THE PESHITTA VERSION OF 2 KINGS.

In two books, entitled respectively An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version (Cambridge, 1897) and The Peshitta Psalter, edited with an Apparatus Criticus (Cambridge, 1904), I began an investigation into the relation of the printed texts of the Old Testament Peshitta to the original authorities as far as they were accessible to me. The results obtained were somewhat different in the two cases. In the books of Chronicles, the Bible printed at Urmi by the American missionaries in 1852 (cited below as U) proved to be substantially no better than the Bible printed in London by Samuel Lee in 1823 (cited below as L). It was otherwise with the Psalter. The American text of the Psalms is superior to Lee's, whatever early authorities, Nestorian or Jacobite, be taken as a standard
of excellence. Even judged as a Jacobite text, Lee's is bad; the posthumous work of the great Dutchman van Erpe (Erpenius) given to the world in 1625 is a far better representative of the Western text.

The inferiority of the text of Chronicles in \( U \) admits of an easy explanation. The Nestorians did not receive Chronicles into their Canon, and MSS containing this book were wanting at Urmi. The Americans therefore took Chronicles (together with Ezra and Nehemiah, I believe) from some printed text, Lee's or the Polyglot, and reissued it with a few corrections of small importance. The Nestorian MS at Berlin, 'Sachau 90', which contains 1, 2, 3 Maccabees, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, &c., written in the seventeenth century, is doubtless derived ultimately from Jacobite ancestors.

The fact, however, that the quality of the text of \( U \) varies so greatly from the Psalter to the Books of Chronicles raises our curiosity as to the quality of the text in other books, and though \( L \) was found wanting in both cases, it is interesting to learn whether more or less trust is to be given to it in other parts of the Old Testament. No doubt the edition of the Peshitta which is promised by two German scholars, Drs Brockelmann and Jacob, will one day satisfy our enquiries, but in the meantime it may be worth while to record the results of a partial and tentative examination of the text of 2 Kings. The choice of this book was made independently of critical reasons connected with the Syriac Old Testament.

The three following MSS have been used for the present enquiry:

(a) The Codex Ambrosianus, published in facsimile by Dr Ceriani, Milan, 1876–1883 (cited as ‘A’). 6th or 7th century.

(b) The Buchanan Bible (Camb. Univ. Library, Oo. i. 1, 2, cited here as ‘B’). Jacobite, 12th century.

(c) Camb. Univ. Library, Add. 1964. Nestorian, 13th century (cited as ‘N’).

It may be remarked that though both A and B are Jacobite, there is good reason for believing that they are independent authorities. Certainly B varies from A considerably both in the Psalter and in Chronicles. In 2 Kings the headings used in the two MSS differ from one another; so ii i; 18; xiii 13.

I have also used the Scholia of Barhebraeus (ed. A. Morgenstern, Berlin, 1895, cited as ‘bH'), and the Homilies of Aphrahat (ed. W. Wright, London, 1869). The Syro-Hexaplar (\( S \)) and the Massoretic Hebrew (\( H \)) are also compared. In the case of \( S \) some discrimination is needed, and I have sometimes stated its testimony within brackets as doubtful. Where the general wording of a verse differs considerably between \( S \) and the Peshitta, it is very difficult to decide whether
coincidence in a single word, or even in a short clause, is significant, unless the expression in question is an unusual one.

Perhaps the most important result of a comparison of the printed text or texts with the three MSS enumerated above lies in the relatively large number of places in which the text of LU, or at least of L, agrees with Ψ, often with Ψς, where the MSS on the contrary shew disagreement. Plainly the later MSS on which L (and to a certain extent U also) depends have been corrupted from Ψ, or in some cases from Ψς through some other channel than Ψ. The following passages should be consulted: (a) cases in which L agrees with Ψ or with Ψς, though codices ABN disagree; ii 14; [iii 7 ter]; iii 21; iv 5; iv 39; vi 12 bis; 23; [cf. vii 6 | ד"ת|]; viii 2; 14; 29 (order of the words); ix 25 bis; 26; 34; x 4; 9; [16]; 24; 31; 33. (b) cases in which LU agree with Ψ or with Ψς, though codices ABN disagree: [i 3; ii 14]; iii 7; 17; iv 4; . . . x 14; &c.

The cases in which L differs from Ψ and also from ABN are very few; vi 15 is perhaps a very late corruption.

The most curious reading (implying perhaps the influence of some Midrash) I have found occurs in iv 4 where, according to codd. ABN, Elisha says to the widow, Pour into all these vessels water. True, the collocation האנה深处 arouses the suspicion that the words are an instance of dittography, but the turn is quite Midrashic. The new reading, and there was not anything in the cauldron (iv 41), puts quite a different complexion on the narrative. It is possible that the translators of the Peshitta regarded vv. 38-41 not as the account of a separate miracle but simply as the introduction to the account of the miracle given in vv. 42-44.

The following collations are not intended to be complete, even for 2 Kings i-xiii; they are meant to be merely illustrative.

i 2. מַמְחֻשָׁה] L = B

3. מַמְחֻשָׁה] LU = Ψ

9. מַמְחֻשָׁה] L = BN

ii 1. לְקַלֵּל LU = B

8. מַמְחֻשָׁה] LU = Ψ

[see note]
10. $U = \text{ABN}$

14. $\text{LU [S]}$

om. ABN

pr. ABN

add $U = \text{ABN bH}$

18. $\text{LU [S]}$

add $A [\text{BN}]
\text{AN [B ]}$

om. $A$

iii 7. $\text{LU [S]}$

om. $\text{ABN}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

om. $\text{ABN}$

10. $\text{LU [S]}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

17. $\text{LU [S]}$

om. ABN Aph

om. ABN $\text{S}$

21. $\text{LU [S]}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

23. $\text{LU [S]}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

25. $\text{LU [S]}$

$U = \text{ABN}$

iv 4. $\text{LU [S] ut U}$

$U = \text{ABN}$
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5. 6  L  = ABN
    pr.  U = ABN

6. 6  (sine add)  L  [S  U = ABN
    add  U = ABN

8. 6  L
     U = ABN

10. 6  (sine add)  L  U = ABN
     add  U = ABN

22. 6  L
     U = ABN

24. 6  LU = BN S
     A

27. 6  (sine add)  LU  U = ABN
     add  U = ABN

29. 6  L

31. 6  L = BrYd  U = AN

32. 6  [U om. e] = ABN

33. 6  [N / sup ras]

39. 6  U = ABYd  S

41. 6  LU  U = ABYd  S

42. 6  LU = BN  S

v 3. 6  LU  S
    U = ABN

6. 6  L  U = ABN

7. 6  L

11. 6  LU  = ABN
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13. 
\[ L \text{ [S cum ast.]} \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ L \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ LU \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

14. 
\[ L \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ LU \quad \text{om. ABN} \]

16. 
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ LU \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

17. 
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ LU \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

18. 
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ LU \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

19. 
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ LU \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

20. 
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ U = ABN \]

21. 
\[ L \]
\[ U = ABN \]

22. 
\[ L \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ \text{om. ABN \ bH} \]

23. 
\[ L \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ \text{om. ABN \ bH} \]

24. 
\[ LU \]
\[ \text{om. ABN \ bH} \]

25. 
\[ (2^\circ) \]
\[ U = ABN \]

26. 
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ LU \]
\[ \text{om.} \]

vi 1. 
\[ \text{(sine add)} \quad L \quad [\text{sine add}] \]
\[ \text{add} \]
\[ \text{om.} \]

3. 
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ U = ABN \]

12. 
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ U = ABN \]
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ L \quad \scriptstyle{\text{sine add}} \]
\[ \text{om.} \]
\[ (\text{sine add}) \]
\[ U = ABN \]

\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

\[ \text{om. ABN} \]

\[ \text{om. AB[N]} \]
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15. \( \text{L} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)  
17. \( \text{muhā floats (1st)} \) \( \text{L} \)
   \( \text{add} \ U = \text{ABN} \)  
18. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L = \text{A} \)
   \( \text{mēna} \ U = \text{BN} \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)  
20. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{AN} \)  
23. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
29. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \) \( [\text{S}] \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
32. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L U = \text{ABN} \) \( [\text{S}] \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( \text{Aph}^{18} \)  

vii 1. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)  
2. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)  
4. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{om.} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
5. \( \text{mēna} \) \( (2nd) \) \( L \) \( [\text{S}] \)
   \( \text{om.} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
6. \( \text{mēna} \) \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{tr. verba} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
   \( [\text{S}] \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)  
7. \( \text{mēna} \) \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{tr. verba} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
8. \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
9. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
   \( \text{mēna} \)
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)
10. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
    \( \text{mēna} \)
    \( U = \text{ABN} \)
11. \( \text{mēna} \) \( L \)
    \( \text{mēna} \)
    \( U = \text{ABN} \) \( [\text{S}] \) g. v.]

[n. 1. B
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12. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

13. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

14. Ἐφανα L [U] Ἡ [cf. §]
   om. ABN

15. Ἐφανα L
   tr. subst. \( U = \text{ABN} \)

16. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

17. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

18. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

19. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

20. Ἐφανα L [§ cum ast.]
   om. \( \text{ABN} \)


viii 2. Ἐφανα L Ἡ [§]
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

6. Ἐφανα L [u] Ἡ
   (sine ㎞) \( \text{ABN} \)

7. Ἐφανα L
   \( U = \text{ABN} \)

8. Ἐφανα L
   tr. verba \( U = \text{ABN} \)

9. Ἐφανα L
   tr. verba \( U = \text{ABN} \)

14. Ἐφανα (ad) L Ἡ
   pr. \( U = \text{ABN} \)

15. Ἐφανα (sine add) L [u] Ἡ
   add \( \text{ABN} \) bH

20. Ἐφανα L Ἡ
   \( U = \text{ABN} \) bH
18. \(L\) 
\(U = \text{ABN}\)

19. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

21. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

26. \(LU\) 
\(\text{ABN}\) bH

28. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

29. \((\text{i mo}) \ L\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

30. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{om. ABN}\)

34. \(LU \ [\text{ABN}]\) 
\(\text{ad fin. ver. U} = \text{ABN}\)

35. \(LU \ [\text{ABN}]\) 
\(\text{add}\)

37. \(LU \ [\text{ABN}]\) 
\(\text{add}\)

20. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

21. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

23. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

25. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

27. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ABN}\)

29. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{om. ABN}\)

30. \(LU \ [S]\) 
\(\text{ab fin. ver. U} = \text{ABN}\)
NOTES AND STUDIES

1. (sine add) Ῥῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource ABN
   add Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης ABN
   om. ABN

2. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
   Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης ABN

4. (sine add) Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
   Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης ABN
   (sine add) Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource [8] [U ῲ ῲ ḫ ource]
   add Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource ABN

5. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource = A Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
   Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = BN 8
   Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource [8] U = ABN
   (sine 6) U = ABN

6. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
   Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN

9. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
   om. U = ABN

10. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN [U ῲ ῲ ḫ ource 8]

11. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN

14. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN

16. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN 8
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource ABN 8

17. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN

18. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN

19. Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN
    tr. verba U = ABN
    Ῠῲ ῲ ḫ ource, ματημάτης U = ABN
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20. منمأ مدعًا  

\[ L \]

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]

22. قنلم مكتبأ  

\[ LU \]

om. ABN

24. (sine add) \( L \)  

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]

25. حكملا  

\[ LU \]  

\[ \text{ABN} \]

27. حكملا  

\[ L \]  

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]

29. حكملا  

\[ L \]  

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]  

[s cum obel.]

31. حكملا  

\[ L \]

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]  

[s]

33. حكملا  

\[ L \]

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]

[A][B] N  

[مصمي ب] [مصمي B]  

[s cum obel.]

8. حكملا  

\[ LU = N \]

[م. ل. ب]

12. حكملا  

\[ LU \]

\[ \text{ABN} \]

14. حكملا  

\[ LU \]

om. ABN

\[ U = \text{ABN} \]
16. \( L = N \) \( U = AB \)
17. \( (\text{sine add}) \) \( LU \) \( \Phi \)
\( \text{add} \) \( \Phi \) \( \text{om.} \) \( ABN \)
\( LU \) \( [S] \)
18. \( L \) \( \text{om.} \) \( ABN \)
19. \( L = N \) \( \Phi \)
\( \text{om.} \) \( AB \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xii} & 4 \quad \Phi \quad \text{om.} \quad U = ABN \\
10. & \quad \text{sine add} \quad L \quad \Phi \quad U = ABN \\
11. & \quad \text{om.} \quad U = ABN \\
12. & \quad \text{add} \quad U = ABN \\
13. & \quad \text{om.} \quad U = ABN \\
14. & \quad \text{add} \quad LU \quad \Phi \quad \text{om.} \quad \text{ABN} \\
15. & \quad \text{sine add} \quad \Phi \quad \text{om.} \quad LU \quad \Phi \quad \text{om.} \quad \Phi \quad \text{om.} \quad \text{ABN} \\
21. & \quad \text{add} \quad U = ABN \quad \Phi \quad \Phi \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xiii} & 2 \quad \Phi \quad \text{om.} \quad U = ABN \\
5. & \quad \text{sine add} \quad L \quad \Phi \quad [S \ q.\ v.] \\
6. & \quad L = A \\
\end{align*}
\]
In conclusion I may perhaps call attention to the fact that an interesting Lucianic (perhaps Midrashic) reading of ii 14 is found in the Syro-Hexaplar:—'And he took the cloak of Elijah which fell upon him and smote the waters and they were not divided, and he said, Where is the LORD the God of Elijah, ἀφφω? And he smote the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, and Elisha went over.' The words in italics are found also in some texts of the Latin Vulgate.

W. Emery Barnes.

RHYTHM IN THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

In the first edition of his Grammatik des Neuestamentlichen Griechisch (§ 82, 3) Professor Blass remarked on the occurrence of fragments of verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews. So frequent are they that he was disposed to think that they were not the result of pure accident. Since that edition appeared he has discovered a rhythmical principle which runs through the whole Epistle. This principle is described in the second edition of his Grammatik as follows: 'If the fragments of verse', he says, 'are not purely fortuitous, at any rate they are not the essential point. This consists rather in a mutual assimilation of beginnings and endings of sentences and clauses running through this Epistle. Ending may correspond to ending and beginning to beginning, also ending to beginning, especially if contiguous. Rhythm of this kind must have been taught in the rhetorical schools of Greece and Rome of the time, and the author of this Epistle must have passed through such a school.' To take a single instance, in the opening sentence we have a clause ending with (παράγων ἐν τοῖς προφήταις) followed by a clause ending with (εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον) ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν ζωή, i.e. twice ὅ——ἄ — , the omission of the definite article before ἔνω being due to metrical considerations. The subject has been worked out in detail by Professor Blass elsewhere.

In view of the many points of resemblance, especially in matters