly understood the first two words as being in a construct relationship, while the Gk translator understood such a relationship for the last two words.” But this Vorlage does not account for the ΠΟΙΧΙΛΑ or the ΠΟΙΣΙΣ of the Greek texts.

This writer proposes a different Vorlage, reading ḫadj “ingenious” “for ingenious twisting of words.” The ḫadj could be either ḫadj “turning” (which equals στροφής) or ḫadj “perversity” (which equals διαστροφής and ḫadj). In the LXX the stem ḫadj is translated by poikiliva (which also translated ḫadj “work, deed”) and by poivhsi (which also translated ḫadj “work, deed”): Mss 149, 260, 471, and 606 rendered ḫadj by poivhsi; and mss 253 and 236 translated it by poikiliva. However, all the Greek readings missed the most likely identification of ḫadj here. It was the noun ḫadj “ingenious.” If the Greek translators can be faulted for missing the nuance, the Syriac translator missed the word entirely; that is to say, a corresponding word for ḫadj is lacking in the Syriac.

Moreover, when poikiliva is translated as “manifoldly twisted” (Gray 1913: 644) or “diversity” (Trafton 1985: 134) or “twisted” (Wright 1985: 662) the translation misses an important nuance of poikiliva cited by Liddell and Scott (1940: 1429): “versatility, subtly, mostly in a bad sense.” Thus, poikiliva is a close match for ḫadj “ingenious.”

12:2b

ὡσπερ ἐν λαῷ πῦρ ἀνάπτον
καλλονὴν αὐτοῦ (Greek*)

137 See Hatch and Redpath, 1954: 1168, for poikiliva and poivhsi.
THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON

138

Kittel (1900: 141) argued for the ωσπερ ἐν ἀλῳ πῦρ ἀνάπτον καλάμην αὐτοῦ (Greeka) (they are) as a fire among a people which scorches its beauty (Greeka) as on a threshing floor a fire burning up its stubble (Greekb)

for he pretends {to be} like one who acts properly, but he kindles fire among the people

but he appears like one who speaks conciliation, but he kindles a fire among the people according to his pleasure

Greek mss 149, 260, and 471 (= Greekb in this section) read differently from mss 253 and 336 (= Greeka in this section), having ωσπερ ἐν ἀλῳ πῦρ ἀνάπτον καλάμην αὐτοῦ “as on a threshing floor a fire burning up its stubble.” Greeka and Greekb are not translations of each other and the Syriac cannot be a translation of either since it lacks a corresponding word for καλλονήν αὐτοῦ “its beauty” or καλάμην αὐτοῦ “his stubble.” It is possible to interpret λαῷ and ἀλῳ, as well as καλλονήν and καλάμην, as inner–Greek corruptions, and Trafton (1985: 116–117) has well summarized the debate as to the original Greek reading.138

But it is equally possible that the difficulties are due to the Hebrew Vorlage. A solution to the problems in the line lies in recognizing the confusion of τ and τ, of ᾿ and ᾿, and of η and η

---

138 Kittel (1900: 141) argued for the ωσπερ ἐν ἀλῳ πῦρ ἀνάπτον καλάμην αὐτοῦ of manuscripts 149, 260 and 471 (= Greekb) as original while Swete (1894: 15), Viteau (1911: 314–317) and von Gebhardt (1895: 178–180) opted for the ωσπερ ἐν λαῷ πῦρ ἀνάπτον καλλονήν αὐτοῦ of the other manuscripts. Gray’s (1913: 644) comment that “It is very questionable whether any of the readings or conjectures preserve or recover the sense of the original” provides an apt evaluation of the conjectures.
The Vorlage of Greek\textsuperscript{b} must have had מַרְחִיק “threshing floor,” which was a misreading of מִרְחִים “people” (equal to ἐν λαῷ of Greek\textsuperscript{a} and the Syriac מִרְחִים). The Vorlage also had מַרְחִיק “his beauty,” which was misread by Greek\textsuperscript{b} as מֵרְחִים “his stubble, straw” (reflecting the confusion of מ and מ). The ὠς προς “as for” of both Greek\textsuperscript{a} and Greek\textsuperscript{b} (which could equal מ or מ) may well be all that survived of the missing introductory phrase (to be discussed next), suggesting that the Greek text suffers from an omission rather than the Syriac text having an addition.

Although Syriac lacks a corresponding element for the מַרְחִיק it does have a phrase not found in the Greek, namely, מַרְחִיק מִרְחִים “for he pretends {to be} like one who acts properly.” (Trafton cited 1985:114–116 but did not discuss this phrase.) The Vorlage of the extra line was probably מַרְחִיק מִרְחִים “for he appears as one speaking conciliation.” The Syriac stem מַרְחִיק “to do” was used for filling offices, for consecrating kings and bishops, and for the passing of time (J. Payne Smith, 395). This semantic range matches well the semantic range of Hebrew root מַרְחִיחַ “to fill,” which was also used for consecrating priests, for the passing of time, and for keeping a promise.

However, if the Syriac Vorlage had מַרְחִיק מִרְחִים “for he appears as one speaking,” it may be that מַרְחִיחַ מִרְחִים “as one speaking conciliation” was a misreading of מַרְחִיחַ מִרְחִים “as one who speaks goodly (words).” This phrase would be the equivalent of מַרְחִיק מִרְחִים “the one who gives goodly words” (Genesis 49:21). Since the p'el of מַרְחִיחַ means “to make pleasing, to conciliate, to harmonize” (Jastrow, 1619), מַרְחִיחַ מִרְחִים would contrast significantly with the inflammatory speech referred to in the next line.

The Vorlage follows the Syriac for this poetic line and retains the additional phrase of the Syriac text even though none of the

\footnote{See Delitzsch 1920: 112 § 110\textsuperscript{e}, 112 § 109\textsuperscript{e}, and 119 § 131, respectively.}
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Greek manuscripts or the Syriac has completely represented the probable Vorlage.

12:3

his visit fills homes with a false tongue

for his sojourning is that he might fill houses with lying talk

his quarreling (visit) fills homes with lying words

The Syriac "his sojourning" could be the equivalent of Hebrew יֵרְע גִּבֹּל "to reside (as an alien)," since יֵרְע can mean "to colonize" (J. Payne Smith 1903: 418). The Greek παροικία also may include the idea of residing as an alien or stranger (Liddell and Scott 1940: 1342). However, the poet may well have intended יֵרְע stem II, meaning "to stir up strife" (BDB, 158), or he may have intended a double entendre, with יֵרְע I "to sojourn" and יֵרְע II "to quarrel." 40 Far from being conciliatory, the "lawless one" was inflammatory.

The choice between יֵרְע גִּבֹּל "lying tongues" (attested in Psalm 109:2, Proverbs 6:17, 12:19, 21:6, and 26:28) or "lying words" (found in Exodus 5:9, Isaiah 32:7, 59:13; Jeremiah 29:23, and elsewhere) is difficult to decide. There is no Semitic root which could account for a confusion of יַלְשָׁנָה "tongue" with יַלְשָׁנָה or יַלְשָׁנָה or יַלְשָׁנָה, all of which mean "word." Trafton makes the most convincing case for a Vorlage (having paronomasia) such as יַלְשָׁנָה הַיָּלָה בַּמַּלְכָּה "filling house with words." This suggestion has been adopted in the above Vorlage, differing only in favor of the plural יַלְשָׁנָה שְׁכֵרִים "with lying words."

40 Note Kittel’s suggestion (1900: 141) for a Vorlage with יֵרְע גִּבֹּל (from stem III) "terror" instead of יֵרְע (from stem II) "to sojourn."
12:3b

cka devnd ra evfrsiny flgizovsh paranmous
cuts down trees of joy, inflaming criminals

he cut down the trees of his delight
in the burning of transgression

he gleefully cut down trees in violation of Torah

The difficulty of this poetic line is evidenced by the fact that von Gebhardt (1895: 80–81), Frankenberg (1896: 78), and Gray (1913: 644) left the line untranslated or partially untranslated. Trafton (1985: 118–119) summarized the conjectures over the past century, none of which—including Geiger’s (1871: 14) “putting the evil doer into the fire” and Kittel’s (1900: 141–142) “from igniting malice”—have been convincing.

The clue to the line is in the Syriac RB`d which Trafton translated as “which is transgressing” or “of the transgressor.” He associated RB`d with the preceding ADOIb “in the conflagration” and conjectured it meant “in the heat of transgression,” even though ADOIb is in the emphatic state rather than the construct state. Nevertheless, RB`d and ADOIb need to be addressed together since they appear to be a doublet from a Vorlage which originally had the verb rb “to transgress.” It is obvious that DOI “to burn, to set on fire” is the equivalent of rb “to burn.” But far less obvious was the metathetic shift which changed the original rb “to transgress” into the verb rb “to burn.” Even though in English we speak of “inflammatory speech,” it seems doubtful that rb was originally in the Vorlage. It was a variant reading which survived as a doublet in the Vorlage and in the Greek and Syriac traditions. Consequently, both flgizovsh and DOI are correct translations of rb, the doublet of rb.

It seems most likely that the Vorlage initially dealt simply with the cutting down of trees, without any subsequent reference to burning of them or anything else. The idea of burning inserted
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itself in the tradition through the misreading of הבְּלֵד as הבּ. The issue addressed in the poetic line was the prohibition in Deuteronomy 20:19–20, “when you besiege a city for a long time, making war against it in order to take it, you shall not destroy its trees by wielding an axe against them; for you may eat of them, but you shall not cut them down.”

Contrary to the Torah, the “lawless one” mention in 12:1 was cutting down trees “to his heart’s content” (ἐνθροσύνης and παρανόμως), thus transgressing the law (παρανόμους and מִתְּכַנֵּס). The Greek παρανόμους and Syriac מִתְּכַנֵּס are the equivalent of the Hebrew הבְּלֵד which appears in Isaiah 24:5 (“for they have transgressed the laws [הָלַיְתוֹן], violated the statutes, broken the everlasting covenant”) and Daniel 9:11 (“all Israel has transgressed thy law [רֹאשׁ, and turned aside, refusing to obey thy voice”).

The phrase מַעְרָצֵה in the reconstructed Vorlage consists of a qal perfect (or participle), followed by a plural direct object, and an adverb. Through a haplography of a consecutive מַעְרָצֵה, the Syriac mistakenly read the two nouns as the construct chain מַעְרָצֵה מַעְרָצֵה מַעְרָצֵה מַעְרָצֵה “the trees of his delight” and supplied a possessive suffix.

12:3c (G), 12:4a (S)

συγχάισαι οἶκους παρανόμους
ἐν πολέμῳ χείλεσιν ψιθύρως
by slander he incites [criminal]
homes to fighting
he destroyed the houses of transgressors
with war and with whispering lips
he destroyed the houses of the rebels by war and by rumor

141 παρανόμους is found in mss 149, 260, 471, and 606.
Since συγχέαι can mean “to demolish” (Liddell and Scott 1940: 1668), συγχέαι οίκους παρανόμους ἐν πολέμῳ “demolish criminal houses in war” and ήθος άλλων ἐν πολέμῳ “he destroyed the houses of those transgressing the law with war” could be translations of each other. Similarly, the Greek χείλεσιν ψιθύρους “whispering lips” (= Wright’s translating “by slander”) and φυλακὴν οἴκου “and (with) whispering lips” could be translations of each other. The difficulty with this line is not the wording per se but with the idea expressed that, seemingly, the “lawless one” was destroying not the righteous but other lawless ones. Ryle and James (1891: 105) attempted to defuse the problem as follows:

. . . if it [the clause συγχέαι ψιθύρους] is to be joined to v. 3, the sense may very well be that the slanderer will not scruple to set those of his own party by the ears (ἐν πολέμῳ), and that there is no real ‘honour among thieves.’

However, παρανόμους “criminal” and ήθος άλλων “of transgressors against the law” in this context are probably not translations of a Vorlage with רָשָׁע “the wicked” but one with לְשׁוֹנ רָשָׁע “the rebellious ones” (as used in I Kings 12:19, “so Israel has been in rebellion (לְשׁוֹנ רָשָׁע) against the house of David to this day.” The “lawless one” of 12:1 (καὶ ήθος or παρανόμου) and of 12:2 (ἄνδρος ποιητοῦ or Ἰακὼβ [ms 10hl] or ήθος [ms 16hl]) was not out to destroy his own kind, but those who rebelled against him and his kind. The reconstructed Vorlage attempts to remove the ambiguity in the Greek and Syriac texts by introducing לְשׁוֹנ רָשָׁע rather than לְשׁוֹנ רָשָׁע.

Psalm Thirteen

13:1

δεξιὰ κυρίου ἐσκέπασέν με
δεξιὰ κυρίου ἐφείσατο ἤμων
the right hand of the Lord covered me,
the right hand of the Lord spared me.
The right hand of the Lord covered us, the right hand of the Lord spared us.

The difference between the Greek and Syriac is a minor one of whether the pronomial element is singular or plural. The Greek ἐσκέπασέν με “covered me” does not match the Syriac bable “covered us.” The ἐφείσατο ἡμᾶς “spared us” (contra Wright [1985: 662] “spared me”) is in agreement with the Syriac abelle “spared us.” Trafton (1985: 123) has correctly observed that the Syriac is to be preferred and “Gk could reflect a misreading of something like כַּלָּה for כָּלַה .” This would be another example of the widespread confusion of * and . The same error occurs in 12:2 where the Syriac ms 16hl reads עָשָׁה “he saved me” where ms 10hl has the contextually more appropriate עָשָׁה , which equals the Greek ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς “he saved us.”

13:2

ἀπὸ βουμαμάς διαπορευούμενος
from the sword that passes through

מִמְּחַלָּה מַחְלַה
from the moving spear

According to Trafton (1985: 122), the Syriac ṣדָּה to move” would be an unlikely translation of the Greek διαπορεύω “to pass through.” But Hatch and Redpath (1954: 308) cited fourteen passages where διαπορεύω is used to translate הָלַל “to walk.”

Consequently, the Vorlage of the Greek and Syriac could have been אָמַר. Of interest on the wide semantic range of אָמַר “missile, weapon,” which has the meaning “sword” in Job 36:12, “hand–weapon” in II Chronicles 23:10, and “spear” in II Samuel 18:13—even though the collocation of אָמַר “pestilence” and אָמַר “famine” and אָמַר “sword” thirteen times in Jeremiah, three times in Ezekiel and once in Revelation could lead one to assume that אָמַר was in the Vorlage. However, since Syriac has a cognate of אָמַר, אֶמַר “sword, blade, dagger,” one would expect this cognate to have been used in Syriac if אָמַר was in the Vorlage. Since אֶמַר is not in the Syriac text, it is more like that more generic אָמַר was in the Vorlage, permitting the Greek translator to use אָמַר and the Syriac translator to use אָמַר. For this reason the reconstructed Vorlage uses אָמַר “the weapon” rather than אָמַר “the sword.”

13:2b

ἀπὸ λιμῶν καὶ θανάτων ἁμαρτωλῶν
and from famine and the sinner’s death

καὶ αἵματα ῥεῖν· ῥέοντες καὶ ῥεῖται
and from famine and the death (befitting) sinners

In light of the suffering predicted of IV Ezra 15:5, “I will bring evils upon the world, the sword and famine and death and destruction” and 15:49, “I will send evils upon you, widowhood, poverty, famine, sword, and pestilence,” the poet could have used any number of deadly agents in addition to the אָמַר, “pestilence,” אָמַר “famine,” and אָמַר “sword” mentioned in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The addition of “(befitting)” in the translation of the
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*Vorlage* is suggested by III Maccabees 3:25, “you are to send to us those who live among you, together with their wives and children, with insulting and harsh treatment, and bound securely with iron fetters, to suffer the sure and shameful death that befits (πρεπούση) enemies.” What was explicitly stated by the author of III Maccabees 3:25, was only implicitly stated by the poet in the Psalms of Solomon 13:2b, who could have been explicit had he used παρά “seemly” (one of the two stems translated by πρεπεῖν in the LXX [(Hatch and Redpath 1940: 1201)].

13:3a

θηρία ἐπεδράμοσαν αὐτοῖς πονηρά

wild animals [they] attacked them viciously

he brought evil beasts quickly upon them

הוא יручא ירעהו עליהו

he [the Lord] brought wild animals quickly upon them

The difference in this line between the Greek and Syriac is the subject of the verb. The Greek has the plural ἐπεδράμοσαν “they rushed upon, attacked,” making the wild animals the subject of the verb; but the Syriac singular יручא (an *aphel*) “he brought quickly,” requires יручא “the Lord,” mentioned as the *casus pendens* in 13:1–2 (“right hand of the Lord . . . the arm of the Lord”), to be subject.

The Greek πονηρά, which appears as the adverb “viciously” in Wright’s translation, in the *Vorlage* was probably intended to be the appositional modifier of the animals. The term for wild animals in Hebrew is יручא ירעהו, literally, “animals, bad ones.” The “wild” of the “wild animals” in Wright’s translation is required to convey the meaning of יручא “beasts.” The *hiphil* used in the Semitic idiom for a wild animal (ירע ירעה) was misunderstood as an adverb and translated πονηρά. The *hiphil* of Hebrew ירעה and the *aphel* of Syriac يручא carry with them the idea of moving or bringing (something) with haste. The adverb “quickly” in the English translations of the Syriac and the *Vorlage* are based upon the form
of the verb, not upon a separate word. The Vorlage follows the Syriac text here.

13:3b
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὑφλαῖσιν ὑθλων ὁστὰ αὐτῶν
and crushed their bones with their molars
κρατυκαὶ σκότα αὐτῶν
and were cutting off their bones with millstones
καὶ ἔκλεκτον αὐτῶν
and crushed their bones with their jawbones

The Greek ὑθλων “crushed” and the Syriac מועלה “cutting off” cannot be translations of each other, nor can ὁστα “tooth, molar” be a translation of מועלה “millstone,” or vice versa. But the differences can be accounted for by a Vorlage having the verb גרה “to crush,” which appears in the Greek text tradition. But the Syriac translator or the source of his Vorlage misread גרה as קרה “to cut off.” The confusion of ק and ק is attested elsewhere in Judges 7:21, where MT חנה הערבל קיה and all the army ran” is to be read חנה הערבל קיה “and all the army awoke with a start” (Boling, 1975: 147).

The Greek מועלה can mean “molars” and “millstones,” but the Syriac מועלה can mean only “millstone.” Kuhn (1937: 27–28) assumed that the Syriac translator did not know the rare Hebrew word מועלה “molars” and based his translation at this point on the מועלה of the Greek text. Begrich (1939: 134–135) faulted Kuhn for not recognizing that all of the Syriac was a translation of the Greek. Trafton (1985: 125) rightly faulted Kuhn and Begrich, stating, “. . . they also imply a certain lack of intelligence on his [the Syriac translator’s] part to miss such an obvious synonymous parallelism [of ‘teeth’ in the previous line].” However, the synonymous parallelism was not one of “teeth” and “molars” but of “teeth” and “jaw-bone(s).” The Vorlage must have had מועלה (dual) “jawbones” (BDB, 534); but this was misread by the Syriac translator as מועלה (dual) “millstones” (Jastrow, 1466). The confusion of ג and ק is attested elsewhere, most notably in Genesis
15:18, where MT reads דָּיִם מִצְרַיִם “the river of Egypt” instead of מַעֲרֵץ מִצְרַיִם “the wadi of Egypt” (i.e., the modern Wādī el-‘Arish). The paronomasia of the bones . . . jawbones in the English translation of the Vorlage is no more conspicuous than the שָׂלָל שֵׁל דָּיִם . . . in the Vorlage. This poetic line provides a good example of the Syriac translator’s literal style. Even though “cutting (§ 50) bones with a millstone” would be a difficult feat, the translator called it as he saw it. In his Vorlage he saw מִצְרַיִם, not מַעֲרֵץ מִצְרַיִם.

13:7–8
καὶ ἡ καταστροφὴ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν (8) ἐν περιστολῇ . . . as the destruction of sinners. (8) In secret . . .

like the overthrow of the lawless (7) who are in knowledge

like the overthrow of the wicked with their knowledge

The difficulty in understanding the parallelism in 13:7–8 is demonstrated by Gray’s (1913: 645) parenthetical gloss “(for sins done)” on the Greek τῶν δικαίων ἐν ἄγνοιᾳ, which was followed by Wright (1985: 663) who glossed “(for things done).” The poet is not permitted by the translators to make the claim, literally in Syriac, that “the chastening of those who are unknowingly righteous is dissimilar to the overthrow of knowledgeable sinners.”

The Greek ἐν περιστολῇ “in secret” and the Syriac § 50 “with knowledge” cannot be translations of each other. Contextually, one would expect an antithetical parallel to the ἐν ἄγνοιᾳ / § 50 “ignorance,” matching the antithetical parallel τῶν δικαίων / § 50 “the righteous” in the previous stich. Since the Syriac text (13:6) has the balanced antithetical parallelisms (a) “righteous” and “lawless” and (b) “in ignorance” and “in knowledge,” it is the preferred text. The differences between the Greek and Syriac translations are probably derived in

—

part from a Vorlage having the root בָּשַׁל “to think, to plan, to do (something) with intention” (BDB 363). If so, the Greek περιστολή “wrapping” reflects a misreading of בָּשַׁל as בָּשָׁל “to bind, to bind on, to bind up” (BDB, 289). Consequently, περιστολή—which Wright translated as “in secret”#144—actually stands in lieu of a word which should be translated “intentional.” Kuhn’s proposal (1937: 30) that περιστολή goes back to a misreading of בָּשַׁל “intentional” as בָּשָׁל “bandage” is also noteworthy. Either way, περιστολή reflects a misreading of a Hebrew original having either בָּשַׁל or בָּשָׁל—either of which could be translated into Syriac by כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים “with knowledge, knowingly.”

13:12 (G), 13:11 (S)

καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτὸν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ
and his mercy is upon#145 those who fear him

he will have compassion on all who fear him

and his compassion is on all those who hold him in awe

The synonymous parallelism of ὀσιοῦς and ἔλεος matches the parallelism of בָּשַׁל and כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים. However, the Greek and Syriac differ in several respects: (1) with respect to “mercy,” the Greek

#144 Ryle and James (1891: 109) noted, “The word occurs nowhere in the LXX or the N.T. and no other instance of its use in Hellenistic Greek is known to us. In classical Greek its one meaning seems to be the decking out of a corpse for burial.” If Ryle and James are correct, περιστολή “wrapping, decking out” would literally indicate a public, rather than a secretive, action.

#145 Wright’s note d. on 13:12 that the Syriac has “he will treasure” is problematic since J. Payne Smith (1903: 538) gives no such meaning for כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים.

#146 In light of the example of כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים cited by J. Payne Smith (1903: 538), “I will not pity (כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים) or have compassion (כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים),” there is no basis for Kuhn’s suggestion (1937:33) for a Vorlage with כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים “to shelter” (which was corrupted in the Greek tradition to כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים “to delight in”) in order to account for the כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים of the Syriac. כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים is an excellent parallel for כְּדַרְשׁוּמִים.
has a noun and the Syriac has a verb in the imperfect, and the noun / verb variation may be due simply to a participle in the Vorlage which was translated correctly but differently; (2) the Greek reads ἔλεος αὐτοῦ “his mercy,” which equals יְדֵי צְדָקָה but the Syriac has הַשְּׁדִי “he will have compassion,” which equals יְדֵי צְדָקָה; and (3) Syriac has ἐστὶν מַלְוָה “all of those” for which there is no corresponding element in Greek.

In Mss 253, 655, and 659, the αὐτῶν of φοβουμένους αὐτῶν is lacking, and this difference could be due to a Vorlage which had the suffixed participle ἄναρχος “ones fearing him,” which was misread in the tradition of the S stemma as ἄναρχος / ἄναρχος “ones fearing.” Is so, this misreading would be another example of the confusion of ἦ and ἐ (Delitzsch, 1920: 120, § 132). The מַלְוָה (= מַלְוָה) was probably a doublet from a misreading of מֵלֶל as מְלֶל, or the original מֵלֶל מַלְוָה of the Vorlage possibly became by way of haplography simply מֵלֶל in the Greek text tradition. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text tradition in having the noun מַלְוָה instead of the verb יְדֵי צְדָקָה and having simply מֵלֶל instead of מֵלֶל מַלְוָה.

Psalm Fourteen

14:1
toῖς πορευομένοις ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ

προσταγμάτων αὐτοῦ
To those who live in the righteousness of his commandments.

לָבִיא הָעָם מַעָּשָׂה

to those who walk in righteousness in his commandment

לָבִיא הָעָם בְּצַרְרָךְ הָוָה

to those who walk in righteousness
(according to) his statutes

The only real difference between the Greek προσταγμάτων αὐτοῦ and the Syriac, מַעָּשָׂה is that the Greek has a genitive and

---

147 See Wright, 1994: 16.
the Syriac has a preposition. Kuhn (1937: 34–35), followed by Trafton (1985: 131–132), reconstructed for this phrase and the next the following Vorlage for the Greek: וַיִּקְרָא הַתּוֹרָה for the Syriac: נַחֲלָלֵס הַתּוֹרָה, and the almost identical Vorlage for the Syriac: נַחֲלָלֵס הַתּוֹרָה, differing only on the location of the second prepositional ב.

It is most likely that the early translators interpreted the text by what modern grammarians call “the double–duty preposition,” where a preposition in one stich controlled a noun in the next or previous stich. If the ב of בֶּןֶרֶךְ was read as a double duty preposition, the translations could have differed with reference to the second noun which the ב controlled. It appears that the Syriac read a double–duty ב and applied it to the next word, making it appositional and precluding כְּדַברִים from being read as a construct noun. But the Greek translator, seemingly, applied the double–duty ב to the next stich. The parenthetical “(according to)” in the reconstructed Vorlage is the equivalent of the double–duty ב of בֶּןֶרֶך.

14:2b

ἐν νόμῳ ὤ ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν εἰς ζωὴν ἡμῶν

in the law which he has commanded for our life.

he gave us the law for life

he commanded the Torah for us to live by

As noted in the paragraph above, the Greek ἐν has no corresponding preposition in the Syriac. The translations also differ with respect to the whether the word for “life” had a modifier. Greek has εἰς ζωὴν ἡμῶν “for our life” but Syriac has simply לחיים “for life.”


149 Given the fact that ב was used as direct object indicator with only a very limited number of verbs (see BDB, 90, section IV), Trafton’s (1985: 132 ) interpretation that the Syriac translator correctly read ב as a direct object sign with כְּדַברִים must be accepted with caution.
The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text, using ἐν μετοχῇ ἀμαρτίας, which was translated as the infinitive “for us to live by” (following Franz Delitzsch [n.d., ad loc.] and Stein [1969: 454]), even though ἐν μετοχῇ could also be read as the preposition attached to the suffixed abstract noun “for our living” (as in II Samuel 20:3).\footnote{150}

\begin{verbatim}
14:6b (G), 14:4b (S)
oi ηγάπησαν ἡμέραν ἐν μετοχῇ ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν who love (to spend) the day in sharing their sin

κοινωνίαν οἵτινες οἱ ἐν χάριτι αὐτῶν those who love the day in the approval of sin

who daily love the fellowship of their (fellow) sinners
\end{verbatim}

The Syriac "in the approval of sin" and the Greek ἐν μετοχῇ ἀμαρτίας “in sharing sin” cannot be accurate translations of each other. The difference between them can readily be accounted for by assuming a Vorlage with ἐν συνεργίᾳ “in fellowship with” (= ἐν μετοχῇ), which—due to a metathesis of η and б—became “in choosing” (= ἐν μεταξύ). A similar confusion of η and б is attested in I Samuel 20:30, where the MT reads ἡγιάσατε ἰδίαν ἰδιότητα “I know that you have chosen the son of Jesse,” but the LXX reads γὰρ οἴδα ἵνα μέτοχος εἰσίν τῷ υἱῷ Ἰεσσαί “for I know that you are an accomplice of the son of Jesse.” Another example is in Ecclesiastes 9:4, “but he who is joined with all the living has hope,” where the MT has a Qere’/Ketib variant reading ἐν συνεργίᾳ, “is joined” for ἐν μετοχῇ “is chosen.”

The phrase ἐν συνεργίᾳ in the Vorlage assumes that... ἐν μετοχῇ б (.= ἡμέραν ἐν) was a misreading of an original ... ἐν μετοχῇ “daily,” being another example of the confusion of б and б.\footnote{151} The noun in the Vorlage that was translated by ἀμαρτίας and by κοινωνίαν was probably the plural of ἁμαρτία “sinner” rather than ἁμαρτήματα or...
“sin.” The αὐτῶν properly reflects a διή 3mpl suffix, although there is no corresponding suffix in the Syriac.

14:7 (G), 4:4c (S)
ἐν μικρότητι σαπρίας ἢ ἐπιθυμία αὐτῶν
their enjoyment is brief and decaying
cαμπάς τις καθάπας
for their desire is in the brevity of evil
καὶ οὕτως μείναις ῥαθήσεται
for their enjoyment is worthless and offensive

The Greek σαπρίας “decaying” and the Syriac ܟܕܐܒܐ “evil” are not translations of each other. Kuhn (1937: 37–38) proposed a Vorlage with הָרֹמָח “to decay, to putrefy” which the Greek correctly translated as σαπρίας, but was misread by the Syriac translator as הָרֹםח “evil, bad” and translated accordingly as ܟܕܐܒܐ “bad, evil”. However, Delitzsch (1920) did not cite a single example of the confusion of ה and ו in the entire Biblical text. Thus, while a הָרֹמָח / וָרֹמָח error is possible, it seems unlikely.

However, a Vorlage with הֶרֶם could account for the differences. The root הָרֶמ has several meanings, including (1) “to decay,” which would have been the basis for the Greek text’s having σαπρίας “decaying”; (2) “to offend, to sin,” which would have been the basis for the Syriac text’s having ܟܕܐܒܐ “bad, evil”; (3) “to go free, to exceed, to be excessive”; and (4) “to intercept, to lacerate” (BDB, 710; Jastrow, 1024). The cognate of הָרֶמ, אֵרֶמ, is attested in Syriac, but the Syriac translator might have chosen another stem since אֵרֶמ also has a wide variety of meanings (including “to hurt, to injure,” or “to defile [a maiden]” or “to signify, to indicate”) which could lead to an uncertain reading. The Syriac translator’s use of ܟܕܐܒܐ “evil” would have removed the ambiguity of the Hebrew הָרֶמ, and at the same time a Vorlage with הָרֶמ would account for the Greek σαπρίας “decaying.”

Wright (1985: 664) omitted the ἐν and added a καί, both of which are necessary to give meaning to a a text which means literally, “their desire in brevity of decay.” The reconstructed Vorlage shifted the ἐν (= ו) to לָנו “for” and also added a conjunction. The
translation “worthless” reflects a reading of קְלָלָה in this context as having a qualitative nuance rather than being quantitative.

Psalm Fifteen

15:1

εἰς βοήθειαν ἡλπίσα τοῦ θεοῦ Ιακωβ

I expected the help of Jacob’s God

καὶ ἐκάλημεν θεῷ Ἰακώβος ἰδίαι

and I called to the God of Jacob for my aid


and I called for (my) salvation/strength to the God of Jacob

Both the Greek and the Syriac are contextually appropriate but they cannot be translations of each other. The semantic range of the Greek ἡλπίσα “I expected, I hoped” and the Syriac ḫ .= t “I called” do not overlap. Trafton (1985: 137–138) cited Kuhn’s (1937: 15, 39) suggestion for a Hebrew Vorlage with קָרֵא that “I hoped” (which the Greek accurately translated with ἡλπίσα and the Syriac misread as קָרֵא “I called”) as evidence for the improbability of Begrich’s (1939: 138) argument that the Syriac was in this instance a mistranslation of the Greek. Trafton also noted

On the other hand, Kuhn’s argument can be reversed: Hb had קָרֵא, which was rendered correctly by the Sy translator but was misread by the Gk translator as קָרֵא [as in the proposed Vorlage]. In either case, of course, Sy would be explained on the basis of a Hb Vorlage.

The second difference between the Greek and the Syriac, the lack of a possessive pronoun in the Greek text matching the Syriac’s “my aid,” could be explained by a Vorlage with either קִלְיָהוּ for salvation or קִלְיָהוּ “for strength.” If the Vorlage were קִלְיָהוּ, the

---

152 The נ of the stem נֶרֶא has been elided. For instances of this well attested feature of final נ verbs see Delitzsch (1920: 21–22 § 14 “and 36–37 § 31*”), McDaniel (1983: 124, 222 n. 238) and (GKC § 68a).
Syriac possessive suffix on «חָיוֹן» was an accurate reflection of the Hebrew. The Greek translator apparently misread the יָני as a י. Consequently, the Greek text has no corresponding element for the possessive suffix. The Syriac text, with its equivalent of the waw–consecutive, more accurately reflects the proposed Vorlage here.

15:2 (G), 15:3 (S)

πίς γὰρ ἵσχύει ὁ θεός εἰ μὴ ἐξομολογήσασθαι σοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ
for who, O God, is strong
except he who confesses you in truth

ἐξεισώμεθα σὺς θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ σεβάζομαι ἔχων σοι ἀλήθειαν
for who, being strong, will praise you in truth
except he who praises you in truth

Two elements in the Greek text, ὁ θεός and εἰ μὴ, have no equivalents in the Syriac text. In light of the use of double-duty vocatives in classical Hebrew (discussed by Dahood and Penar [1970: 439–441], who listed thirteen examples in the MT), it is most likely that the Greek translator made explicit what was implicit in Hebrew and Syriac, although, given the Syriac word, order one cannot be absolutely sure on this issue. The absence of a Syriac equivalent of the εἰ μὴ “except” (= כְּפָדֵךְ) is probably due to a haplography of כְּפָדֵךְ כְּפָדֵךְ where the כְּפָדֵךְ dropped out of the text.

153 As Trafton (1985: 137) noted, in 15:2 and 15:12, the Greek does not reflect the Hebrew waw–consecutive.

154 In 15:2b, the Greek τί δυνατός ἄνθρωπος “what a power (is) a man” and the Syriac «וֹסֶפֶת וּסָפְרָב» “and what is the might of man” may reflect a Vorlage having the bound nouns יָנוּל וּבִין (as in 1 Chronicles 26:8, יָנוּל וּבִין “qualified man”). If so, the Greek translator read the two words as a noun clause, while the Syriac translator recognized the construct state but reversed the word order.
because it was confused with the ק of קִלֵּי. Trafton’s (1985: 138) proposal for homoioteleuton, in which the phrase כל לארשי קלאייהי “O God, except he will praise” ended up being read as קלאייהי, is attractive, although one cannot be certain that there was a corruption since the Syriac translator may have recognized the double-duty vocative. The reconstructed Vorlage draws from the Syriac and the Greek.

15:3b (G), 15:5b (S)

ἐν ὀργάνῳ ἡμοιομένῳ γλώσσῃ
with the tuned instrument of the tongue

κλαίει

with an instrument which is established by the tongue

בַּכַל עַל נְנוֹן לֵיה

with a tuned instrument for the tongue

The Greek ἡμοιομένῳ “tuned” (Liddell and Scott, 243) and the Syriac בַּכַל “which is established” cannot be translations of each other, but both can be good translations of a Vorlage which had the verb יָכַל or יָכַל “to establish.” The Syriac translator read the verb as יָכַל, a polal form of יָכַל “to establish” and translated it appropriately by the בַּכַל “to establish” (J. Payne Smith, 1903: 618). But the Greek translator recognized it as יָכַל, a piel of the same stem, and gave it the meaning “to tune,” a meaning which is still used in Modern Hebrew. However, the Greek translator, while having the contextually more appropriate ἡμοιομένῳ, missed the double-duty preposition which was prefixed to יָכַל. The Syriac translator appropriately rendered the single preposition with two prepositions: “with an instrument . . . by the tongue.”

15:3b (G), 15:5b (S)

ἀπαρχὴν χειλέων
the first fruits of the lips

---

155 On the confusion of ק and ק see Delitzsch, 1920: 113, § 112.
While it is true, as Begrich noted (1939: 140–141), that the phrase “first fruits of the lips” does not occur in the Hebrew Bible, the “fruit of the lips” appears in Isaiah 57:18, Hosea 14:2, and Hebrews 13:15. Stein (1969: 455, like Franz Delitzsch [n.d., ad loc.]) used "fruit of the lips" in his translation of 15:3b, and followed it with "first fruits of the lips" in 15c. Begrich’s (1939: 140–141) conclusion that ἀπαρχή translated ἀφιενη “offering” and conclusion that χειλέων “of the lips” was a corruption of χειρών “of the hands,” overlooked the most obvious synonymous parallelism of the singular bound–noun, “fruit of the lips,” and the plural bound–noun, “the first–fruit of the lips.” Wright’s (1985: 664) translation, cited above, of the feminine singular ἀπαρχή as the plural “first fruits” obscures the difference between the Greek and the Syriac in this line. The Syriac quite correctly preserves the parallelism between “fruit [singular] of the lips” and “first–fruits [plural] of the lips.”

15:4b (G), 15:6b (S)

 флóк пυρός καὶ ὀργή ἀδίκων οὐχ ἐμεται αὐτοῦ
the flame of fire and anger against the 
unrighteous
will not touch him

 the flame of fire and the anger of the 
lawless
will not touch them

γιὰ τὸ ἔλεγχον τοῦ τιμίου Λαότος
for the flame of fire and the anger of the Most High
will not touch them

156 The Greek ἀπαρχή occurs seventy–six times in the LXX and translates five different Hebrew words.
The Greek ὀργῇ ἀδίκων, which could reflect a construct chain in Hebrew, was translated by Wright (1985: 664) as “anger against the [italics added] unrighteous.” The need to add “against the” hints at the difficulty of this poetic line. Wright’s translation is sensitive to context, but the addition of a preposition without textual support is problematic. An alternative solution is to recognize a misreading of one of the words in the Hebrew Vorlage in the Greek and Syriac traditions, namely, the misreading of לֵלָלֶא “lawless one” instead of the proposed original לֵלָל “Most High.” The motif of God (the Most High) sending fire is well attested. The point that the poet seems to be making is that the righteous will not be touched by the anger of the Most High when he sends fire against the unrighteous.

The text as it now stands makes it difficult for the reader to easily identify the antecedents for the recurring third person pronouns “they” and “them.” The Greek οὐχ ἀμεταλιῆ τοῦ του “it will not touch him” stands in contrast to the Syriac ἀστήρ θανάτου “it will not touch them.” This difference is probably another example of a misreading of the Vorlage in which the original verb ἄρριτον “it will touch them” was misread as ἄρριτον (confusing μα and μυ ) “it will touch him.” The ambiguity of the pronoun “they” and “them” in 15:9 (Syriac) may be due in part to the misreading of מַלְאָך as מַלְאָך. Otherwise it would appear that the poet was having the anger of the “lawless” being directed “against the sinners from before the Most High,” and the pronoun “they” or “them” could refer to the sinner as easily as to the righteous. The Greek text is free from ambiguity even though it apparently misread מַלְאָך for מַלְאָך.

---

157 Ezekiel 39:6; Hosea 8:14; Amos 1:4, 7, 10, 12, 2:2, 5; and IV Ezra 1:23.

158 On the confusion of מ and מ see Delitzsch, 1920: 121, § 133, where he cited among numerous examples (1) the Qere and the Ketib in II Samuel 21:20 of מַלְאָך מַלְאָך and מַלְאָך מַלְאָך and its variant in I Chronicles 20:6, as מַלְאָך מַלְאָך and סֵאלְם סֵאלְם or סֵאלְם סֵאלְם in Ruth 4:20 and מַלְאָך מַלְאָך or מַלְאָך or מַלְאָך reflected in I Chronicles 2:11.
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15:5a (G), 15:7a (S)

from the Lord’s presence

from before the Most High

The Greek κυρίου “Lord” and the Syriac מְשָׁמִיתָא “Most High” cannot be translations of each other. Trafton (1985: 140) concurred with Charlesworth (1977: 755) that the Syriac מְשָׁמִיתָא is a corruption of the Syriac מְשָׁמִית “Lord,” a corruption which is also attested in the Odes of Solomon 23:4. However, in light of the use of יָהָウェֶה מְשָׁמִית “Yahweh, Most High” in Psalm 7:18 ( יָהָֽウェֶה מְשָׁמִיתה יָהָֽウェֶה מְשָׁמִית “I will give to the Lord the thanks due to his righteousness, and I will sing praise to the name of the Lord, the Most High”) and in Psalm 47:3 ( יָהָֽウェֶה מְשָׁמִיתה יָהָֽウェֶה מְשָׁמִיתל “For the Lord, the Most High, is awesome, a great king over all the earth”), a word may have dropped out of the Greek and Syriac text traditions. In the Greek text it appears that יָהָֽウェֶה מְשָׁמִית was lost, whereas in Syriac it was יָהָֽウェֶה מְשָׁמִית which was omitted. Therefore, a conflation of the Greek and Syriac variants may prove to be the correct way to reconstruct the Vorlage.

15:7a (G), 15:8b (S)

famine and sword and death

for death and spear and famine

The Greek and Syriac word differ in this phrase, and the Greek רָעָֽםִית “sword” and the Syriac מְשָׁמִית “spear” are not the usual equivalents to each other. As noted in the discussion of 13:2, the
Vorlage behind ὅμοιας and ἐπεκταχόμενον was perhaps the more generic πῦξ “missile, weapon” (BDB, 1019), which has the meaning “sword” in Job 36:12 and “hand-weapon” in II Chronicles 23:10, and “spear” in II Samuel 18:13.

15:7b (G), 15:9a (S)

for they will retreat from the devout
like those pursued by famine (Wright)
for they will flee, as famine being pursued
from/by the holy ones (Trafton)

for they will flee from them as death flees from life

for they [famine, sword, pestilence]
will flee from the righteous ones —
indeed, famine will flee from the righteous and pestilence
from the living!

The differences between the Greek and the Syriac of this poetic line are so great that it appears that both texts are defective. Trafton (1985: 141–142) has provided a summary of the conjectures offered to bring meaning to the bewildering Greek text and the slightly less perplexing Syriac text. Rahlf’s text, cited above, follows von Gebhardt’s (1895: 81–82) emendation of λιμοῦ to πολέμου, and Wright’s translation reflects a reworking of the word order in order to make the subject of the verb “retreat” to be “famine, sword and death” instead of its being the “righteous.” Trafton’s translation of the Greek, while more literal, is no more intelligible.

Several keys for understanding this poetic line come from properly reconstructing the poetic lines in verses 15:4–6 (Syriac 15: 6–9) and recognizing (1) that the singular κακοῦ “evil” can be a
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reference to the “evil one,” (2) the probability that |a]ta “pestilence” was misread or confused with dhb “death,” and (3) that the emphatic כ “indeed” was misread as the particle כ “for.” The singular ejeļ/h “it / he goes forth” cannot be a reference to the compound nouns “flame of fire and anger” of 5:4b, but it can be the singular kako$ of 15:4a as its subject. By inverting 15:4b and 15:5–6, the singular noun kako$ and the singular verb ejeļ/h come naturally together, and the two nouns “fire and anger” are followed by the three nouns “famine and sword and death” with their respective verbs. Reading the text in this manner it becomes apparent that it is “the evil/evil one” who went forth from the presence of God—just as the adversary went forth from the presence of God in the prologue of Job. The Syriac use of A&I "evil, the evil one" and the Greek use of kako$ "evil" may well indicate a Vorlage having כ "adversary, enemy." The parallels to the Job prologue seem obvious.

The collocation of נו “famine” and מ “pestilence” in Ta’anith 19b provides the basis for reconstructing the Vorlage with these two words rather than with רע “famine” and מ “death.” The reconstructed Vorlage and translation offered above reflect what is considered to be the poet’s use of a double-duty verb and a double-duty emphatic כ which have, heretofore, been unrecognized by the translators and the commentators. The proposal to add the כ to מ and a final כ to מ, even without textual support, offers a solution

159 The rearrangement of the lines and the interpretation offered for individual words or phrases provides for the following logically consistent translation:

15:4a Everyone who does these things will never be disturbed by (the) adversary
15:5 when he goes out from the Lord’s presence against sinners
to destroy every foundation of (the) sinner’s.
15:4b The flame of fire and the anger of the Most High shall not touch them.
15:6 For God’s mark is on the righteous for their salvation.
15:7 Famine, sword and death shall be far from the righteous
for they [famine, sword, pestilence] will flee from the righteous ones —
indeed, famine will flee from the righteous and pestilence from the living!

160 For the review on double-duty prepositions see the above discussion on Psalm of Solomon 14:1.
unavailable from other studies (summarized by Trafton) which have assumed corruptions in the Greek text without addressing the differences in the Syriac tradition, or solutions which have assumed corruptions in the Syriac text but have not addressed the difficulties of the Greek text. Since the corruption is assumed to have been inherent in a Hebrew Vorlage, it has been possible to come to conclusions which can account for the differences in the textual traditions and offer an intelligible reading of these enigmatic poetic lines.

15:9a (G), 15:9b (S)

ως ὑπὸ πολεμίων ἐμπείρων καταλαμβάνονται
they shall be overtaken as by those experienced in war

for they will go before them as those who know war

Indeed, by those trained (for) warfare

they will be confronted

Contrary to Trafton’s (1985: 143) statement, “On the other hand, Syriac יֶהָּנָא would certainly be an unusual translation of καταλαμβάνω,” in the Septuagint Καταλαμβάνω translates Hebrew בָּלָא twice in Micah 6:6, which makes it quite probable that in this line there is no basic difference between the Greek and the Syriac. The ἐμπείρων and יֶהָּנָא could be translations of each other or of a Hebrew Vorlage with יֶהָּנָא having the meaning, “trained (for war)” or “experienced (in warfare)” as in Song of Solomon 3:8.

15:9b (G), 15:10 (S)

ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπος αὐτῶν
for on their forehead

Trafton’s (1985: 143) critique of Kuhn’s conjecture (that a transposition of the same line occurred independently in the Greek and Syriac texts of this psalm) appears valid. Trafton recognized that his critique (that the coincidence would have been too rare) would have been invalid if the corruption had been in the Hebrew Vorlage shared in common by the Greek and Syriac traditions.
The Greek μετώπον, at first glance, would appear to be the equivalent of the Hebrew לֶכֶּשׁ “forehead, brow” and would not be the equivalent of the Syriac نَوْصَرَ “nose, nostril.” In Ezekiel 16:12, Hebrew לֶכֶּשׁ may mean “forehead” (KJV “and I put a jewel on thy forehead”). The Greek and Syriac terms for “forehead” have etymologically the same meaning of “between the eyes,” but the Greek μετώπον also means “with front foremost” and is used metaphorically for “front, face of anything” (Liddell and Scott, 1123). Consequently, μετώπον here could reflect a Vorlage with לֶכֶּשׁ, which would then correspond to the Syriac نَوْصَرَ since نَوْصَرَ could easily translate לֶכֶּשׁ. Therefore, the reconstructed Vorlage has לֶכֶּשׁ rather than נָוֹשֶׁר.

15:10b (G), 15:11b (S)
καὶ αἱ ἄνωμίαι αὐτῶν διώξονται αὐτοῖς and their lawless actions shall pursue them
καὶ αἱ ἄνωμίαι αὐτῶν ἔρχονται αὐτοῖς and their rebellious acts will pursue them

The difference between the Greek plural διώξονται and the Syriac singular ᾠχοῦ is probably due to the verb ἔρχονται “they will pursue them” having been written scriptio defectiva as ἔρχονται (= ἔρχονται). The Syriac translator read ἔρχονται as a singular, but the Greek translator read it as a plural.

15:13a (G), 15:15a (S)
οἱ δὲ φοβοῦμενοι τὸν κύριον ἐλεηθοῦνται ἐν αὐτῇ but those who fear the Lord shall find mercy in it

162 Compare the verb לֹקֶשׁ “they slay them” in Zechariah 11:5.
but in it there will be mercy upon those that fear the Lord

and he will have mercy to those fearing Yahweh upon it [the earth]

The Greek passive ἐλεηθοːσονται “they shall receive mercy” and the Syriac active ṣ̄ȯm a “there will be mercy” are unlikely to be translations of each other, even though the verbs mean the same thing. The difference between the active and the passive in the two traditions can be accounted for by a Hebrew Vorlage with רדיה which was read as a pa'al passive by the Greek translator, but it was read as a pa'el active by the Syriac translator. Once read as a passive, in the context of this verse, the subject could only have been “those who fear the Lord,” even if there were no third masculine plural suffix on the verb. There is nothing in the Syriac corresponding to the Greek phrase ἐν αὐτῇ, the feminine pronoun which must have the τὴν γῆν of the previous line as its antecedent.

Psalm Sixteen

16:1a

ἐν τῷ νυστάξαλ ὕποχήν μου
ἀπὸ κυρίου παρὰ μικρόν
when my soul slumbered, (I was far away)
from the Lord, wretched for a time
[in the sleepiness of my soul
from God (sic) by a little wretchedness]

when my soul disregarded the Lord a little

when my soul forsook the Lord for a bit

The difficulty of the Greek is reflected in Wright’s parenthetical addition and the literal translation given in a note [shown in brackets]. The Greek νυστάξαλ “slumbered” and the Syriac ṣ̄ȯm a
It is of interest to note that Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) initially translated the phrase . . . יִעַל מְדַלָּת הַרְעָה, "when sleeps my soul at a distance from Yahweh . . ." but scratched the יִעַל and drew a line also through הַרְעָה. On a separate sheet he translated instead . . . יִעַל מְדַלָּת הַרְעָה, "when sleeps my soul from Yahweh awhile . . ."

Frankenberg (1896: 80) and Stein (1969: 455) translated νυστάξαι by νάναν “become drowsy,” which appears in parallelism with יָשָׁן “to sleep” in Psalm 121:4. But it would be difficult to account for the difference between the Greek and Syriac texts if יָשָׁן were in the Vorlage. However, in certain forms the roots יָשָׁן and יָשָׁן could more easily have been confused. The stem יָשָׁן is well attested in Aramaic and Syriac (Jastrow, 1606; J. Payne Smith 1957, 586) meaning “to change, to transfer, to desert, to forsake.”

In Hebrew, the stem is sometimes confused with יָשָׁן “to hate,” but it probably occurs in Psalm 119:128, “I forsake every false way” (rather than, “I hate every false way”) and Sirach 7:26, “do not trust yourself to one whom you forsook” (rather than, “. . . whom you hate”).

It is of interest to note that Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc.) initially translated the phrase . . . יָשָׁן מִנְשָׁתָה הַרְעָה, “when sleeps my soul at a distance from Yahweh . . .” but scratched the יָשָׁן and drew a line also through מִנְשָׁתָה. On a separate sheet he translated instead . . . יָשָׁן מִנְשָׁתָה הַרְעָה, “when sleeps my soul from Yahweh awhile . . .”

McDaniel (1994) noted that Jesus’ difficult statement in Luke 14:26, “if anyone comes to me and does not hate (οὐ μισεῖ) his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, even his own life, he cannot be my disciple,” is probably rooted in a written Hebrew or Aramaic tradition in which the word יָשָׁן / יָשָׁן was misread. He noted that the Greek μισεῖ equals יָשָׁן “you hate,” but the context and parallel accounts suggest that יָשָׁן or יָשָׁן should have been rendered ἐπορεύομαι “you forsake,” which occurs in Luke 14:33 and equals יָשָׁן or יָשָׁן. As the vocalization indicates, the confusion of יָשָׁן or יָשָׁן and יָשָׁן could not have been an aural error since the sound of י and י is distinctly different, but both sounds were represented by י in the orthography of Jesus’ time. (The variant spelling of יָשָׁן “sleep” as יָשָׁן is also noteworthy as another example of the interchange of י and י.)
16:1b
παρὰ μικρὸν ἡλισθήσα (165 ἐν καταφορά) ὑπνούστων μακράν ἀπὸ θεοῦ

wretched for a time; I sank into a sleep far from God

I was almost in the lapses of the sleep of corruption, and when I was far from the Lord

for a while I sank into a deadly coma; and when I was far from the Lord

In 16:1a, παρὰ μικρὸν “by a little” corresponds to מָלַל “a little while,” and in 16:2a παρ᾽ ὀλίγον “for a moment” corresponds to מָלַל “almost”—all of which equal Hebrew מָלַל or מָלַל. However, in 16:1b nothing in the Greek text corresponds to the מָלַל in the Syriac text.

The Greek manuscript variants ἡλισθήσα “I had slipped” (all mss except 336) and ὑπνώσα “I slept” (ms 336) are not due to scribal corruptions of graphically similar letters or words. There is not a single Semitic root which can mean both ἡλισθήσα and ὑπνώσα. These variants are most likely due to two different ways of reading a word in the Hebrew Vorlage. The root מָלַל (= ἡλισθήσα) “a little

165 Ms 336 reads ὑπνώσα “I slept” (= שָׂנָה), which appears to be a misplaced doublet of τῷ νυσταξάει ψυξάν μον “slumbering of my soul,” which would mean that ms 336 lacks a word corresponding to ἡλισθήσα.

166 Mss 149, 260, 336, 471, 629, and 769 read καταφορά “destruction, death, ruin” (equals the noun מְלָל I.), whereas mss 253, 606, 655, and 659 read καταφορά “bringing down, a downward stroke, a downward motion, a sloping place” (equals the noun מְלָל II., from the root מְלָל or מְלָל). Since, both καταφορά and καταφορά can be valid translations of the מְלָל I. or II., there is no need to postulate a scribal error.

167 The “wretched” and “wretchedness” in Wright’s translation (1985: 604) apparently renders καταφορά or καταφορά.
Delitzsch (1920: 119 § 131) cited only the variants in I Samuel 27:8, where the MT מָלַתָה appears in the LXX as Ὀλίσθησα (“I had slipped”) rather than מָלַתָה, and there is not corresponding word for מָלַתָה (= מָלַתָה) in the Greek text of 16:1b.

The confusion of מָלַתָה in the reconstructed Vorlage is based on the Hebrew מָלַתָה “they sank into sleep” of Psalm 76:6. If the Vorlage read מָלַתָה, it would appear the Syriac translator read מָלַתָה as a masculine plural construct noun meaning “the lapses of,” which was followed by an intervening preposition before the nomen rectum, “the lapses of the sleep of corruption.” The Greek text, in contrast, appears to have rendered מָלַתָה מָלַתָה in reverse word order since ἐν καταφορᾷ ὑπονοοῦσιν translates the construct chain מָלַתָה מָלַתָה.

The Greek has no corresponding equivalent to the מָלַתָה מָלַתָה in the Syriac text, i.e., it is lacking a conjunction, a particle, and the first person singular verb prefix, which together mean “and I was almost ….” However, the τῷ τῷ of ms 336 (and possibly ms 629) could be what survives as a translation of מָלַתָה in the Hebrew Vorlage, the equivalent of the Syriac מָלַתָה. This equation assumes that the attested τῷ τῷ is a corruption of an original תֻּתֶה. If the Hebrew Vorlage had the verb יָרָה “I was far away,” the Syriac rendered it as an 'aph'el, but the Greek read it as the feminine noun ἡρόν or ἡρόν “a distant one, a distance.”

16:3a
 Kumate  ψυχήν μου
 my soul was drawn away
 Kumate  ψυχήν μου
 when my soul bent down

164 Delitzsch (1920: 119 § 131) cited only the variants in I Samuel 27:8, where the MT מָלַתָה appears in the LXX as Ὀλίσθησα (ὁλίσθησα). Note McCarter’s (1980, 413) translation “from Telem” for MT מָלַתָה.
The Greek διενεχθηναι “was drawn away” and the Syriac سوخ “was bent down” cannot be translations of each other, but they can be accurate translations of a Hebrew Vorlage having the root ליה. This root in Hebrew is etymologically derived from two proto–Semitic stems which survived independently in Arabic, namely, سوخ “to sink down” [šwh became šwḥ in Hebrew] and سوخ “to flow or melt away, to spread” [šwh became šwḥ in Hebrew]. The Greek διενεχθηναι reflects لיה (سوخ) and the Syriac may reflect لיה (سوخ). Since the Greek has a passive infinitive, presumably the Vorlage had a passive, but if the stem were the passive of لיה it would most likely have been the distinctive hithpael form لיה, which would have been difficult for any Syriac translator to have rendered as an active verb. Therefore, it may well be that the Syriac translator read لיה as لية “to bend down, to prostrate oneself,” which, in other context, would correspond closely to لية فلاتن “prostrate adoration” (J. Payne Smith, 542).

16:4a
ενυξεν με ὅς κέντρον ἵππου ἐπὶ τὴν χρηστησίαν αὐτοῦ
he jabbed me as a horse is goaded to keep it awake
κέρνον μελαμφρον ποτε λαχνιρη
he pierced me with a horse-goad to arouse me

The Greek κέντρον ἵππου “a horse-goad” and the Syriac كئنترون رabad “the horse-goad” could be translations of each other or of a Hebrew Vorlage with רבד נבבII מצל or רבד נבבII מצל II. The proposal by Kuhn (1937: 49) to read the רבד of his reconstructed Vorlage as subject-object (“the goad pierced the horse”) 169 For the passive use of the hithpael see GKC § 54h.
rather than as a construct chain (“the goad of a horse”) seems
However, the Greek and Syriac translators seem to have misread
two letters of the Vorlage, namely, (1) the preposition ב “by, with” was
misread as the preposition כ “as, like” (=וּס and כֶּלֶב), and (2) the
י suffixed on the הָרֶפֶל infinitive לַחֲמֵר יִרְזֵה “to arouse me” was read as
ים, i.e., לַחֲמֵר יִרְזֵה “to arouse him [the horse].” Since the Greek and
Syriac texts reflect this same error, the misreading of כ as ים and ב as
ים was more like a matter of scribal errors in the Vorlage itself.

16:5

οτί ἀντελάβοι μου εἰς σωτηρίαν
who came to my aid for (my) salvation

καὶ ᾠλώνθες ήμον σωτηρίαν
you helped me with your salvation

ἐφέστη με σωτηρίαν
you rescued me with your salvation

The Greek text lacks a pronomial element corresponding to the
י “your” suffix in the Syriac. Wright’s (1985: 665) translation
provides “(my)” as a gloss, suggesting that a μου dropped out of the
Greek text or a י suffixed out of its Hebrew Vorlage. Since the Syriac
is unambiguous in reading “your salvation,” it seems more likely that
a σου dropped out of the Greek text or a י suffixed out of its Hebrew
Vorlage. The MT provides several examples of הָרֶפֶל with the י
suffix and with the י suffix: הָרֶפֶל לַחֲמֵר יִרְזֵה “my salvation” appears in Psalm
38:24 and 51:16, and with the י suffix: הָרֶפֶל לַחֲמֵר יִרְזֵה “(and) thy salvation”
appears in Psalm 40:11, 17; 71:15; 119:41 and 81. Since either suffix
is possible, there is no apparent reason for not following the Syriac
text.

16:6b

μηδὲ τὴν μνήμην σου
nor your memory

δο not let your remembrance depart
At first glance it appears that a verb corresponding to the Syriac
depart’ has dropped out of the Greek text, analogous to the
loss of a σου or a ἐπ’, as discussed immediately above. However, the
Greek text, as it stands, probably reflects perfectly the original
Hebrew poetic line in which the poet used a double–duty verb.170
What the poet and the Greek translator left implicit, the Syriac
translator made explicit by adding as a verbal gloss. The “nor”
in the translation of the reconstructed Vorlage reflects the simple
conjunction ἀλλά. The negative μηδὲ in the Greek text is probably a
gloss for what was a double–duty negative לא in the original
Hebrew.

16:7a

restrain me, O God, from sordid sin (Wright)
rule me, O God, (keeping me back)
from wicked sin (Gray)
save me, O Lord, from evil sin

The Greek ἐπικράτησόν μου “rule over me” and the Syriac
“save me” cannot be translations of each other. In the
Septuagint, ἐπικράτειν translates שָׂרֵת, חֵפֶץ, נֹשֶׁר, and
תַּמִּים, none of which have the meaning “to restrain.” Ryle and James
(1891: 121) suggested that the Hebrew Vorlage had the verb מָלַךְ “to hold fast, to protect,” whereas Kuhn (1937: 51–52) proposed a
Vorlage with מָלַךְ “he held me back” which was subsequently

---

corrupted to יבגפנפפ “he held me fast.” But as Trafton (1985: 151) noted, “Kuhn’s suggestion is ingenious but not wholly convincing.”

A more likely reason for the presence of the very different ꝆꝆꝆꝆ and ꝆꝆ Ꝇ is that the Vorlage had the verb Ꝇ “to cleanse (away), to wash, to rinse” which was misread by the Greek translator as Ꝇ “to rule over, to have dominion.” The verb Ꝇ appears also in Isaiah 4:4, Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ “when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem.” In the Septuagint, ἀμαρτίας translates Ꝇ Ꝇ or Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ “offence, guilt, wrong-doing, guiltiness” in Genesis 42:21, Exodus 6:6, and Isaiah 53:10. The stem Ꝇ would well fit the verb Ꝇ to express the idea “cleanse (me) from the guilt of sin.” The semantic range of Syriac Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ “to depart from, to remove” J. Payne Smith (1903: 464–465) is broad enough to accommodate Trafton’s translation “save me” and the Hebrew Ꝇ used in the reconstructed Vorlage meaning “to cleanse.”

16:8b
καὶ παντὸς ὑποκειμένου ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας ἀνοφελείας
nor anyone subject to useless sin (Wright)
and anything existing from unprofitable sin (Trafton)

nor any sin which there is
ἁμαρτία ἁμαρτίαι
nor any evil women

The Greek καὶ “and” and the Syriac ጀ “nor” are not exactly the same. Wright’s (1985: 665) translating καὶ as “nor” is

---

171 In support of the aural error, Kuhn cited the variant in the Jerusalem Talmud Pesahim 15, 7, where Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ is attested in the Berlin edition of 1920, but in the 1926 Wilna edition Ꝇ Ꝇ Ꝇ right appears.

172 On the confusion of Ꝇ and Ꝇ and on the confusion of Ꝇ and Ꝇ, see Delitzsch, 1920: 105–107, § 104°; and 109, § 109°, respectively.
contextually correct, making explicit what was implicit in the poet’s use of a double-duty negative. In this respect, Wright’s translating “not...nor” for the Greek μη...καί follows the Syriac translator’s use of compound negatives: אֵלֶּחֶם...אֵלֶּחֶם. The poet’s use of double-duty negatives was a stylistic option, analogous to English usage of a single or double negative, such as: “not (this) or (that)” or “not (this) nor (that).”

The Syriac text lacks any corresponding adjective for ἄνωφελος, “useless,” which appears in the Septuagint as the translation of בֵּיתוֹ “that is profitable for nothing” in Isaiah 44:10 and of לֹא דְּיוֹתִים “things that do not profit” in Jeremiah 2:8. But the Syriac וַעֲשַׂרְתָּם...כל “all that exists” (= כל MAIL) and the Greek ἁμαρτίας, along with the Syriac מָשָׂא (= מח “wickedness”), provide the clues for determining the origin of the problematic ἁμαρτίας ἄνωφελος “useless sin” and the puzzling מָשָׂא מָשָׂא “sin which exists.” The conflation of כל...כל and מָשָׂא produces the word cluster מָשָׂא כל “all exists wicked,” a senseless phrase which, however, is graphically similar to כל נָשִּׁים “all women of wickedness”—a word cluster which would be a very meaningful parallel to the “lawless women” mentioned in 8a. It seems very probable, therefore, that the Greek ὑποκείμενον “existing” and the Syriac מָשָׂא “which exists” reflect a shared Vorlage in which כל...women of” was misspelled or misread as כל...exists.” The Greek ἄνωφελος, which has no parallel in the Syriac text, would appear to be a doublet reflecting the misreading or misspelling of the original כל נָשִּׁים (= כל נָשִּׁים כַּל לְתָרָם “not exist value” or “useless”). In light of this analysis of the differences between the Greek and Syriac texts, the reconstructed Vorlage is as short as the Syriac text but differs from the Greek and the Syriac texts by exchanging כל, the particle of existence, for the construct noun נָשִּׁים “the women of...”


The Greek ἀλογον “thoughtless” and the Syriac ἀλογον “unreasoning” could be translations of each other or they both could be accurate translations of a Hebrew Vorlage having בֵּל הָעֵצֶת “without knowledge.” The Peshitta translates בֵּל הָעֵצֶת in Job 38:2 (“who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?”) as ἀλογον “with words lacking understanding” and in Job 42:3 (“who is this that hides counsel without knowledge?”) as ἀλογον “without knowledge.” Therefore, to insist that the Syriac is dependent upon the Greek, seems itself rather “befremdlich.”

The expanded Syriac text, cited above, stands in contrast to those places where the Syriac has presented a significantly shorter text, namely in 5:17 (S, 5:20), 7:9 (S 7:8b), and 8:5 (S, 8:6) (noted above
The motif of "irrational animals" introduced by the poet in 16:10c is found elsewhere in the literature coming from essentially the same period, namely, in IV Maccabees 14:14 and 18, "...and indeed, here, even the irrational animals have for their young an affection and love similar to men's... and what need have we of examples of the love of offspring among irrational animals..."

16:11a

γογγυσμὸν καὶ ὀλιγοψυχίαν ἐν θλίψει
μάκρων ἀπ' ἐμοῦ
put grumbling and discouragement in persecution
far from me

remove from me murmuring
and faintheartedness in tribulation

The Greek text and the Syriac text of this line could be translations of each other or of a shared Hebrew Vorlage. The Greek

177 The motif of “irrational animals” introduced by the poet in 16:10c is found elsewhere in the literature coming from essentially the same period, namely, in IV Maccabees 14:14 and 18, “...and indeed, here, even the irrational animals have for their young an affection and love similar to men’s... and what need have we of examples of the love of offspring among irrational animals...”
PSALM SIXTEEN

"faint-hearted" (which was used in the Septuagint to translate "pusillaminous" (literally, "little of soul," noted above in the discussion of 3:4a) could well translate Hebrew "to be faint" which is always used with "and the whole heart is faint," Jeremiah 8:18, "my heart is sick within me," and Lamentations 1:22, "my heart was faint."

16:14a

ἐν τῷ ἐλέγχεσαι ψυχήν
ἐν χειρὶ σαπρίας αὐτοῦ ἢ δοκιμασία σου
when a person is tried by his mortality, your testing . . .

(— no comparable line in the Syriac text —)

with my (being) cleansed of my offense
or
with his (being) cleansed of his stench

The nonsensical extra line in the Greek text of this line does not read like an explanatory gloss since it is in desperate need of a gloss itself. Its absence from the Syriac may be due to the fact that even the Syriac translator found the Hebrew Vorlage unintelligible. The reconstructed Vorlage uses the Greek text but it is not simply a back translation of the Greek into Hebrew since the Greek is probably a translation of a corrupted Vorlage. For example ἐν χειρὶ (which Wright omits in his translation) is the equivalent of "the hollow of the hand," but a Hebrew text with "with my/ his cleansing" would be contextually much more appropriate.

---

178 Note Trafton’s rare misspelling of θοτασι. In his study he has θοτασι, spelled with an initial nun (1981:266), and in his monograph he has θοτασι, spelled with an initial yud (1985: 154).

179 ἐν χειρὶ translates יָדוֹ in Exod 9:8, Lev 16:12, and Ezek 10:2 and 7.

180 The confusion of a † with a * or a † is discussed by Delitzsch (1920: 111–112, § 110§:).
Similarly, the Greek σαπρίας αὐτοῦ “his stench” (which Wright paraphrased by “mortality”) could reflect a Vorlage with “my stench, my offense” or ὑποζηύς “his stench, his offense,” with ambiguity due to uncertainty as to whether the last letter of the word was a γ or a η. Lastly, the Greek ἡ δοκιμασία σου is the equivalent of Hebrew הברך “your testing,” but the consonantal הברך (= בְּרֶכֶם) is graphically identical to the word הבך (= בְּרֶךֶם) “by your grace.” The latter word, בְּרֶךֶם, fits the context much better than the former word, בְּרֶכֶם.

The remaining uncertainty in the reconstructed Vorlage for this phrase is limited to the suffix ending, as to whether it was “my” or “his.” In 16:1–12, the focus is on the first person and verse 16:14 makes a fitting conclusion for a personal confession which included the phrase “. . . of my being cleansed of his stench.” However, since verse 16:15 in Syriac and 16:14a in Greek have the third person singular, the verse now designated 16:14a/16:15 could have been intended to shift the focus from the first person to the third person by making the statement, “. . . of his being cleansed of his stench.”

Psalm Seventeen

17:1
κύρει σὺ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐτί
Lord, you are our king forevermore

O Lord, you are our king now and forever

It is possible that the Greek εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐτί “for ever and beyond” and the Syriac כְּפֶר אֱלֹהִים וְשֵׁועָה וְעֵתָר “now and forever” could be idiomatic translations of each other, or they could reflect a slightly
different Vorlage, the Greek having had לְהַלְיַּכֶּל and the Syriac having had לְהַלְיַּכֶּל יָדֵר. The differences between the Greek and the Syriac suggest that the original Hebrew had לְהַלְיַּכֶּל יָדֵר, as well as לְהַלְיַּכֶּל יָדֵר. The reconstructed Vorlage uses אָדָּנֵי instead of אָדָּנֵי in order to provide for greater assonance which was a common element in Hebrew poetry.

17:2a
καὶ τὸς ὁ χρόνος ζωῆς αὐθώποι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
how long is the time of a person’s life on the earth
καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁ χρόνος ζωῆς αὐθώποι ἐπὶ τὴν ζωὴν
and what is the life of a man upon the earth

but what is the time of the life of man upon the earth

The Syriac text lacks a corresponding element for the Greek ὁ χρόνος “the time,” having simply the question, “what is the life of man . . . ?” This absence of a word corresponding to χρόνος and the presence of θέμ “now, already, at present,” for which there is no corresponding word in Greek, are apparently related to each other. Χρόνος equals Hebrew לְהַלְיַּכֶּל and θέμ equals Hebrew יָדֵר. A confusion of the consonant cluster ἐπὶ and יָדֵר, though in different lines, could easily be made. On the other hand, Kuhn (1937: 56) suggested that the Vorlage began with the question מָה לְהַלְיַּכֶּל and concluded, “יָדֵר אָדָּנֵי gab δ’ sinngemäß ganz richtig wieder durch τὸς ὁ χρόνος ζωῆς, während S genauer übersetzte מָה מָה לְהַלְיַּכֶּל, מָה מָה לְהַלְיַּכֶּל,” (i.e., the original Hebrew מָה was translated by the plural copula מָה). However, the unnecessary copula, מָה is probably a doublet for a misreading of מָה “what” as the metathetic מָה “them.” Appeal to paraphrase should be made only when other explanations are lacking.

17:2b
καὶ ἔλεπίς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν
so also is his hope in him

so also is his flesh
The Greek ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ “his hope” and the Syriac שָׁם “his flesh” cannot be translations of each other. Trafton (1985: 156) suggested that שָׁם was an inner-Syriac corruption of an original שָׁם “hope.” But the erroneous metathesis could just as easily have been made in Hebrew, with בָּשָׂל “flesh” having been corrupted to בָּשָׂל “hope.”

The masculine ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ, for which there is no corresponding element in the Syriac text, could be a corruption of the feminine ἐπ’ αὐτῆς, with its antecedent being γίνοι in the proposed Vorlage of 17:2a. Other proposals have been made to read the antecedent of ἐπ’ αὐτῶν as χρόνος (= שָׁל “time of . . . .”) (Geiger, 1871: 67), or ἀνθρώπου (= בָּשָׂל “man” (Ryle and James (1891: 129), or coming from a Vorlage having בָּשָׂל “himself” (Kuhn, 1937: 57). The Greek text has been followed in reconstructing the Vorlage for this phrase, although liberty has been taken to change the gender of the pronoun.

17:5b (G), 17:6b (S)
καὶ ἔξωσαν ἡμᾶς οἷς οὐκ ἔπηγγέλω
μετὰ βίας ἀφειλαντο
καὶ οὐκ ἐδόξασαν τὸ ὄνομα σου τὸ ἐντύμον
. . . and drove us out. Those to whom you did not (make)
the promise, they took away (from us) by force

καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκαν τὸ ὄνομα σου τὸ ἐντύμον
. . . and took me away: With force they took the things
which you did not give charge to them

182 Trafton’s (1985: 160) statement that Kuhn proposed בָּשָׂל [sic] “himself,” when he actually proposed בָּשָׂל “himself,” demonstrates how the confusion of בָּשָׂל and בָּשָׂל can make its way into even the most carefully prepared texts.
The Greek ἐξωσάω ἡμᾶς “they drove us out” and the Syriac ṣṣṣ mắt “and took me away” cannot be accurate translation of each other. But both texts could be translations of a Hebrew Vorlage having a first person verbal suffix. The Greek translator correctly read the suffix as ἡμᾶς “us” but the Syriac translator took the suffix to be ה, which would be another example of the confusion of a ה and a ב ב. The actual verb which carried the suffix is uncertain. The Greek ἐξωσάω suggests the root ṣṣष “to drive, to push, to thrust,” and the Syriac שמת suggests a Vorlage having the root ṣṣष “to take, to seize, to snatch away.” Were either ṣṣष or שמת in the Vorlage, it is easy to see how they could have been confused with each other.183

The difference between the Greek οὐκ ἐπηγγέλει “did not promise” and the Syriac δὲς “did not give charge” is too great for them to be translations of each other, but both could be based upon a Hebrew Vorlage having the root רמ “to say.” Hebrew רמ, like ἐπηγγέλει, can mean “to promise,” as well as “to command.” The Greek οὐς and the Syriac שמת are reflected in the reconstructed Vorlage by the relative רמ ... שמת, which could be either personal (with the Greek) or impersonal (with the Syriac). The translation of the Vorlage (“promise . . .” and “those . . .”) indicates that the Greek text is followed for this line.

17:6a (G), 17:7b (S)

ἐθεντὸς βασιλείου ἀντὶ ύψους αὐτῶν
they set up a monarchy because of their arrogance

and they put a kingdom in place of their exalted position

והלפם נזר ח聯א/חuenta נזרותה

and they exchanged their (priestly) turbans for a crown

The Greek βασιλείου “kingdom” and the Syriac שמת “kingdom” could well be translations of each other or of a common Vorlage. The following proposal of Begrich (1939: 141–142) that a

183 See Delitzsch, 1920: 103–104, § 103–104+.*.

184 See Delitzsch, 1920: 109, § 106+* on the confusion of ה and ב, and 105–107 § 104+* on the confusion of ה and ב.
miserstood *Vorlage* lies behind υπερήφανος and ἄλληγματος is quite convincing:

Begrich’s choice of ἄλληγματος as the underlying word for the headgear provides another example of an error originating from sound rather than sight.\(^{185}\) The confusion of (נָבָה) “high, height, turban” to the near homophonic נבָה “high, exalted, arrogance” could easily occur. (The stem נבָה is translated by ὕφους ten times in the LXX). In Exodus 28:40, 29:9, and Leviticus 8:13, נבָה is used for the head-gear of the common priest. However, in Exodus 39:28, נבָה appears in a list of garments made for Aaron and his sons; and in Ezekiel 44:18, נבָה “linen turbans” are designated to be used by Levitical priests descended from Zadok.

Although Trafton (1985: 162) found Begrich’s arguments “hardly compelling,” in the opinion of this writer, Begrich’s argument has been convincing and the reconstructed *Vorlage* follows his proposal, rather than taking either the Greek or the Syriac as accurate (re)-productions of the original poetic lines.

**17:6b (G), 17:8a (S)**

ηρήμωσαν τῶν θρόνων Δαυὶδ ἐν ὑπερήφανίᾳ ἄλληγματος they despoiled the throne of David with arrogant shouting
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and they devastated the throne of David
in the pride of their change

and they terminated the throne of David
in their audacious coup d'etat

The Greek ἀλλάγματος “shouting” of mss 260 (149, 471, 606, and 3004) and the Syriac  אָלָלֶהוֹמ  אֲלָהא “of their change” cannot be translations of each other, although ἀλλάγματος “change,” found in the other manuscripts, could (1) be the source of the Syriac, or (2) be a translation of the Syriac, or (3) be an independent translation of a shared Vorlage. If the Greek and Syriac both come from a Hebrew Vorlage, the Hebrew root could well have been וְלָלֵה, the cognate of Syriac ساَل “to change.” If so, there may be particularly strong political overtones in light of the Arabic cognate خلف “the ‘Calif,’ i.e., the successor” (BDB, 322, Lane, 1865, 792–799). In light of Jastrow’s (1950, 472) citation of וְלָלֵה and וְלָלֵה as synonyms of לָלֵה “in place of, instead,” the stem could also have been in the Vorlage of 17:6a, replacing לָלֵה “instead,” which would have provided for enhanced paronomasia in Hebrew. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text and the Greek texts having ἀλλάγματος “(ex)-changing,” over against ἀλλάγματος “shouting,” which contextually is best rendered coup d’etat.

17:8b (G), 17:10b (S)

εὑρέθησαν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἑργά αὐτῶν
it happened to them according to their actions

and it will be found to them according to their works

it will be dealt out to them according to their works
The Greek infinitive εὐρεθήσῃ, rendered by Wright (1985, 666) as “it happened,” and the Syriac imperfect هلمست “and it will be found” cannot be accurate translations of each other, but each could be a translation of a Hebrew Vorlage having the stem הָנָּה “to encounter, to be opportune, to meet” or הָרָה “to assign, to apportion” or סָכָה/סָכֵּה “to befall, to encounter, to meet.” In light of synonymous parallelism קָדָּה תַּא ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν...Kat tα ἐργα αὐτῶν, one expects a synonym of ἀποδώσεις “you rewarded” to appear in 17:8b. Stein (1969: 457) used ὅλητ “you will recompense” in his translation of 17:8b. If this were the original verb in 17:8a, it to recompense, to deal out to” might well be the synonymous parallel in 17:8b. Appropriate parallels of לְמַל can be found in Psalm 13:6, 116:7, 119:17 and 142:8. Although here one cannot be certain what the exact Hebrew was, the difference between the Greek and the Syriac, is probably due to the semantic range of the original Hebrew. The לְמַל “may you (not) repay” in ms 16hl instead of מַל “may you (not) have mercy,” in 17:11 (S) appears to be a misplaced variant for מַל for 17:10b (S), cited above, which equals the לְמַל in the reconstructed Vorlage and supports the use of this word as the synonymous parallel.

17:9b (G), 17:11b (S)

καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτῶν ἑνά, and did not let even one of them go ἄοι καὶ σφοδρός ἐγκατέλαβε, and do not leave even one of them ἀλλὰ δὲν ἀφαίρεσθαι do not give pardon to any one of them

The Greek οὐκ ἀφῆκεν “he did not let go” and the Syriac לְמַל הה “you will not leave,” aside from the difference of

---

186 Mss 253, 336, 655, 659, and 769 have the infinitive, but all other manuscripts read the optative εὐρεθήσῃ.
person and form,\textsuperscript{187} could be translations of each other. But it is difficult to account for the differences in the tenses between the Greek and Syriac text if they are translations of each other. Therefore, it is more likely that \textit{δίκαιος} and \textit{σοφός} are translations of a Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} having the verb meaning “to forgive,” such as \textit{חזר} (or \textit{חזרה}, \textit{חזרות}, or \textit{חזרות}), “to forgive, to pardon.”

Since the verb \textit{חזר} takes the preposition \textit{ל} (as in Psalm 25:11), the \textit{ל} here could account for the difference between the Greek \textit{αὐτῶν} \textit{ἐνα} “a single one of them” (\textit{לאחד מביתו}) and the Syriac \textit{חזרות לאחד מביתו} “not even a single one of them” (\textit{לאחד מביתו לאחד מביתו}). If the \textit{Vorlage} had \textit{חזרות לאחד מביתו לאחד מביתו}, then the \textit{חזרות לאחד מביתו} was read by the Greek translator as the preposition \textit{ל} and the noun \textit{חזרות} (\textit{ל"אחת}) but the Syriac translator read the \textit{חזרות} as the negative particle \textit{לא} and the noun \textit{חזרות} (\textit{ל"אחת}) — an understandable error since in Syriac the root \textit{חזרות} is the verb “to seize” (\textit{Hebrew \textit{חזרות}}), not the number “one” (which is \textit{יח} = \textit{יח}, as in Ezekiel 33:30). The reconstructed \textit{Vorlage} follows the Syriac text with reference to the tense of the verb and the Greek text by having a single negative particle.

17:11a (G), 17:13a (S)

\textit{από ἐκκατομμύρων αὐτὴν}

so that no one inhabited it (Wright)
from (\textit{από}) those who were inhabiting it (Trafton)

\textit{ἱπτὴ} ἐκκατομμύρων

no one was living in it
[for lack of one living in it]

\textit{מָאָם וּמָאָם}

no one was living in it

Contrary to Wright’s translation of \textit{από} as “so that no one. . . ,” the Greek text of this line does not have a negative element

\textsuperscript{187} The Greek text of 17:7–9 has \textit{one} future indicative and \textit{two} aorist indicatives, but the Syriac (17:5a–8a) has \textit{two} imperfects (which, with the negative particle \textit{ב}, have the force of the imperative) and \textit{one} imperative.
corresponding to the Syriac “for lack of, without.” Kuhn’s (1937: 60) proposal, which followed the earlier suggestion of Delitzsch, that the Hebrew Vorlage was has been adopted above, but not his explanation: “während Ḍ etwas frier übersetzen mußte.” It was probably not a matter of a more free translation, but a matter of the Greek having a slightly different Vorlage. The Greek translator must have read ḏב (= ἄπο) rather than ḏב, literally, “from nought of,” reflecting the loss of the Ν in his Vorlage. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac, since as Wright’s translation indicates, the context requires a negative.

17:12a (G), 17:14a (S)

ἐν ὀργῇ κάλλους αὐτοῦ

in his blameless wrath (Wright’s text)

[the wrath of his beauty] (Wright’s note)

ἐν τῷ θυμῷ τῷ βραχῷ

in the beauty of his wrath

Aside from an inverted word order, the Greek and Syriac texts could be translations of each other. But commentators have long viewed the phrase in Greek with suspicion. Proposals have been made to emend κάλλους “beauty” to ζῆλος “zeal” or to reconstruct a Vorlage in which (1) ἁραμάς, as a synonym of ἀρίστη, meant “boastful,” or (2) that ὀξύς “wrath” was corrupted to ὀξύς “his beauty,” or (3) ἔλεος “his soul” was corrupted to ὀξύς “his beauty.” Two other suggestions need to be made. First, the confusion could have been with ἱερός “splendor” (which is also used in the LXX to translate κάλλος) and ἴρυς “to burn.” Second — and more probable than any of the other suggestions — is the confusion of ἱερά.

---

188 See Trafton, 1985: 164–165, for a summary and bibliography on the three proposals.
Metathetic errors have been noted above in the discussions on 2:27, 4:18, 12:3b, 14:6, and below on 18:2. See also Delitzsch, 1920: 118, § 129.

Compare Kuhn (1937: 61) who proposed a Vorlage having the stem צז “to boil up, to seethe,” and Begrich (1939: 142–143) who suggested that the original Hebrew was צז צז “acted arrogantly.”

Aside from their form, the Greek ἐπερηφανίαν “arrogantly, brutally, sumptuous” and the Syriac מָהָרֵךְ מְלָפָּה “boasting” could be translations of each other, but they may also be translations of a Vorlage in which there was a confusion of בָּלָר “inhumane, brutal” (= ἐπερηφανίαν) and בָּר בָּר “boastful” (= מָהָרֵךְ מְלָפָּה). This suggestion has the support of Ezekiel 31:31 and 21:36, which collocates “the fire of my wrath” and בָּר בָּר “brutal men.” Although Delitzsch (1920: 120, § 131) listed examples of the confusion of ב and ב (and the reverse confusion of ב and ב), he cited no examples of the confusion of ב and ב. The confusion of ב and
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The root ָּה could have been another example of an aural error (see, above, the discussion on 17:6a). The context supports the Greek text with ὑπερφηνάντας / ὑπερφηνάνας being understood as “brutal.”

The Greek ἀλλοτρία “alien” and the Syriac مَسْتَفْلِا “in a foreign manner” could be translations of each other, or they could be comparable translations of a Vorlage with the stem מָכַר “foreign.” If the root were מָכַר, the poet may have intended a double entendre since stem I means “to recognize” and stem II means “to be alien” (BDB, 648). The semantic range of the Arabic cognate of stem II is noteworthy. The Arabic نَكْر “cunning” is said of a man who is “intelligent and evil.” Lane (1893, 2850) cited the Qur’an, Sura 18:73, “Verily, thou has done a bad, an evil, an abominable, or a foul thing (يَكْرَ)”.193

17:14a (G), 17:16a (S)
καὶ πάντα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμῳ
So he did in Jerusalem all the things
καὶ ἠλέησαν Ἰεροσολύμῳ
and Jerusalem did everything
καὶ ἀνέπεσεν σφαλής Ἰεροσολύμῳ
and all that he did in Jerusalem

191 Compare Frankenberg’s (1896: 95) suggestion for the Vorlage having בּוֹרָה “in pride” and Gray’s (1913, 648) proposal for a Vorlage having מָכַר “like an alien” for מָכַר.

192 The nuances of stem II in Arabic are of interest. נְכָר can mean “to be ignorant of, to be unacquainted with, to disavow, to deny” (Hava, 1915: 797). In stem IV (= hiph'il) it has the meaning “to deny, to disown, to disacknowledge” (Lane, 2849). In the Qur’an, Sura 16:85 states, “they confess . . . the favor of God; then they deny it (نَكُرُوْنَا).” If نְכָר had a similar nuance, it would give additional support to the interpretation that the enemy was the Hasmoneans who have disavowed and denied the faith, despite their confessions.

193 Two of the angels of death are Munkar (מְנָקָר) and Nakir (נָקִיר). On the use of Hebrew מָכַר “calamity,” see Job 31:3 and Obadiah 12.
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The Syriac and the Greek differ in that in Syriac “Jerusalem” is the subject of the verb while the Greek has ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ (the Syriac text lacks any equivalent for the ἐν) “in Jerusalem.” However, this can hardly be explained as Kuhn (1937: 62–63) proposed, as an instance where the Syriac translator found the text “unverständlich” and stumbled over a preposition. As noted with reference to Psalm 17:8–13 (S 17:10–15), the Syriac and the Greek had difficulty in understanding the Vorlage, but they usually got the preposition ἐν straight. It is also unlikely that the Syriac and Greek texts are translations of each other.

The difference, as to whether or not “Jerusalem” was the subject of the verb was probably due to a confusion of a ἐν and a ἐν in the Vorlage, i.e., whether the verb was ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ “he did” or ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ “she did”. The Greek Vorlage, no doubt, had a third masculine singular ἐν, and consequently “the enemy” became the subject; the Syriac read ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ as third feminine singular and, consequently, “Jerusalem” became the subject. If the Syriac Vorlage had a ἐν preposition prefixed to Ἰερουσαλημ, the ἐν could easily have been read as an emphatic ἐν which went untranslated.194 In this context the Greek best represents the Vorlage and the reconstruction above follows the Greek text.

17:15a (G), 17:17a (S)
καὶ ἐπεκρατοῦσαν αὐτῶν οἱ γυναῖκες τῆς διαθήκης ἐν μέσῳ ἐθνῶν συμμικτῶν
and the children of the covenant (living) among the gentile rabble adopted these (practices)

and the sons of the covenant were holding them among mixed nations


195 Traflon (1985: 166) has the Syriac here as σωμ rather than σωμ.
The Greek ἐπεκρατεῶν “maintained” and the Syriac ʿaskar “holding, adhering to, maintaining” could be translations of each other, or they could be accurate translations of a shared Vorlage. Hatch and Redpath (1954: 523) lists six words translated by ἐπεκρατεῶν, including ἀνέβας and Ἄνδρα, both meaning “to strengthen.” In light of Daniel 9:27, where ἀνέβας is used with ἄνευ ἐνθεορίας, with the sense of “confirming a covenant” (BDB, 149; Montgomery, 1927: 385), is more likely to have been in the Vorlage than Ἄνδρα. The behavior referred to in Psalm 106:35, “they mingled with the nations and learned to do as they did,” corresponds to the behavior described in this verse. Wright’s (1985: 666) rendering ἐσγαὶον συμμίκτων as “gentile rabble” is a contextually based pejorative, rather than a strictly literal, translation. However, his parenthetical “(practices)” is contextually correct and indirectly reflects the phrase “all the things the gentiles do for their gods” of the preceding verse. The reconstructed Vorlage follows closely the Greek and Syriac texts which approximate each other.

17:15c (G), 17:17b (S)
oύκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁ ποιῶν . . . ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαν no one among them . . . acted . . . (with) mercy or truth
and there was not among them anyone who was doing mercy and {truth}

196 and there was not among them one who was doing mercy and truth

196 The reconstructed Vorlage of this line follows Stein (1969: 458).
The Greek and Syriac texts of this line are essentially the same, but Syriac ms 16hl reads ἄρα “and we were doing truth.” The difference between ἄρα and ἄρα reflects a confusion of α and ι, i.e., a misreading of the plural noun ἄρα, the first person plural verb. The Greek text and the context argues against the reading of 16hl. The reconstructed Vorlage has followed the Greek text and the other Syriac manuscripts.

**17:16 (G), 17:18b (S)**

ὡς στροφία ἐξεπέτασθησαν
ἀπὸ κοίτης αὐτῶν

as sparrows fled from their nest

and they flew like sparrows who fly from their nest

λιπαροὶ τὰ ἄρα πλοῖα

like sparrows they flew from their nest

The Syriac text has a doublet. The initial ἄρα “they flew” corresponds to the Greek ἐξεπέτασθησαν “they fled.” The Greek suggests that the Vorlage had the root בاء in the hiphil meaning “to take wing,” as in Job 39:26 כן אֲרָבָא “the hawk soars.” But the doublet favors the stem מַגָּה, wherein the original מגָה “they flew” was read as מַגָּה ( = מַגָּה) “flying ones,” reflecting a confusion of מ and מ. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek and omits any equivalent for the relative particle and the participle, מַגָּה.

**17:17a (G), 17:19a (S)**

ἐπλανώντο ἐν ἑρήμων
σωθῆναι ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ κακοῦ

(they became) refugees in the wilderness

to save their lives from evil

---

197 Wright’s (1985: 666) “(they) fled” for ἐξεπέτασθησαν “they flew, they stretch forth, they expanded (sails)” (Liddell and Scott, 516) is strange unless it is a misprint for “flew” under the influence of the “fled” of the previous line.

198 On the confusion of מ and מ see Delitzsch, 1920: 121, § 132c, 132f.
and they were wandering in the desert
in order to save their soul from evil
they wandered in the wilderness
to save their souls from evil

The Greek passive verb σωθήναν “they might be saved” (which Wright translated as active, “to save”) and the Syriac active infinitive מִלְפְּדָלִים are not accurate translations of each other. Kuhn’s (1937: 15–16, 66) suggestion that the Hebrew Vorlage had the hiph’îl infinitive מְלַפְדָלִים “to save” (= מְלַפְדָלִים, or with scriptio plena מַלְפְדָלִים), which the Greek translator read as the niph’al מְלַפְדָלִים “to be saved,” is quite convincing. However, the root need not to have been מְלַפְדָלִים, for the same ambiguity would have occurred with niph’al and hiph’îl of מְלַפְדָלִים “to save.”

The Syriac Vorlage may have had נֵפְשָׁהוֹן (scriptio defectiva) for נֵפְשָׁהוֹן “their souls,” in which case the Syriac misread נֵפְשָׁהוֹן instead of נֵפְשָׁהוֹן. The reconstructed Vorlage has adopted the active infinitive of the Syriac and the plural ψυχάς αὐτῶν “their souls / their lives” of the Greek.

17:17b (G), 17:19b (S)
καὶ τίμιον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παροικίας
ψυχή σεσωσμένη ἐξ αὐτῶν
the life of even one who was saved
from them was precious in the eyes of the exiles

καὶ τίμιον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παροικίας
ψυχή σεσωσμένη ἐξ αὐτῶν
the life of even one who was saved
from them was precious in the eyes of the exiles

and the sojourning of the soul which was saved
from them was precious in their eyes

and precious in the eyes of the [refugees]
wandering [in the desert]
The Greek and Syriac texts have words in this poetic line which correspond to each other, but they have a very different syntax, making it impossible for them to be an accurate translation of each other. But both texts could go back to a Hebrew Vorlage which could have been read in different ways. Kuhn (1937: 16, 67) proposed that the Hebrew Vorlage of the Syriac was יֶדֶר בֵּיתוֹת מָוָּה נַפְשֶׁה, whereas the Hebrew Vorlage behind the Greek text must have been יֶדֶר בֵּיתוֹת מָוָּה נַפְשֶׁה. The difference between the two texts was the position of the בְּלָא in the middle of the phrase. It was either affixed to the prefixed noun בְּלָא meaning “in their eyes” (= Syriac) or it was prefixed to the following bound noun, מִלָּוָּי meaning “the ones sojourning” (= Greek), in which case the extra ב of the מִלָּוָּי became the suffix, changing מִלָּוָּי to מִלָּוָּי. Begrich’s (1939: 148–149) reservations about the equation of παροικίας with בְּלָא were unfounded in light of the fact that Hatch and Redpath (1954: 1071) listed twelve examples of πάροικος having been used to translate בְּלָא “sojourner, or בְּלָא “to sojourn.”

Kuhn’s proposal may not be absolutely correct, but to challenge it, as did Trafton, in favor of speculative possible adjustments by a Syriac paraphraser’s unspecified misreadings of the Greek text — while asserting, at the same time, that the Syriac text could reflect accurately a Hebrew Vorlage — seems contradictory and unnecessarily cautious.

---

199 Since παροικίας was used in the LXX to translate בְּלָא “exile,” as well as מִלָּוָּי, and מִלָּוָּי “to sojourn, sojourning,” one cannot not preclude the possibility that the Vorlage had the stem בְּלָא. If the Vorlage had מִלָּוָּי, the Greek translator could have used προσηλυτός, as in Ezekiel 14:7, where בְּלָא אֲלֵךְ גְּדוֹלָה מֵאֲזָרִים פְּרוֹשֵׁהוֹתֵם, פְּרוֹשֵׁהוֹתֵם “or of the immigrants who stay in Israel” (NAS) appears in the LXX as αἱ ἐκ τῶν προσηλυτῶν τῶν προσηλυτεύοντων ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ.

200 Trafton’s (1985: 168–169) reservations about Kuhn’s ideas are surprisingly speculative. He noted:

But Kuhn’s argument is not absolutely convincing either. He was correct in pointing out numerous, if indeed minor, differences between Sy and Gk in this
The reconstructed Vorlage, above, follows Kuhn’s analysis, but not his conclusion. He thought that the Syriac reading was correct, but this writer finds the Greek reading to be preferable since the Syriac syntax is awkward and atypical in producing the expression “the sojourning of the soul.” The collocation of ἀναστήσεως and ἐπάθειας in this manner is unattested elsewhere. The Greek text reflects a more traditional syntax with its disassociating, through case endings, παρακλήσεις from ψυχή, even though they are adjacent to each other in the poetic line.

17:20a (G), 17:21b (S)

καὶ λαός ἔλαχιστος

to the commonest of the people (Wright)
and of the least people (Trafton)

ﺇﺫﺍlectron

to their least ones

The λαός “people” of the Greek text and the ἐπάθαν “and to” of the Syriac text cannot be translations of each other. Begrich (1939: 149) suspected that the Syriac translator, using the Greek text, translated καὶ λαός as ἐπάθαν “and of the people” which was subsequently contextually corrupted to ἐπάθαν “and to.” Trafton (1985: 169) followed Begrich and suggested that the corruptions were intentionally done by the Syriac translator, who (apparently for this word or verse) used the Greek text as the basis of his translation.

The above reconstructed Vorlage follows Gray (1913: 626) in recognizing a misreading of a Hebrew Vorlage in which דע (ם) was read by the Greek translator as פא (ט). Delitzsch (1920, passim, especially 119, § 131) listed numerous places where ד and פ were
confused with ב, ב, י, י, ב, ב, ו, ו, and י. Consequently, a proposal for an occasional confusion of י and ב is not unreasonable.

17:22a (G), 17:24b (S)

ἀρχοντας ἀδίκους
the unjust rulers

ἀλαυτ
the rulers of lawlessness

ဝ комнат
sinful rulers

The differences between the Syriac Ṛ dầu产业集聚Enumeration “rulers who are lawless” of ms 10hl and Ṛ dầu产业集聚Enumeration “rulers of lawlessness” of ms 16hl, as well as the Greek ἀρχοντας ἀδίκους “lawless rulers,” are probably due to the position of a ב in the Vorlage. The Greek text and Syriac ms 10hl evidently read שילח ינס, i.e., the plural noun followed by its appositional plural modifier, literally, “rulers, sinful ones.” The Syriac ms 16hl evidently read שילח ינס, i.e., the construct plural noun followed by the nomen rectum. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek and Syriac ms 10hl.

17:22b (G), 17:25a (S)

καθαρίσαι ἱεροσολύμῳ
to purify Jerusalem

Increase יבר ירROL
that he might purify Jerusalem

that he [the son of David] might purify Jerusalem

The Greek infinitive καθαρίσαι “to purge” and the Syriac imperfect יבר ירROL “that he might purge her” cannot be accurate translations of each other even though both use their respective

---

201 The Greek καθαρίσαι in Rahlf’s text, followed by Wright, is an emendation of καθάρισον.
words meaning “to purge.” The simple Syriac imperfect (with its prefixed relative ܐ and the anticipatory suffix ܡ) does not support the statement of Kuhn (1937: 69): “καθαρίσεων ist Korruptel in Ἐ für ursprüngliches καθαρίσαι (Inf. Aor.), wie schon Geiger erkannte und wie es jetzt Ṣ bestätigt.” The Syriac can only confirm that the Vorlage did not have an imperative, even though καθαρίσεων could be parsed as (1) a second singular imperative (Trafton, 1985:171; and was so recognized by Gray, 1913: 649), or (2) a second singular aorist imperfect active. It appears that the Greek translator read a πι' el infinitive ἐκκαθαρίσεται, whereas the Syriac translator read the imperfect ḫw, reflecting the confusion of ܘ and ܒ. 202 The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text, noting that Trafton correctly used the modal “that he might purify” for the Syriac imperfect.

17:25a (G), 17:27b (S)

ἐν ἄπειλήν αὐτοῦ
at his warning

畤ךך at his rebuke

The Greek ἄπειλή “warning” and the Syriac 畤ךך “rebuke” are not literal translations of each other. The broad semantic range of ἄπειλή “to promise, to threaten, to boast, to brag” (Liddell and Scott, 183–183) and the narrow semantic range of 畤ךך (J. Payne Smith, 1903: 201, 203) “to reprove, to rebuke, to chide” do not overlap to include both ideas of “warning” and “rebuke.” But ἄπειλή and 畤ךך could be literal translations of a Hebrew Vorlage having רזג, stem II (attested in the hiph'il and niph'al only) meaning “to instruct, to teach, to warn, to admonish.” In contrast to Stein (1969: 459) who used the stem רזג “rebuke,” (as did Franz Delitzsch [n. d., ad loc.

202 On the confusion of ܒ and ܒ, see Delitzsch 192: 115 § 119').
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17:27b), the reconstructed *Vorlage* uses רֹדֵב to accommodate the ideas expressed by the Greek and the Syriac.

17:26a (G), 17:28a (S)

οὗ ἀφηγησετάλ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ
whom he will lead in righteousness

which will boast in righteousness

which will boast in righteousness

whom he will lead in righteousness

The Greek ἀφηγησετάλ “he will lead” and the Syriac רֹדֵב “he will boast” cannot be translations of each other. Kuhn (1937: 16–17, 70) was on target with his suggestion that in reading the *Vorlage* there was a confusion of the root לָדָה “to lead” and the root לָדָה, which in the *qal* and the *hiphil* means “to boast.” Kuhn opted for a *hithpa`el* לְדוֹתָה, but in light of Psalm 75:5, where the *qal* of לָדָה is attested with one לָדָה (לָדָה לָדָה “do not boastful”), the *Vorlage* could have been the *p`el* לָדָה (the *qal*, with the ` assimilated, is unattested). In this case, the Syriac translator misread, or his *Vorlage* had, לָדָה for לָדָה. The reconstructed *Vorlage* follows the Greek text which is contextually appropriate.

17:29a (G), 17:31b (S)

κρινεῖ λαοῖς καὶ έθνη
he will judge peoples and nations

because he judges nations and cities

surely, he will judge the peoples and the nations

203 On the forms of ל"ד verbs see GKC, 177, § 67c-s.
The Syriac ṣḥăm “because” has no corresponding particle in the Greek text. The extended debate, as to whether or not ṣḥăm is derived from a misreading of ḥēl (in 17:28) as the particle ḥēl, has been summarized by Trafton (1985: 173–175). Surprisingly, no one has suggested that the Greek text could have been ḥēl ḥēl, and that the ḥēl was dropped from the Greek due to haplography. On the other hand, the Syriac ṣḥăm suggests that the Hebrew Vorlage had an initial emphatic ḫ or ḫ, which was misread as the preposition. In either case, the force of the emphatic ḫ in the original Hebrew went unrecognized by the Syriac and Greek translators. The hint of its presence survives only in ṣḥăm, which is unnecessary as a causal particle.

The Syriac ᵐḏам, “cities” does not translate the Greek λαοὺς or ἐθνη. A Hebrew Vorlage with נְבֵל asm as in Isaiah 2:3 and Nehemiah 9:22) was misread by the Syriac translator as נְבֵל “cities.” The reconstructed Vorlage restores the emphatic and follows the Greek collocation of “nations and peoples.”

17:30a (G), 17:32a (S)

καὶ ἔχει λαοῖς ἐθνη

and he will have gentile nations

וכָה נִישׂים מִן הָעָם

and he will possess a nation from the nations

and he will possess gentile peoples

The Greek ἔχει “he will have” and the Syriac ᵐḏам “he will possess” could be translations of each other, but the absence of ἀπό from the Greek text corresponding to the Syriac מר “from” suggests that the translations are derived from a Hebrew Vorlage having the

---

204 See the discussion above on 17:22 for other examples of the confusion of ḫ with ḫ or ḫ.
verb יָשֵׁר (which equals the כִּמּוֹת “to possess”) which was misread by the Greek translator as the particle ἐστὶ “being, having.”

The preposition μή probably comes from a Vorlage which had מְנַעֵם נִמְנַעֵם “peoples, gentile (ones).” However, it was read by the Syriac translator as מְנַעֵם מְנַעֵם “the peoples from the gentiles.” The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek and has no preposition equivalent to the Syriac מְנַעֵם.

17:30b (G), 17:32b (S)

καὶ τὸν κύρος δοξάσει ἐν ἑσπερίῳ πάντας τῆς γῆς

and [he] will glorify the Lord in (a place) prominent

(above) the whole earth

καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐν ἑσπερίῳ δοξάσει ἀναστὰς ἐν ἑσπερίῳ

and they will glorify the Lord openly in all the land

ἔχουσιν γὰρ διά τὸν κύρος ἀναστὰς ἐν ἑσπερίῳ

they will glorify Yahweh freely in all the earth

The Syriac δέρμα “publicly” and the Greek ἑν ἑσπερίῳ “in prominence” cannot be accurate translations of each other. However, they may be translations of a Hebrew Vorlage which had the noun יָשֵׁר “liberty,” used as an adverbial accusative meaning “freely, openly, publicly,” which the Greek translator misread as יָשֵׁר יָשֵׁר “splendor, honor.” A similar confusion of יָשֵׁר with יָשֵׁר “splendor” according to Hoffmann (ZAW 1882, 103, cited in BDB 214), occurs in Micah 2:9, ἑν ἑσπερίῳ δοξάσει ἀναστὰς ἐν ἑσπερίῳ, “the women of my people you drive out from their pleasant houses; from their young children you take freedom for ever” (RSV, “... my glory forever”).

205 For other examples of a construct chain with an intervening preposition see the discussions on 6:3a and 16:1b.

206 On the confusion of י with י and and the confusion of י with י, see Delitzsch, 1920: 105–106, § 104+ and 114, §114+.
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The difference between the Greek δοξάσει “he will glorify” and the Syriac نبزي “they will glorify” can readily be accounted for by a Vorlage having "they will glorify Yahweh," in which the final ו of נבזב was lost by haplography due to the initial ו of נבזב. The reconstructed Vorlage follows the Syriac text at this point.

The Greek remains problematic as Gray (1913: 650) indicated by his inserting “(?))” in his translation and Wright’s (1985: 667) inserting “(a place)” and “(above)” in his translation. Here is an example of the importance of the Syriac text as a possible corrective to the Greek text which needs to be recognized by those who work with the theology of the Psalms of Solomon. The haplography of a single letter can transform a statement of universalism (“they [the nations which serve the son of David] will glorify Yahweh freely in all the earth”) into a narrow, nationalistic statement (“he [the son of David] will glorify Yahweh freely in all the earth”).

17:31b (G), 17:34b (S)

τοὺς ἐξοσθενηκότας ὑιοῖς αὐτῆς
her children who had been driven out (Wright)
her sons who had fainted (Trafton)

מִשְׁמָטָיו לְאָחָיו מְסֻלָּל

to her sons who were scattered from her

לָבֲנֵיהֶם נָוָים

to her sons, the ones scattered

The Greek ἐξοσθενηκότας “who were faint” and the Syriac מִשְׁמָטָיו “those who were scattered” cannot be translations of each other. For this participle, Wright (1985: 667) apparently translated the Syriac verb rather than the Greek. Kuhn (1937: 17, 72–73) proposed a Hebrew Vorlage with הָיָהוֹרִים “the ones scattered” which became corrupted to הָיָהוֹרִים “the ones who became faint.” Begrich (1939: 146) argued against Kuhn, noting that a corruption of ו and ו is not likely. Delitzsch (1920, passim) listed numerous examples of the ו being confused with ו, ו, ו, and ו, but he
cited no example of the confusion of ז and ר, which lends support to Begrich’s reservations.

Nevertheless, Kuhn’s approach was correct although his targeting of the roots דא and וב may have been in error. In light of the MT of Ezekiel 6:8, דא וב גאפניא “when you are scattered through the country,” and Ezekiel 36:19, דא וב גאפניא “I scattered them among the nations and they were dispersed through the countries,” it is much more likely that the Hebrew Vorlage had the root דא, which was misread by the Greek translator as וב “to be faint, to be ill.”

In light of Isaiah 49:22, “and they shall bring your sons in their bosom, and your daughters shall be carried on their shoulders” (direct object) and Isaiah 60:4 and 9, “and your daughters shall be carried in the arms. . . . to bring your sons from far, their silver and gold with them” (indirect object), υἱὸς αὐτῆς “her [Jerusalem’s] sons” could be either the direct object or the indirect object. The Greek understood it to be the former (“to bring as gifts her children”), and the Syriac took it to be the latter (“they bring gifts to her sons”). The reconstructed Vorlage has followed the Syriac text, making “her sons” the recipients of gifts which were carried.

17:32c (G), 17:36c (S)
καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κυρίος
and their king shall be the Lord Messiah

וְלַמֵּלָהּ מֶלֶךְ אֲשֶׂרֶד
and their king (will be) an anointed lord

In much the same manner in which רבי המלך ישהנה in I Samuel 16:6 (LXX ἐνωτίνων κυρίου χριστός) was interpreted to mean the “Lord’s anointed is before him” (KJV, RSV), the χριστός κυρίος

207 On the confusion of ז with י and ר with ג, see Delitzsch, 1920, 113 §112 and 111 § 109.
in this poetic line has generally, but incorrectly, been emended to χριστός κυρίου and considered to be the equivalent of הושע. Gray (1913: 650) translated it as “the anointed of the Lord”; and Wellhausen (1924: 162) similarly rendered it “der Gesalbte des Herrn”; and the emendation appeared in Rahlf’s text (1935, 488). However, the κυρίου of χριστός κυρίου is not a reference to הושע but to the Judean king introduced in 17:21, “raise up for them their king, the son of David” and referred to as “lord” in 17:34.

The collocation of “O Lord,” “their king,” and “O God” in 17:21 (Syriac 17:23) provides the clue for understanding the use of “Lord” in all of 17:20–51. Reference to “the king” in 17:20 is clearly the earthly ruler (seemingly the Hasmoneans who exchanged the priest’s turban for the king’s crown). The divine “Lord” and “King” (א主動) is referred to in the following verses:

Greek 21a (Syriac 23a) “O Lord”
Greek 21b (Syriac 23b) “O God”
Greek 26b (Syriac 28a) “the Lord their (Syriac = ‘his’) God”
Greek 30a (Syriac 32b) “the Lord”
Greek 31a (Syriac 35a) “with which God”
Greek 31b (Syriac 35b) “by God”
Greek 34a (Syriac 38a) “for the Lord (Syriac + ‘himself’) is his king”
Greek 34b (Syriac 38b) “his God”
Greek 37a (Syriac 42a) “his God”
Greek 37b “for God”
Greek 38 (Syriac 43) “of the Lord”
Greek 39 (Syriac 44a) “in the Lord” (Syriac “. . . the Lord”)
Greek 40a (Syriac 44b) “fear of (Syriac + ‘his’) God”
Greek 40b (Syriac 45a) “of the Lord”
Greek 42a “which God knew”
Greek 44 “which God will”
Greek 45 “may God”
Greek 46 (Syriac 51b) “the Lord (Greek + ‘Himself’)”

The earthly “lord” or “king” is the antecedent of the explicit / implicit “he / him” in 17:21–44 (Syriac 17:23–50); but in 17:45 (Syriac 17:51) the antecedent of the third person singular pronouns is God. In 17:45–46 (Syriac 17:51) the noun “Lord” is in synonymous parallelism with “God,” and the third person singular pronouns are a reference to God. In contrast, the “an anointed lord” here in 17:32c (Syriac 17:36b) is clearly not a reference to הושע — who would be the הושע “the anointer” — but to the הושע “the anointed.”
The Syriac phrase, \( \text{κυρίος} \text{αναστατμένος} \), consists of two nouns in the emphatic state, namely, “the anointed” and its appositional modifier, “the Lord.” The syntax differs from the similar phrase \( \text{κυρίος} \text{αναστατμένος} \) in Lamentations 4:20, which has both nouns in the emphatic state, but the relative pronoun stands between them, requiring the meaning to be “the anointed of the Lord.” It is noteworthy that the definite article is not attested with either \( \chiριστός \) or \( \kυρίος \).²⁰⁹

Hann (1982: 138–139, 176; 1985: 620–627) and Wright (1985: 667–668) were correct in accepting the \( \chiριστός \kυρίος \) as it appears in the manuscripts, recognizing that it is analogous to the title \( \text{βασιλεὺς} \kυρίος \) given to Herod the Great and Herod Agrippa.³³ “an anointed lord” appears in the reconstructed Vorlage above, in contrast to Frankenberg’s (1896: 84) and Franz Delitzsch’s (n. d., ad loc. 17:36b) and Stein’s (1969: 459) \( \text{μελέτημεν} \kυρίος \), all of which need to be translated “their king, the anointed of Yahweh.”²¹⁰

17:33b (G), 17:37b (S)

\[
\text{kai} \text{πολλοίς λαοῖς οὐ συνάξει ἐλπίδας (Rahlfs)}
\]

nor will he build up hope in a multitude (Wright)

\[
\text{kai} \text{πολλοῖς οὐ συνάξει ἐλπίδας (Wright)}
\]

and to many things he will not gather hope (Trafton)

\[
\text{και} \text{πολλοῖς οὐ συνάξει ἐλπίδας (Wright)}
\]

and he will not trust in many

\[
\text{και} \text{πολλοῖς οὐ συνάξει ἐλπίδας (Wright)}
\]

and he will not place his hope upon the generals

²⁰⁹ However, the absence of the definite article is not decisive for reading \( \text{kυρίος} \) (over against \( \text{δόχος} \)) as “lord” rather than “the Lord.” In Exodus 23:17, for example, the phrase \( \text{βασιλέως} \text{κυρίος} \text{αναστατμένος} \), “before the Lord Yahweh” was paraphrased in the LXX as \( \text{ἐνάοπτου κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου} \), “before (the) Lord the God of you.”

²¹⁰ Ordinarily, the attributive modifier (which, in this case, is \( \text{κυρίος} \)) follows the noun (which, in this case, is \( \text{kυρίος} \)). But Gesenius (GKC § 132’) has noted examples where the adjectival attribute stands appositively before its substantive for emphasis. Note Joosten’s study (1993) on the “ante-position” of the attributive adjective.
The Greek συνάξει ἐλπίδας “he will gather hope” and the Syriac ḫannū “he will hope” are not literal translations of each other, though they express a similar idea. Likewise, Wright’s (1985: 668) translation of πολλοῖς as “multitude” is not equivalent to Trafton’s (1985: 179) translation of πολλοῖς as “many things,” for “multitude” permits the reference to be to people (as though Wright was drawing on Rahlf’s [1935, 488] addition of λαοῖς to the text), whereas “many things” precludes πολλοῖς from referring to people.

The contextually enigmatic πολλοῖς σὺνάξει ἐλπίδας has given rise to a number of emendations of the Greek text, well summarized in Trafton (1985: 178–179), including the following proposed “corrections” seeking to make sense of this poetic line within the context of verses 32–40:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Proposed Meaning</th>
<th>Translator/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πολλοίς</td>
<td>= ἀρχιστήριον</td>
<td>“archers” Geiger (1871: 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλπίδας</td>
<td>= ἄσπιδας</td>
<td>“shields” Hilgenfeld (1886, 160; 1871, 413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολλοῖς</td>
<td>= ἀλλοίς</td>
<td>“others” Hilgenfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολλοῖς</td>
<td>= παλαῖς</td>
<td>“spears” Hilgenfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολλοῖς</td>
<td>= ὄπλοις</td>
<td>“weapons” Hilgenfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολλοῖς</td>
<td>= πλοῖοις</td>
<td>“by ships” Ryle and James (1891: 142–144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνάξει</td>
<td>= προσφερόμενο Χριστός</td>
<td>“hoping” Ryle and James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλπίδας</td>
<td>= προσφερόμενο Χριστός</td>
<td>“hope” Ryle and James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολλοῖς</td>
<td>= πολλοῖς</td>
<td>“many people” von Gephardt (1895, 187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαοῖς</td>
<td>= πολλοῖς</td>
<td>“many” Viteau (1911, 362–363)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all these proposals, only the suggestions of Geiger and Kittel for a Vorlage having מָנֶגֶן “Menge, archers” lead to a reasonable interpretation of the poetic line. Their reconstruction to מָנֶגֶן was correct, but Geiger and Kittel failed to recognize a more appropriate definition of מָנֶגֶן. Although מָנֶגֶן could be from מָנֶגֶן stem II “to shoot (arrows)” or from מָנֶגֶן stem I “much, many (either quantitative or qualitative),” מָנֶגֶן probably had the special nuance
found in the following passages in which הָגַר is a synonym for "officer":

(1) Jeremiah 39:3, where הָגַר occurs twice in names/titles of the officers (םַנְאָמָה פָּלַשְׁתֵּי מֶלֶךְ-בֶּנֶל):

"all the princes of the king of Babylon came and sat in the middle gate:
Nergalsharezer, Samgarnebo, Sarsechim the Rabsaris, Nergalsharezer the Rabmag,
with all the rest of the officers of the king of Babylon."
(The LXX [46:3 = MT 39:3] translates הָגַר as ἡγεμόνες βασιλέως Βαβυλωνός.)

(2) Jeremiah 39:13, where הָגַר occurs four times, three times as a name component and once in the phrase סַרְסֶחי מֶלֶךְ-בֶּנֶל "chief officers of the king of Babylon": 211

"So Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard,
Nebushazban the Rabsaris,
Nergalsharezer, Rabmag, and all the chief officers
of the king of Babylon sent. . . ."

The LXX is lacking this part of Jeremiah, but in light of the translation of הָגַר as ἡγεμόνες βασιλέως Βαβυλωνός "officers of the king of Babylon," one would expect the same translation for the synonymous סַרְסֶחי מֶלֶךְ-בֶּנֶל.

211 These officers equal the מֶלֶךְ-בֶּנֶל in 39:3.
(3) Jeremiah 41:1, where רבי המלך (rebbe melakh) appears as a synonym for רבי המלך (rebbe melakh):

רבי המלך נשלחו משפחות
כאלנשיים ומכרים חליפות
ורבי המלך נשלחו משפחות

“Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, son of Elishama, of the royal family, one of the chief officers of the king, came with ten men . . .”

Unfortunately the Greek text lost the equivalent phrase for רבי המלך (rebbe melakh) (or had a different Hebrew Vorlage lacking the phrase).

Since the Greek translator rightly rendered שיר מַלְכֶּךָ as ἡγεμόνες βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος, one can assume that he would have known the meaning of רבי המלך in the same chapter. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude, even with the loss of the phrase from the LXX in verse 48:1, that רבי המלך and שיר מַלְכֶּךָ are synonymous and that both would appear in Greek as ἡγεμόνες βασιλέως. The noun בר would be the equivalent of ἡγεμόνες. The Greek and Syriac translators can be faulted, in words borrowed from Barr (1968: 268), for “a strong tendency towards leveling the vocabulary and the interpretation of that which is rare as if it was that which is more normal.” Instead of offering a contextually controlled translation of בר, they gave πολλοί and θεατή, simple lexical equivalents.212

The Syriac has only רבי המלך “he will hope” corresponding to the Greek phrase συνάξει εἴλπίδας “he will bring about hope.” This difference suggests that the poet probably used a schema etymologicum, similar to that used in Lamentations 1:8, זָאַבְזִי לְבָדִי, “Jerusalem sinned a sin.”213 The Syriac translator evidently

212 Note the use of רבי המלך in Esther 1:8, ראני ישו אל מלך על כל יבש עיר, “the king had given orders to all the officials of his palace.” In Jeremiah 41:1, רֹאָשׁ בַּר “nobles, chiefs, princes” was the Peshitta’s word of choice for the רֹאָשׁ.

213 See GKC § 117*.
simplified the poetic line by translating the verb without its cognate accusative.

If one accepts any of the emendations noted above, the latent clues for the proper understanding of the poetic line become inaccessible. (Maintaining the integrity of the text does not require simple satisfaction with a literal interpretation of the text, especially when there is evidence that the text is a translation.) The reconstructed Vorlage has the schema etymologicum and it restores the technical nuance of מובא הרש which is equal to ἡγεμόνες “generals, governors”214 and οἱ συμβάσεις “nobles, chiefs, princes.”

17:34a (G), 17:38a (S)

\[\varepsilonλπις τοι δυνατου \varepsilonλπις θεου\]
the hope of the one who has a strong hope in God (Wright)

\[\text{the hope of the power by the hope of God (Trafton)}\]

\[\text{his trust and his power are in the trust of God}\]

\[\text{the hope of the mighty man (is) in the hope of God}\]

The Greek and the Syriac texts have four corresponding lexical elements in this line, but their syntax is very different. The \(\varepsilonλπις \ldots \varepsilonλπις\) is matched by \(\text{μεσο} \ldots \text{μεσο}\), \(\text{τοι δυνατου}\) has a corresponding \(\text{μεσο}\), and \(\text{θεου}\) is matched by \(\text{μεσο}\). But the Greek cases and the Syriac pronomial suffixes, preposition, and particle do not correspond. The translations of \(\text{τοι δυνατου}\) differ. Wright made \(\text{τοι δυνατου personal; Trafton made it impersonal. In order to make sense out of the line, Wright made the dative \varepsilonλπις the direct object of the genitive \text{τοι δυνατου, and Trafton introduced the preposition “by” to accommodate the dative \varepsilonλπις.}\)

214 Note Thomson’s (1808, ad loc. [1960: 1208]) translation of Jeremiah 39:3 (LXX = MT), “and all the generals [italics added] of the king of Babylon entered and sat in the middle of the gate . . . . ”
The third person singular suffixes ס and ח in the Syriac text are anticipatory suffixes, characteristic of Aramaic idiom. They would not have been in the Hebrew Vorlage. The balanced use of ב twice and ח three times in the reconstructed Vorlage seeks to restore what may have been the assonance in the original Hebrew.

17:36b (G), 17:41b (S)

by the strength of his word
with his word
by the strength of his word

The Greek "strength" has no counterpart in the Syriac text, and the suffix ס of the Syriac has no equivalent in the Greek text. The reconstructed Vorlage conflates the two traditions; and the root חגע “strength” was selected as the word of choice in restoring alliteration and a consonant cluster which could easily have led to haplography, namely, חגע חגע “the strength of his word.” The Samaritan (mis)spelling of MT חגע חגע “your strength” in Deuteronomy 33:25 as חגע חגע (יִסְכּוּיָתָא in the LXX and חק in Syriac), though it reflects the confusion of ח and ח, demonstrates that חגע and חגע were by-forms. A Vorlage reading חגע חגע was corrupted in the Syriac tradition to חג ע חג ע, consequently, the reconstructed Vorlage follows the Greek text.

215 S. R. Driver (1903, 415) noted with reference to MT חגע חגע, that it is “as yet unexplained” (Di.). Strength (חגע חגע Saad.) yields an excellent sense; but it has no philological justification, a root חגע חגע not being known.” Since S. R. Driver wrote, the stem חגע has been attested in Ugaritic, and G. R. Driver (1971, 116–117) gave חג ע the meaning of “prowess” in Baal IV, ii, 1, line 21, “for Baal will anoint the horn of thy prowess (קרן.חג ע).”
As Trafton (1985: 180) noted, “would be an unusual translation of ἀσθενήσει.” But both and ἀσθενήσει could be translations of a Vorlage having the stem “to slip, to totter, to fall,” which was confused with “to be or become small, to be diminished.” Hatch and Redpath (1954, 172) listed sixteen words in Hebrew translated by ἀσθενής, including , including . The confusion of and has been noted already in the discussion of 16:1a, on the line, “my soul forsook the Lord for a bit,” and 16:1b, on the phrase, “for a while I sank into a deadly coma.” The reconstructed Vorlage, having , is not a literal back-translation of either the Greek or the Syriac.

Aside from the matter of tense, the Greek and the Syriac texts could be translations of each other, but the difference in tense is enough to suggest that they are translations of a Hebrew Vorlage in which there was a confusion of the verbal prefix ἑ (used for the perfect tense of the hiphil and hophal, which is suggested by the Syriac) and the imperfect prefix ἐ (used across the paradigm for the
third masculine singular, which is suggested by the Greek).\textsuperscript{216} Since the poet in 17:34a spoke of power, which could have been \( הָיָֽלָה \) in the \textit{Vorlage}, the word for “weakness” in this verse could have been \( הָיָֽלָה \) for assonance and paronomasia. A Hebrew text which read \( הָיָֽלָה \) (a \textit{hophal} imperfect) would have been misread by the Syriac translator as \( הָיָֽלָה \) (a \textit{hophal} perfect). The reconstructed \textit{Vorlage} follows the Greek text by having the imperfect tense.

\textit{17:39b (G), 17:44a (S)}
\[
\text{καὶ τίς δύναται πρὸς αὐτόν}
\]
then \textit{who will succeed} against him
\[
\text{μετὰ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν}
\]
and \textit{who will rise up} against him
\[
\text{ὃς ἔσται ἐν αὐτῷ}
\]
\textit{who will prevail against him}

The Greek τίς δύναται “who will succeed” and the Syriac \( מַמָּשׁ \) “who will rise against” could possibly be free translations of each other. Kuhn (1937: 77) proposed that they were derived from a Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} having \( מַמָּשׁ \) “who is standing before him.” However, Hatch and Redpath (1954, 355) listed twenty-five Hebrew words which are translated by δύνατος and בֵּין was not one of them. The proposed Hebrew root in the \textit{Vorlage} is \( לָלַי \) “to be able, to have power,” with the nuance attested in Psalm 13:5, \( לָלַיָּהוּ בְּשֵׁם יְהֹוָה \). “lest my enemy say, ‘I have prevailed over him’; lest my foes rejoice because I am shaken.’”

\textit{17:40c (G), 17:45b (S)}
\[
\text{ἐν τῷ ποιμνί ἑαυτῶν}
\]
in their pasture
\[
\text{ἐν τῷ ποιμνί}
\]
in his flock

\textsuperscript{216} On the confusion of 7 and ἴ, see Delitzsch, 1920: 114, § 116\textsuperscript{e}.  

---

\textit{The Psalms of Solomon}
The Greek νομῇ αὐτῶν “their pasture” and the Syriac ܢܘܡܐ ܐܘܛܘܢ “his flock” do not appear to be translations of each other, but in light of the metonymy appearing in Jeremiah 10:21 (כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ נָמַה לֹא כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ נָמַה לֹא כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ נָמַה כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ נָמַה כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ נָמַה כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ נָמַה כְּשָׁפְיָהוּ Nāmaḥ), “for the shepherds are stupid, and do not inquire of the Lord; therefore they have not prospered, and all their flock [literally, ‘their pasture’] is scattered”), either the Greek or the Syriac translator could have used the same device. If it were the Greek translator, he was wiser than the LXX translator of Jeremiah 10:21, who rendered the last half of the verse διὰ τοῦτο ὡκ ἐνόησαν πᾶσα ἡ νομῇ καὶ διεσκορπίσθησαν, “therefore, the whole pasture has failed, and have been scattered.”

The reconstructed Vorlage follows the מַלְבָּשָׂה attested in Jeremiah 10:21.

17:41a (G), 17:46a (S)

ἐν ἴσότητι πάντας αὐτοῖς ἔξει
he will lead them in all holiness

לְכָלָה<br>he will gather all of them in serenity

כָּלָה יְשִׁירֵיהוּ כָּלָה<br>he will lead all of them in righteousness

The Greek ἴσότητι “equality” or the variant ὁσιότης “pious” (found in mss 149, 260, 471, 606, and 769, which are the basis for Wright’s “holiness”) cannot be translations of the Syriac ܢܘܡܐ ܐܘܛܘܢ “simple, sincerity, serenity.” But all three readings could be derived from a Hebrew Vorlage having the root רָשָׁר “to be smooth, to be straight, to be right” or one of its derivatives like רָשָׁר “uprightness” or בִּינָשׁ “evenness, equity.” Stein (1969: 460) used this root in his

217 Note Thomson’s (1808, ad loc. [1960, 1164]) use of metonymy, “therefore the whole flock [italics added] was thoughtless and they are scattered.”
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218

Franz Delitzsch (n.d., ad loc. 17:46) initially translated \( \text{!lkAta lhny vdqb} \) ["in holiness he will lead all of them"], but changed it to read \( \text{!lkAta lhny} \) ["he will lead all of them equity"].

219

The translation is based upon the nuance of \( \text{rvy} \) cited by J. Payne Smith (1903: 430 [c.]) "sore, previous, heavy, hard, severe."

220

The collocation of the stem \( \text{!hyl} \) and \( \text{hny} \) is attested in the Qere of Psalm 123:4, "Too long our soul has been sated with the scorn of those who are at ease, the contempt of the proud oppressors (\( \text{!ynI/y yaegÒli} \) for Kethib \( \text{!ynI/yaegÒli} \))."
might bring oppression,” which could have been misread as the hop'kal הָוַלָּה (אַ֣בְרָם) “it [ולא] be oppressive.”

17:43a (G), 17:48a (S)

τὰ ρήματα αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένα ὑπὲρ χρυσίου
to πρῶτον τίμιον

his words will be purer than the finest gold, the best

καὶ τὰ ρήματα παρέπεμπεν ὑπὲρ τιμίου

his words will be proven more than gold and will be precious


his words will be more precious than choice gold

The Greek πεπυρωμένα “fire–tested” and τὸ πρῶτον “the first, the finest, the choicest” appear to be a doublet since a word corresponding to τὸ πρῶτον is lacking in the Syriac. The doublet reflects the confusion of הָבָל “to test” and הָבָל “to choose.” A similar confusion of הָבָל and הָבָל is attested in Isaiah 4:10, אָבָל אִבָּל אִבָּל אָבָל אָבָל אָבָל “behold, I have refined you, but not like silver; I have chosen you in the furnace of affliction.” For the MT יִבְּרָל (= LXX ἐξειλάμην), the Qumran scroll 1QIs reads יִבְּרָל “I have tested you.” The Greek τίμιον “the best” is used in the LXX primarily to translate the stem ḫp “precious,” indicating that in this line τίμιον is the equivalent of the Syriac קְרָומָה “precious.” Stylistically, the Syriac translator produced a more idiomatic poetic line than the Greek translator, who read ḫp as an appositional adjective rather than a verb. The reconstructed Vorlage has an inverted word order — for emphasis — with the verb coming at the end. The word order follows the Greek text, which has τίμιον at the end of the line, as well as the Syriac text, which has

221 Compare Luke 15:22, ἐδεινεύκατε στολὴν τὴν πρώτην “bring forth the choicest robe.”

222 For the confusion of ה and ה, see Delitzsch, 1920: 112, §111.

223 Note that Stein (1969: 460) did not translate τίμιον. Frankenberg (1896: 84) translated it by the noun ἴδιον “refined gold.”
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The translation of χρυσίων as ἀργυρόν “gold,” rather than ἀλάτον which is the cognate of אֲלָתָה, highlights the fact that χρυσίων is a Semitic loanword in Greek, perhaps mediated through Mycenean (Chantraine, 1968: 1278).

Psalm Eighteen

18:2a
οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ αὐτὰ
your eyes are watching over them

καὶ οὐχ ὑπερήφανε ἐξ αὐτῶν
none of them will be in need

καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν μετὰ τὴς ὑπακοῆς
and there is nothing which is hidden from them

and nothing is hidden from them [your eyes]

The difference between the Greek ὑπερήφανε “will lack” and the Syriac ḫurar “is hidden” can be accounted for by assuming that the Hebrew Vorlage had the verb דָּרַךְ “to hide,” which was correctly
render in Syriac, but the Greek translator or his Vorlage read ὑπερ “to lack” instead of ὑπὲρ and translated accordingly. Metathetic variants have been noted elsewhere in this study, and the confusion of ἐν and ἐν has been well documented by Delitzsch (1920: 118, §129).

18:2b

τὰ ὕπατα σου ἐπακούει εἰς δέησιν πτωχοῦ ἐν ἐλπίδι

your ears listen to the hopeful prayer of the poor

and your ears hear the hope of the poor

your ears harken to the hopeful prayers of the poor

The Greek δέησιν “prayer” has no corresponding element in the Syriac text. It would appear that a word has dropped out of the Syriac. If the Vorlage had ὑπερ “in hope” and ἐπάνω “to the prayers” (scriptio defectiva), it would be easy to account for a haplography of ὑπερ or ἐπάνω. Although ὑπερ in Biblical Hebrew is generally followed by the preposition ἐν, the preposition ἐν is attested occasionally, as in Job 15:8, ἔχεις ἀλλάζεις τῷ πνεύματι, “Have you heard the counsel of God?” (NKJV).

18:3b (G), 18:4a (S)

ή ἀγάπη σου ἐπὶ σπέρμα Ἀβρααμ υἱὸν Ἰσραὴλ

and your love is for the descendants of Abraham, an Israelite

and your love is upon the seed of Israel, the son of Abraham

and your love is upon the seed of Israel, the son of Abraham

The singular υἱὸν Ἰσραὴλ was understood by Wright (1985: 669) as an appositional modifier of Ἀβρααμ, making Abraham an Israelite. On the other hand, Ryle and James (1891: 149) and Gray (1913: 651) followed mss 655 and 659 in reading the plural υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ and translated, respectively, “even the sons of Israel” and
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“the children of Israel.” For them, the plural υἱῶν was the appositional modifier of the singular collective σπέρμα (σπέρματα in mss 655 and 659), making for a poetic parallel — though not a parallelism — with Ἰσραὴλ being in parallel with Ἀβραὰμ and σπέρμα / σπέρματα being in parallel with υἱῶν.

The Syriac clearly makes Ἰσραὴλ σιὼν “the son of Abraham” to be the modifier of the man named Israel, i.e., the singular “son” modified the singular proper name, not the singular noun ὕιος “seed.” The ambiguity of ὕιος in the Hebrew Vorlage, which could be a collective or a true singular, may have contributed to the secondary shift of σπέρμα to σπέρματα and υἱῶν to υἱῶν, as well as the inversion of the proper names in the Greek tradition.

If the Greek ἐπὶ σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ reflects the original meaning, it would seem to be an attempt to exclude the offspring of Ishmael and Esau, an exclusion which was a moot issue at the time of this psalm. Since Abraham is nowhere else in Jewish tradition identified as an “Israelite,” it appears that the Syriac text provides the best reading by making “the son of Abraham” a modifier of the proper noun “Israel,” rather than the common noun “seed.”

Summary

In the above psalm by psalm examination of the 18 psalms in 213 instances where the Greek and Syriac texts are not equal to each, three methodologies (text critical, exegetical and philological) have provided possible solutions to explain the differences. One hundred and forty-two of these proposals involve errors of the textual transmission and/or translation process (confusion of graphically similar letters, haplography, metathesis, doublets, and dittography).

Another 65 can be attributed to errors involving the semantic range of the proposed Hebrew Vorlage where either the Syriac or Greek translators (or both) chose the contextually inappropriate meaning or missed it altogether or because of the ambiguity of an unpointed Hebrew text. Again, Barr’s (1985:268) comments on the Septuagint translators are pertinent here:
It seems to me in general that the ancient translators did their task remarkably well given the circumstances. Their grasp of Hebrew, however, was very often a grasp of that which was average and customary in Hebrew . . . . Where it is a matter, however, of obscure words in the normal contexts and of strange meanings for common words there was a strong tendency toward the leveling of the vocabulary and the interpretation of that which is rare as if it was that which was more normal.

There are only twelve instances where an appeal to cognate languages provides the clues for the differences between the Greek and Syriac and somewhat surprisingly, given the frequent appeal by Dahood in his Anchor Bible volumes on Psalms to Ugaritic, it was of no importance for these psalms. These Psalms are much later than the canonical Psalms but it might have been possible for some of the Ugaritic features to survive if there had been much conscious imitation of the canonical Psalter. The Greek variants were likewise of little importance—only twice were they able to provide the clues to the proposed Vorlage. Eight times the suggestion is made to redivide the proposed Hebrew consonantal text and in six places the emphatic particles went unrecognized by the Greek and Syriac translators. For seven of the examples the solution may go back to an aural stage in the transmission of the text. Five times the difference can be explained by the preservation of a Hebrew idiom in either the Greek or the Syriac and failure to recognize double-duty verbs, vocatives, prepositions, or negatives occurs eight times.

In only a relatively few instances is appeal made to a more speculative methodology such as idiomatic translation (5 times), conflation of the Greek and Syriac texts (4 times), inversion of a line (once) and emendation (only once in all of the eighteen psalms). On the whole the cumulative weight of the evidence indicates a high degree of probability for an original Hebrew Vorlage.

Following is a listing of the passages (using the Greek enumeration) under the different categories:
89 occurrences of the confusion of graphically similar letters:

\( \text{and} \ \hat{y} \)  
17:31b  
8:20a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{y} \)  
2:8b  
2:9a

\( \text{and} \ \hat{r} \)  
17:22b  
8:15b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{r} \)  
3:1b–2a  
8:1  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{r} \)  
3:6b  
8:22b  
9:4a  
5:12b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{r} \)  
6:2a  
10:2a  
13:3b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{r} \)  
7:3  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
3:3b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
8:8b  
2:4a  
5:1a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
12:2b  
4:6a  
14:6  
4:5b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
13:1  
8:8b  
3:4a  
5:16  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
16:4a  
4:4a  
9:4a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
16:14a  
8:16b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
17:5b  
10:4b  
2:8  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
4:10a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
13:12  
13:3b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
4:12b  
8:7a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
6:2a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
6:3b  
12:2b  
2:6b  
17:20a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
8:8a  
17:29a  
18:2a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
9:3a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
6:2a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
11:1  
2:23  
11:4  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
17:30b  
8:12a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
15:3  
17:38b  
8:12b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
4:8a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
4:6a  
4:12a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
6:3a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
7:3  
17:30b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
15:14b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
16:14a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
17:14a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
17:14a  
5:13a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
8:1b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
10:1b  
6:3a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
2:21  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
15:1  
11.1  
16:1b  
5:6b  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
12.2  
17:37a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
17:31b  
16:7a  
\( \text{and} \ \hat{b} \)  
2:19a
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11:5b and</th>
<th>10:3c and</th>
<th>15:4b and</th>
<th>8:2 and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 41 occurrences of a valid, but inappropriate, choice within the semantic range of the Hebrew:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>2:31b</td>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>14:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1a</td>
<td>3:2a</td>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>15:7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2b</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>7:8a</td>
<td>15:9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:6b</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>8:5b</td>
<td>15:9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>8:9a</td>
<td>17:5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:19b</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>10:4b</td>
<td>17:8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>5:12b</td>
<td>12:2a</td>
<td>17:25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:21b</td>
<td>5:16a</td>
<td>12:3</td>
<td>17:33b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:26b</td>
<td>5:17a</td>
<td>13:2</td>
<td>17:41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:29b</td>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>13:3a</td>
<td>18:3b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 23 occurrences of haplography with one or two letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>5:1a</td>
<td>9:2</td>
<td>17:11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:3b</td>
<td>5:6a</td>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>17:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:5a</td>
<td>8:1b</td>
<td>11:4</td>
<td>17:30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10b</td>
<td>8:5a</td>
<td>12:3b</td>
<td>17:36b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:14a</td>
<td>8:14b</td>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>18:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20b</td>
<td>8:16a</td>
<td>16:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3 occurrences of haplography involving entire lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>16:10b</td>
<td>16:14a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 24 occurrences of ambiguity of the unpointed Hebrew text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>5:14b</td>
<td>8:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>4:24</td>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>8:2b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8:7a  9:9b  16:1a  17:17a
8:7b  14:2b  16:14a  17:41b
8:25a  15:13a

with scriptio defectiva:

2:25b  2:26b  7:7a  10:3  15:10b

with scriptio plene:

8:12a

15 occurrences of the metathesis
of two or more letters in a word:

2:20  5:7a  14:6  17:2b
2:27  10:1a  16:3a  17:12a
2:33a  12:3b  16:7  18:2a
4:18  13:7–8  17:2a

12 occurrences where appeal to cognate
languages brings clarity to differences:

**Arabic:**
2:1  3:1  8:2a  17:13
2:33a  8:1b  17:6b

**Akkadian:**
2:5  2:19  2:21b

**Aramaic:**
3:7  17:34

8 occurrences of the misdivision
of the consonantal text in (of) the Vorlage:

1:3  2:6b  17:9b  17:22
2:1b  2:23  17:17b  17:30a
SUMMARY

7 occurrences of doublets:

**Greek:**
- 2:13b
- 4:10b
- 8:9a
- 17:43a

**Syriac:**
- 6:5a
- 7:2a
- 17:16

7 occurrences of aural errors in the transmission of the text:

- 8:9a
- 8:25a
- 9:5a
- 9:6b
- 16:1b
- 17:6a
- 17:13

6 occurrences where emphatics particles went unrecognized:

**Emphatic **×:**
- 6:4a
- 9:4a
- 15:7b
- 17:29a

**Emphatic 7:**
- 10:8
- 2:24

5 occurrences where a Semitic idiom is reflected in the Greek or the Syriac:

- 1:4b
- 2:13a
- 2:32b
- 4:5b
- 8:12a

5 occurrences of idiomatic translation:

- 2:4a
- 3:1
- 3:12b
- 4:7
- 17:1

5 occurrences of dittography:

- 2:1b
- 5:12a
- 5:13a
- 7:6b
- 10:3b

4 occurrences requiring the conflation of the Greek and Syriac texts:

- 4:18
- 15:5a
- 17:36b
- 18:2a
2 occurrences where manuscript variants are appealed to for solution:

11:4 (Syriac) 17:6b (Greek)

2 occurrences of “double duty” prepositions:

14:1 15:3

2 occurrences of “double duty” verbs:

15:7b 16:6b

2 occurrences of “double duty” negatives:

16:6b 16:8b

1 occurrence of a “double duty” vocative:

15:2

1 occurrence of “double duty” emphatic:

15:7b

1 occurrence of the inversion of lines:

15:7b

1 occurrence of metonymy:

17:40c

1 proposed emendation:

15:7b

Since the focus of this chapter is on the disagreements of the Syriac and Greek texts, the issue of which text to follow in the proposal of a Hebrew Vorlage had to be decided in each instance.
SUMMARY

Where the proposed Vorlage follows either the Greek or Syriac text in the proposed Hebrew the division was almost fifty-fifty. Sixty-six times the Vorlage followed the Syriac text and sixty-five times the Greek (out of the 215 total).

Fifty-three times the Vorlage followed neither the Greek or the Syriac arguing that neither had retained the sense of the proposed original Hebrew text. Both had been corrupted in the process of transmission or translation. However, without both the Greek and the Syriac texts the proposed Vorlage would have been much more difficult to produce and much more speculative. It is the control of having both texts and often the mistakes of both that in many instances provided the clue to the proposed Vorlage.

Twenty three times the Greek and the Syriac together provided the basis for the reconstruction of the Vorlage with both retaining some element of the proposed Hebrew. In six instances the Greek and the Syriac approximate each other and either could be used in the construction of the Vorlage. This was usually due to an overlapping semantic ranges of a word. While neither the Greek or the Syriac seems to more reliably preserve the Hebrew original in 61% of the texts one or the other is followed in the proposed Vorlage. In about 25% of the above passages neither the Greek or the Syriac has been the basis for the Hebrew. Following is a summary by verses of the different categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>3:7</th>
<th>6:2a</th>
<th>9:3a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:5a</td>
<td>6:3b</td>
<td>9:9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6a</td>
<td>4:5b</td>
<td>7:3</td>
<td>10:1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1b</td>
<td>4:8a</td>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4a</td>
<td>4:10a</td>
<td>7:8b</td>
<td>10:3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:5b</td>
<td>4:10b</td>
<td>7:10b</td>
<td>10:3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Syr)</td>
<td>4:14a</td>
<td>8:8a</td>
<td>11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:5–6a</td>
<td>5:1a</td>
<td>8:8b</td>
<td>11:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8a</td>
<td>5:6a</td>
<td>8:14b</td>
<td>11:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8b</td>
<td>5:12b</td>
<td>8:20a</td>
<td>12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:21</td>
<td>5:14b</td>
<td>8:22b</td>
<td>13:3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6b</td>
<td>5:16a</td>
<td>8:25a</td>
<td>13:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 14:1  | 17:2a | 17:16 | 17:30 |
| 14:2b | 17:2b | 17:17b| 17:36b|
| 14:6  | 17:5b | 17:22a| 17:38b|
| 15:10b| 17:14a| (+Syr)| 18:2b |
| 16:3a | 17:15c| 17:26a|
| 16:6b | (+Syr)| 17:29a|

**Syriac**

| 1:1  | 4:1  | 8:1b  |
| 2:1b | 4:3b | 8:2c  |
| 2:6b | 4:4a | 8:7b  |
| 2:29b| 4:6a | 8:12b |
| 2:32b| 4:12 | 8:15b |
| 3:2a | 4:12b| 10:4b |
| 2:6b | 4:18 | 10:8  |
| 2:10 | 4:20 | 12:2a |
| 2:19b| 6:3a | 12:3b |
| 2:20 | 6:4a | 12:3c |

**Neither**

<p>| 2:21b| 4:1  | 8:1b  |
| 2:24 | 4:3b | 8:2c  |
| 2:26a| 4:4a | 8:7b  |
| 2:26b| 4:6a | 8:12b |
| 2:33a| 4:12 | 8:15b |
| 3:2a | 4:12b| 10:4b |
| 3:3b | 4:18 | 10:8  |
| 3:5  | 4:20 | 12:2a |
| 3:10 | 6:3a | 12:3b |
| 3:12b| 6:4a | 12:3c |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13:2b</th>
<th>16:4a</th>
<th>17:13</th>
<th>17:37a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:7</td>
<td>16:8b</td>
<td>17:32c</td>
<td>17:40c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:4b</td>
<td>16:14a</td>
<td>17:33b</td>
<td>17:41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:7b</td>
<td>17:6a</td>
<td>17:34a</td>
<td>17:41b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>8:2b</td>
<td>17:17a</td>
<td>Either Greek or Syriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>8:5b</td>
<td>17:25a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>8:9a</td>
<td>17:39b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>13:2</td>
<td>17:43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>18:2a</td>
<td>2:4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>15:3b</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>15:4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>15:5a</td>
<td>2:13b</td>
<td>15:9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>17:8b</td>
<td>5:6b</td>
<td>16:11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>17:9b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Syriac</td>
<td>17:15a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE

CONCLUSIONS

J. R. Harris who discovered the Syriac text of the Psalms of Solomon and the lost Odes of Solomon had little regard for the Psalms of Solomon, in contrast to the Odes of Solomon which he esteemed highly (1916: vii). He noted, “The Psalms of Solomon as they come to us are a very harsh and unpleasant product, the result of a couple of ungainly translations . . . . it has little interest for ourselves and will probably have less for other people.” Previously (1911:46), he said “we cannot expect to get any nearer to the original language of the [Greek text of the] psalms by means of the Syriac.” Harris’ opinion notwithstanding, this study has shown that without a careful study of the Syriac text of the Psalms of Solomon no one can expect to get closer to the original language of these psalms. By using both the Syriac text and the Greek text, in key passages a Hebrew Vorlage has been reconstructed by a process of “triangulation.” The reconstructed Vorlage, rooted in the Syriac and Greek texts, in turn, shed new light on these textual traditions, resulting in an accumulative body of evidence which supports—with a high degree of probability—the argument that a Hebrew Vorlage lay behind the Greek text and the Syriac text of these psalms.

The discussion above (68–69) of the difficulty of the Greek in Psalm 3:2a provides a good illustration of the value of the Syriac. Both Wright (1985:654) and Trafton (1985:53) called the Greek of this poetic line “unintelligible,” and at first glance the Syriac (which Wright also called “unintelligible”) did not seem to be of any help in clarifying the meaning of the phrase in Greek. Trafton translated the Syriac phrase as “and be excited in his excitement,” which contextually makes no better sense than the Greek—which means literally, “be awake in his wakefulness. It was, however, the Syriac stem ܐ؏ siden, which has a wider semantic range than simply “to become excited, to arouse (from sleep),” which provided the clue to the meaning. This stem is a cognate of the Aramaic/Hebrew עָנָן which appears in
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Daniel 4:1, 14, and 20 as a technical term for the “Watchers” of heaven who never sleep but continually praise God. This nuance, not the simple dictionary equivalent “to be excited,” is the basis for the proposed Vorlage meaning “rejoice with his Watchers.” Without the clue from the Syriac ܐܓܘܠܐ, the meaning of the Greek phrase would remain enigmatic. As it now stands, only Trafton’s translation of the Syriac is problematic since he missed here the nuance of ܐܓܘܠܐ.

While the cumulative weight of the psalm-by-psalm examination of the places where the Syriac and Greek texts disagree has indicated that both are translations of a Hebrew original, it is not possible to say with certainty exactly when the translations were made from the Hebrew. Because neither the Syriac or Greek textual variants were of much value in reconciling the difficulties or in providing clues for the reconstruction of the Hebrew Vorlage, it is likely that the translations of the psalms into Greek and Syriac were early and that most of the variants occurred in the later transmission of the texts in their independent traditions. This is indicated by many instances where the Syriac text disagreed with respect to singular/plural forms with the Greek text. Prior to the fourth century C.E., when the system of pointing nouns to distinguish between the singular and the plural, the Syriac text would have been ambiguous with reference to number. This argues for the translation from Hebrew into Syriac to have taken place at least before that date, and probably earlier as portions of the Peshitta were translated in the first century C.E.

An important aspect of this study is the methodology employed. Barr (1987: 5–8) in his introductory work on the philological methodology sets philology, which deals with new possibilities of meaning for existing texts (often with appeal to cognate languages), over against textual criticism, which deals with graphic errors in transmission (where an appeal to variant readings is possible and where, in the absence of such variants, contextual emendation is used). He asserted that “Philology undercuts the foundations of the textual treatment” and that the “philological treatment, if right, cancels out textual treatment.” He admitted, however “... these are not distinct [methodologies] in the sense that one must consistently follow one and ignore the other. A competent worker must under-
stand both, and as we have seen, it is a very common practice to mingle the two.”

This study illustrates the complimentary nature of textual criticism and philology, and the necessity to use both to reconcile differences in and between textual traditions or to reconstruct a Vorlage reflecting the traditions. These methodologies do not cancel out or undermine each other. Without the use of both methods, the argument for a Hebrew original for both the Greek and the Hebrew behind the Psalms of Solomon would have been much more speculative. While the majority of proposals presented in Chapter 2 are those within the arena of textual criticism resulting from the confusion of graphically similar letters, there are numerous instances where philology has supplied the best possible solution. Textual criticism, exegetical considerations dealing with the semantic range of a word, and philological inquiry into cognate languages were all indispensable.

In reconstructing the Vorlage, any individual word was selected from a list of synonyms. Consequently, while absolute certainty is not possible for any of the proposals, one can be certain of the value of the methodology. Compared to Trafton’s thirty-eight instances where the Syriac or the Greek supported a Hebrew Vorlage, this study offers 213 instances. Even if all of them are not as convincing to others who have worked with the Psalms of Solomon as they are to the author, none of them can be simply dismissed out of hand. The methodology employed in this study could easily be applied to many of the pseudepigraphical works believed to have been originally written in a Semitic language.

Another contribution has been the proposal of significant new translations which depart from Wright’s translation of the Greek and Trafton’s translation of the Syriac. The following new translations should be noted in particular:

1:1 “at my defeat” instead of “when I was severely troubled”

2:1b “general” instead of “sinner”

2:2 “boots” instead of “sandals”
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2:6b “chains upon their forearms” rather than “their neck in a seal”
2:19b “ruler” instead of “beauty”
2:20b “ruler” instead of “beauty”
2:21b “ruler” instead of “beauty”
2:24 “indeed” instead of “not”
2:24 “pierced by the nobles of Egypt” instead of “pierced on the mountains of Egypt”
3:2a “Watchers” instead of “he is aware of you”
8:1 “the sound of tearing down walls” for “the blast of the trumpet”
10:4 “the law codes of the Lord in the commandments are above the rules of men” for “and the testimony of the Lord (is) in the ways of men”
10:8 “indeed” instead of “because”
16:1b “deadly coma” for “sleep”
17:6a “they exchanged their priestly turbans for a crown” rather than “they set up a monarchy because of their arrogance”
17:32c “anointed lord” for the controversial “Lord Messiah”
17:33b “generals” instead of “multitude”

These translations and the other new ones offered in Chapter 2 are important for any subsequent full translation of the Psalms of Solomon which draws upon both the Syriac and the Greek textual traditions.

These translations would also be of importance to anyone working on the theology of these psalms. The discussion and proposed Vorlage of 17:30a, for instance, supports the Greek text which speaks of a universal God who will “have gentile nations,” against the Syriac text which speaks of an ethnocentric God who “possess a nation from the nations,” perhaps in reference to the Jews in the diaspora. Which textual tradition is supported theologically makes a great deal of difference. Many other instances and the discussion of the textual differences between the Syriac and the Greek texts have similar import for understanding the theology of the Psalms of Solomon.
The above study also supports the conclusion that Psalm 2 (and perhaps Psalm 3) are about Pompey, and thus it supports a date for this psalm being not too long after the events referred to. If the proposed interpretation of Psalm 4:18b holds up, the curse “may his old age be bereft of children, from his children not one will bury him” needs to be added to the list of (treaty) curses. If the proposals for reading emphatic particles in 2:24, 6:4a, 9:4a, 10:8; 15:7b, and 17:29a are correct, then their use, especially that of the emphatic ַ, survived much later than has been previously recognized.

All of the items highlighted in the above paragraph are significant in and of themselves as they resolve the differences between the textual traditions, but the demonstration of the probability of a Hebrew Vorlage behind both the Syriac and the Greek texts is still the main contribution of this study.
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