

[יָשַׁע]

[Both the hiphil and the rarer niphil are dealt with here.]

(For fuller discussion of the lexical field as a whole see the ‘Overview of SAHD entries for “Deliverance” words’ on this site)

Introduction

Grammatical Type: vb hiph and niph.

Occurrences: Total 205x OT, 6x (or 7x?) Sir, 27x Qum, 4?x inscr.

Sir (numbering according to Beentjes 1997): 4.9; add 13.6 (cf. DCH, Ges18)?; 33.1; 34.6; 48.20; 49.10; 51.3.

Qum: CD 5.19(A) (dupl. in 4Q267 2.2 and 6Q15 3.2); 9.9(A), 10(A); 1QH^a 10.25; (?) 11.6 (DCH = Sukenik 3.6); 1QM 10.4, 8; 11.3; 1QS 6.27; 4Q166 2.14; 4Q171 4.21; 4Q174 1.13; 4Q183 2.3; 4Q288 1.5; 4Q365 6a ii + 6c 3; 4Q372 1.16; 4Q380 1 ii 4; 4Q381 15.2; 31.2; 4Q385a 18 ii 10; 4Q389 1 ii 3 (= 4Q387a 3 ii 11); 4Q417 22.2; 4Q511 10.9; 11QT 59.8, 11, 18; 66.8 (dupl. in 4Q524 6-10.2).

The following additional instances lack any context and so are not amenable to semantic analysis: 4Q226 5.1; 4Q372 8.3; 4Q374 2 ii 10; 4Q381 42.2.

inscr: D-1.008.4?; D-15.008.1; D-25.003.3; Naveh & Magen 1997:43?.

Text doubtful:

A.1 The phrase at 1Ch 11.14, וַיִּוֹשַׁע יְהוָה תְּשׁוּבָה גְדוּלָה, ‘and the Lord saved a great victory’, corresponds to the wording at 2Sm 23.12, which differs only in the verb (2Sm reads וַיַּעַשׂ ‘and he made’). A metathesis of the two letters, ‘*ayin* and *shin/sin*, in the verb has probably occurred in transmission, but it is difficult to say which was the original reading (see Tov 1992:250). The frequency of the verb עָשָׂה, however, with the direct object תְּשׁוּבָה suggests the wording of 2Sm 23.12 is the original and that the metathesis at 1Ch 11.14 has been occasioned by the noun calling to mind the (possibly) cognate verb.

A.2 At Is 64.4 the verb should probably be read as נִפְּשַׁע.

A.3 MS B at Sir 34.6 reads the niphil inf לְהוֹשִׁיעַ, but Bmg corrects this to the hiphil לְהוֹשִׁיעַ, the error in B being explicable by the easy loss of a *yodh*.

B.1 Although the LXX ἐσώζετο (cf. Pesh: *zk' hw'*) at 1Sm 14.47 implies the verb [יָשַׁע] rather than the MT reading יָרַשׁ, there is no sufficient reason for emending.

B.2 Although the NAB (cited by Clines 1989) reads the verb at Jb 5.11, the MT reading of the noun יָשַׁע can be regarded as correct, if understood as an adverbial accusative (GKC:§ 188 q). See יָשַׁע Text Doubtful B.3, Syntagmatics A.3.

B.3 The reading at D-1.008.4 is badly damaged and is doubted (see Renz 1995: 429).

B.4 The three letters יָשַׁע (with the *yodh* uncertain) appear on a late third-century/early second-century inscription from Mount Gerizim (Naveh & Magen 1997:43, text D). Since the inscription is broken off immediately before these letters, it is not possible to determine whether this is a whole word or part of it. It may be significant to note that the context suggests some form of dedicatory prayer, and the possible appearance of the word יָקוּם (denoting resurrection?) could indicate that it is a prayer or Psalm to God. This would support the reading יָשַׁע, which, if it is the noun, reflects its appearance in poetry in the OT and most often in prayers and Psalms. The verb also appears most frequently in Psalms and could be an alternative reading here to the noun.

B.5 In 1QH^a 11.6 DCH and ThWQ (col. 316) read [הוֹשַׁע עָתָה נִפְּשַׁע], recalling the language of 10.25. But many scholars do not adopt this conjecture (e.g. Dupont-Sommer

1961:207, Lohse) and the *Study Edition* of the texts (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997: 164-65) prints עתה as a complete word ('Now') preceded by a *vacat*. This 'occurrence' is best omitted from consideration.

Qere/Ketiv: none.

1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 [ישע] in the OT is attested in the hiphil (184x) and in the niphil (21x). The nouns ישע and ישועה are cognate, whilst תְּשׁוּעָה may only be formed by analogy with יְשׁוּעָה and not actually be cognate (see תְּשׁוּעָה Root and Comparative Material). According to Sawyer (1990: 443) there are 14 proper names in the Hebrew Bible that are probably cognate, but this number is swollen by several that contain the element שׁוּע, supposedly a by-form of the root ישע. They may belong to a separate root altogether (see the sections on Root and Comparative Material for שׁוּע, שׁוּע, and תְּשׁוּעָה). Even if they are not counted, there are certainly six in BH which contain instances of ישע (two with variant forms) and, in addition to some of these, others are found in Hebrew inscriptions: יוֹישַׁע, יִשַׁע, יִשַׁעָא, יִשַׁעְהוּ (cf. *AHI*: 282, 333-34, 371, 381-82; *AHI2*: 132, 153, 169-70). In two of these names, אִלְיִשַׁע and יִשַׁעִיהוּ, it has been thought that Qal forms of the verb, which do not occur in BH, may be present (Noth 1928: 36, 176).

A.2 The Proto-Semitic root *y \dot{t} ' now seems to lie behind Hebrew [ישע], being attested in proper names in NW Sem and most of the ESA languages. The Ug evidence attests to the second consonant being \dot{t} (Sawyer 1975:78). This new evidence counters some earlier interpretations based on Arb (see B.1). The main arguments outlined by Sawyer (1975) are the evidence of proper names in NW Sem (A.3, A.4, B.3), the collocation of y \dot{t} ' terms with deities' names (as with ישע; see A.1, 3, 5, 7-10; also Syntagmatics A.1), chronological evidence (see A.5, 7-10) and phonological equivalence (B.1). Earlier KB (412, along with *wasi* 'a), Huffmon (1965: 215) and Stolz (1971: 786, citing Sawyer 1965:475-76, 485) had supported this view; and at the conference where Sawyer originally presented his paper T.L. Fenton and H.W.F. Saggs had indicated their strong agreement with it (Sawyer 1975: 83-84). Significantly this view was adopted in the latest Hebrew lexicon to incorporate philological data (Ges18: 510 [1995]). Unfortunately the occurrences of y \dot{t} ' do not give an independent indication of its meaning.

A.3 The appearance of a root in a name is not evidence for a verbal form ever existing (cf. Sawyer 1975:77), but the existence of this root in non-biblical theophoric proper names may correspond to the use of ישע in Hebrew personal names and as a verb with primarily God as the subject. The root-morpheme y \dot{t} ' is attested relatively frequently in proper names in Amorite. It is the only Sem language from the early second millennium B.C. in which the root appears. The earliest occurrence is the name *lašuil* in a legal document from c. 2048 B.C. (Buccellati 1966:165). The verbal form derived from this is *yašuh*, found also in eight names from Mari (Huffmon 1965:215-16). The root appears to be frequent in Amorite names in comparison with some of the other NW Sem evidence.

A.4 The verb appears in the Moabite inscription (line 4) in the expression *hš'ny mkl hšlkn* 'he delivered me from all assaults' (Segert 1961; Gibson 1971:77-78). The noun might also appear in lines 3-4 – *bmt* [y]š' 'in the high place of salvation'. For an alternative reading to *bmt* see Gibson 1971:78.

A.5 The root y \dot{t} ' is attested in proper names in Ugaritic. It is found in the names y \dot{t} 'd (Gröndahl 1967:47) and perhaps y \dot{t} 'il, if it is a shortened form of y \dot{t} 'il (Sawyer 1975:78).

A.6 In an Amarna letter the name of a leader in the revolt in southern Palestine is *yašuia*, a probable example of a name with the verbal root (Knudtzon 1915: II, 319).

A.7 The Aram. name *hdys'y* (Akk. *adad-it-'i*) in ll. 1, 6 and 12 of the Tell Fekheriye bilingual inscription, probably of the mid-ninth century, can plausibly be associated with the root *yṯ'/yṯ'* (see initially Abou-Assaf et al. 1982: 43-44, 80: more recent bibliography in Millard 2000: 154). *yṯ'* is a loan-word in Aramaic found in the Prayer of Nabonidus (Milik 1956:413) and in the targum (Sokoloff 1990: *ad loc.*). Aramaized forms of two Biblical Hebrew names are found in the Elephantine papyri (Noth 1928:154–55, 176).

A.8 In Sabaean two personal names with the form *hayṯa'* or *hayṯi'* (Ryckmans 1934–35:I, 232; cf. 112) appear to correspond to the causative element, as in the Hebrew hiphil.

A.9 One name with the root *yṯ'* is recorded in a Nabatean text (Cantineau 1930–32:II, 105).

A.10 The root *yṯ'* is attested in proper names in Epigraphic South Arabian (Ryckmans 1934–35:II, 10, 75–76), some of them very common. Müller (1963:310; cf. *HAL*:427) suggested associating [yṯṯ'] with ESA *ws'* = 'reichlich geben, reichlich versorgen mit', but this does not seem to have been widely adopted. Many North Arabian personal names also include the element *yṯ'* (see Müller 1979, who proposed an association of it with a different root *yš'* = 'be high').

B.1 The connection with Arab *wasi'a* 'to be spacious', which in the causative conveniently corresponds morphologically with the Heb hiphil, is made by many writers (e.g. Driver 1890: 90-91; *HAL*: 427; Fohrer TDNT: 973; Kraus 1978:139), although BDB (446) did express doubt in 1908. It seems to have first been proposed by Schultens (1761: 7-9; see Sawyer 1968: 20, nn. 1, 2, but Sawyer's page ref. is incorrect) and was supported by Gesenius (1810: 419 and 1835-58: 639-40, 1380). A proposed Proto-Hamito-Semitic root **ws'* is apparent from Egyptian 'to be wide', Berber *usa'* and Arabic *ws'* 'to be wide, spacious', but any semantic connection between this and *yṯ'* seems far-fetched. Sawyer notes that to connect this root with [yṯṯ'] would involve two exceptional correspondences, now that the latter is seen to be cognate with *yṯ'/yṯ'*: Egyptian *s* with Sem *ṯ* and NWSem *ṯ* with Arb *s* (1972:94).

Since [yṯṯ'] has Pe Waw forms in both its surviving conjugations, the Hiphil and the Niphal, it was natural to seek an Arabic cognate for it with initial *waw* and the correspondences *w/s* and *w/'*, while not universal in either case, are widely attested. The idea that the underlying meaning of [yṯṯ'] could be '(make) wide, spacious' finds support in the fact that there is an antonym in Heb., צָרָר I, 'be in/cause distress', with cognate nouns and an adjective, with another meaning 'narrowness', as already noted by Schultens (9), and occasionally occurrences of the two roots are directly related to one another (Jg 10.14; Is 46.7; 63.9; Jr 14.8; 30.7; Ps 34.7; Ne 9.27; 2Ch 20.9). There are difficulties, however, with these arguments. First, now that a possible alternative etymology, from Proto-Semitic **yṯ'*, has come to light, it turns out that the phonological argument is not as decisive as it previously seemed (on the possible problem of the initial *y* in **yṯ'* see below on Formal Characteristics A.1). Secondly, there is in fact no actual overlap in meanings between the attested uses of [yṯṯ'] and those of *wasi'a*: [yṯṯ'] never means 'be wide' or 'make wide' (and *pace* Gesenius 1835-58: 640 קִישַׁע in Ps 12.6 need not mean 'in a wide space') and *wasi'a* never has the sense of 'save, deliver, help' (Lane 8[supplement]: 3052-53; on such problems in general see Barr 1968: 86-91). Thirdly, while צָרָר I is attested meaning both 'narrowness' and 'distress', it cannot be said to be established that 'narrowness' is the basic meaning from which 'distress' is derived. In fact 'narrow' in the physical sense is a rather rare meaning of the root. Finally, while [yṯṯ'] and צָרָר do sometimes occur together, this is also true of נָצַל and צָרָר (1 Sm 26.24; Ps 34.18; 54.9; Jb 5.19), suggesting that the association may well be due to semantic considerations rather than related underlying etymologies (cf. Sawyer 1965: 475 n. 5).

B.2 The possibility that both $y\bar{t}$ and Ar. *wasi'a* might go back to a common Proto-Semitic original was apparently envisaged by KB (412), and the North-West Semitic evidence for $y\bar{t}$ might have developed from a Proto-Semitic $*w\bar{t}$. But this is unlikely for Epigraphic South Arabian, where an initial *waw* is normally preserved, and the problem of \bar{t} = Arb *s* noted by Sawyer (above, B.1) remains. The apparent use of *s* to represent \bar{t}/w in the Old Aramaic name *hdys'y* at Tell Fekheriye (see Root and Etymology A.7) might seem to be a helpful 'bridge' between the two, but it is probably due to an orthographical peculiarity that is (so far) unique to this inscription, where it occurs in some other words (Abou-Assaf et al. 1982: 44).

B.3 It has been suggested that the Moabite name Mesha on the Moabite stone (cf. 2Kg 3.4) was probably originally *mōšā'* (cf. LXX $\mu\omega\sigma\alpha$; Segert 1961:246), but this seems unlikely. The verbal form also appears in the Moabite stone with the god Chemosh as subject. Gibson argues for a double base in proto-Semitic, one with the first consonant *y-* and one with *w-* (1971:77).

B.4 Although it is possible that the element *išhi-* in 10 personal names from Mari is related, some argue that it is non-Amorite (see Huffmon 1965:215).

2. Formal Characteristics

A.1 From a synchronic point of view $y\bar{w}$ appears to be a pe-yodh root (in view of some of its nominal derivatives, $y\bar{w}$ and $y\bar{w}$). But historically classification either as pe-yodh or as pe-waw is possible, since originally pe-waw verbs are at first sight pe-yodh too, as a result of the early North-West Semitic development of initial *waw* in most cases into *yodh* (Moscati 1964: 46). Indeed pe-waw is more obvious for $[y\bar{w}]$ when consideration is given to the morphology of the Hiphil and Niphal forms of the verb. Ultimately its classification depends on the etymology which is accepted.

A.2 Although the formation of the Hiphil (and the less common Niphal) is a good first indicator of the original first radical, it is not decisive, especially in a case where no other conjugations are attested. There is at least one case, $y\bar{w}$, where a truly pe-yodh verb (cf. the retention of the *yodh* in the Qal imperfect and the Ar. cognate *yabisa*) forms its Hiphil as if it were a pe-waw verb (the Niphal does not occur) and the same could be true for $[y\bar{w}]$. Modern grammars deal differently with this anomaly. GK places most such 'hybrids' under its heading 'Verbs originally Pe Waw' (§69d-f) and only $y\bar{w}$, which is treated very briefly, in the section for 'Verbs properly Pe Yodh' (§70, cf. paras. a,c). However, BL treats them as pe-yodh with deviant forms in the Hiphil and Niphal (377i, k) and Bergsträsser, who makes the form of the imperfect Qal his primary criterion for distinguishing the two main classes of pe-yodh verbs (weak and strong) apparently agrees (2, §26n). JM (§76d) artificially isolates the case of $y\bar{w}$ from the other hybrids (the wording here, like most of the treatment of this group of verbs, is that of Joüon), but this is an unsatisfactory approach to the evidence. Whichever approach is preferred, $[y\bar{w}]$ with $y\bar{t}$ as its older form could be explained in the same way as $y\bar{w}$.

A.3 See BL:229f for the form at 1Sm 17.47 and Ps 116.6.

B.1 The form $y\bar{w}$ is the hiphil participle, although Sawyer notes that it has lost its participial and verbal characteristics, being used as the object of verbs of sending or appointing (1965:477; cf. Syntagmatics A.5).

3. Syntagmatics (examples from narrative books, Isaiah, Psalms and Qumran)

A.1 $y\bar{w}$ hiphil has human agents as subject: $y\bar{w}$ 'Moses' (Ex 2.17), $y\bar{w}$ Shamgar (Jdg 3.31), $y\bar{w}$ 'a man' (1Sm 9.16), $y\bar{w}$ 'David' (1Sm 23.2, 5), $y\bar{w}$ 'my lord' = David (1 Sm 25.31), $y\bar{w}$ 'the hut of David' (4Q174 1.13), $y\bar{w}$ denoting $y\bar{w}$ 'the king' (Ps 72.4, 13),

הגוואים ‘the nations’ (4Q166 2.14), פסילי הגוים ‘the carved images of the nations’ (4Q385a 18 ii 10) qal m pl ptc ‘to study astrology’ (Is 47.13), יד ‘hand’ + 1p s suffix denoting Israel (Jdg 7.2), + 1/2p s suffix denoting David (1Sm 25.26, 33: cf. CD 9.9), + 2/3 p m s suffix denoting an unruly man (CD 9.10; 1QS 6.27: perhaps also 4Q380 11 ii 4 and 4Q417 22.2), and זרוע ‘arm’ + 3p pl suffix (Ps 44.4), also (with חָרַב) + 1 ps suffix (Ps 44.7), both denoting Israel. More frequently it has a divine agent as subject: יהוה ‘the Lord’ (Ex 14.30; Jdg 2.16; 1Sm 4.3; 7.8; 14.23, 39; 17.47; 25.26; 2Sm 3.18; 8.6, 14; 2Kg 6.27; 19.19; Is 33.22; 37.20; 49.25; Ps 6.5 + 44x with a divine subject in Pss; 4Q381 31.2; 11QT 59.11, 18; D-1.008.4?), אֱלֹהֵי ‘Lord’ (Ps 86.16 [cf. 4Q381 15.2]; 1QH 10.23/25), אֱלֹהִים ‘God’ (Is 35.4; 1QM 10.4; 4Q511 10.9), אֵל ‘a god’ (Is 45.20) or ‘God’ (4Q171 4.21; 4Q183 1 ii 3; 4Q 288 1.5), הֵמָּה ‘they [denoting gods]’ (Jdg 10.14), יד ‘hand’ [of the Lord] (Is 59.1), יְמִין ‘right hand’ [of the Lord] (Ps 44.4; 98.1; 138.7), and זרוע ‘arm’ [of the Lord] (Is 59.16; Ps 44.4; 98.1).

A.2 יִשַׁע hiphil is followed by vocative יהוה ‘O Lord’ (D-15.008.1), and the verb עָנָה ‘to answer’ (Is 46.7).

A.3 יִשַׁע hiphil has as direct objects יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘Israel’ (Ex 14.30; Jdg 3.31; 6.14, 36, 37; 10.1; 13.5; 1Sm 14.23, 39; 1QM 10.4; 11.3; 4Q166 2.14; 4Q174 1.13; 4Q183 1 ii 3), עַם ‘people [sc. Israel]’ (1Sm 9.16; 2Sm 3.18; Ps 18.28; 28.9), עַם ‘people [in general]’ (2Sm 22.28), קַעִילָה ‘Keilah’ (1Sm 23.2), יֹשְׁבֵי קַעִילָה ‘inhabitants of Keilah’ (1Sm 23.5), דָּוִד ‘David’ (2Sm 8.6, 14), מְשִׁיחוֹ ‘his anointed’ (Ps 20.7), הַמֶּלֶךְ ‘the king’ (Ps 20.10), בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן ‘Ammonites’ (2Sm 10.19), and בֶּן pl ‘son’ (Is 49.25), יִשְׂרָיִלָב ‘the upright in heart’ (Ps 7.11), חוֹסִים ‘fugitives’ (Ps 17.7), דַּבְּאֵי־רוּחַ ‘the oppressed in spirit’ (Ps 34.19), אָדָם וּבְהֵמָה ‘man and beast’ (Ps 36.7), צִיּוֹן ‘Zion’ (Ps 69.36), עֲנִי־עַם ‘the afflicted among the people’ (Ps 72.4), נַפְשׁוֹת ‘the lives of the poor’ (Ps 72.13), כָּל־עֲנוּי־אָרֶץ ‘all the humble of the earth’ (Ps 76.10), עַבְדְּךָ ‘your servant’ (Ps 86.2), בְּנוֹ־אֲמָתְךָ ‘the son of your handmaid’ (Ps 86.16 [cf. 4Q381 15.2]), נַפְשִׁי ‘my life’ (1QH^a 10.23/25), הַיְחָד ‘the community’ (4Q171 4.21), יוֹסֵף ‘Joseph’ (4Q372 1.16).

A.4 The direct object of יִשַׁע hiphil may also be denoted by אָת + 2p m pl suffix (Dt 20.4; Jdg 7.7; 10.12, 13), + 3p m s suffix (Jdg 6.31), + 1p s suffix (Jdg 12.2), + 1p pl suffix (1Sm 11.3); and by 1p s suffix (Ps 3.8, + 18x in Pss; 4Q381 31.2), 2p s suffix (4Q380 1 ii 4), 3p m s suffix (Ps 34.7; 11QT 59.18), 1p pl suffix (Ps 44.8; 106.47), 3p m pl suffix (Ps 37.40; 106.8, 10, 21; 107.13, 19; 145.19; 11QT 59.11).

A.5 יִשַׁע hiphil participle is the object of the verbs קוּם hiphil ‘to raise up’ (Jdg 3.9, 15), נָתַן ‘to give’ (2Kg13.5), and שָׁלַח ‘to send’ (Is 19.20).

A.6 יִשַׁע hiphil is followed by the preposition מִן ‘from’ + הַמָּס ‘violence’ (2Sm 22.3), צָרָה ‘trouble’ (Is 46.7; Ps 34.7; 4Q166 2.14), רֹדֵף pl ‘pursuer’ (Ps 7.2), פִּי אַרְיָה ‘the mouth of the lion’ (Ps 22.22), צָר pl ‘foe’ (Ps 44.8), אַנְשֵׁי דָמִים ‘men of blood’ (Ps 59.3), מְצוּקָה pl ‘distress’ (Ps 107.13, 19), שֹׁפְטֵי נַפְשׁוֹ ‘the judges of one’s life’ (Ps 109.31); or יָד + מִן + the nouns מִצְרַיִם ‘Egypt’ (Ex 14.30), אוֹיֵב pl ‘enemy’ (Jdg 2.18; 2Sm 3.18; 11QT 59.11), שׂוֹנֵא ‘hater’ (Ps 106.10), pl (11QT 59.18), מְבַקֵּשׁ נַפְשׁוֹ pl ‘seeker of one’s life’ (11QT 59.18), מִדְיָן ‘Midian’ (Jdg 8.22), פְּלִשְׁתִּים ‘Philistines’ (Jdg 13.5; 1Sm 7.8; 9.16; 2Sm 3.18), and + 3p m pl suffix (Jdg 10.12; 12.2; 4Q372 1.16), + 3p m s suf (2Kg 19.19; Is 37.20); or the participle qal m pl ‘plundering’ (Jdg 2.16).

יִשַׁע hiphil is followed by the preposition מִן + בֶּרֶךְ + the nouns מִדְיָן ‘Midian’ (Jdg 6.14, 15), אוֹיֵב pl ‘enemy’ (1Sm 4.3), מֶלֶךְ ‘king’ (2Kg 16.7).

A.7 יִשַׁע hiphil is followed by the preposition לְ (Josh 10.6; Jdg 10.14; 2Sm 10.11; Ezk 34.22; Ps 72.4; 86.16; 116.6; Prov. 20.22; 1Ch 18.6; 4Q385a 18 ii 10; D-25.003.3) or לְ with suffix + מִן ‘from’ + pl noun רָעָה ‘evil’ (1Sm 10.19). In Jdg 7.2; 10.14; 1Sm 25.25, 31, 33; Is 59.16; 63.5; 44.4; Ps 98.1; Job 40.14; CD 9.9-10; 1QS 6.27 the attached pron. suffix is reflexive. The appearance of לְ after the verb is sometimes taken as evidence of an original

intransitive sense (Sawyer 1965:481, n. 3; *HAL*: 428), which may also be indicated by the collocation with certain verbs of saying (cf. A.2).

A.8 *ישע* hiphil is followed by the preposition *בְּ* ‘by means of’ + *יָד* ‘hand’ (Jdg 6.36, 37; 7.7; 2Sm 3.18; 2Kg 14.27; 1QM 11.3); or by the preposition *בְּ* ‘in’ (2Sm 8.6, 14; Ps 106.21).

ישע hiphil is followed by the preposition *בְּ* in the expressions *בְּרַב אוֹ בְּמַעַט* ‘by great or by little’ (1Sm 14.6), *בְּחֶרֶב וּבְחַנִּית* ‘by sword and by spear’ (1Sm 17.47), *בְּחֶסֶדְךָ* ‘by your loyalty’ (Ps 31.17; pl in 1QH^a 10.23/25), *בְּצִדְקָתְךָ* ‘by your righteousness’ (Ps 71.2) and *בְּבְרִית* ‘by covenant’ (4Q183 1 ii 3).

A.9 *ישע* hiphil is followed by the prepositions *בְּעִבּוּר* ‘for the sake of’ (1QM 11.3-4), *בְּ* ‘according to’ (Ps 109.26) and *לְמַעַן* ‘for the sake of’ (Ps 6.5; 106.8).

A.10 *ישע* hiphil participle forms a clause with *אֵין* (Dt 22.27; 28.29, 31; Jdg 12.3; Is 43.11; 47.15; Ps 18.42; 4Q389 1 ii 3; 11QT 59.8; 66.8), *יֵשׁ* (Jdg 6.36) and *הֵמָּה* ‘they’ (4Q226 5.1); it is the predicate of *יהוה* ‘the Lord’ (Is 43.3; 60.16; 4Q365 6a ii + 6c 3), and in apposition to *אֱלֹהִים* ‘God’ (Is 45.15), *אֵל* ‘God’ (Is 45.22), *יהוה* ‘the Lord’ (Is 49.26).

A.11 *ישע* hiphil is followed by *waw* + *עָזַר* (Josh 10.6).

A.12 *ישע* hiphil is joined by *waw* to *בּוֹא* ‘to go’ (Is 35.4), *גָּאֵל* participle (Is 60.16).

A.13 *ישע* niphil has as subjects *עַם* ‘people’ (Dt 33.29), *יִשְׂרָאֵל* ‘Israel’ (Is 45.17; CD 5.19: implied Ps 80.4, 8, 20; 1QM 10.8 [citing Nu 10.9]), the king (Ps 18.4; 33.16) or the psalmist (Ps 119.117).

A.14 *ישע* niphil is followed by *מִן* ‘from’ + *אֹיְבֵי* pl ‘enemies’ (Nu 10.9 [and hence 1QM 10.8]; 2Sm 22.4=Ps 18.4), and *בְּ* + *יהוה* ‘the Lord’ (Dt 33.29; Is 45.17 [+*הַשְׁוֹעָה*]) and *רַב־חַיִל* ‘greatness of strength’ (Ps 33.16).

A.15 *ישע* niphil is joined by *waw* to *פָּנָה* ‘to turn’ (Is 45.22), *עָמַד* ‘to stand’ (Is 47.13: cf. 1QH^a 10.22-23).

4. Versions

a. LXX:

Hiphil – ἀμύνομαι (Is 59.16);

ἀνασώζω (Zc 8.7);

[[ἀπόλλυμι]] (Jb 5.15);

βοηθέω (Dt 22.27; 28.29, 31; Pr 20.22; 1Ch 19.19);

βοηθός (2Sm 22.42);

διασώζω (Dt 20.4; Ho 13.10; Zc 8.13);

[[εἰσακούω]] (Ps 55[54].17);

ἐλέεω (Sir 33.1);

ἐξαιρέω (Josh 10.6; Sir 4.9);

λυτρόω (Sir 48.20; 49.10);

ποιέω [+ σωτηρίαν = *הַשְׁוֹעָה*] (1Ch 11.14);

ῥύομαι (Ex 2.17; 14.30; Josh 22.22; Is 49.25, 26; 63.5; Ezk 37.23);

σωτήρ (Jdg 3.9, 15; 1Sm 10.19; Is 45.15, 21; Neh 9.27);

σωτηρία (2Sm 22.3; 2Kg 13.5; 14.27; Is 38.20; 47.15; 63.8);

σωτήριον (Is 63.1);

σώζω (Jdg 2.16, 18; 3.9, 31; 6.14, 15, 31, 36, 37; 7.2, 7; 8.22; 10.1, 12, 13, 14; 12.2, 3; 13.5; 1Sm 4.3; 7.8; 9.16; 10.27; 11.3; 14.6, 23, 39; 17.47; 23.2, 5; 25.26, 31 [+*χεῖρα*], 33; 2Sm 3.18; 8.6, 14; 10.11, 19; 14.4; 22.3, 8; 2Kg 6.26, 27 [2x]; 16.7; 19.19; Is 19.20; 33.22; 35.4; 37.20, 35; 43.3, 11, 12; 45.20 [pl]; 46.7; 47.13; 59.1; 60.16; 63.9; Jr 2.27, 28; 11.12 [1x]; 14.8, 9; 15.20; 17.14; 31[38].7; 42[49].11; 46[26].27; Ezk 34.22; 36.29; Ho 1.7 [2x]; 13.4; 14.4; Ob 1.21 [passive]; Hb 1.2; Zp 3.17, 19; Zc 9.16; 10.6; 12.7; Ps 3.8; 6.5; 7.2, 11; 12[11].2; 17[16].7; 18[17].28, 42; 20[19].7, 10; 22[21].22; 28[27].9; 31[30].3, 17; 34[33].7,

19; 36[35].7; 37[36].40; 44[43].4, 7, 8; 54[53].3; 57[56].4; 59[58].3; 60[59].7; 69[68].2, 36; 71[70].2, 3; 72[71].4, 13; 76[75].10; 86[85].2, 16; 98[97].1; 106[105].8, 10, 21, 47; 107[106].13, 19; 108[107].7; 109[108].26, 31; 116[114].6; 118[117].25; 119[118].94, 146; 138[137].7; 145[144].19; Jb 22.29; 40.14; La 4.17; Neh 9.27; 1Ch 16.35; 18.6, 13; 19.12; 2Ch 20.9; 32.22);

Omitted: 2Kg 19.34; Is 25.9; Jb 26.2?; Sir 34.6.

Large omission: Jr 30.10, 11.

Niphal – βοηθέω passive (Pr 28.18);

διασώζω passive (Nu 10.9; Jr 8.20);

[[πλανάομαι]] (Is 64.4);

σώζω active (Zc 9.9);

σώζω passive (Dt 33.29; 2Sm 22.4; Is 30.15; 45.17, 22; Jr 4.14; 17.14; 23.6; 30[37].7;

Ps 18[17].4; 33[32].16; 80[79].4, 8, 20; 119[119].117);

Large omission: Jr 33.16.

Minor Greek Versions [MRN]:

A.1 Although the primary translation of ψ in the LXX is σώζω and its compounds (for both the hiphil and the niphal), there are some equivalents that express various other nuances corresponding to some of the translations for the cognate Hebrew nouns. ἀμύνομαι ‘to ward off [danger etc.]’ at Is 59.16 indicates that ψ can denote protection from danger and not merely ‘deliverance’. Likewise βοηθέω ‘to help, assist’ and its cognates indicate another connotation of the verb.

A.2 The choice of the verb ἐλεέω at Sir 33.1 corresponds to the use of the noun ἔλεος in the LXX for translating the nouns ψ (Is 45.8) and ψ (Sir).

A.3 For the active of σώζω to translate the Niphal at Zc 9.9, see Targum.

B.1 ἀπόλλομι at Jb 5.15 is probably an attempt to explain a difficult syntax, or arose from a corruption to יגוע ‘to let perish’ (Lust *Lexicon*:53).

B.2 The MT reading of נפשע at Is 64.4 has been confirmed by the text of 1QIs^a (cf. Pesh, Tg and Vg), although the LXX πλανάομαι ‘to wander, stray’ could imply the reading נפשע ‘we have erred’ (Westermann 1969:391; Lust *Lexicon*:378). Some scholars have indeed suggested the emendation נרשע ‘we have become wicked’ (e.g. Cheyne 1899:73, 171; BHS), although others have followed the MT (e.g. Watts 1987:238).

b. Peshitta:

Hiphil –

tābā’ (Is 43.11);

‘*bad pōrqānā*’ (2Sm 3.18);

‘*bad* [+*neṣhānā*’ = ψ] (1Ch 11.14 [cf. LXX]);

‘*dar*’ (2Sm 10.11, 19; 1Ch 19.19);

Aphel *npq* (Ps 107.19);

pš’ (Dt 22.27; 28.31; Jdg 6.31; 2Sm 22.3; Hb 1.2; Ps 34.7; 119.94; 1Ch 19.12);

praq (Ex 2.17; 14.30; Dt 20.4; 28.29; Josh 22.22; Jdg 2.16, 18; 3.9, 31; 6.14, 15, 36, 37; 7.7; 8.22; 10.1, 12, 13, 14; 12.2, 3; 13.5; 1Sm 4.3; 7.8; 9.16; 10.19, 27; 11.3; 14.6, 23, 39; 17.47; 23.2, 5; 25.26, 33; 2Sm 8.6, 14; 14.4; 22.3, 28; 2Kg 6.26, 27 [2x]; 14.27; 16.7; 19.19, 34; Is 25.9; 33.22; 35.4; 37.20, 35; 38.20; 43.12; 45.20; 46.7; 47.13, 15; 49.25; 59.1, 16; 63.1, 5, 9; Ezk 34.22; 36.29; 37.23; Ho 1.7 [2x]; 13.4, 10; 14.4; Ob 1.21; Zp 3.19; Zc 8.7, 13; 9.16; 10.6; 12.7; Ps 3.8; 6.5; 7.1; 10; 12.2; 18.28, 20.7, 10; 22.22; 28.9; 31.3, 17; 34.19; 36.7;

37.40; 44.4, 7, 8; 54.3; 55.17; 57.4; 59.3; 60.7; 69.2, 36; 71.2, 3; 72.4, 13; 76.10; 86.2, 16; 98.1; 106.8, 10, 21, 47; 107.13; 108.7; 109.26, 31; 116.6; 118.25; 119.146; 138.7; 145.19; Jb 5.15; 22.29; 26.2; 40.14; Pr 20.22; 1Ch 16.35; 18.6, 13; 2Ch 20.9; 32.22); Sir 34.6; 48.20; 49.10);

pārōqā (Jdg 3.9, 15; 2Sm 22.42; 2Kg 13.5; Is 19.20; Is 43.3; 45.15, 21; 49.26; 60.16; 63.8; Zp 3.17; Ps 17.7; 18.42);

šzb (Sir 51.3);

zkā (Jdg 7.2);

Omitted: 1Sm 25.31; Josh 10.6

Niphal –

pārōqā (Zc 9.9);

pōrqānā (Dt 33.29; Is 45.17);

Ethpe. *prq* (2Sm 22.4; Is 30.15; 45.22; 64.4; Ps 18.4; 33.16; 80.4, 8, 20; 119.117; Pr 28.18);

Ethpe. *ps* (Nu 10.9);

A.1 The Pesh, as the Tg (see below), has a preference for the verb *praq*. The rendering *šzb*, popular with some lexemes in the semantic field, is found only once (Sir 51.3). *ps* appears slightly more frequently, but is still an infrequent equivalent.

A.2 The Aphel *npq* ‘to bring forth’ (Ps 107.19) denotes some movement in the action of the verb, but this equivalent also appears only once.

A.3 The meaning of bringing assistance is found in the translations *zkā* (Jdg 7.2) and *dar* (2Sm 10.11, 19; 1Ch 19.19).

A.4 The translation *pārōqā* ‘saviour’ is found frequently, for the most part to render the ptc. מוֹשִׁיעַ.

c. Targum:

Hiphil –

פָּרַק (O – Ex 2.17; 14.30; Dt 20.4; 22.27; 28.29, 31; Josh 10.6; 22.22; Jdg 2.16, 18; 3.9 [2x], 15, 31; 6.14, 15, 31, 36, 37; 7.2, 7; 8.22; 10.1, 12, 13, 14; 12.2, 3; 13.5; 1Sm 4.3; 7.8; 9.16; 10.19, 27; 11.3; 14.6, 23, 39; 17.47; 23.2, 5; 25.26, 31, 33; 2Sm 3.18; 8.6, 14; 10.11, 19; 14.4; 22.3, 28, 42; 2Kg 6.26, 27; 13.5; 14.27; 16.7; 19.19, 34; Is 19.20; 25.9; 33.22; 35.4; 37.20, 35; 38.20; 43.3, 11, 12; 45.15, 20, 21; 46.7; 47.13, 15; 49.25, 26; 59.1, 16; 60.16; 63.1, 5, 8, 9; Jr 2.27, 28; 11.12 [1x]; 14.8, 9; 15.20; 17.14; 30.10, 11; 31.7; 42.11; 46.27; Ezk 34.22; 36.29; 37.23; Ho 13.4, 10; 14.4; Hb 1.2; Zp 3.17, 19; Zc 8.7, 13; 9.16; 10.6; 12.7; 1Ch 11.14; 16.35; 18.6, 13; 19.12, 19; 2Ch 20.9; 32.22);

Af פָּרַק (Ho 1.7);

פּוֹרְקָנָא (2Sm 22.3?);

שִׁיזַב (Ob 1.21);

Niphal –

פָּרַק (2Sm 22.4; Zc 9.9);

Af פָּרַק (O – Nu 10.9; Is 30.15; 45.17, 22; 64.4; Jr 4.14; 8.20; 17.14; 23.6; 30.7; 33.16);

פּוֹרְקָנָא (O – Dt 33.29);

A.1 There is nothing exceptional in the renderings of the Pesh or Tg, both translating the verb by the same words as they do for many others in the semantic field.

A.2 There is a clear preference in the Tg for the verb פָּרַק. Only once do we find the equivalent שיזב (Ob 1.21), which is more frequent as a translation for other lexemes in the semantic field.

A.3 At Tg Ho 1.7, the Targumist avoids presenting God as acting as a warrior, and therefore turns the verb into a third person passive (Cathcart & Gordon 1989:30; Smolar & Aberbach 1983:148–49).

A.4 In the Tg to Zc 9.9 MS V, printed in Sperber's edition, has the Peal active, although MS Z posits a passive participle, corresponding to the Niphal in the MT. LXX, Pesh and Vg all render as active too. Comparison may be made with Ps 33.16 where in the Tg נושע is rendered מתפריק (Cathcart & Gordon 1989:205).

d. Vulgate:

Hiphil – *adiuvo* (Dt 28.31; 1Ch 18.6);

auxilior (2Sm 10.11);

custodio (Josh 22.22);

do [+ *salutem* = תְּשׁוּעָה] (1Ch 11.14);

defendo (Ex 2.17; Jdg 3.31; 1Sm 11.3);

dux (Jdg 10.1);

eruo (Dt 20.4; Jdg 10.12);

libero (Ex 14.30; Dt 22.27; 28.29; Josh 10.6; Jdg 2.16, 18; 3.9; 6.14, 15, 37; 7.2[pass], 7; 8.22; 10.13, 14; 13.5; 2Sm 22.3; Jr 2.27, 28; 11.12; Pr 20.22);

praebeo auxilium (Jdg 12.2; 2Sm 10.19; 1Ch 19.19);

pugno (Jdg 6.31);

salvator (Jdg 3.9, 15; 2Sm 22.3; 2Kg 13.5; 14.27; 16.7; Is 19.20; 43.3, 11; 45.15; 63.8; 14.8; Ho 13.4; Ob 1.21; Ps 17[16].7; 106[105].21; Neh 9.27);

salvo (1Sm 4.3; 7.8; 9.16; 10.19, 27; 14.6, 23, 39; 17.47; 23.2, 5; 25.26; 2Sm 3.18; 22.42; 2Kg 6.26, 27[2x]; 19.34; Is 25.9; 33.22; 35.4; 37.20, 35; 43.12; 45.20, 21; 46.7; 47.13, 15; 49.25, 26; 59.1, 16; 60.16; 63.1, 5, 9; Jr 11.12; 14.9; 15.20; 30.10, 11; 31.7; Ezk 34.22; 36.29; Ho 1.7; 13.10; 14.4; Hb 1.2; Zp 3.17, 19; Zc 8.7, 13; 9.16; 10.6; 12.7; Ps 6.5[4]; 7.2[1], 11[10]; 12[11].2; 18[17].28, 42; 20[19].7, 10; 22[21].22; 28[27].9; 31[30].3, 17; 34[33].7, 19; 37[36].40; 44[43].4, 7, 8; 54[53].3, 17; 57[56].4; 59[58].3; 60[59].7; 69[68].2, 36; 71[70].2, 3; 72[71].4, 13; 86[85].2, 16; 98[97].1; 106[105].8, 10, 47; 107[106].13, 19; 108[107].7; 109[108].26, 31; 116[114].6; 118[117].25; 119[118].94; 138[137].7; 145[144].19; Jb 22.29 [passive]; 40.14[9]; La 4.17; Neh 9.27; 1Ch 16.35; 18.13; 2Ch 32.22);

salvus (Jdg 6.36);

salvum facio (2Sm 22.28; 2Kg 19.19; Is 38.20; Jr 17.14; 42.11; 46.27; Ezk 37.23; Ps 3.8[7]; 36[35].7; 76[75].10; 119[118].146; Jb 5.15; 2Ch 20.9);

servo (2Sm 8.6, 14; 14.4);

sum in praesidium (1Ch 19.12);

sustineo (?Jb 26.2); 'to preserve'?

ulciscor (1Sm 25.31, 33);

Omitted: Jdg 12.3

Niphal – *eruo* passive (Nu 10.9);

salvator (Zc 9.9);

salvo passive (Dt 33.29; 2Sm 22.4; Is 30.15; 45.17, 22; 64.4; Jr 8.20; 23.6; 30.7; 33.16; Ps 33[32].16; 80[79].4, 8, 20; 119[118].117; Pr 28.18);

salvus fio (Jr 4.14);

salvus sum (Jr 17.14; Ps 18[17].4);

A.1 Although *salvo* and *libero* are the two most frequent renderings for יִשַׁע, other translations (e.g. *adiuvo* ‘to help’) indicate various shades of meaning.

A.2 In Jdg 2.18 the translation is free and rearranged, but *et liberabat* will be the rendering of והושיעם (cf. v. 16).

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

A.1 Both in the Bible and at Qumran יִשַׁע is often found in parallelism or close association with other members of the deliverance’ group: e.g. נָצַל (Ps 7.2; 4Q171 4.21), פָּלַט (Ps 37.40), עוֹזֵר (Ps 37.40), פָּדָה (Ps 55.17; 11QT^a 59.11), גָּאֵל (Is 49.26; Ps 106.10), מָלַט (Ps 107.19; 4Q183 1 ii 3), and also הִלִּיץ (Ps 6.5; 34.7; 60.7=108.7).

A.2 Related words which are not strictly synonyms are also associated with יִשַׁע, such as שָׁפַט and דִּין (Ps 7.11; 54.3; 72.4; 76.10), שָׁמַר (Ps 12.2; 17.7; 34.19; 86.2; 145.19), זָכַר (1QM 10.8), and אָוֵר פָּנִים (Ps 31.17; 80.4, 8, 20).

A.3 Other words specify the action denoted by יִשַׁע in particular cases more precisely, such as שָׁלַח (Ps 44.4), קָבַץ (Ps 106.47), רָפָא (Ps 107.19), סָעַד (Ps 119.117), עָלָה (4Q381 31.2) and more surprisingly יָרַשׁ (Ps 44.4; 69.36) and בָּנָה (Ps 69.36).

A.4 יִשַׁע Hiphil is found in parallelism with נתן ביד ‘to give into the hand’ (Jdg 7.7). The Hiph ptc is in parallelism with ‘refuge’ מָנוֹס (2Sm 22.3), and with the verb עָנָה ‘to answer’ (2Sm 22.42).

B.1 One of the most common words to occur with יִשַׁע in the Psalms (also in Is 46.7) is עָנָה, ‘answer’, and synonyms such as שָׁמַע, ‘hear’ and אָזַן + הִיפּוּ, ‘incline the ear’ (Ps 31.3; 71.2; 86.2). These should probably not be regarded as members of the lexical field, as their use is related not to the meaning of יִשַׁע as such but to the fact that, in the Psalms at least, it is so frequently used (21x) in the imperative form to express a request.

6. Exegesis

A.1 יִשַׁע appears to denote primarily the bringing of help to someone rather than the actual rescuing or removal of them from danger. Its agent is primarily God or a religious/military leader. The meaning, however, of rescuing or removal from danger may be possible in some prose military contexts.

A.2 In prose יִשַׁע denotes God’s acts in past history, including God’s saving Israel from Egypt (Ex 14.30). It is also used in the time of the Judges of the protection from foreign nations (e.g. Jdg 2.16, 18). Such military contexts apply the verb both to the acts of God (1Sm 17.47) and to those of military heroes (e.g. Jdg 6.14–15; 1Sm 9.16).

A.3 יִשַׁע is found in forensic contexts, but this need not be the original meaning (see B.1 below). Although it is primarily found with the noun מוֹשִׁיעַ (e.g. Dt 28.29, 31) it may be implied with this sense in the appeal of the women of Tekoa to David to help her in her case (2Sm 14.4) (Hubbard 1997:557) and in some Psalms. The implication is that the King can dispense justice in the same manner that God does in the Psalms. The examples are few and the argumentation is tentative. In each of these instances one could argue that the verb יִשַׁע means merely ‘to save’ and that the context indicates the saving will be forensic. Certainly when an appeal to a king is made it denotes acquittal, but this is probably a developed sense from the general meaning.

A.4 The idiom יִשַׁע Hiphil + הָ + לְ is used in the context of bloodguilt (1Sm 25.26) and refers to taking revenge. It denotes specifically exercising justice oneself (with the implication that someone else has done or should do it). In Jdg 7.2 God warns the Israelites that they might boast of executing the victory on their own part rather than giving credit to God (cf. Jb 40.14). As already noted (Syntagmatics A.7) יִשַׁע Hiphil is quite frequently followed by לְ

instead of the more common direct object. This does not generally seem to be because the texts concerned are late (GK §117n), though the substitution of לָ for אָתָּה in 1Ch 18.6 (cf. 2Sm 8.6) could be explained in this way. More likely the variation is related to the use of לָ with Hiphils of some intransitive verbs, where it has been suggested that the expression is ‘properly (as it seems) a *dat. commodi*’ (BDB, p. 511). Alternatively (or additionally), one might associate it with the exceptional frequency of nouns cognate with יָשַׁע (such as יָשַׁע and יְשׁוּעָה), which is a distinctive feature of יָשַׁע among the words for ‘deliverance’: the verb may in these cases have been thought of as a kind of denominative equivalent to ‘bring יָשַׁע/יְשׁוּעָה to a person or group (see further 7. Conclusion). A special group is constituted by instances where the subject of the verb is דָּ (or a similar word like אָרַוּע or נִמְיָן) with a pronominal suffix and the ‘beneficiary’ is denoted by לָ with the same suffix. The meaning is thus reflexive: someone’s own ‘hand’ brings him the success or victory denoted by יָשַׁע hiph. A sequence of examples occurs in 1 Sm 25.26, 31 (where many commentators insert יָ before אָדָנִי with LXX) and 33, in the dialogue between Abigail and David about how David is to respond to Nabal’s insults (vv. 10-11). The fact that in all three places the phrase is associated with incurring bloodguilt could be taken as evidence, in isolation, that it means specifically a judicial misdeed (so Sawyer, *TDOT* 6, pp. 454, 457). But this is improbable in the light of the full range of occurrences of this idiom, especially those in which it is applied to God in a wholly positive sense (Is 59.16; 63.5 and probably Ps 98.1). The data were assembled already by Driver (*Samuel*², pp. 200-02), who concluded that יָ (and its synonyms) referred to the use of one’s own power (‘force’) to achieve one’s aims. When God does this, it redounds to his glory. But human beings must, in a widespread biblical view, rely on God to help them, for they cannot succeed on their own. Using one’s own human power is therefore viewed negatively (so also in Jdg 7.2; Ps 44.4 and Jb 40.14). Two clear occurrences of the idiom at Qumran fit well into this picture. CD 9.9-10 (the duplicate 4Q267 i 4-5 preserves a few letters of the context) cites 1Sm 25.26 freely as the basis for not using force to make someone swear an oath; 1QS 6.27 uses the phrase of aggressive, arrogant behaviour towards a more senior member of the community (cf. 6.10-11). In neither case does it have a specifically legal character. The same idiom may also have been present in 4Q380 1 ii 4 and 4Q417 22.2.

A.5 Appeals to one’s ally on the basis of a treaty imply that יָשַׁע may in these instances have a meaning of providing assistance (e.g. Josh 10.6; 2Sm 10.11–12).

A.6 In Wisdom literature the verb only appears twice in Proverbs and four times in Job. In Proverbs it denotes the assistance provided by God (Pr 20.22) against one’s enemy (cf. A.5) and the prolonged state of well-being given to those who follow the way of God (Pr 28.18). In Job it is three times used of saving the weak (Jb 5.15; 22.29; 26.2) and once used of winning victory (Jb 40.14).

A.7 The verb is most frequent in Isaiah of all the Prophets. In the Prophets the verb often denotes in oracles of salvation God’s future deliverance from the Exile (e.g. Is 49.25; Jr 30.7; cf. acts of history in A.2). It often seems to be a call for help when in danger (Is 37.20) or for healing from sickness (e.g. of Hezekiah at Is 38.20).

A.8 יָשַׁע appears most frequently in the book of Psalms (57x) in addition to 13 psalm-like passages elsewhere in the OT (for the latter see Sawyer, *TDOT*, 6, p. 459). The occurrences in the Psalms relate to all the varied kinds of situation that have already been mentioned: deliverance in past history (Ps 44.4 [cf. vv. 2-3]; 98.1; 106.8, 10, 21; 107.13, 19), war (18.4, 28, 42; 20.7, 10; 33.16; 44.7-8; 60.7=108.7; 76.10 [cf. vv. 6-7]; 80.4, 8, 20), legal disputes (7.2, 11; 69.2; 71.3 [cf. v. 13]; 109.26, 31), future deliverance of Zion/Israel (69.36; 106.47), the support of the needy (17.7; 34.19; 72.4, 13; 76.10), the righteous and devout (7.11; 37.40; 86.2, 16; 145.19) and the king (18.4; 20.7, 10), as well as intervention in times of a breakdown in society (12.2; 36.7), protection in undefined circumstances against personal ‘enemies’ (3.8; 22.22; 28.9; 31.3, 17; 54.3; 57.4; 86.2, 16) and sickness (107.19; perhaps 6.5).

Here especially the generality of the word is very evident. Most often it presupposes a situation of distress, but it is accompanied by מן in only about one-fifth of its occurrences and the military uses do not all arise out of the danger of defeat (note 118.28, with the parallel צלח, ‘succeed’). ישע hiph overlaps with עזר in the breadth of its usage (and they are associated in 109.26 [cf. Josh 10.6; Is 63.5; Job 26.2]), but they are complementary rather than synonymous: עזר is more focused on the relational aspect of the action, while its effect and result is more prominent in ישע hiph, whether it refers to deliverance or the bestowal of success and victory. The subject in the great majority of cases is God and his wonderful, mighty power is sometimes explicitly mentioned (98.1; 106.21). But so is his חסד, ‘loyalty’, in associated prepositional phrases (6.5; 31.17; 109.26: cf. 57.4), as are related words like צדקה, ‘righteousness’ (71.2), and שם, ‘name’ (54.3; 106.8). The most distinctive feature of the use of ישע hiph here is the high frequency of the imperative, often in its emphatic form, in the appeals to God which are so characteristic of the numerous laments in the Psalter (3.8; 6.5: over twenty times in all).

A.9 In expressing God’s action to his people by ישע Niphal the Lord is described as ‘shield of your help’ (Dt 33.29), which is interesting considering the use of the noun ישע with such expressions.

A.10 At Qumran ישע appears three times in the War Scroll, reflecting perhaps the biblical usage in military contexts (A.2), and four times in the Temple Scroll, mainly in historical references. These also appear elsewhere (CD 5.19; 4Q372 1.16; 4Q385a 18 ii 10; 4Q389 1 ii 3). The reuse of the idiom discussed in A.4 suggests its continued use in everyday speech, but ישע hiph is not a prominent expression of contemporary prayer or liturgy: there is only one secure occurrence in 1QH^a and three more in other texts (4Q380 1 ii 4; 4Q381 31.2; 4Q511 10.9). The contrast with the biblical psalms could not be greater, and perhaps reflects its infrequency in LBH and as a loan-word in Aramaic other than Samaritan Aramaic (Sawyer 1975:80). But the seven occurrences preserved in the Heb. of Sirach (if 13.6 is included) give a rather different impression, especially when compared with the rarity of ישע hiph in the biblical wisdom literature.

B.1 Whilst ישע can be found in forensic contexts in the Hebrew Bible (see A.3 above), its origin as a forensic term, later developing from this technical to a non-technical sense, as advocated by Sawyer (1972:94-95; 1975:80), is uncertain. Scepticism regarding this origin was first expressed in 1970 by participants at the conference where Sawyer presented his findings (recorded in Sawyer 1975:83–84), and Sawyer himself admits that the question must remain open until a wider range of contexts is available (1975:80). The main pieces of evidence marshalled by him are:

- a) its use in forensic situations in the Bible (see A.3 above);
- b) a forensic origin explains the use of מוֹשֵׁעַ (e.g. at Dt 22.27), if it means originally ‘counsel for the defence’ (see Sawyer 1965; B.2);
- c) the verb’s parallelism with other words that may denote legal terms (see Lexical/Semantic Field(s) A.2);
- d) the appearance of legal terms in proper names in Semitic languages.

The last of these is the weakest. For a) the evidence can be interpreted in either direction. It may have had a non-technical sense and developed its use to include the technical sense, especially since the cases of parallelism (c) are not conclusive. Likewise, (b) the meaning of מוֹשֵׁעַ, as well as not denoting exclusively a ‘counsel for the defence’ in synchronic Hebrew, could have derived from the technical sense of the verb after the latter had itself developed from the non-technical sense.

B.2 In his study of מוֹשֵׁעַ Sawyer is careful not to read too much into one word (1965:486), but expresses conviction that the evidence points to his interpretation. He sees the

form מוֹשִׁיעַ (which he takes to be a noun; see Formal Characteristics B.1) as denoting a specific legal office of ‘advocate’ or ‘witness for the defence’, for which there is no other word in Hebrew but there would have been a need for one.

7. Conclusion

A.1 It now appears that the root may not be related to the Arabic ‘to be spacious’, and that little semantic evidence can be gained from tracing the verbal root. The frequency of the root in personal names may suggest that it is a verb used of God, but that much may already be derived from the Hebrew evidence.

A.2 יִשַׁע denotes the bringing of assistance to someone in need, whether in military, civil or judicial contexts. It may also denote the actual saving of someone in battle or in history in general. From this a meaning of being in a prosperous state appears to have developed (especially in Wisdom literature).

A.3 On a few occasions יִשַׁע might denote the provision of defence from enemies.

A.4 In its breadth of application יִשַׁע is particularly close to עֲזַר among the words for deliverance and as a result the translation ‘help’ has sometimes been preferred (compare Exegesis A.8). But יִשַׁע also remains close to other words in the group such as הִצִּיל, as the (moderate) frequency of its use with מָן attests, hence the continuing popularity of the rendering ‘save’ (and compare the Versions). The following account may clarify the synchronic relationship, whether or not its possible diachronic implications (for which there is no proof) are valid. In the Exegesis section of the entry for עֲזַר (A.3) it is suggested that its use in the majority of its biblical occurrences (especially in the Psalms) for ‘help’ where deliverance was involved led to its occasional association with מָן like other members of the group. With יִשַׁע there seems to be an extension in the opposite direction. One might envisage a continuum of human experience extending from distress at one pole to equilibrium at the centre and to victory and success at the other pole. יִשַׁע like other members of the ‘deliverance’ group mainly represents a movement from the negative pole to equilibrium, but it was natural for it also to be applied to the movement in the same ‘direction’ from equilibrium to the positive pole of success and victory. As such it came to occupy the original domain of עֲזַר, ‘help’, as well.

A.5 It has also been suggested above (Exegesis A.8) that, while עֲזַר refers to the action done in its relational aspect, יִשַׁע refers to its effect or result.

B.1 Although Sawyer has argued that the origin of יִשַׁע lies in forensic contexts, the evidence is inconclusive. It is perhaps better to consider the synchronic evidence more than the diachronic.

Bibliography

- Abou-Assaf, A., et al. 1982. *La Statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne*. (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations).
- Barr, J. 1968. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Buccellatti, G. 1966. *The Amorites of the Ur III Period* (Naples).
- Cantineau, J. 1930–32. *Le nabatéen*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux).
- Cathcart, K.J. & Gordon, R.P. 1989. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets, translated, with a critical introduction, apparatus, and notes*. [The Aramaic Bible; v. 14] (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

- Cheyne, T.K. 1899. Commentary on *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text*. [SBOT] (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs).
- Clines, D.J.A. 1989. Commentary on *Job 1–20*. [WBC 17] (Dallas, Tex.: Word Books).
- Dohmen, C. 2013. Article on עשׁ^{\prime} yš^{\prime} in *ThWQ*, vol. 2, 309–18.
- Driver, S.R. 1890. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford Clarendon Press).
- Dupont-Sommer, A. 1961. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- Fohrer, G. 1964. Article “ $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ und $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ im Alten Testament” in TWNT VII:970–81.
- García Martínez, F. and E. Tigchelaar. 1997, 1998. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill).
- Gesenius, W. 1810. *Hebräisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch über die Schriften des Alten Testaments. Erster Teil*. (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel).
- . 1835–58. *Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti* (Lipsiae: F.C.G. Vogelii).
- Gibson, J.C.L. 1971. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic inscriptions: vol.1, Hebrew and Moabite inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Gröndahl, F. 1967. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. [Studia Pohl 1] (Rom: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut).
- Hubbard, R.L. 1997. Article on עשׁ^{\prime} in W.A. VanGemeren (ed.). *The New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Carlisle: vol. 2, 556–62.
- Huffmon, H.B. 1965. *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A structural and lexical study*. (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press).
- Knudtzon, J.A. 1915. *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, mit Einleitungen und Erläuterungen*, 2 vols. [Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, 2/1, 2] (Leipzig).
- Kraus, H.-J. 1978. Commentary on *Psalmen*. [Biblischer Kommentar] (5th ed., Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag).
- Lane, E.W. 1863–93. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. (London: Williams and Norgate).
- Lohse, E. 1971. *Die Texte aus Qumran. Hebräisch und Deutsch*. (2nd ed., Munich: Kösel Verlag).
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie. 1992, 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft). (=LEH)
- Milik, J.T. 1956. ‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d’un cycle de Daniel: fragments araméens de Qumran 4. *RB* 63: 407–15.
- Millard, A.R. 2000. Article ‘Hadad-yith’i (2.34)’, in W.W. Hallo and K.L. Younger (ed.), *The Context of Scripture, 2, Monumental Inscriptions* (Leiden: Brill), 153–54.
- Moscatti, S., et al. 1964. *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Phonology and Morphology*. [Porta Linguarum Orientalium 6] (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Müller, W.W. 1963. Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon. *ZAW* 75:304–16.
- Müller, W.W. 1979. Abyta[‘] und andere mit yt[‘] gebildete Namen im Frühnordarabischen und Altsüdarabischen. *Die Welt des Orients* 10:23–29.
- Naveh, J. & Y. Magen. 1997. Aramaic and Hebrew inscriptions of the second-century BCE at Mount Gerizim. *Atiqot* 32:37–56 [Hebrew], 9*–17*.
- Noth, M. 1928. *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*. [BzWAT 3/10] (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).
- Ryckmans, G. 1934–35. *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques*. [Bibliothèque du Muséon 2] (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon).
- Sawyer, J.F.A. 1965. What was a *mošia* ‘? *VT* 15:475–86.
- . 1968. Spaciousness (An important feature of language about salvation in the Old Testament). *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 6:20–34.

- . 1972. *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation*. [Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, 24] (London: SCM Press).
- . 1975. A historical description of the Hebrew root *yšʿ*. In J. & T. Bynon (eds). *Hamito-Semitic. Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Historical Section of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain, March 1970 London University* (Patua Janua Linguarum; The Hague), 75–84.
- . 1982. Article on *עִשׂ* in *TWAT*, vol. 3, 1035-59 (ET 1990 in *TDOT*, vol. 6, 441-63).
- Schultens, A. 1761. *Origines Hebraeae sive Hebraeae linguae antiquissima natura et indoles ex Arabiae penetralibus revocata*. (2nd ed., Leiden: Luchtmans and Le Mair).
- Segert, S. 1961. Die Sprache der moabitischen Königschrift. *Archiv Orientalni* 29:197–268.
- Smolar, L. & Aberbach, M. 1983. *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. [The Library of Biblical Studies] (New York: Ktav Pub. House; Baltimore Hebrew College).
- Sokoloff, M. 1990. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University).
- Stolz, F. 1971. Article *‘עִשׂ jšʿ hi. Helfen’* in *THAT* 1:785-90.
- Tov, E. 1992. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press; Assen: Van Gorcum).
- Watts, J.D.W. 1987. Commentary on *Isaiah 34–66*. [WBC 25] (Waco, Tex.: Word Books).
- Westermann, C. 1969. Commentary on *Isaiah 40-66*. (London: SCM Press).

James K. Aitken and Graham Davies
University of Cambridge