

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SYRIAC VERSION OF ISAIAH: II ¹

LEONA G. RUNNING

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Part I included a brief history of the study of the Syriac version; an outline of the procedures followed in our investigation; a list of abbreviations and symbols used, including bibliographic references for works referred to only by their abbreviations in Part II; and a list of MSS used, with their sigla and brief descriptions. Part III will contain a few comparisons and conclusions concerning our study of the manuscripts and of NT quotations from Is, and, finally, a summary and our conclusions concerning the whole investigation.

Of the many thousands of variant readings found in studying the 94 MSS used in this investigation, 3049 were chosen for statistical analysis. And from all the quotations of Is by the Syrian authors, 290 variants were gleaned. Of these 3339, 101 were selected for evaluation after all the others had been eliminated because of agreement with the Hebrew, Greek, or Syrohexapla texts or because the type of variation involved was not significant. These 101 and their evaluations are here presented, in Part II.

Examples of orthographic variants disregarded beyond the 3339 are: the addition of initial or medial *'alaph* in the names Israel and Judah and in various other words; the presence or absence of the "otiose *yūdh*" on feminine verb forms; the addition of a *waw* in ܘܢ and ܘܢܘܢ; the addition of *sēyāmē* plural dots on numerals, plural verbs and participles and other inherently plural words; words in which the scribe has

¹ The first part of this article was published in *AUSS*, III (1965), 138-157.

obviously misread one letter for another; variants between a pronoun added to a participle or standing separately after it; the addition of a *yūdh* in **ܕܠܗ**; and similar differences which are characteristic between East and West Syriac, and which have no real significance. Most of these were also omitted in Diettrich's *Apparatus*² after the first mention, hence it was useless to retain them in the MSS studied in addition to Diettrich's 28. The eliminating was done conservatively, however. Goshen-Gottstein well states:

It is not always easy to draw the line between "real" variants and text-corruptions. Diettrich's study of Isaiah—which is far from utilizing all the available manuscripts—serves to warn us where this wealth of material leads. The really important variants are drowned in the sea of textual corruptions and orthographic alternations, and a fair number of "real" variants were overlooked by him.³

The classification of a reading as a "real variant" means no more than the assumption that such a reading may have been part of a textual tradition (in particular, as opposed to the mistakes of individual scribes). It is a statement about an assumed fact, but not a value judgment as such. Only in a small minority of cases will a "real variant" qualify as a "superior reading."⁴

The base for collation was the Urmia text in the edition published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London.⁵ The Ambrosian MS edited by Ceriani,⁶ used by the Peshiṭta Institute as the collation base for the "International Project to Establish a Critical Edition of the Old Testament Peshiṭta," was also thoroughly collated with the Urmia edition, beyond its appearance in Diettrich's *Apparatus*. The reading of the

² Gustav Diettrich, *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pešitto zum Propheten Jesaia* ("Beihefte zur ZAW," vol. VIII; Giessen, 1905).

³ M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta," in *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem, 1960), p. 169, n. 29.

⁴ *Ibid.*, "Introduction," p. XIII, n. 19.

⁵ *Ketābā Qaddīšā; Diatēqē 'Attīqtā* (Holy Scriptures; Old Testament, Urmia text; London, 1852; reprinted 1954).

⁶ A. M. Ceriani, ed., *Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI photolithographice edita*. Vol. VI, Parts I and II, of *Monumenta Sacra et Profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan, 1876-1883).

Urmia text is given first for each variant evaluated below, followed by the variant found, and then by the sigla of the MSS showing the variant, arranged alphabetically for convenience. The sigla show at a glance what type of MS is involved. For the age of the MS the reader may refer to the *List of MSS* in Part I. Following the manuscript support and separated by a slanting bar between all the groups, the agreement shown by the four texts, Hebrew,⁷ Targum,⁸ Greek,⁹ and Syrohexapla,¹⁰ by the patristic quotations of Is,¹¹ and by the New Testament,¹² is listed, indicated by abbreviations (see the *List of Abbreviations and Symbols*, in Part I).

The 3049 variant readings from our manuscript study and the 290 from our patristic study were analyzed as to type. The types identified, ranked by frequency within coherent groups, are as follows:

1. Different word(s).
2. Scribal mistakes.
3. Other scribal variations.
4. Omission of word(s).
5. Addition of word(s).
6. Different form of the same word (as, different verb tense).
7. Prefixing of a *waw* conjunction.
8. Omission of a *waw* conjunction.
9. Omission of a preposition (prefixed or not).

⁷ *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. Rud. Kittel (3d ed.; Stuttgart, 1937).

⁸ Alexander Sperber, ed., *The Bible in Aramaic*. Vol. III, *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan* (Leiden, 1962).

⁹ Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta; Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. XIV: *Isaias* (Göttingen, 1939).

¹⁰ A. M. Ceriani, ed., *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus*. Vol. VII of *Monumenta Sacra et Profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan, 1874).

¹¹ For patristic quotations the exact reference is given in abbreviated form with the citation; the full bibliographic entry is found under the abbreviation in the *List of Abbreviations and Symbols* which appeared in Part I.

¹² *The New Testament in Syriac* (Peshitta text; London, 1955).

10. Prefixing of a preposition (or its insertion if not prefixed).
11. Change to a different preposition.
12. Change from prefixed preposition א to prefixed *waw* conjunction.
13. Change from prefixed *waw* conjunction to prefixed prep א.
14. Change from prefixed ו to *waw* conjunction.
15. Change from *waw* conjunction to prefixed preposition ע.
16. Change from *waw* conjunction to אע.
17. Change from אע to *waw* conjunction.
18. Addition of *sēyāmē* plural dots.
19. Omission of *sēyāmē* plural dots.
20. Omission of a suffixed pronoun.
21. Change to a different suffixed pronoun.
22. Addition of a suffixed pronoun.
23. Change of verb form to singular.
24. Change of verb form to plural.
25. Change of verb form to feminine.
26. Change of verb form to masculine.
27. Change of plural verb form to masculine.
28. Addition of a prefixed *t* to a verb form (change to passive).
29. Omission of a prefixed *t* in a verb form (change to active).
30. Change of a participle to the singular.
31. Change of a participle to the plural.
32. Change of a plural participle to the feminine.
33. Transposition of words, or of phrases or clauses.
34. Different wording in a clause.
35. Repetition of a word.

In the remainder of Part II the more important variants are shown and discussed individually, as to the possibility of their being traces of the Targum substrata and Old Syriac text forms. The variants discussed are organized by types of texts—older MSS, Massora correction MSS, later MSS, Lectionaries, Canticles (or Psalter and Biblical Odes) MSS, and patristic quotations—but the variants to be mentioned will be confined to categories 1-3, 4, 5, 6, 33, and 34 of the above list of types of variants found; in other words, not

simply presence or absence of a *waw* conjunction, a suffix, a preposition, pluralization, etc. These features may well represent the Old Syriac text, of course, in many instances; but they may also be simply scribal errors or variations coming in from other influences. Vööbus gives the following caution:

Ein anderes Problem kommt auf, nämlich ob alle auffälligen Abweichungen in der syrischen Vorlage wirklich so zu erklären sind, dass sie altertümliche Elemente sind, die der Frühgeschichte der Peschitta angehören? Können sie aber nicht von der syro-hexaplarischen Übersetzung herkommen, die mit dem Peschittatext in eine Mischform zusammengeschmolzen war, etwa so wie das Werk von Ja'qōb von Edessa? In diesem Fall würden wir mit einer anderen Quelle der targumischen Traditionen im Syrischen zu tun haben, die durch die Kanäle der Septuaginta fließt, die ja selber auch in die Familie der Targumim gehört. Für unsere Zwecke würde aber diese Quelle unser Interesse verlieren.¹³

Goshen-Gottstein joins Vööbus, Kahle, and others in considering the early history of the Greek text a targumic development,¹⁴ but he states:

However, in the case of the Peshitta, we can detect no indication to make us assume that the same conditions prevailed as, perhaps, characterized the early history of the LXX and the Targum. On the basis of our MSS—and this is borne out by many indications in the text itself—it seems rather more likely that the text of the Peshitta represents *one* translation only, which was, however, corrected for some time, possibly on the basis of some other tradition.¹⁵

This is opposite to Vööbus' viewpoint on the Old Syriac text, with its flexible and varied texture: "... the Vetus Syra is by no means a homogeneous and uniform text. The Vetus Syra originally must have contained more than the two extant representatives [Curetonian and Sinaitic Old Syriac Gospel codices]." ¹⁶ But Vööbus agrees with the above

¹³ Arthur Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs* (Stockholm, 1958), p. 63.

¹⁴ Goshen-Gottstein, *op. cit.*, p. XII. Cf. Paul E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2d ed.; Oxford, 1959), pp. 232-264; Vööbus, *op. cit.*, p. 63, etc.

¹⁵ Goshen-Gottstein, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹⁶ Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*. CSCO, vol. 128, Subsidia, Tome 3 (Louvain, 1951), p. 167.

statement by Goshen-Gottstein concerning the Peshitta, as contrasted with the Old Syriac text:

The Peshitta was one of the numerous manuscripts of the *Vetus Syra* which was made the basis of redaction and adaptation to the vulgar Greek text held valid in the patriarchate of Antioch. The result of this revision was that digressions were eliminated, additions removed, omissions supplemented and peculiarities retouched. . . . After the revision, the text assumed a wholly new form, conforming more or less to the Greek original [of the New Testament] An entirely new text type came into existence. While the Peshitta's back is turned on the ancient and endeared Syrian traditions, its face is decidedly turned towards the Greek form.¹⁷

In studying the early history of the Syriac version, these two phases are both involved—one must try to go behind the rather rigid, standardized revision represented by the Peshitta, to the varied, individualistic, “wilder” text of the Old Syriac, with its targumic characteristics, a tendency to paraphrase and to find more than one way of expressing a thought. In this view, all the minutiae mentioned *en masse* in the statistical tables and chapters [of our full unpublished dissertation] could be seen as reflecting the Old Syriac text except where they have the agreement of the Greek and the Syrohexapla; and even in these cases, the agreement may be merely a coincidence, and they may really belong to the Old Syriac—or, they may actually be only scribal errors. Goshen-Gottstein emphasizes the “Law of Scribes,” that “the same textual change may creep into the text again and again, mostly for purely linguistic reasons. Not every corruption is a ‘variant’, . . .”¹⁸ On the other hand, a necessary caution is expressed when he says:

However, if we overwork our tools of analysis—*e.g.* by explaining readings as linguistic alternants, simplifications, syntactic smoothings, harmonizations and exegetical changes, influences from similar verses etc. etc. . . .—our misinterpretation of the facts will be hardly less glaring than that of the reigning textual criticism. The method may work so well that the vast majority of variants can be explained away, and we might easily throw out the baby with the bathwater.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.

¹⁸ Goshen-Gottstein, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. XIII.

In his footnote on the last sentence of the above statement, he adds:

By now it ought to be clear that many alleged variants in the ancient versions are due much less to the process of translation than was assumed before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. The dynamics of textual change are very much the same everywhere, so that identity of result cannot *per se* be taken as proof of relatedness or common tradition.²⁰

With these cautions concerning both extremes in view, only those variants will be given consideration here, in most cases, that have the Targum in agreement and/or a patristic quotation. Thus the bulk of the accidental agreements will be eliminated. The use of italics for a text reference indicates a singular reading. At the end of each section a brief summary is given of the total variants in the respective types of MSS.

Variants in the Older MSS

1 : 15^c ܩܠܝܠ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ] ܩܠܝܠܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ P⁶ / NT

1 : 15^c in P⁶ is an interesting variant, though without any support from the four texts, the Hebrew, Targum, Greek, or Syrohexapla, or from the Syrian authors. It may be a scribal error (bringing it in from another context), or typical of the "wilder" text of the Old Syriac. The exact words are found in the Peshitta text of Rom 3 : 15, but are there related to "feet" rather than to "hands"—a telescoping of the similar wording found in Is 59 : 7, where the exact words appear in the Syrohexapla. See also the mention of this variant in Part III, the section on NT quotations of Is.

2 : 3^a ܕܡܫܝܚܐ] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ P⁶ S^{1, 2, 4, 5-1} / Eph *Op Om* II, 24

2 : 3^a appears only in P⁶ and 4 of the Mt. Sinai Lectionaries and Ephraim. A synonym, it may well be an Old Syriac form, if not a scribal error.

2 : 3^c ܡܫܝܚܐ] (1) ܡܫܝܚܐ S⁴⁻¹ / (2) ܡܫܝܚܐ P⁶

2 : 3^{c2}, only in P⁶, a synonym, may be a scribal error or an Old Syriac form.

2 : 20^c ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ L⁶ (2) / (H T) G S

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. XIII, n. 17.

2: 20^c is an example of many where the Old Syriac form may actually be the wording in the Peshitta, the variant having only one (or in some examples a very few) MS with it, along with Hebrew, Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla, but the vast majority of the MSS being with the Peshitta text base contrary to these. When the Old Syriac forms thus hide in the Peshitta text, they are impossible to designate safely.

3: 12^a [ܘܥܠܡܝܬܐ] ܘܥܠܡܝܬܐ L⁴ M¹ P⁶ R^{2, 3} S^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5-1}
/ T / Aph I, 640

3: 12^a, a different form of the word, could be brushed aside as merely an orthographic difference. Appearing in the Targum and in Aphrahat's quotation, however, along with 3 early MSS, 2 late ones of the 17th cent., and 5 Mt. Sinai Lectionaries, it may well be genuine.

5: 4^a [ܘܠܚܘܕ] pr ܘܠܘܠ L⁴ L¹²⁻¹ M¹ P^{4, 6} R^{2, 3} R⁶⁻¹ S^{1, 3, 4, 5-1} /
Aph I, 228; Eph *Op Om* II, 26

5: 4^a, appearing in 3 older, 3 later, and 6 Lectionary MSS, also in quotations by Aphrahat and Ephraim, may be Old Syriac, though unimportant.

10: 5^b [ܘܥܒܪ] + ܘܠ J¹ L⁴ M¹ P⁶ R^{2, 3} / Zach II, 190

10: 5^b occurs in 3 older and 3 later MSS and in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Zacharias Rhetor translated into Syriac; it is an idiom characteristic of the early language, probably reflecting the Old Syriac text type.

10: 9^a [ܘܠܗܘܠ] ܘܠܗܘܠ C^{1, 3, 4, 5} F¹ L^{1, 2, 3 (2), 5, 6 (2)} L^{7, 8, 9, 10, 11-m}
M^{1, 2} O^{1, 2} P^{3, 5} R^{1, 4, 5}

10: 9^a could be a scribal variant in older, Massora correction, and later MSS, but the *yūdh* in both forms may be the Old Syriac spelling, since all four texts and Ephraim have *nūn*, as shown in Eph *Op Om* II, 38, supported by H T (G S).

10: 14^b [ܘܠܗܘܠ] (1) om ܘ R¹ / (2) ܘܠܗܘܠ F^{1 (1)} P³ R^{3, 5} /
Eph *Op Om* II, 38

10: 14^{b2} is found in F¹ and the group of 17th-cent. MSS that

are close to it, and in Ephraim; it could well be an Old Syriac form of wording.

11: 16^e ܐܠܗܐܝܢ (1) + ܡܠ M¹ / (2) ܐܠܗܐܝܢ C¹ O² S¹, 2, 3, 4-1 / H G (S)

11: 16^{e2}, though isolated in M¹, may be an archaic reading.

14: 10^b ܐܠܗܐܝܢ F¹ P³ R², 3, 5 / Eph *Op Om* II, 43

14: 10^b occurs in F¹ accompanied by its small late group and Ephraim; it could be a scribal error or Old Syriac.

15: 1^b ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܐܠܗܐܝܢ F¹ P³ R² (t), 3, 5 / Eph *Op Om* II, 44

15: 1^d ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܐܠܗܐܝܢ F¹ P³ R² (t), 3, 5

15: 1^b, 15: 1^d contain a transposition occurring in F¹ and its small late group and Ephraim; either a scribal error or Old Syriac form of the text.

16: 8^c ܐܠܗܐܝܢ (1) pr ܐܠܗܐܝܢ R² (t) / (2) ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܐܠܗܐܝܢ F¹

16: 8^{c2}, 16: 8^{c2} are each confined to one MS but share the same variant largely, occurring only in F¹ and one of its close associates, the text of R², in which the marginal corrections generally have the effect of conforming the text to the Urmia Peshitta type. It could be an Old Syriac reading, or a scribal error, the 17th-cent. MS copying it from the rather individualistic earlier one.

17: 9^a ܐܠܗܐܝܢ pr ܡܠ L⁵ M¹

17: 9^a is a common idiom which the scribes of L⁵ and M¹ may easily have brought in from elsewhere in the text or simply in their minds; or it may be the older reading.

18: 7^c ܐܠܗܐܝܢ om F¹ P³ R², 3, 5 / Eph *Op Om* II, 49

18: 7^c is an omission by F¹ and its close late group and Ephraim; it could be scribal, or Old Syriac.

20: 2^d ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܐܠܗܐܝܢ C¹ L⁵ L⁷, 9, 10, 11-m M¹ P^{6*}
P^{7-m} R² R⁷, 8, 9-m / Eph *Op Om* II, 52

20: 2^d is attested in 3 older, all but 1 of the Massora correction, and 2 of the later, MSS as well as Ephraim. The transposition may be Old Syriac.

20: 3^a ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ] ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ F¹ L^{4, 5} M¹ P^{6*} / (Eph)

20: 3^a is identical with 20: 2^d, but is attested by 5 of the older MSS and Ephraim.

26: 13^c ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ] ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ C^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5} F¹ J¹ L^{3, 4, 5, 6} L¹²⁻¹ L^{27-c} M^{1, 2}
O¹ P^{1, 2, 3, 5, 6} R^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5} R⁶⁻¹ R^{10, 12-c} S^{6, 7, 8, 9-c}
W^{2-c} / (T) / Eph *Op Om* II, 63

26: 13^c is mentioned here because it is found in almost all the older, later, and Canticles (Psalter and Biblical Odes) MSS plus 2 of the Lectionaries, and Ephraim and the Targum. It could have been a scribal error, but is more likely a genuine older trace in all these, being with Targum.

30: 15^b ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ] om F¹ M¹ P^{3, 6*} R^{2, 3, 5} / Eph *Op Om* II, 71

30: 15^b is an omission in F¹ and its small late group, plus M¹ and P⁶ (uncorrected), and in Ephraim. It is perhaps a scribal error.

33: 7 ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ] ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ F¹ L⁵M¹ R² (t)
/ (H) / Eph *Op Om* II, 76

33: 7, occurring in three older MSS and in the text of R² (the marginal correction being, as usual, the same as the Urmia Peshitta), as well as in Ephraim and the conjecturally restored Hebrew אַרְאָא (ה) לַ(ה) ׀, supported by the 1QIs^a reading אַרְאָא לַם, is probably a piece of the original text fabric woven into the Peshitta by the Old Syriac from the Hebrew primary source. This is actually the highly preponderant situation, but is the kind that cannot be demonstrated and is here excluded, for the most part, in order to focus on the items of the contrary type that stand out against this Peshitta background.

37: 25 ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ] ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ F¹ / T / Aph I, 189

37: 25, in F¹, has the support of the Targum and Aphrahat; it may be Old Syriac.

38: 2^b ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ] + ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ F¹ J¹ L⁴ M^{1, 2(mg)} R^{1, 2, 3} S^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5-1} / T

38: 2^b, occurring in several older, later, and Lectionary

MSS, with support of the Targum, may be Old Syriac or just a scribal error.

43: 8^b ܐܠܗܐ¹] + ܐܠܗܐ L¹⁽²⁾, 2, 5 / Syr Did 74a, n.

43: 8^b, appearing in L⁵ and also in the second hand of L¹ and in L², as well as Ephraim and the Syriac *Didascalia*, is an addition that could have come in from Eze 12: 2, either as a scribal error or as an addition of the *Vetus Syra*.

43: 15 ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ P⁶ / Eph Lamy II, 105

43: 15 occurs only in P⁶ and Ephraim; this substitute word could well be an Old Syriac trace—or a scribal error.

49: 12^b ܐܠܗܐ²] om ܐܠܗܐ O²

49: 12^b, the word ܐܠܗܐ in both Peshitta and variant may be Old Syriac, for none of the four texts has it or its equivalent.

51: 3^b ܐܠܗܐ] + sey. F¹ L^{9-m} M¹ O² P³ R^{2(t)}, 3, 5

51: 3^b, both Peshitta and variant may represent the archaic text, since the four texts are completely different here.

51: 12 ܐܠܗܐ] om F^{1(t)} P³ R², 3, 5 / H T G S

51: 12 is an omission by F¹ and its group and by all four texts; the words may be an Old Syriac trace hiding in the Peshitta.

51: 18^b ܐܠܗܐ] om F¹ L⁴, 5 M¹ P³, 6(t) R^{1(t)}, 2, 3, 5 / H T G S

51: 18^b is the same situation as 51: 12; several more of the older MSS also omit the words, however.

55: 1^c ܐܠܗܐ²] om F¹ R^{2(t)} / Eph Lamy II, 155

55: 1^c, the second occurrence of the verb, is omitted in F¹, the text of R², and Ephraim. It may be a scribal error or an old text form.

55: 13^d ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ L⁴ M¹ P⁴ R⁶⁻¹ S¹, 2, 4, 5-1 / H T G S

55: 13^d—again, the Old Syriac may be against the variant, with the Peshitta and the majority of older and other MSS; the four texts support the variant.

58: 1^b ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ F¹ L⁴, 5 M¹ S¹, 2, 4, 5-1 / H T G S

35: 2^c [ܡܠܟܐ] + ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ L^{7-m} M² O^{1, 2}
P^{1, 2, 5(mg)} R⁴

35: 2^a, 35: 2^c represent liturgical additions in Massora correction MSS and later MSS.

45: 16 ܡܠܟܐ (1) om sey. F¹ P³ R^{2, 3, 5} / (2) ܡܠܟܐ L^{10-m} / T

45: 16² is a synonym, occurring in 1 Massora MS and the Targum. It may well be a genuine old Targum trace here.

55: 1^e ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ R^{8-m} / Aph I, 24

55: 1^e occurs in 1 Massora MS and Aphrahat; this transposition is probably scribal.

56: 10^e ܡܠܟܐ L^{7-m} M² O¹ P^{1, 2, 5(mg)} R⁴ / Eph Lamy II, 161

56: 10^e occurs in 1 Massora and several later MSS and Ephraim. It may be a scribal confusion of letters in Nestorian script.

66: 23^c ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ L^{10-m} / Eph Lamy II, 211

66: 23^c, occurring in 1 Massora MS and Ephraim, may be a trace of the archaic text, or the Massoretic correction may be from Ephraim's text; similarly 66: 22^{1, 2}, where S⁵⁻¹ shows ܡܠܟܐ, and S⁴⁻¹ shows ܡܠܟܐ, respectively.

There are no other variants worth mentioning in the Massora MSS besides these 7, 1 of which is duplicated in the section on older MSS. The Massora correction MSS contain, all together, 649 variants, of which 176 (27.1%) are singular (5.8% of the 3049 manuscript variants). One is supported by the Curetonian Old Syriac Gospels codex, and 5 by the NT Peshitta. Aphrahat agrees with 11, Ephraim with 93; one is supported by another patristic source, the 7th-cent. *Livre de la Perfection* (merely omission of *səyāmē*).

Variants in the Later MSS

2: 4^a ܡܠܟܐ] ܡܠܟܐ L^{1, 2}

2: 4^a, appearing in 2 late MSS, is probably a scribal corruption from Mic 4: 3.

3: 12^a was mentioned in the section on older MSS; likewise 5: 4^a, 10: 5^b, 10: 9^a, and 10: 14^{h2}.

13: 22^b ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] om C¹ M² P¹ / T

13: 22^b is an omission in the Targum as well as in 3 later MSS, but it could be a scribal error.

14: 10^b was mentioned in the section on older MSS; likewise 15: 1^b, 15: 1^d, 18: 7^c, 20: 2^d, and 20: 3^a.

22: 12^a ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] om P⁴ / Eph *Op Om* II, 56

22: 12^a occurs in a 13th-cent. MS and Ephraim. The omission may be merely scribal.

30: 15^b and 33: 7 have already been mentioned among older MSS.

30: 32 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] P³ R^{2(t)}, 3, 5; Eph *Op Om* II, 73

30: 32 occurs in the group of 17th-cent. MSS usually associated with F¹, and in Ephraim. It would be an easy scribal error to make, or it may be the old text form.

34: 14^a ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] M² O² P¹, 2, 3, 5 R⁴ / Eph *Op Om* II, 78

34: 14^a, found only in late MSS and Ephraim, is doubtless a scribal error; it does not fit the context well.

38: 2^b and 43: 8^b have already been mentioned.

44: 25^a ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] + ܘܠܗܘܢ O² / Eph Lamy II, 113

44: 25^a occurs only in the wretchedly written O², but supported by Ephraim; the addition of the pronoun to the participle, such a common idiom in Syriac, could have come into each independently as a scribal addition.

47: 8^b ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] + ܘܠܗܘܢ R⁴ / T

47: 8^b occurs only in the 17th-cent. R⁴ and the Targum; it is an easy addition to be made from many parallel texts, so that it could have come into both independently.

55: 1^c and 58: 11^b have been mentioned in the section on older MSS; 56: 10^e, in the section on Massora MSS.

60: 5^b ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ] C¹ L³⁽²⁾ / Eph Lamy II, 173

Lectionaries, besides Ephraim and Jacob of Edessa. It is probably the Old Syriac text form.

2: 3^a and 3: 12^a have already been mentioned in the section on older MSS.

5: 1^a [ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢ] (1) om S⁵⁻¹ / (2) ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢ S^{1, 2, 3, 4-1} / Ish VI, 95; Dion I, 336

5: 1^{a2} is confined to 4 Mt. Sinai Lectionaries besides Isho'dad and Dionysius bar Ṣalibī, who copies from him. The insertion of the word is a later Syriac characteristic, doubtless not in the Old Syriac text.

5: 4^a has already been mentioned in the section on older MSS.

5: 21 [ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢ] L¹²⁻¹ R⁶⁻¹

5: 21, in 2 13th-cent. Lectionaries, is without support but is possibly an Old Syriac reading, or merely scribal.

6: 6 [ܘܢܘܢ] (1) pr ܘ C⁵ / (T G) / (2) ܘܢܘܢ S^{1, 2, 4, 5-1} / (T)

6: 6^a is limited to 4 Mt. Sinai Lectionaries and the Targum, although the latter uses a different root in Pa'el form, with the same meaning. This may be a trace of the Old Syriac preserved in the Lectionaries, Targum influence being only the insertion of the *yūdh*.

8: 4^a [ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢ] S⁵⁻¹ / T / Eph *Op Om* II, 34

8: 4^a, in 1 very poorly written Lectionary and the Targum, may be an Old Syriac form, though it could easily be a scribal error.

9: 6^a [ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢ] S⁵⁻¹ / (Erech 59, 62)

9: 6^a is in 1 very poorly written Lectionary, and the noun appears in the Syriac translation of the quotation by Erechthios; the synonym substitution may be a scribal error.

10: 18^a [ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢ] (1) om ܘ S⁴⁻¹ / (2) ܘܢܘܢ S⁵⁻¹ / (T)

10: 18^{a2} looks like a scribal error in the very poorly written Lectionary, but it is partially supported by the Targum. It may be a genuine old form.

26 : 19^g [ܠܘܢܐܢܐ] (I) ܠܘܢܐܢܐ R^{10-c} S^{6, 7, 9-c} / (T) G S / (2) ܠܘܢܐܢܐ
L^{27-c}

26 : 19^{g1}, the substitution of a different word, appears in 4 Canticles MSS, supported by the Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla. It may be the archaic form; it could have given rise to the synonym in 26 : 19^{g2}.

No other reading in the Canticles sections, Is 26 : 9-19 and 42 : 10-13, 45 : 8, is worth mentioning, besides these 4. All together, the Canticles MSS present 374 variant readings, of which 47 (1.5% of 3049, and 12.6% of the 374) are singular. No support is found for any Canticles readings in the NT Peshitta quotations of Isaiah, nor in the Curetonian or Sinaitic Old Syriac Gospels. Aphrahat's reading gives support to 1 variant, with 4 Canticles MSS, while the reading of Ephraim supports 7 variants, with 38 occurrences in the MSS, and the 7th-cent. *Livre de la Perfection* is with 3 Canticles MSS at 26 : 9^d (merely prefixing a *waw* conjunction).

General Observations

It is not possible to be sure in most of the cases presented above, whether a variant is a scribal error or a genuine trace of the Old Syriac text form. And many of the variants excluded here, such as suffixes, different prepositions, etc., may actually be genuine old forms. A variant that one would think merely scribal will often turn out, on checking, to have the support of one or two or all four of the Hebrew, Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla texts; but this agreement may be accidental and a coincidence, and the variant where it occurs may still be a scribal error, according to the "Law of Scribes" mentioned earlier.

A similar case occurs in Lectionaries, where a variant seems obviously due to the fact that a new lection is beginning at that spot. But on checking, one may find that the word actually occurs in the text of the Syrohexapla, with the equivalent Greek in the Greek text from which that was

translated and thus influencing the text type of the Lectionaries. Such an instance is the prefixed ܐܘ at 49:6^e, before ܘܚܘܒܐ, shown by S^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5-1} and supported by G S, where a lection begins in the middle of the verse.

In several of the above references (2: 20^e, 5I: 3^b, 5I: 12, 5I: 18^b, 55: 13^d, 58: 1^b, and 66: 16) the Old Syriac forms may be hiding in the Peshitta text. Other examples, not included in the 3049 variants from the manuscripts, may be the following:

9: 12 ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ H T G; ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ S, where all the MSS studied are with the Urmia text.

11: 14 ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ H G S; all MSS are with the Urmia text.

21: 9 ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ om H T G S.

32: 14 ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ om H T G S.

49: 4 ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ om H T G S.

51: 3^a ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ H T G S.

51: 3^b ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ] ܐܘܢܐܘܪܐ H T G S.

42: 9, the four texts have the first two clauses in reverse order from that of the Peshitta.

This is not an exhaustive list, but contains only some variants that were noted incidentally, as the present investigation was not carried on in a manner that would expose all of these. Such a method would seem, however, to be one approach toward the *Vetus Syra*.

Following his presentation of similar targumic traces in MSS of differing ages and types, Vööbus remarks:

Nun beginnt im Lichte dieses Textmaterials etwas von der Entwicklung der Peschitta aufzudämmern. Einerseits sind wir jetzt imstande, zu erkennen, dass die älteste Gestalt der Peschitta viel "wilder" gewesen ist. Andererseits muss die Revision ihrer Natur nach viel einschneidender gewesen sein, als wir sie uns bisher vorgestellt haben.²¹

²¹ Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs*, p. 112.

Wir stoßen auf die interessante Tatsache, dass die weniger revidierten oder sogar die unrevidierten Bibelhandschriften weiterlebten, vervielfältigt wurden, und so noch immer den Einfluss des altpalästinischen Targums verbreiteten, lange nachdem die syrische Christenheit bereits eine revidierte Textgestalt besass, und sogar lange nach dem Aufkommen mancher gelehrten und akuraten Übersetzungen.²²

Variants in the Patristic Quotations

Concerning the variants found in the MSS, it was interesting to observe very many times in working on one of our sets of worksheets that one variant would be supported by Ephraim with Hebrew and Targum, and the very next variant that had any such support would have it from Ephraim with Greek and Syrohexapla, in completely impartial fashion. Speaking of the early commentaries, Goshen-Gottstein remarks, as an outcome of his studies, "It happens very seldom—and in rather unimportant cases—that these commentaries agree with an early manuscript against the prints."²³ Of the text of such commentaries, he states:

It cannot be said that any of the early commentaries, etc., consistently quotes the Peshitta text verbatim from written copies. On the contrary, it is obvious that the early writers often quoted from memory, omitted parts of verses, and, of course, changed verses to fit their homiletic needs.²⁴

More formidable is the problem that not seldom one is led to suspect that the quotation does not belong to the Peshitta tradition, but rather is based on a different tradition. These "free" renderings, in which the commentaries and homilies abound, may be interesting for the study of the problem of a possible O.T. *Vetus Syra*, . . .²⁵

It is such variants that are considered in the final section of this chapter. Again, only those variants, in most cases, will be referred to that fall in categories 1-3, 4, 5, 6, 33, and 34 of the types of variants and that have the agreement of the Targum only.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 113.

²³ Goshen-Gottstein, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

1: 21² [ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ] Jn Ruf 551 / (T)

1: 21², occurring in the *Plérophories* by Jean Rufus, has essentially the same words as the Targum and seems probably a genuine trace.

1: 22^(c) [ܫܡܝܬܐ] Eph Op Om II, 23 / T G

1: 22^(c), Ephraim and the Targum agree on the different word; the Greek has both readings, conflating.

3: 3 [ܫܡܝܬܐ] Eph Op Om II, 24 / T

3: 3, both Ephraim and the Targum have this substitute word. Other such variants are found at 4: 3; 5: 1^(b); 5: 14; and 6: 2^{3(c)} (where both Ephraim and Jacob of Edessa are with the Targum, though they have a plural suffix, as the Peshitta has, while that of the Targum is singular).

6: 7 [ܫܡܝܬܐ] Anon 149 / (T)

6: 7, an anonymous author has the same word as the Targum, but makes it plural.

9: 7 [ܫܡܝܬܐ] Ish VII, 9; Syn Nest 233 / T / NT (Lk 1: 33)

9: 7, the word of the Targum appears in *Synodes Nestoriens* and a quotation of Isho'dad, also in the NT Peshitta at Lk 1: 33.

10: 27^(c) [ܫܡܝܬܐ] Eph Op Om II, 39

10: 27^(c) needs a little discussion. The addition of pluralization occurs in early, Massora, and late MSS. Ephraim, according to Diettrich's *Apparatus*, and the Targum have "Anointed One" or "Messiah," [ܫܡܝܬܐ], *ܡܫܝܚܐ*. Diettrich, however, states a correction in his Introduction, calling it a typographical error for [ܫܡܝܬܐ].²⁶ The present investigator found Ephraim's reading to be, in fact, [ܫܡܝܬܐ]. Stenning has a footnote stating that the spelling *ܡܫܝܚܐ* in the Targum is probably an error for *ܡܫܚܐ*.²⁷ If this is true, it would bring the

²⁶ Diettrich, *op. cit.*, p. xxix.

²⁷ J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford, 1949), p. 39, n. on vs 27.

Targum and Ephraim to the same word, agreeing with the Hebrew. The late and poor MS P² has a marginal correction to the form ܠܘܥܐ, as Ephraim's really is.

14: 12 ܠܘܥܐ] ܠܘܐܝ Livre P I, 83 / T

14: 12, the *Livre de la Perfection* has the same word as the Targum.

14: 15 ܠܘܥܐ] (a) ܠܘܥ Eph Op Om II, 43 / (b) ܠܘܥܐܐ Aph I, 189 / (T) / (NT) (Mt 11: 23; Lk 10: 15)

14: 15^(a), 14: 15^(b); Ephraim's reading may be a scribal error, omitting the first letter and thus turning the form from an imperfect to an imperative, which also fits the context. Aphrahat's form is close to that of the Targum (ܠܘܥܐܐ). The NT at Mt 11: 23 and Lk 10: 15 has ܠܘܥܐܐܐ.

19: 17¹ ܠܘܥܐܐ] + ܠܘܥܐܐ Evag 524 / T

19: 17¹, Evagrius, in Syriac translation, and the Targum add the same noun. Likewise in 19: 17² (ܠܘܥܐܐ] ܠܘܥܐܐ) they have the same verb, although Evagrius makes it plural while the Targum's singular is like the singular Peshitta form. In 19: 17³ (ܠܘܥܐܐ] ܠܘܥܐܐ) the Syriac translation of Evagrius and the Targum again are alike, although this is outside the few categories selected here.

24: 23 ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ] ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ
Eph Op Om II, 60 / (T)

24: 23, the verbs in the first two clauses are exchanged in both Ephraim and the Targum, the latter being characteristically expanded.

25: 6 ܠܘܥܐܐ] ܠܘܥܐܐ Eph Op Om II, 61 / H T G S

25: 6 may be an instance, like some mentioned in former sections, where the Old Syriac form is hiding in the Peshitta. Ephraim is with the four texts, opposite all the MSS (the variant substituting a different preposition).

27: 13 ܠܘܥܐܐ ܠܘܥܐܐ] om Eph Op Om II, 66 / H T G S

If no restrictions had been placed on the categories included here, only six more would have been included:

16: 8 [ܐܠܗܐ] om ܐ Eph Op Om II, 46 / T

24: 5 [ܡܫܚܐ ܕܗܠܐ] Eph Op Om II, 59 / T

41: 19 [ܡܫܚܐ] + sey. Aph I, 913 / (T)

49: 9^a [ܡܫܚܐ] (a) ܡܫܚܐ Eph Lamy II, 129 / T / (b) + ܡܫܚܐ
Eph Lamy II, 129

60: 15 [ܡܫܚܐ] Eph Lamy II, 177 / T

66: 19² [ܡܫܚܐ] pr ܕ Eph Op Om I, 559 / T (ܝܬ ܝܩܪܝ)

These consisted of a *waw* omitted, a preposition inserted, a plural form of the noun in one codex of Aphrahat and in the Targum, omission of a suffix pronoun in Ephraim and the Targum, the change from a feminine to a masculine verb form in Ephraim and the Targum, and the addition of a preposition ܕ in Ephraim to indicate the direct object of the verb, corresponding to ܝܬ in the Targum.

After presenting a similar selection of variants in the patristic sources, supported by the Targum, Vööbus states:

Eine eingehende Betrachtung und Würdigung dieser Auswahl typischer Beispiele—und hier sind nur solche hineingenommen, die gegen die Peschitta, die Septuaginta und den masoretischen Text (im letzten ausgenommen nur ein paar Fälle) gehen—zeigt, dass diese Abweichungen einzig dann eine ausreichende und befriedigende Erklärung finden, wenn man ersieht, dass diese als echte Überbleibsel der targumischen Überlieferungen zu betrachten sind. Diese enthalten etwas, was durchaus den Stempel der altpalästinischen Traditionen an der Stirn trägt. Die verschiedenen Fäden des textlichen Gewebes der verlorenen Textgestalten, die uns in der patristischen Literatur greifbar werden—exegetische Zusätze, neue Ausdrücke, Abweichungen in der syntaktischen Konstruktion, und viele Minuzien—führen bei näherer Nachprüfung zu einem targumischen Textmuster, das die Peschitta einst getragen hat. So reichen die angeführten Beobachtungen dazu aus, um erkennen zu lassen, dass die altpalästinische Targumüberlieferung die Frühgeschichte der Peschitta noch weit mehr überschattet hat, als uns die vorhandenen Handschriften der Peschitta darüber Auskunft geben wollen.³⁰

³⁰ Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs*, p. 36.

One needs to remember also, however, the tremendous mass of patristic quotations that have been discarded as exhibiting strong influences from the Greek and the Syrohexapla texts, besides those presented in selection here. The Targum traces here set forth are very few in comparison, genuine though they are. The main body of Targum influence, doubtless, is still concealed in the Peshitta text, indistinguishable, at least by the approaches made in this study.

Since there are no extant fragments of an Old Palestinian Targum of the Prophets, one cannot specify that type of targumic trace in Is, but only targumic traces in general. Vööbus' mention of "this selection of typical examples" may mislead the reader to believe that the whole Syriac OT teems with these, whereas this is not an accurate picture of the situation.

Summary information concerning the variants found in the manuscript study is presented in the following Tables.

TABLE I

Summary Concerning Variant Readings

MSS	Total	Singular	Percent.	Percent., 3049	Cor	Mg	2nd Hand	3rd Hand	Totals
Older MSS	1466	174	11.9	5.7	8	4	15	0	1493
Fragments	24	8	33.3	.3	0	0	0	0	24
Totals	1490	182	12.2	5.9	8	4	15	0	1517
Later MSS	5077	744	14.7	24.1	26	61	149	27	5340
Total General	6567	926	14.1	30.4	34	65	164	27	6857
Massora MSS	649	176	27.1	5.8	0	15	2	0	666
Lectionaries	1989	322	16.2	10.6	2	0	0	0	1991
Canticles MSS	374	47	12.6	1.5	1	2	0	0	377
Totals	9579	1471	15.4	48.2	37	82	166	27	9891

TABLE 2

Distribution and Agreement of Variant Readings

Variants	Total	Percentage of 3049
In Lect. MSS only	261	8.6
In Mass. MSS only	39	1.3
In Cant. MSS only	48	1.6
In Lect. and Cant. MSS only	2	.07
In Lect. and Mass. MSS only	7	.23
In Cant. and Mass. MSS only	5	.16
In Funerary MS only	1	.03
Agreement with H	487	16.0
Agreement with T	457	15.0
Agreement with G	535	17.5
Agreement with S	562	18.4
Agreement with G Hex	22	.72
Agreement with Smg	15	.49
Agreement with Aph	28	.92
Agreement with Eph	166	5.4
Agreement with Others	49	1.6
Agreement with Cur	4	.13
Agreement with Sin	4	.13
Agreement with NT	20	.66

TABLE 3

Mean Percentages of Hebrew, Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla Agreements with Variants in the MSS

MSS	H	T	G	S	All 4	H-T	G-S
Older	39.0	35.0	29.8	29.5	18.4	8.2	6.3
Later	30.9	29.1	26.4	26.6	15.0	6.8	7.2
Mass.	16.8	17.1	18.0	21.8	8.3	3.4	6.0
Lect.	21.2	23.3	24.7	26.6	11.5	3.8	7.2

TABLE 4

Summary of Evaluations of Variants

Source of Variant	Scribal Error or Old Syriac	Scribal Error	Old Syriac	Old Syriac in Peshitta	Total
Older MSS	13	1	15	7	36
Massora MSS	1	4	1	..	6
Later MSS	1	9	1	..	11
Lectionaries	3	4	4	..	11
Canticles MSS	..	2	2	..	4
Patristic quotations	2	3	24	4	33
	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	20	23	47	11	101

(To be concluded)