THE PESHITTA VERSION OF 2 KINGS.

(A Continuation.)

For this continuation of an examination of the Peshitta text of 2 Kings I have used some additional authorities, so that the full list now runs as follows:—

A, The Codex Ambrosianus, published in facsimile by Dr. Ceriani, Milan, 1876–1883. 6th or 7th century.
B, The Buchanan Bible, Camb. Univ. Library, Oo. i. 1, 2. Jacobite, 12th century.
O, British Museum, Add. 14440. Nestorian, probably earlier than 'N'.
L, Lee's Syriac Old Testament of 1823.
U, The Urmi Bible of the American Missionaries of 1852.
Ish, Isho'-dād (Nestorian, fl. 850 A.D.), *Nuhārā* on Kings from British Museum, Or. 4524.
HI, Hebrew Massoretic text. $S$, Syro-Hexaplar.

In *The Peshitta text of Chronicles* (Cambridge, 1897) I attempted to prove that Lee's text of *Chronicles* was derived ultimately from MS 'Syriaques 6' of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. But no such thesis can be maintained with regard to the text of *2 Kings*, for of this only an unpointed fragment is preserved in 'Syriaques 6'. Only the negative conclusion can be established that the text of the Editio Princeps was not derived from any of the MSS used for this Apparatus. It might be worth while, however, for some scholar to compare the text of *2 Kings*

1 See *J. T. S.* vol. vi pp. 220–232.
2 The too learned persons who compiled the Massora are sometimes disposed to correct a reading of the Peshitta from an outside authority, and are so far untrustworthy.
given in ‘Syriaques 7’ of the Bibliothèque Nationale with the printed text, for an inscription in this MS asserts that it was used for the Paris Polyglot. ‘Syriaques 7’ is a copy of a Florentine MS, ‘Laurent. Orient. 58’, a ninth-century codex with a very interesting text in Chronicles and Psalms.

As in Chronicles and Psalms so also in 2 Kings the text of Lee differs but little from that of the Polyglots. Instances of divergence are found in xviii 31 (for \( W \)); xxiii 19 (\( W \)); 35 (mutilated in \( W \)). But on the whole Lee made very little use of his MSS for the improvement of the text of 2 Kings.

One main result stands out clearly from a study of the whole Apparatus. There are in existence two texts of the Peshitta version of 2 Kings. These two are not to be distinguished as Nestorian and Jacobite, but as the Receptus (represented by the two Polyglots and Lee) and the Non-receptus (represented by the Authorities collated for this Apparatus). The Urmi text, which stands between them, must be described as ‘mixed’. The Receptus is distinguished from its rival mainly by a closer approximation to the Hebrew Masoretic text. This approximation shews itself in the order of words, in the omission of words not found in the Hebrew but almost necessary for the smooth reading of the version, and finally in many quite small details. The general impression which the character of the Receptus makes upon the student is that of a Revised Version, i.e. of a Version revised to bring it into closer agreement with the Original.

A TENTATIVE SELECT LIST OF READINGS.

2 KINGS.

xiv 3. \( \text{L} \)

\( U = \) ABNO e HI

5. \( LU = \) ANOX

om. B e

14. \( LU = \) ANO HI

om. B e

19. \( L = \) A HI

U = BNO e

Cited as ‘1’ in The Peshitta text of Chronicles.

* Cited as ‘F’ in The Peshitta Psalter (Cambridge, 1904).

* I single out these two books because I have collated them with some fullness.

* The following passages may be cited: xviii 12, 16, 17, 22; xix 6 (bis); xx 14, 19; xxi. 17; xxii 2, 5, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17; xxiii. 5, 8 (\( \text{L} \)); 11, 13, 16, 32; xxiv. 4, 11 (bis), 13; xxv. 13, 16.
25. LU = ANOX bH
   om. BZ e

xv 23. مسقُمٍ (sine add) L
   add U = ABNO e HI
25. Avid BNOX [الهُمَّة] U
   e bH [الهُمَّة] Z

xvi 5. مَن لِـ؟ LU = AN e
   لَمَّا؟ BO
16. LU = ANO
   هُمَّة مَضْغُوتُهُ B e

xvii 5. دلُّ مسقُمٍ LU = BNO e
   لم مَضْغُوتُهُ A HI
14. [علاء] LU = ABN e
   لَم O HI
19. L = e
   لَمَّا؟ مَضْغُوتُهُ U = ABNO
28. LU = ABN e bH
   لم O HI
34. (1Mo) (sine add) L [B e]
   add مَضْغُوتُهُ U = ANO
38. LU مَضْغُوتُهُ لَمَّا؟ لَمَّا؟ U = ABNO e

xviii 12. [علاء] L HI
   لَمَّا U = [A]BNOX e
   لَمَّا [مسقُمٍ] U = ABNOX e
15. لَمَّا مَضْغُوتُهُ L = A HI
   لم مَضْغُوتُهُ U = BNO e
16. مَضْغُوتُهُ L HI
   لم U = ABNO e bH
   لم [علاء] U = ABNO e bH
17. لم مَضْغُوتُهُ L HI
   tr. verba U = ABNOXZ e bH
   لم Mلَمَّا U = ABNO
   لم Mلَمَّا U = ABNOX e
18. $L = BN e HI$
   $U = AO$

22. $L = HI$
   $U = ABNO X e$

23. $L = A HI$
   $U = BNO e$

24. (sine add) $L = B e$
   $U = ANO HI$

25. (sine add) $L = A HI$
   $U = ABNO X e$

26. (sine add) $L = A HI$
   $U = BNO e$

27. $L = A$
   $U = ABNO e HI$

28. $LU = ABNOX e$

29. $L = A HI$
   $U = BNO e$

30. $L = O$
   $U = ABN e HI$

31. $LU = ABNO e Ish HIS$
   $W$
32. [om. L] U = ABNO e HI
om. L U = ABNO e HI

33. (post ْبُحَصْصَل ْبُحَصْصَل) L
post ْبُحَصْصَل / U = ABNO e

xix. 4. ُبَحَصْصَل L
(ُبَحَصْصَل) L HI
post ْبُحَصْصَل / U = ABN'eO e

5. (sine add) L HI
حَصْصَل U = ABNO e

6. ُبَحَصْصَل LU HI
(ُبَحَصْصَل) (tandum) ABNO e

7. (ad fin vers) L HI
post ْبُحَصْصَل / U = ABNO e

8. [HA] LU = AO HI
حَصْصَل BN e

9. [om. L] U = ABNO e

11. ُبَحَصْصَل L = O cur pr HI
حَصْصَل U = BNO cur alt e

12. (sine add) L U HI
حَصْصَل / ABNOZ e

14. (2°) (sine add) L U HI
حَصْصَل / ABNO e

15. ُبَحَصْصَل L
حَصْصَل U = ABNO e

16. ُبَحَصْصَل L
حَصْصَل U = ABNO e

17. ْبُحَصْصَل L
حَصْصَل [A]BNO e

18. ُبَحَصْصَل L
حَصْصَل A[B]NO [e]
[om. L] حَصْصَل U

20. [om. L] عَمَو L
حَصْصَل / U = ABNO e

21. [om. L] ُبَحَصْصَل L
حَصْصَل / U = ABNO e
23. \[ \text{حمضات [A]BNOX e} \]
24. \[ LU \text{ HI om. ABNOX vid e} \]
26. \[ U = \text{ABNO e} \]
27. \[ U = \text{ABNO e} \]
31. \[ U = \text{ABNO} \]
32. \[ U = \text{ABNO e} \]

xx. 4. \[ \text{[sine praepositione HI} \]
5. \[ U = \text{ABNO e} \]
7. \[ U = \text{ANO B bH} \]
11. \[ U = \text{ABNO e bH} \]
13. \[ U = \text{ABNO e} \]
14. \[ U = \text{A[B]NO [e]} \]
17. \[ \text{tr. verba} U = \text{ABNO e} \]
19. \[ \text{om.} U = \text{ABNO e} \]

xxi. 3. \[ \text{om.} U = \text{ABNO e HI} \]
NOTES AND STUDIES

4. حصلته وجدت L HI
   (tantum) U = ABNO e
   حصلته L
   om. U = ABNO e HI

7. حصلته L
   حصلته [U] = ABNO e HI
   U = ABNO e HI
   (sine add) L HI
   add حصلته وجدت U = ABNO e
   I حصلته

8. (sine add) L = A HI
   add 001 U = BNOXZ e bH

13. حصلته L = AOZ
   U = BN ras e
   حصلته L
   U = ABNO e

15. حصلته L = A HI
   U = BNO e

17. حصلته [HI]
   U = ABNO [e sine sey]

xxii. 2. حصلته L HI
   حصلته U = ABNO e

5. حصلته L HI
   حصلته ABNO e

6. حصلته L HI
   pr. حصلته U = ABNOX e
   حصلته L HI
   om. 0 U = ABNO e

7. حصلته L
   add 001 U = ABNOeHtX e

9. حصلته [HI]
   U = ABNO e HI

10. حصلته L = A HI
    حصلته U = BNO e

13. حصلته L HI
    حصلته U = ABNO e
540 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

14. (sine add) L
   add 400 U = ABNOXZ e bH
   \added{LU}{HI} ABNOXZ e Ish bH

17. (sine add) L HI
   add |AJ| "U = ABNOX e

xxiii. 4. خسلا (sine add) L
   خسلا \added{LU}{HI} ABNOXZ Ish bH HI

5. خسلا \added{LU}{HI} ABNO e

7. \om. ? U = ABNO e

8. لابن U = ABNO e bH HI
   (2do) L HI
   خسلا \added{LU}{HI} ABNOX e bH
   \om. U = ABNO e bH

10. خسلا (sine add) L
    \om. ? U = ABNOXZ e bH
    خسلا post \added{LU}{HI} ABNO e bH

11. خسلا \om. ? U = ABNO e
    \added{LU}{HI} ABNOX [Ish B e]

12. خسلا \om. 400 U = ABNO e

13. خسلا (2do) (sine add) L HI
    add \added{LU}{HI} ABNOX e

14. خسلا U = [A]BNOX e

15. خسلا \added{LU}{HI} ABNO e

16. خسلا \added{LU}{HI} ABNO e HI
NOTES AND STUDIES

\[(\text{rmo}) \quad LU = HI\]

\[\text{e} \quad \text{ABNO e}\]

17. \(\text{Lu}

\[U = [A]B[N]O \quad \text{e} \quad bH\]

18. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[(\text{sine add}) \quad L \quad HI\]

\[\text{add.} \quad U = [A]BNO \quad \text{e} \quad bH_{\text{comm}}\]

\[\text{L} \quad HI\]

\[\not\exists \; U = \text{ABNO e}\]

20. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[\text{ABNO e}\]

24. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[\text{L} \quad \text{ABNO e}\]

29. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[U = \text{ABNO e}\]

32. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[\text{HI} \quad U = \text{ABNO e}\]

34. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[U = \text{ABNO e}\]

xxiv. 3. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[(\text{sine add}) \quad L \quad [HI]\]

\[\text{add.} \quad U = \text{ABNO e}\]

4. \(\text{Lu} \quad HI\)

\[\text{e} \quad \text{ABNO e}\]

7. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[U = \text{ABNO e} \quad \text{HI}\]

11. \(\text{Lu} \quad HI\)

\[\text{e} \quad \text{ABNO e}\]

13. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[U = \text{ABNO e}\]

14. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[U = \text{ABNO e}\]

xxv. 1. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[U = \text{ABNO e} \quad \text{HI}\]

13. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[\text{HI} \quad [\text{pr.} \quad \text{Lu}\]

15. \(\text{Lu}\)

\[\text{ABNO e} \quad \text{[pr.} \quad \text{Lu}\]

\[\text{A}\]
16. \( om. U = ABNO \) e HI

17. \( \text{pr. } U = ABNO \) e

19. \( U = ABNO \) e

28. \( LU = B \) e

28 (29). \( U = ABNOX \) e

It remains to be added that these collations are offered only as provisional. In the great majority of cases I have not found time to verify the readings given by a second examination of the MSS. But the interest attaching to some of the readings not found in Lee justifies, it is hoped, their publication in the Journal; see (for example) xviii 24, 25; xix 24, 31; xx 4; xxi 7; xxii 2, 13, 14; xxiii 4, 8, 18, 29; xxiv 7; xxv 28.

W. Emery Barnes.

**EZRA'S RECENSION OF THE LAW.**

According to a tradition repeated several times in the Talmud, Ezra wrote the Law, בֵּבלָב אָשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל, in Assyrian writing. The most explicit passage is in *Sanhedrin* fol. 21b:—'Mar Zutra, or according to others Mar 'Uqba, said, the Law was originally given to Israel in Hebrew writing and in the holy language. It was given to them again, in Ezra's time, in Assyrian writing and in the Aramaic language. Israel chose to retain the Assyrian writing and the holy language, leaving to the ignorant the Hebrew writing and the Aramaic language. Who are meant by "the ignorant"? Rab Hisda said they are the Samaritans...

Further on:—'Although the Law was not (actually) delivered through him (Ezra), the writing (of it) was changed by him.'

And again:—'Why was it called Assyrian? Because they brought it from Assyria.'