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Abstract
It is agreed by those who have worked on the subject, that the study of the old Syriac translation of the Bible known as the Peshitta has not by any means been exhausted. Numbers of studies of great value have naturally appeared, especially in the years from 1890 to 1910, but two large gaps in Peshitta studies remain to be filled. The first lacuna felt by all who deal with this version is the lack of a critical text. Indeed a text of any kind can not easily be secured.¹

Some steps have been taken by different scholars toward filling this long-felt need.² The first effort at collation of various texts was by Herbert Thorndike in Vol. VI of the London Polyglot of 1657. He cites only three authorities for Nehemiah, and his collations, though helpful, are in no sense an answer to the need. Many more manuscripts are available to us than Thorndike had at hand and the principles for their use are far better understood
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The interest of the author was first turned in the direction of the textual criticism of the Old Testament in his days as a student at Westminster Theological Seminary where also he began the study of Syriac under Dr. Allan A. MacRae. His interest was further sharpened and basic principles of the art were given him in courses at the University of Pennsylvania under Dr. Ephraim A. Speiser. To both of the above men and institutions, the author is happy to acknowledge his great obligation. It was Dr. Joseph Reider of the Dropsie College, however, who directed the author’s particular interest to the Peshitta as an important witness to the Old Testament text—a witness which has been considerably neglected. It is a pleasure to express sincere thanks to Dr. Reider for his encouragement and direction in this thesis and for the very valuable assistance given in the planning and also in the details of the work. Further thanks are due to him for his great patience with the author during many hours of conference during the progress of the thesis. Indeed the author greatly appreciates the kind cooperation and encouragement of all those of the Faculty of the Dropsie College in making available to him its excellent facilities for research.

A word should be said by way of apology for the appearance of the thesis. A Hammond typewriter was used which has interchangeable type faces for English, Greek, and Hebrew. No type face for Syriac is now available. These machines are no longer manufactured, their patents being taken over by the Coxhead Vari-Typer Company. They
have the advantage of writing the different languages, but they have disadvantages also. The keyboard is not quite standard. A thin paper must be used even to secure one carbon. As a result mistakes are frequent and corrections not always neat. It is hoped that the advantage of having the Hebrew properly typed in will overbalance the rather obvious disadvantages of the typewriter.
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Chapter 7: Introduction

The modern editor is agreed by those who have worked on the subject, that the study of the old Syrian translation of the Bible known as the Peshitta has not by any means been exhausted. Numbers of studies of great value have naturally appeared, especially in the years from 1890 to 1910, but two large gaps in Peshitta studies remain to be filled. The first is the felt by all who dealt with this version is the lack of a critical text. Indeed a text of any kind can not easily be secured. 17 manuscripts for this work. Some steps have been taken by different scholars toward filling this long-felt need. The first effort at collation of various texts was by Herbert Thorndike in Vol. VI of the London Polyglot of 1657. He cites only three authorities for Nehemiah, and his collations, though helpful, are in no sense an answer to the need. Many more manuscripts are available to us than Thorndike had at hand and the principles for their use are far better understood.

W.F. Barnes in 1897 published his Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version. This book is not a critical edition, but was an important step in that direction as 17 manuscripts were collated and other principles were suggested which should be followed in preparing a critical character of an early type of text which he claims to have isolated.

(1) The writer was informed in the fall of 1944 by the publishers that the most common edition — that by Samuel Lee — is out of print. Second hand copies of this or of the London Polyglot are quite scarce.

(2) Haeffelin in Die Peshitta des alten Testaments, p.2, has collected some remarks by Nestle in 1887, Duval in 1307, and Barnes in 1897 speaking of the need of a critical text and the possibilities of having one.

(3) He had desired "to construct on the collated evidence of Eastern and Western authorities a text which would prove to be older than the division between the Eastern and Western text." (p. xvi).

(4) "His apparatus criticus sur Peshitta sur Prophete Jesaja", Peshitta VII of the VTT, (1805).

(5) JTS 7 (1906) 406

(6) "The Origin and Early History of the Syrian Pentateuch" JTS 15(1914) 197.
In 1305 G. Dietrich published a critical apparatus to Isaiah which carried forward the work of collecting materials for a critical text of the whole version. Barnes in a review of Dietrich's work calls it a "complete and final textual critical apparatus to Isaiah." Considerable collating of material on Genesis and Exodus was done by Pinkerton, but a complete critical apparatus was not prepared. All the manuscripts of Gen. and Ex. prior to the 10th century (10 in number) were collated and certain conclusions drawn with regard to the Jewish character of an early type of text which he claims to have isolated. These are, it seems, the only critical apparatus to the Peshitta so far prepared, but mention should be made of Leo Haeffeli's study already so far prepared. 

---

(3) He had desired "to construct on the combined evidence of Eastern and Western authorities a text which would prove to be older than the division between the Eastern and Western texts." (p.xlv).
(5) JJS 7 (1906) 465.
(6) "The Origin and Early History of the Syriac Pentateuch" JJS 15(1914) 14 ff.
Doubtless the preparation of a critical edition of the Peshitta will be long delayed. Barnes says of his work on the Psalter, "I have spent a considerable part of my best working time during the past seven years on the task." Nevertheless it seems that as far as the material is concerned, it should not be too difficult to make at least a complete collation without the great labor necessary for the preparation of such a work on the Septuagint or New Testament where thousands of manuscripts and other witnesses are involved. There are only some 20 important Peshitta manuscripts of the whole Old Testament mentioned by Haefflin and Barnes, and of them 8 or more are apparently late daughter manuscripts of one or two of the more important exemplars. These authors list, in addition, two Pentateuch manuscripts. One of these has the special interest of being dated in "the year of the Greeks 775" - therefore 464 - and thus being the oldest dated Biblical manuscript known. Then they mention as being significant 3 more manuscripts on all or several

(7) op.cit.p.3 "Prolegomena zu einer zu herstellenden textkritischen Ausgabe der Peschitta."
(8) JTS 29 (1928) 330.
(10) op.cit. in a section "Die Handschriften der Peschitta," pp.74-86.
(12) Barnes in Chronicles p.vii describes the later Jacobite manuscripts "either as poor relations (if not descendants) of the Buchanan Bible, or as transcripts of the Florentine Ms., or as partly one partly the other."
(13) Brit. Mus. Aid. 14425,
of the prophetic books and about 600 manuscripts on individual books, chiefly the Psalter. Other textual witnesses, such as citations from the church fathers, printed editions, and collections of Syriac Masora are few in number. It would seem that a complete critical apparatus would be too large an undertaking for a group of scholars with the necessary resources for such a work. Much of the work would have to be done in England and Italy. It is to be hoped that the manuscript treasures of Berlin, London, Cambridge, and Milan have escaped the ravages of war with those which are probably safe in Paris and the Vatican. 15

The second unfinished task for students of the Peshitta is the preparation of a Syriac-Hebrew index. The need was expressed by Wellhausen in 1899 and a few indexes to individual books have been prepared.

In 1897, E. Techen published the first such index entitled "Syrisch-Hebräisches Glossar zu den Psalmen nach der Peshitta." Unfortunately Barnes' critical edition of the Psalter was not yet done. Techen used the Codex Ambrosianus as a basis for his index with references also to Dathe's reprint of the Psalter of Erpenius.

In 1901 Arnold Lazarus prepared a similar index for the Book of Judges as his doctoral dissertation for the University of Erlangen. 16

(14) Barnes in Peshitta Psalter, p.xliv, mentions 51 Psalter Mss. in the British Museum, 13 of which are fragments. He only regarded 15 Mss. as important. In the Cambridge Univ. Library are 6 Psalters only one of which he regards as worthy of regular citation.

(15) It may be of interest to list here the major manuscripts:
- Codex Ambrosianus (B 21 Inf.) Milan, 6th Cent.
- Florentine Codex (Laurent. Or. 58) Florence, 3rd Cent.
- Buchanan Bible (Univ. O. P. L. 1, 2) Cambridge, 12th Cent.
- Vat. Syr. 259, Rome, after 11th Cent. (Cf. Barnes Chronicles p.xxiv on date)
- Sachau 90, Berlin, dated 1654/55 (contains only Chron. Bar. Neh. & Est. of the canonical books, but has an important text).

(16) 30. tingen Gelehrte Anzeigen, (1899) No. 3.
(17) ZAW 17 (1897) p.123ff. and 230ff.
After a very brief introduction he gives a collection of the London versions, Lee's edition, Codex Ambrosianus, the Urmi edition, and the Mosul edition. He uses Lee's text as a basis for his index, but cites important variants of the other witnesses. His index is complete except for about 40 of the most common words such as יִשָׂר, מ, ל, some common pronouns, the more frequent prepositions, etc.

In his discussion he seems to give too much weight to the value of the Mosul edition and too little to Codex A. As to the Mosul edition he argues that it is important where it departs from the Urmi edition, but does not follow MT literally. He finds in Judges, fifty-five cases of such departure from the Urmi edition, forty-five of which show agreement with MT. (Especially striking is Jud. 20:20 where the Mosul edition reproduces MT literally against all other witnesses.) The remaining 12 cases he discusses as significant. He does not consider, however, the possible influence of the Vulgate on these other 12 cases and the editor of the Mosul edition expressly says that he used the Vulgate along with other witnesses, according to the testimony of Bloch. It would seem to be safer not to base much on so eclectic a text as the Mosul edition is admitted to be.

As to Codex A, Lazarus argues for a dependence of this witness on MT because it makes a paragraph break after Jud. 13:1, marking it with a double plus sign, and this break coincides with a minor break in this place in MT, marked with a Samech. He points out that a break here is against the sense and therefore the wrong division common to Codex A and MT argues that "the writer of A had an exemplar of MT before him."
It would seem that this evidence is too slight to outweigh the conclusions of all the later investigators that A is independent of MT. There are doubtless other explanations of the coincidence.

In 1905 W. Emil Rosenwasser presented such an index to the two Books of Kings as his doctoral dissertation at Bern. Rosenwasser used as a text the Codex Ambrosianus with comparison of readings of the London Polyglot, Lee’s edition, Thorndike’s variations, the Urnia edition, the Mosul edition and the scholia of Bar Hebraeus.

Further studies have been prepared, but not as yet published. In 1935 Dr. Frank Zimmermann prepared an index on the Book of Job as a part of his doctoral dissertation at the Dropsie College. He also used Codex Ambrosianus as a basis. Rabbi Felix Freifelder is engaged in preparing for the Dropsie College such an index to the Book of Jeremiah. The thesis presented herewith is based on a similar index for the Book of Nehemiah. A further index to the Book of II Samuel is being prepared by a fellow student at the Dropsie College, Rev. Donald Engelt.

Although no other indexes to Old Testament books seem to have been prepared, there is one in the New Testament field that should be mentioned: O. Klein has published a "Syrisch-griechisches Wörterbuch zu den vier kanonischen Evangelien" as Beihefte XVIII of the ZAW, (1916).

The critical study of the Peshitta text of Nehemiah here presented also fills a small but definite gap. The Peshitta can not be considered as a uniform version. From studies made so far, it appears that it was the product of different authors for the different books of the Bible working with different principles in mind. The characteristics of individual books must therefore be learned by studying them one by one.

Even the date of the Peshitta is obscure. The time of the translation has been much discussed, and most will agree with

(32) Der lexikalische Stoff der Königshücher der Peshitta (Berlin 1905).
Facts that it is a work of different hands extending over a considerable period of time." Burkitt argues for quite an early date. In a review of Barnes' book *Peshitta Psalter*, he remarks that the witness of Aphraates (11:345) which, he complains, is not sufficiently emphasized by Barnes, is important for the "general attestation which the earliest surviving Syriac author gives to the Old Testament Peshitta as a whole. The fact is of very great historical importance, for it brings a direct external evidence for the Syriac Psalter, practically as we know it almost into the ante-Nicene age. Whatever Babbula may have done to the New Testament it is evident that he left the Old Testament alone." He alludes to the remark of Barnes that Septuagint influence in the Peshitta is "sporadic" and declares: "surely all this points to an authoritative revision, made to accommodate the Syriac here and there to the Greek......" So far as our scanty historical authorities allow us to see, Pal.NEW founded (or refounded) the Catholic Church in Edessa about the year 200 A.D. At the time of Pal."'s mission a translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew into Syriac was in existence for its influence is visible even in the earliest Syriac versions of the Gospels. But it seems to be the work of a Jewish or Jewish-Christian school... This Old Testament Peshitta of which we have now in De. Barnes' Psalter a well edited specimen, represents a slightly revised form of an original translation from the includes translation from the Hebrew. The original translation can hardly be

(22) *Die syrischen Liturgische Hymnen* (Leipsig 1885) p. 76. "The Peshitta later than the middle of the 2nd century A.D.; while the revision which dates within the same period is not of the Psalter alone..." In the Hebrew psalms (p. 77) ist die Psalmenform auch schon von alten Wirk, (23) *A Short History of Syriac Literature.*
(24) *JTS* 6(1905) 286.
(25) *JTS* 2(1901) 197.
(27) *Die Judische Tradition."*
(28) *"The Origin and Early History of the Syriac Pentateuch"* *JTS* 15(1914) 57ff.
(29) *"Die Verwendbarkeit der Peshitta zur Wuchs-Reform"* *Die Textkritik* 24(17) (1928) 505ff, and 29(1900) 226.
...not improbably a monument of the learning and zeal of the Christians of Edessa. Possibly Jewish converts, or even Jews took part in it." All will not agree that it was of Christian authorship. Pinkerton in an analysis of the text of Genesis and Exodus concludes "The Syriac version of the Pentateuch was made by a Jew (or Jews) for the use of Jews, its chief characteristic being faithfulness to the Hebrew original. The Christian Church took over this version, acting in accordance with exegetical principles current at the time, as well as with the genius of the language, it gradually amplified and improved the style of the original translation." Perhaps Pinkerton concludes more than his evidence allows, but in general he agrees with the observation of Burkitt that the earliest form of the text of the Peshitta was a more literal translation. This translation was then modified or revised resulting in a freer recension including more Septuagint influence. Paumann in his study on Job concludes...
that the translators of this book were Marcionite. Barnes' conclusion is:

"It is difficult to believe that the same school of translators rendered into Syriac both the Law and the Psalter." He means by this that the Psalter has peculiar characteristics differing from all the rest of the Bible, for he adds: "It is only in the Psalter (so it seems to me at the present stage of my work) that any general Greek influence bringing in a new characteristic is to be found. That characteristic is a dread of anthropomorphism from which the Syriac translators of the Pentateuch were free." This conclusion of Barnes may not speak against a fairly uniform work in the translation of the other books, for the Psalter, because of its liturgical use, may well have been translated separately or thoroughly revised. We may compare the situation on the Psalter of the Vulgate version which alone of all the books was translated by Jerome from the Septuagint. Driver calls attention to the varying character of the translations of the individual books: "Thus the translation of the Pentateuch, for instance, often adheres closely to ancient Jewish exegesis, traces of which are also discernible in other books, especially in the Chronicles, the translation of which has additions and embellishments, imparting to it quite the character of a Targum. Job on the other hand, is literal: while the translation of the Psalms is strongly influenced by the Septuagint, with which it often remarkably agrees, where both

(30) "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta" JTS 2(1900-01)187.
In general this translation is seen to be a careful, good, true one conforming itself to the text. Nevertheless there are rather large differences among the individual books. The Pentateuch follows closely the Hebrew text and Jewish exegesis; Isaiah and the Minor Prophets contain much from the Septuagint; Ruth is paraphrastic; Job is translated word for word; Chronicles has quite the character of a Targum; on the other hand, the Targum to Proverbs has made use of our Syriac; the Greek translation seems to have influenced the Psalter.

It may not be amiss to remark that the conclusions with regard to the varying character of the translations of the different books which are put forth by Driver and Nestle and others, are based on the studies of different individuals writing from 1859 on. It is possible that the whole field could be re-examined on the basis of later work and some earlier conclusions shown to be erroneous. Different investigators have used different manuscripts or printed editions as a basis. Different students may evaluate somewhat differently the extent of alleged Septuagint influence though all may grant the presence of a little such influence.

For instance, Hawley in his study of Ezra concludes that it was not influenced by the Septuagint, whereas Siegfried had thought that it was.

---


(33) "Der Pentateuch folgt eng dem hebr. Text und der jüdischen Exegese, Jesaja und die Zwölf enthalten viel aus der Septuaginta, Ruth ist paraphrastisch, Hiob Wort für Wort übertragen, die Chronik ist ganz targumartig; umgekehrt hat das Targum zu Proverbiern unseren Syrer benutzt. Auf den Psalter scheint die griechische Übersetzung eingewirkt zu haben." Or.

(34) A Critical Examination of the Peshitta Version of the Book of Ezra, p.4.

The last is that we have some evidence as to the translation of the Peshitta, as the evidence of Jewish or Christian authorship is quite vague and has not been fully collected. Quite possibly a part - such as the Pentateuch - may be of Jewish origin and the rest Christian. The individual books must be studied one by one - and some restudied - to determine the character of their translations. This has been done for many of the books. Haefeli gives 37 pages to a "Characterization of the text of the Peshitta of individual Old Testament books" in which he refers to the various studies that have appeared and gives much more discussion than do Driver and Nestle, quoted above. He remarks concerning Ezra and Nehemiah, "No studies of these two books have been prepared." In this, however, he was not altogether correct for already in 1922 C.A.Hawley had published his Critical Examination of the Peshitta Version of the Book of Ezra.

Although there is no Targum on the Book of Nehemiah, a general word may be said about the influence of the Targums on the translations of the other books. More study of this point doubtless is needed. Haefeli sums up the situation briefly: According to Schonfelder the Targum of Onkelos appears to have influenced the Peshitta Pentateuch. As noted above, it is usually held since the study by Pinkuss that the Peshitta forms the basis for the Targum to Proverbs. Chaim Heller denies any relation between the two versions and explains apparent dependencies by a living Jewish tradition common to both. Haefeli wisely concludes his

---

(35) Haefeli, op.cit.p.6, quotes Ephraim and Jacob of Edessa as expressly speaking of "translators" in the plural.
(36) op.cit. pp.23-59, "Charakterisierung des Peshitta-textes der einzelnen alttestamentlichen Bücher.
(37) op.cit. p.30, "Es liegen über die beiden Bücher keine Bearbeitungen vor."
(38) op.cit. p.14, "Peshitta, in versione ed in altre traduzioni.
(39) Onkelos und Peshitta (Munich 1863).
(40) Die syrische Übersetzung der Erweiterungen, op.cit. p.47.
(41) Untersuchung über die Peshitta zur gesamten hebräischen Bible(Berlin 1911).
discussion of possible influences of the versions to the remark: "it will be one of the most difficult tasks for the editor of the Peshitta to verify such actual and supposed influences on the Peshitta and, as far as they are not original, to reject them as unwarranted." 42

In some ways the present study is a companion piece to Hawley's work on Ezra referred to above. Hawley, however, did not present an index and his work differs somewhat in plan. Hawley's book was reviewed favorably by Montgomery who gave briefly additional suggestions of special value. 43 Hawley concludes 44 that the translation of Ezra "is, in the main, carefully made and true to the sense without being slavishly literal. The translator has done exactly as we do in rendering French or German into English. On the other hand, in the forms of the verb, especially in the suffixes, and in the additions and omissions of the copula, a greater freedom is taken than we would like. How far this can be laid at the door of the copyists we cannot say.... In the case of doublets, such as 9:7 and 10:12, the blame must not be laid on the translator. These are more likely marginal references which later copyists put into the text." Further he argues that "the Peshitta version of Ezra was not influenced by the Septuagint" 45 and claims that therefore it has a real independent value for criticism of \(L\). He gives a list of forty-two instances where he thinks the Peshitta has preserved the original reading and \(L\) is in error. Several of these concern merely vowel pointing.

Probably several more of his examples will not stand scrutiny. Montgomery differs with two and adds that Hawley's examples of the relation to the Hebrew 46 are "very few" and "not often as certain." 47

(42) op.cit. p.14. "Es wird für den Herausgeber der Peschitta eine der schwierigsten Aufgaben sein, solche wörtlichen und verfeinerten Einflüsse auf die Peschitta zu verifizieren und, sofern sie nicht ursprünglich sind, als unberechtigt abzuweisen."
(43) JAOS 43 (1923) 432f. See the discussion below p.129f.
(44) op.cit. p.10.
(45) op.cit. p.4.
An instance of how classification may improve the usefulness of the material collected may be cited. Hawley on p. 8 lists nineteen sets of letters which are interchanged in Ezra by copyists. He does not indicate the relative frequency of these confusions. In Nehemiah, as will be shown on p. 35 and p. 51, two of these examples of confusion occur with great frequency; the others are very rare or do not occur at all in Nehemiah. Also, Hawley entirely disregards Codex Ambrosianus. Probably reference to this text would have cleared up a few of his difficulties. He remarks that the various editions of the Polyglots, Lee, and "mis are of equal value for all practical purposes and says "I have used L because it is the most convenient." p. 6.
Chapter 17 - The Text Used as a Basis for the Present Study

After the example of Rosenmesser,¹ and Techin,² the
photolithographed edition of the Codex Ambrosianus edited by Ceriani has
been used as the basis for the index and critical study here presented.
References have been made to Lee and the collations of Thorndike where
these are helpful. Reasons should be given for the choice of Ambrosianus
especially because it was neglected by Hawley and rejected by Lazarus.³
It would be more natural instead to have used the handy edition of the
Peshitta edited by Samuel Lee and published by the British and Foreign
Bible Society, which is probably more easily obtainable even though
now out of print. Also some have questioned the value of A. When
Ceriani's handsome edition of A appeared in 1876, Cornill spoke of it
as money wasted⁴ because he felt that the manuscript had been revised
throughout on the basis of the Massoretic Text. If this were true, it
would indeed be of minor value for purposes of Old Testament textual
criticism. It may be noted that, according to a private letter to
Barnes,⁵ Cornill later retracted his harsh judgment of Codex A on the
basis of an article by Rahlfs⁶ and following further study. Barnes
himself regards Codex A as "certainly the most valuable authority which
we possess for the Peshitta text of the Old Testament."⁷

1. Barnes: Chronicles, p.xv, identifies this Vs. as "Syriacum." The Lee's edition and the other printed editions which have more
been used in compilation than any other of the Massorites cited, and it
appeared leave a great deal to be desired. The first printed edition
appeared.

(1) op.cit. p.111.
(2) op.cit. p. 123. The indexes prepared by students at the Dropsie College
have also been based on Codex A.
(3) vide, sup. pp. 13 and 5.
(4) Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, (Leipzig 1886) p.115 "Geld zum
Fenster hinausgeworfen."
(5) Quoted in Chronicles, p.x.
(6) "Beiträge zur Textkritik der Peshitta," ZAW 9(1883) 161ff. Barnes in
his Peshitta Psalter disagrees with Rahlfs on the history of the text.
(7) Chronicles, p.xvi.
of the Peshitta Old Testament was in the London Polyglot of 1853. The
Syriac text there printed was edited by Gabriel Bionita, apparently from
a late manuscript. This text was reprinted in the London Polyglot of
1857 without change except for the addition of a few typographical
errors. In 1823 Lee edited the Peshitta for the British and Foreign
Bible Society claiming to have used old manuscripts and to have
presented a critical text, but it seems that his editing was not well
done. He practically reprinted the London Polyglot. The printed
editions are carefully discussed by Joshua Bloch. He states that Lee,
among other errors, gave too much weight to the comments of Bar Hebraeus,
and states that "Lee's edition contains a large number of readings
which have practically no manuscript authority behind them." He charges
it also with many misprints and with no thoroughness or system in the
use of the critical materials which were available. It represents,
thus, a mixed text and not a good critical edition.

According to Bloch, the other printed editions are not so
much better. The fourth printed edition was the Urmia edition of
Rev. Justin Perkins. Bloch says of it "as regards text there is a
great advancement on Lee's edition. It must, however, be remembered
that this edition of the Peshitta is not independent of that of Lee."

(8) Barnes in Chronicles p.xv, identifies this "S. as "Syriaques 6"
of the Bibliothèque Nationale,Paris. He adds that "it contained more
errors due to homoceuteloton than any other of the Ms here cited; and it
was afterwards revised by an editor who made corrections in the text and
supplied omissions in the margin on a large scale often without any
manuscript authority whatsoever."
(9) "The Printed Texts of the Peshitta Old Testament",AJSL 37(1921) 136-144.
(10) Vetus Testamentum Syriac et Mesyriacae (Urmia 1852).
(11) op.cit. p 140 (italics his).
Especially is it questionable whether this edition is of value in the
book of Nehemiah. Barnes\(^1\) believes that Perkins took Chronicles, Ezra,
and Nehemiah from Lee or the Polyglots rather than from a manuscript.
Of the only remaining printed edition, the Mosul edition,\(^3\) Bloch
says: \(^4\) "its value for the textual critic is very small, if any whatever."
The reason for this is that it was issued by Dominicans of Mosul expressly
for practical missionary purposes and to replace among Catholics of the
Syrian church the Protestant edition of Urmia. It was plainly said,
Bloch continues, that the editor prepared it on the basis of the
edition of the Protestants "and on a manuscript of the seventeenth
century having also before his eyes the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin texts."
Thus the five texts printed to date are all very poor for
purposes of textual criticism and concordance study. In the absence
of a critical edition of the Peshitta, it seems wise to base what
work is done, on the old and valuable Codex Ambrosianus which is
rather widely available, thanks to Ceriani, and is in a very legible hand.

The present study of Nehemiah seems to bear out for this
book also, the conclusions of the above authors with reference to the
relative values of Lee and Ambrosianus. The two were collated and a

table of the variations will be found in the appendix. It is of course
true, as Cornill pointed out and Barnes admits, that in many of the
places where A differs from L it does so in agreement with the Massoretic

\(^{13}\) Biblia sacra iuxta versiones simpliceres dicitur Peshitta (Mosul
1387-91).
\(^{14}\) op.cit. p. 142. He quotes a private letter on the subject.
Text. Cornell argued that, because in 184 meaningful differences between L and A, A agrees with MT 33 times, that therefore there had been a wide revision of A on the basis of MT. It would seem that his proof could not have been complete unless he had cited also the number of instances — presumably large— when A agrees with L and both are against MT. In the book of Nehemiah one is struck by the fact that in the large majority of instances A agrees with L even in its vagaries against MT. There are also a number of disagreements between A and L where neither agree with MT. There are also some — relatively few — where A agrees with MT against L. This situation is exactly what we should expect in an older, better manuscript, and we should not conclude to a revision of A on the basis of MT.

Aside from the numbers of places where A evidently retains an older, better reading and therefore one closer to MT, it is interesting to note in Nehemiah many examples of names where the form of A is intermediate between L and MT. If the same name has one part where A and L agree against MT (and are obviously wrong), and another part where A and MT agree against L, it stands to reason that the part of the name where A is correct and agrees with MT is not the result of a revision — for the balance of the name still needs revision. Rather it is a good early reading preserved in A, but lost in later slipshod copying, appearing corrupt in L.
Some examples of such instances where A agrees with MT in half of a word are given herewith:

3:7 יַלְיָה / A לֶלֶת L (cf. 10:14 לֶלֶת / A and L לֶלֶת)
7:13 נָשִׁית / A לֶלֶת L לֶלֶת
7:28 נָשִׁית / A לֶלֶת L לֶלֶת; לֶלֶת
11:34 וַתְּלַב / A לֶלֶת L לֶלֶת

It is furthermore instructive to note that when A agrees with MT against L, the disagreement of L is often seen to be of a type that admits of easy explanation as an error by a later Syriac copyist of the L text. Instructively, the inner Syriac errors both of this kind and those deduced without the evidence of A, are often of a type directly attributable to the Estrangela script rather than the Jacobite. Of course some letters like Resh and Daleth are quite similar in both scripts, but others like Ayin and Gimel are quite similar in Estrangela, but not in Jacobite. Errors concerning these latter letters are therefore particularly interesting. The following are selected examples of cases where the disagreements of L are easily explainable as due to later copyists:

7:53 יָטֹב / התב L (simple haplography in L)
10:24 נָשִׁית / לָשִׁית L (see p.35 for the נ/ש variant)
12:4 יְהוָה / לָדַי L לָדָי
12:13 יָת / יְת L יָת (This is Ezra the scribe)
12:34 יָת / יָת L יָת
Some examples may also be given of cases where A, L, and MT all differ. In many of these, if not most, the errors of L and A are easily explainable:

3:10 הֵמַע וְּשֵׁנָּא לְסָר (see p. 35 for other examples of this)
7:51 וְּכָּלָה לְמַע / שְׁתִים
10:5 וְּכָּלָה לְמַע / לַשְׁתִים

There are only eleven cases where L agrees with MT against A. These will all be listed here for completeness' sake though they will be discussed in their proper categories in the chapter on Names. It may be said that the errors in A in these eleven cases are of an occasional nature not always easy to explain. They may be peculiar defects of this codex not in general shared by the other members of the A family. However, a few of the odd readings appear in Thorndike's apparatus, and family relationships among the Syriac manuscripts are not very clearly known, so not much can be said:

3:15 קַמָּן לְסָר / בֶּלֶק
3:18 נָשֵׁב לְסָר / שׁוֹבָה
3:17 כָּלָה לְשֵׁנָּא / שְׁתִים
3:24 נָפָל לְסָר / פָּל
7:7 נָסֵל לְסָר / בָּטָל
7:11 נָאֵל לְסָר / בָּל
10:17 נָבֵל לְסָר / בָּל
11:7 יָשֵׁש לְסָר / שֶׁשָּׁא

Thorndike cites another Ms: הַשִּׁמֹן
By way of summary of the above data on names, it can be stated that there are approximately 75 instances of significant difference - not counting vowel letters except for special reasons - between the names of A and L. Of these, there are 11 where L agrees with MT against A; about 30 where A agrees with MT against L; and about 35 where all three disagree. The true state of the A text is not seen, however, until we add that in about 175 cases A goes with L against MT. From these figures it is quite apparent that A is better than L, but that it still is rather corrupt. It certainly has not been revised on the basis of MT for it still shows about 220 cases of disagreement with MT out of a total of around 850 names.

The study of the text of the Peshitta of Nehemiah aside from the names leads us to the same conclusion with regard to the value of A. Here we may mention 11 instances of additions, omissions, or misplacements in L and A which are rather clearly due to blunders of copyists. In eight cases A is superior; in three L has the better text. They are as follows:

5:14 פֶּן לֶאָב לִא אָבְרָא הָאָבָרֶא אֵל. A omits the words לֶאָב לִא אָבְרָא הָאָבָרֶא by a clear case of homoioteleuton. L preserves the correct text.

7:5 הָאָבָרֶא אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל. A omits the four words לֶאָב לִא אָבְרָא הָאָבָרֶא probably by homoioteleuton. L has the correct text.
8:3 A omits the first two words which do not appear in MT and were doubtless added as an explanatory gloss in L.

8:6 A omits the last six words clearly by homoioteleuton. A is correct, agreeing with MT.

8:13 A omits these words thus agreeing with MT. L has apparently added them as an explanatory gloss derived from the similar thought in verse 11.

8:16 A omits the last four words which are not in MT and are probably an explanatory gloss in L.

9:4 A omits these three names which are not found here in MT. They were inserted by an L copyist from verse 5 in order to harmonize the two lists of Levites. Interestingly, A differs from MT just enough, in the treatment of the preceding names to show that there has been no revision of A in this spot.

11:18 These words which belong after the word are placed six words too early and put after the somewhat similar word in L. It was perhaps a kind of homoioteleuton in L. A preserves the true text.

11:34 These two words, standing for are omitted in L for no apparent reason. A is correct—approximately.

12:31 These eight words are repeated verbatim in A by homoioteleuton. L is correct.
These four words are inserted by A just before לָכִי (lit. perhaps as an explanatory gloss. Someone may have felt the obligation to explain the situation of the dedicatory procession which was standing upon both the wall and the towers. In any case, L preserves the correct text.

The net result of consideration of the above evidence is that A in Nehemiah is an independent and a most valuable witness to the original Peshitta text. It reproduces many of the old errors; it adds some of its own; yet it helps us to rectify numerous other errors that later crept into the style of text represented by L. As Earnes puts it "The agreement of the Codex Ambrosianus with the Massoretes is no doubt a fact, but the whole truth seems to be that a text formed from the best and oldest Mss would agree about as frequently as Cod. A with the Massoretic and would disagree as frequently with the present printed text." 15 We are therefore fully justified in using A as a basis for our study in Nehemiah, but other readings will be compared and occasionally they will be found to improve the reading of A.

15 Chronicles p. xxiii, (italics his).
Chapter III - The Transmission of the Text, Apart from the Names

For the proper use of the Peshitta in Old Testament study it is first necessary to know how faithfully its text has been transmitted. As will become apparent on further study, the Peshitta text has suffered considerably in the hands of its copyists. Some of the errors made in transmission can easily be identified by a comparison of L and other text witnesses with A. The important examples of this have been considered in the previous chapter. Other errors of copyists can be spotted with practical certainty though all our textual witnesses agree in the error, simply because the reason for the error is apparent. Certain cases of metathesis would be examples of this type of patent inner Syriac error. Other errors of transmission may be suspected, but their cause must remain conjectural.

The errors of transmission considered in this chapter will be classified as inner Syriac errors, additions to the text which clearly occurred in the process of copying, and omissions by copyists. In the following chapter on personal names, additional material will be presented bearing on the matter of the transmission of the text. Over half of the variants of the Syriac names from MT is due to copyists' errors.

1. Inner Syriac Errors.

a) 2:13 and 15 יִבְשָׁף / יִבְשָׁפָה LXX συμπήγον (which is often in LXX for תָּפָה).

We can not be sure what happened, but the LXX reading clearly supports the Eeth of MT. Quite likely the Syriac was originally שׁפָה changing to שׁפָה by inner error. Possibly the error is due to the translators
who would have misread the Beth as Qoph. יַּעַנ "stop up" does not make too good sense in this context whereas יִכְנָה "think", "consider" might have been a good enough translation.

b) 2:19 The situation here also is not certain, but probably an inner error is involved. Tobiah is called יָשָׁר for לָשֶׁר whereas in vs. 10 in a very similar phrase לָשֶׁר is rendered יָשָׁר. The plural in vs. 10 is due to a false interpretation by which both Sanballat and Tobiah are referred to and called servants of the Ammonites. In the study of personal names we shall see that initial Ayin and Gimel are easily interchanged and the Daleth/Resh is also very common. It would thus be easy to assume a corruption of יָשָׁר to יָשָׁר. This would probably be a better explanation than to posit a free translation of לָשֶׁר as "man". Perhaps the same thing has occurred in connection with the Nethinim. As noted on p. 63 this word is usually transliterated, but in 10:28 it is translated יָשָׁר and in 7:45 יָשָׁר. One of these translations may well have been derived from the other by inner error.

c) 3:1 יְהוֹשָׁע/ יָשָׁר יִשָּׁרוֹ. The meaning of this form "its holy things" does not seem to fit the present Syriac context and possibly we should suppose an inner error here for יָשָׁר יִשָּׁר which does appear later. The reason for the inner error is found in the position of the word which is slightly different from that in MT.

d) 3:4 יַּכְנָה / יָשָׁר. A tempting hypothesis may be mentioned in order to explain this mistake. The Syriac of יַּכְנָה, יָשָׁר, so closely resembles יָשָׁר that we may well wonder if the
3:19, 20, 24, 25. In 3:19 and 20 this word seems rather clearly to suffer metathesis. In 3:24 A has \(\text{בכיניש} \) and L has \(\text{בכיניש} \).

In 3:25 A has \(\text{בכיניש} \) and only L shows metathesis: \(\text{בכיניש} \). Neither of these Syriac words is listed in Payne-Smith's "Thesaurus". Apparently we should assume a transliteration of a difficult Hebrew word with later metathesis in some cases. Where the word \(\text{בכיניש} \) is used elsewhere - in Exodus and Ezekiel concerning the tabernacle and its furniture - it is translated well by \(\text{מגון} \) "angle" or \(\text{מכון} \) "side".

3:20 The Hebrew \(\text{בכיניש} \) is rendered: \(\text{בכיניש} \). In view of the frequent interchange of Resh and Daleth, it seems best to take this as an inner error for \(\text{בכיניש} \) the Aphele of \(\text{בכיניש} \) The word \(\text{בכיניש} \) is difficult of translation. The LXX simply omits it. \(\text{בכיניש} \) does not seem to be a possible translation of \(\text{בכיניש} \), but on the above suggestion it would be literally translated with easy subsequent inner Syriac error.

3:21 (second occurrence) / \(\text{לך} \) In view of the witness of L we probably must see here a copyist's error. It probably was due to carelessness.

3:32 / \(\text{לך} \) As the reading of L shows, this is an inner error in A. The change of initial Ayin to Gimel is easily explained (cf. (b) above), but there is no precedent for the change from Nun to Shin, nor is there a good reason why the change would suggest itself to a scribe.
context. Probably the best suggestion to explain the error is that a Caph/Taw variant in not observed in the study of the transmission of names, it would be a very natural one.

j) 9:5 Probably an inner error is to be recognized in the reading

\( \text{...} \) “all creation”, for \( \text{...} \). The LXX supports MT. Likely there is here only a careless omission of Caph in the form \( \text{...} \).

k) 9:33 An attractive conjecture positing an inner error here may relieve a difficulty. For the word \( \text{...} \), A has \( \text{...} \), and L has \( \text{...} \). MT has nothing equal to \( \text{...} \), certainly nothing like \( \text{...} \) which doesn’t fit this context. If we assume the careless loss of a Tau and final Nun, we may join these last two words, omitting a vowel letter and read \( \text{...} \). This would agree well with the Hebrew and make excellent sense. It is only a conjecture, but may well have been what happened.

l) 10:32 \( \text{...} \) is read \( \text{...} \) probably by corruption within the Syriac as there are other instances (cf. p.33) where the Nun/Feth interchange occurs. It is possible, on the other hand, that the change from \( \text{...} \) to \( \text{...} \) was intentional as there may have been a feeling that the contribution of one-third stater (about 23σ) per annum was too small and that it must have been this amount per week.

m) 11:35 ἀθανασία This doubtless came from ἀθανασία. Cf. p.63 for discussion.
The same tower in 8:1 is called correctly. The present instance may be another case of mere free translation. Just as a tower might be described as a "great tower" rather than named, it could also be described as a high one. Cf. the several gates and towers called simply \( \text{x} \); listed on p. 101.

A second possibility is more attractive. Perhaps the name was first set down as \( \text{x} \) then, as the Daleth/Resh variant is so common, it could easily have become corrupted to \( \text{x} \); and then \( \text{x} \). The LXX translates it \( \text{x} \) \( \text{x} \) corrupting it in another direction.

\( \text{o) 13:2 } \frac{1}{10} / \frac{1}{10} \) As the witness of \( \text{L} \) shows, there has been a simple metathesis in the text of \( \text{A} \).

\( \text{p) 13:5 } \frac{1}{10} / \frac{1}{10} \) This reading fits the context well enough, but is quite inaccurate. Possibly it was just a free and careless translation. Perhaps, however, we should see here an inner error for the word usually used to translate \( \text{20} \), namely \( \text{20} \). The insertion clearly took place in the course of copying of the Syriac text, because it is a ditography of the Syriac word for "name." The two Syriac words, though differing considerably in details are quite similar in form. The Daleth/Resh variant and the Nun/Yodh variant, though differing considerably in details are quite similar in form. The Daleth/Resh variant and the Nun/Yodh variant are so common as to be no problem. The change from Pe to Eeth is also very understandable. The hypothesis is tenuous, but has a good bit to recommend it.

There are doubtless many more additions due to copyists.

2. Additions due to copyists.

\( \text{a) 2:5 } \) There is apparently a purposeful insertion of \( \text{20} \) as an explanatory gloss. The Syriac is: \( \text{20} \) translating the Hebrew: \( \text{20} \). Apparently first the construct relation of \( \text{20} \) and \( \text{20} \) was lost sight of as shown by
by the insertion of הָעַר, a word borrowed from the similar phrase in vs. 3. Then to specify more particularly the city which was meant, a copyist added וֹסְד. The text of L reads without the addition: יָבַשׁ רָעֵשׁ יָשַׁב... The text of the Syriac text reads: יָבַשׁ רָעֵשׁ יָשַׁב... These words agree with vs. 24 except that יָבַשׁ is there... The repetition is odd as the immediate contexts are not too similar.

The chapter is made up of a series of such statements concerning the builders and it was easy for a copyist to lose his place and repeat.

b) 3:30 Here a sentence is repeated almost exactly from vs. 24 where it occurs properly. It is: יָבַשׁ רָעֵשׁ יָשַׁב... These words agree with vs. 24 except that יָבַשׁ is there... The repetition is odd as the immediate contexts are not too similar.

The chapter is made up of a series of such statements concerning the builders and it was easy for a copyist to lose his place and repeat.

c) 7:63 An extra בָּהַפַּת has been inserted in the Syriac text by dittoography thus: יָבַשׁ רָעֵשׁ יָשַׁב... The insertion rather clearly took place in the course of copying of the Syriac text, because it is a dittoography of the Syriac word for "son".

Incidentally, the name does not mean "son of Zillai", but "man of iron". The Syriac dittoography arose from a false etymologizing of the name.

There are doubtless many more additions due to copyists than the above three instances, but the others are difficult to separate from explanatory additions of the original scribes and so will be listed in Chapter V "Mistakes of the Translators".
a) There is an omission of the two words in 1:7: סֶלֶם סֶלֶם (or two similar ones) because of homoioteleuton. The reconstructed section would be: אֶלֶף עַל עַל אֲמִסֵּם סֶלֶם סֶלֶם and the present reading is: אֶלֶף עַל עַל אֲמִסֵּם סֶלֶם סֶלֶם. The Hebrew reads: לְאָלֶף עַל עַל אֲמִסֵּם סֶלֶם סֶלֶם. Note that the present Syriac text retains סֶלֶם representing הַסֶּלֶם which argues slightly against it being an omission of the translator. The phrase just before this one reads הַסֶּלֶם סֶלֶם סֶלֶם סֶלֶם.

b) 2:5 Two words are omitted from the sentence originally reading as follows: יִהְיֶה הַיָּדוּעַ יִהְיֶה הַיָּדוּעַ. The words omitted are: יִהְיֶה הַיָּדוּעַ so that the reading of Ἄλας thus: Ἀλας Βασιλεύς Ἰωάννου. I still has the original reading given above so it is clearly a copyist's omission due probably to the tendency to drop one of the rather synonymous phrases.

c) 4:14 Ἄλας has the words οὕτως ἐκχαίρουσιν μέταλμα which translate בְּבִירוּת בְּבִירוּת בְּבִירוּת. But, Ἄλας omits the last four words stating ending the verse with οὕτως. It was a careless omission of the last two elements of a series.

d) 10:34 There has been an omission of half the verse by a rather clear case of homoioteleuton. The words which have been omitted may be reconstructed thus: אֲלֵהֶם לֵאמֹר (וַהֲנֵי הַעֲשִׂים פִּסֵּמַת) אֶלֶף לֵאמֹר אֲלֵהֶם לֵאמֹר. representing וַהֲנֵי הַעֲשִׂים פִּסֵּמַת אֲלֵהֶם. פִּסֵּמַת
The word following the omitted section are יְהֹוָ֥ה הָאָ֥לֶלֶתָּ֖ה יָהּ לָ֥הֶנֶּקַֽה.

Doubtless the similarity of the first word in the omitted section to the following phrase was the cause of the omission. Since the words concerned are alike in both Hebrew and Syriac, it must be allowed that the homoioteleuton may have been due to the translator about as definitely as to a copyist.

On p. 12, Haefeli was quoted as saying that it is often most difficult to decide which readings are original and which are due to copyists and editors of later times. The above group of examples serves to underscore Haefeli's remarks. It is doubtless true that the above list of copyists' mistakes could be increased if we could certainly identify all the mistakes of this nature. But in the other instances we have no definite proof of the cause of the error and therefore such cases have been relegated to Chapter V "Mistakes of the Translator".

Enough has been said in this chapter to show that our present text is in a rather poor state of preservation. Further study dealing with the personal names will strengthen the conclusion that many of the copyists' errors entered the text at such an early time that even a good critical edition based on the existing MSS would not by any means correct all the errors of transmission.
Chapter IV: The Names in Nehemiah

As noted above (p. 33), there are about 350 names in Nehemiah of which about 220 show significant differences between MT and our standard codex, A. This does not count vowel letters except when specially significant. Lee's text shows approximately 30 additional variations. That there is a disproportionately large number of variations in the names in the Peshitta of Nehemiah is shown by the fact that in Gen. 10 and 11 the Peshitta shows only about 10 variations out of about 100 different names. And there the variations are not serious in nature often being only minor mistakes affecting one letter. Clearly the text of Nehemiah has been more carelessly treated in this regard than has Genesis.

A study of the names in Nehemiah is quite useful in illustrating the types of error made by the Syriac translators and copyists. And because there is a large number of names in Nehemiah, the study is especially illuminating and necessary. An effort will be made to classify the variations and to suggest possible explanations. In many instances, of course, it will not be possible to be certain in the classification, but in such cases some explanation will be made. The major distinction will first be drawn between mistakes made by the copyists - inner Syriac errors - and variations introduced by the original translators. The inner Syriac errors will be further subdivided into mistakes of the eye, slips of the pen, mistakes of speech and errors of memory. Variations due to the translators will be
of the understanding - mistranslations and the like. In all of the variations it will be noticed that MT is very seldom suspect and the LXX very rarely agrees with the Peshitta in a divergence from MT.

I. Variations from MT due to Copyists' Errors

A. Mistakes due to the eye.

1. Variations of Resh and Daleth. This is the most common variation of all, but will be treated at greater length under errors of the translators. The form of the two Hebrew letters was so similar at various times that the Syriac translators, like the Septuagint translators only more frequently, misread the one letter for the other. But, since the two letters are so similar in Syriac also, differing only by the diacritical point, it is doubtless true that some of these divergences are due to careless copying. This would seem to be clearly the case where the Syriac textual witnesses disagree. Unless we posit a later correction of some of the manuscripts, a disagreement would indicate that the original copy had been correct and some of the daughter manuscripts at descendants of A. Some errors of transmission were made in the introduced error. In Chapter II it was shown that it is not likely that our text witnesses have been revised on the basis of MT or the LXX and therefore we may class these particular discrepancies as inner Syriac errors. There doubtless are some others which should also be thus
classified, but it is practically impossible to tell which. We shall therefore largely confine ourselves in this section to instances where either A or L is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.

a) 3:7: \[\text{either } A \text{ or } L \text{ is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.}\]

b) 3:10: \[\text{either } A \text{ or } L \text{ is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.}\]

c) 7:53: \[\text{either } A \text{ or } L \text{ is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.}\]

d) 8:8: \[\text{either } A \text{ or } L \text{ is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.}\]

e) 10:15: \[\text{either } A \text{ or } L \text{ is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.}\]

f) 16:17: \[\text{either } A \text{ or } L \text{ is correct and the other text introduces a mistaken reading of Daleth or Resh. Errors that concern other letters in these names will be considered in later sections.}\]

...
2. Variations of Yodh and Nun. These variations are common and are obviously due to inner Syriac errors. In some Mss. these letters hardly differ.

(Where no reading of L is cited, it agrees with A)

a) 3:7 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת L (1)

b) 3:13 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת and 11:30 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת. After the mistake was made in one place, memory may have caused a scribe to change the other occurrence also. But such harmonizing was not regularly done.

c) 6:14 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת. Here A and L share both mistakes.

d) 10:8 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת L. (Note that L only has the error.

e) 10:25 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת. But cf. the frequent name מְדֹּרַת/ מְדֹּרַת, and the similar name מְדֹּרַת/ מְדֹּרַת. These other names may have caused a scribe to err through memory and the mistake in that case would not be a simple error of the eye.

f) 11:5 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת. Perhaps here the Resh was misread by the translator and then the new and common name then suggested itself to a copyist. This suggestion is supported by the situation in 12:6 and 19 where the Resh is always changed to Daleth, but the rest of the name is variously treated, thus: 12:6 מְדֹּרַת / מְדֹּרַת

L מְדֹּרַת 12:19 (same man): מְדֹּרַת

(1) Is it possible that the Yodh/Nun variant here and in (f) and (k) is entirely dialectal due to the fact that the Yodh prefix of the 3 m.s.Impf. took the form of Nun in Syriac? Against this suggestion is the occurrence of the reverse in (1) and (c) and the apparent ease with which a copyist could confuse the two letters as shown by the many examples of such mistakes.
g) 11:7 אב / יב. The further error of L comes possibly by metathesis from the text of A, or perhaps it arose by the omission of the first Yodh and a miscopying of the second Yodh as Nun. The ending י is regularly י .

h) 11:28 חק / כר. 

i) 11:34 סח / סח. Note that L shares one mistake with A, but introduces another one through metathesis.

j) 12:15 סח / סח .

k) 12:34 סח / סח . L סח. Like (d) above, L only has the error.

l) 12:41 סח / סח.

m) 11:32 כז / כז. Possibly this may be considered as involving a Nun/Yodh variant, but the addition at the beginning is not clear. Focoeke, quoted by Thorndike, gives כה.

Thus there are in all, 12 instances of this variation in Nehemiah. In none of them is the Syriac supported by the Greek and more often than not the Syriac form is definitely inferior as a Semitic name, to the form of MT: Clearly all the above are inner Syriac errors. Very similar to this class is the following group of variants:

3. Variations involving Yodh and Heth, or a Nun and Heth, or a Heth and Nun-Yodh.

a) 3:10 ג/ ה. A ditography of the perpendicular stroke for Yodh yields the Heth. A slight misreading of the two strokes yields the Nun-Yodh of L. The reading of L almost surely arose from that of A, but A itself has a copyist’s error already.

b) 3:18 ג/ ה. Also in 10:9 ג/ ה. Note that by haplography one of the three strokes has been dropped. Cf. also 3:24 (same man as 3:18 ג/ ה). Here it must be confessed that the strokes
3. Variations involving Yodh and Heth, or a Nun and Heth, or a Heth and Nun-Yodh.

a) 3:10 נינ / ל תב. A ditto of the perpendicular stroke for Yodn yields the Heth. A slight misreading of the two strokes yields the Nun-Yodh of L. The reading of L almost surely arose from that of A, but A itself has a copyist's error already.

b) 3:18 נינ \ ל תב. Also in 10:9 שמ. Note that by haplography one of the three strokes has been dropped. Cf. also 3:24 (same man as 3:19). Here it must be confessed that the strokes...
of the Nun and Heth are so similar that it is quite difficult to tell
in A whether ה was written, or ה The same remark applies to the
occurrence in the Syriac of 3:20 where the Syriac (both L and A) has
an extra line which has been introduced from 3:24. The name is י"ע L ימש
\[\text{c) 3:23} י"ע כזש קז L ימש. In this instance only L has the error,
but in 10:23 and 11:15 both A and L are in error: ימש / ימש.
\]
It is possible that in the case of this name we do not have a simple
copyist's error of the eye, but that the name somehow became confused
with the well-known name of Joshua.

\[\text{d) 7:22 ימש / ימש L ימש. Only L has the error different that}
\]

\[\text{e) 7:63 ימש / ימש. The same man in Ezr.2:31 is ימש / ימש. Note}
\]
The situation in Nehemiah here is not clear. The second Nun could be
explained as having arisen from the Beth, for which variant there are
a few examples (cf. p 38). The first Nun can be explained as coming
from the Heth for which we have some examples, or it could be considered
as arising from the second Nun by dittography.

\[\text{f) 10:24 ימש / ימש L ימש. Again this mistake is only in L.}
\]

\[\text{g) 7:18 ימש / ימש. In Ezr.2:13 it is ימש / ימש. Note}
\]
that both A and L share the mistake in the Resh for Daleth and
thus even A has a very unsatisfactory name. However the name was not
very familiar, only occurring elsewhere in Ezr.8:13 where the Syriac
again has ימש. The mistake of Neh. 7:18 is only found in L.

\[\text{h) 11:5 ימש / ימש L ימש. Again only L has the error.}
\]
It is probable that the mistake in treatment of the Heth is a copyist's error like the others in this section. One stroke of the Heth has fallen out in A; both of them are missing in L. The confusion at the end of the word may be an interchange of -Yah for -El. It will be discussed later, (p. 43)

In the two further examples MT and L agree but A shows a mistake of this sort:

j) 7:51 פְּצָרַת לָשׁוּן קַדְשׁוֹן. There is a place (p. 147) but it is prominent, only occurring six times in the Old Testament.

k) 7:59 לָשׁוּן לָשׁוּן. This name is so very different that it may not be a proper example of the change we are considering. Note the adjacent name לָשׁוּן which may have influenced the ending and surely caused the peculiar insertion of Pe in L.

In the above list there are five cases where only L has the mistake in question (c,d,f,g,h) and two where L is superior to A.

Taking this section with the preceding one dealing with the Nun/Yodh variant, we can say that the most numerous copyists' mistakes, by far, concern the upright stroke which occurs in the Yodh and Heth and also the Nun in the Estrangelo script. In fact this error is almost as common as all the variations of Resh and Daleth of whatever cause. Moreover many of these errors are quite old, going back to the time before the divergence of the A and L types of text. As would be expected with so typical an inner Syriac error, the LXX never supports the Syriac in the above variations.
Variations of Beth and Nun.

a) 7:4 כ'ג / כ'. Cf. (e) above p. 85 for discussion.

b) 3:4 כ"ג / כ"ג . This variation is at first not easy to understand as a copyist's error, but reference to Codex A will show that the Beth in the old script was rather rectangular, thus:

If the upper left line became blurred in a faded manuscript, the remainder would resemble a Nun. In any case the mistake was not common.

c) 10:6 כ"ג / כ"ג There is a place כ"ג but it was not prominent, only occurring six times in the whole Old Testament and not at all in Nehemiah. It is not used as a personal name.

Other occurrences of the present name complicate the situation.

In 12:16 we have כ"ג / כ"ג but L כ"ג . The Ayin is confused with a medial Beth only here. In 12:4 there is another mention of the same man named in 12:16. There the name is כ"ג / כ"ג . The extreme errors of 12:4 are hard to explain and will be discussed later, (p. 39).

5. Miscellaneous mistakes, chiefly single instances, probably mistakes of the eye.

a) Initial Ayin/Gimel. 10:5 כ"ג / כ"ג . This mistake may be ascribed by some to the pronunciation of the Ghain like the Greek Gamma. It is true the LXX represents the Ayin by Gamma in כ"ג , כ"ג , etc. but the Greek (properly) does not in the case of כ"ג . Nor does the Syriac use Gimel in
representing מ- מ, or even מ- מ, elsewhere. Also this view would not so well explain the two variations of Gimel/Ayin next to be considered. Reference to Codex A will show the similarity in form of מ- and מ- especially in the initial position and it seems best to explain these mistakes as due to copyists.

b) Initial Gimel/Ayin. 7:49 מ/ מ. But cf. p.50 for discussion. 12:4 מ/ מ. Cf. p.38 (c) where it was mentioned that the same man in 12:16 is called מ- מ. Kittel-Kahle notes that "many manuscripts" read this in 12:4 also. It seems to be the correct reading. The LXX omits the name except for מ which reads מ, following the error of MT. Probably the Syriac also follows this error of MT reading originally, perhaps מ- מ. A few other examples of the Nun/Zayin variation will be given later, (p.55).

g) Feth/ Yodh. 11:17 מ/ מ. The reason for this variant is not clear, but it may be due to a copyist's error. Cf. p.38, where a Nun/Feth varian occurs in three cases. By a very similar error a Feth could become Yodh.

d) Mem/ Ayin. 10:5 מ/ מ. There seems to be no satisfactory explanation for this variant. Possibly there was a confusion of memory with the name מ, but this only occurs 3 other times in MT and not in a context similar to this in Mem.10:5.

In 7:23 the place מ is written מ.
It seems that the explanation of the Pesah/Shin would not be difficult except for the Lem/Ayin variant which is not found elsewhere.

e) Pesah/Shin 10:19 The derivation of the reading of A from that of L is not too difficult (Cf. the variations of the scribes, p. 57). But the Pesah/Zayin shift is more of a problem. It is not without precedent (p. 45), but in this case we may think of interaction of this form with יִלּוֹכַת of the next verse.

The following miscellaneous mistakes occur only in L:

f) Coph/Teth 7:53 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים

g) Pesh/Tau 7:53 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים

h) Pesh/Maw 7:57 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים

i) Shin/Coph 10:13 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים

j) Lamedh/Ayin 10:24 לֶאַמִּ֔ים L לֶאַמִּ֔ים. A surprisingly rare error.

The following occur only in A and L is superior:

k) Zayin/Yodh 3:15 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים

l) Nun/Zayin 3:18 לֶאַמִּ֔ים L לֶאַמִּ֔ים. The same man in 3:24 is אַמִּ֔ים and Kittel-Kahle notes that 2 Mes in 3:18 also read יִלָּדָּה which supports this. Probably we should replace the Nun in MT. In that case, L has the correct reading and the origin of the reading in A is a problem. There are, however, examples of a Nun/Zayin shift:

m) Ayin/Heth 3:18 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים Cf. לֶאַמִּ֔ים (e) above.

n) Shin/Ayin 12:8 לֶאַמִּ֔ים לֶאַמִּ֔ים same man as God above.
Still dealing with mistakes of the copyists we now take up those errors caused by a simple careless miswriting of what the scribe had probably seen and understood correctly. The errors to be considered here are not so numerous. They concern mistakes caused by metathesis and the petty omissions of letters. A few additions of letters by dittography and from miscellaneous causes are also to be considered.

1. Metathesis.

a) 1:1 נַעֲרַיָּה/ סְדָרָה. This name of Nehemiah's father also shows metathesis in ג'חֵלֶאֵל and in the Vg Helchiae, but not in מ'חֵלֶאֵל. In 10:2 (also Nehemiah's father) נַעֲרַיָּה/ סְדָרָה. LXX ἡρτιά. Perhaps this error of 1:1 is more of a mistake of memory, confusing the names rather than a simple metathesis.

b) 3:8 יִנְהָר / יִנְּהָר. Cf. also 9:4 נֶרֶנֶת/ לָבָנִים and 8:5 נֶרֶנֶת/ לָבָנִים. In the same case a whole syllable was omitted.

c) 3:26 נַעֲרַיָּה / סְדָרָה. Cf. Mistakes of the Translators p.113 for discussion.

d) 7:49 יְנֵֽו/ יָנֵנַי. (Ezr. 2:46 יָנֵנַי/ יְנֵֽו). Only L has the error.

e) 10:20 נַעֲרַיָּה / סְדָרָה. In Thorndike's collation the witness cited as "nostri" reads קָנָר. Thorndike lists as קָנָר. Probably A has a form developed from the form preserved by L. The name after metathesis was further changed to yield the more common name.

f) 11:7 נַעֲרַיָּה / סְדָרָה. L סְדָרָה. Probably A has a form developed from the form preserved by L. The name after metathesis was further changed to yield the more common name.

g) 12:17 נַעֲרַיָּה / סְדָרָה/ סְדָרָה/ סְדָרָה same man as 12:5 נַעֲרַיָּה/ סְדָרָה.

h) 11:17 זָרְבֶּל (צָרְבֶּל) / צָרְבֶּל. Metathesis plus the Daleth/Pesh variant.
It is interesting to note that these errors, practically all of which are clearly copyists' errors of a common type, are shared by both Codex A, although old and relatively good, apparently had a long history of copying behind it.

2. Letters omitted.

a) 3:8 Omission of the He מ"מ ל ו Kittel-Kahle notes that many MSS read מ"מ ל ו. This is favored by G1 Barxhtev (G1AN omits). We may add that the Syriac evidence would favor this reading as the omission of a Heth beside a Yodh is easily explainable; the omission of a Heth difficult.

b) 7:53, The Yodh, נ"ו ל As the preceding word ends in Yodh, this is doubtless a case of haplography.

c) 9:5, The Nun, נ"ו ל Because of the similarity in form of the Nun and Yodh, this could be regarded as an omission by haplography.

On the other hand, the error may have arisen by confusion with the common name נ"ו ל. Cf. also 9:4 נ"ו ת and 8:5 נ"ו ל.

d) 7:53, The Beth, ב"ו ל Only L has the error. Cf. 12:25 where in the same name a whole syllable was omitted.

But in 12:9 and 11:17 it is correct.

e) 10:20, The Ayin, י"ו ל Thorndike lists as another variant: י"ו ל. Cf. above, p 41, for the metathesis.

f) 10:24, The Heth, י"ו לא We might explain this readily as the omission of a guttural, for such sounds became indistinct in the passage of time, but other examples of such omission are few.
3. Letters added by dittography or through miscellaneous causes.

The few cases of miscellaneous addition perhaps should not be classified here, but they too may be slips of the pen and for convenience' sake will be put with the other additions which are more easily explained.

a) 7:52, Addition of the Tau, מ"הו / מ"הו Ezr. 2:50

has מ"הו / מ"הו. The reason for this addition is not at all clear. The Greek witness is: G.מ"הו G.מ"הו G.מ"הו. Perhaps the Sigma and the Tau reflect some common name unknown to us.

b) 11:5 and 12, The Zayin, מ"הו / מ"הו. This may have been originally a case of addition of Daleth by dittography with a subsequent shift from Daleth to Zayin. Cf. p.44 for the Daleth/Zayin variant. Also we should notice two instances of similar mistreatment of these letters in close association: 11:15 מ"הו מ"הו and 3:23 מ"הו מ"הו. We may learn from the Elephantine Papyri.

c) 11:10 & 11 (one verse, text confused), The Caph, מ"הו / מ"הו. This addition, too, is difficult, but it may have been caused by the fact that this word occurs in a series using מ"הו six times. An extra final Resh may have been carelessly inserted from the context.
a) 12:6, 11:10, 11:18, 12:1, 12, The Feth, יט / וט L מָכָה. The regularity of this mistake - only in L - shows that it is not a mere slip, but a confusion with the common name מָכָה by a copyist of L.

f) 11:22, The Feth, יט / וט. This insertion of Feth does not seem to be like the above instances. The explanation is obscure.

g) 12:5, The Resh, ר"ע / וט. Probably this Resh was originally a Daleth added by dittography.


C. Mistakes of Speech.

Here we classify those variants introduced by copyists who were more familiar with other forms of speech and of pronunciation than those given in the text they were copying. Dialectal peculiarities of scribes will reflect themselves in variations of this type and also dialectical peculiarities of the originals will be obscured by the scribes' tendency to avoid what was unfamiliar to himself. There are not so many errors that can be classified here with certainty.

l. Variations of Daleth and Zayin. As we may learn from the Elephantine papyri, the treatment of these letters was not uniform in the pre-Christian centuries and it appears that it still was not uniform in the period of translation and transmission of our text. The best proof that copyists interchanged these letters because of their phonetic similarity is the variants occurring between the L and A texts. These will be specially noted.
a)  שִׁנְיָא / שִׁנְיָא (Ezra 3:19, same name, \(\square\)).

b)  שִׁנְיָא / שִׁנְיָא (Ezra 2:56, same name, \(\square\)).

c)  יִנְיָא / יִנְיָא . This instance is not clear (Cf. p. 44), but at least it probably illustrates the Zayin/Daleth shift.

In the following cases only L illustrates the shift:

c)  יִנְיָא / יִנְיָא .

d)  יִנְיָא / יִנְיָא . This instance is particularly interesting because Zayin does not occur in MT at all. It may have been written by the translators as a result of misreading the Nun (cf. p. 55 for further examples of this), but in any case L has the further shift to Daleth. In 7:50 both A and L have for this name.

In the following case only A shows the shift:

f)  יִנְיָא / יִנְיָא .

Less clear are the following instances:

g)  יִנְיָא / יִנְיָא . We may say that L agrees in the shift to Daleth, but carries it on by a further error to Resh.

h)  יִנְיָא and יִנְיָא , really a shift from Zayin to Resh, but like the preceding it may be via the Daleth גר / לאש (7:28 has לאש; ).

Cf. the discussion of 10:5 גר / לאש on p 39.

i) Miscellaneous. The following examples, probably related, have already been cited (pp.40 and 43): יִנְיָא / יִנְיָא .

The only other occurrence of this name in Nehemiah is in 12:32 and 12:43 where the major variants are: יִנְיָא and יִנְיָא . The LXX supports the text now. This latter is poor LXX witness and
Variations of Beth and Mem. There are not as many instances of this variation as we might expect considering the similar sound of these letters. Note the different treatment of the same name in various passages.

a) 7:45; 8:8; 12:25 / מָגְדַּה / מָגְדַּה In 11:19 it is מָגְדַּה. In Ezr. 2:45 it is מָגְדַּה but in Ezr. 2:42 and 1 Chr. 9:17 it is written מָגְדַּה by confusion with the name of the patriarch. In Gen. מָגְדַּה is regularly מָגְדַּה.

c) 10:21 / מָגְדַּה similarly in 11:24 it is מָגְדַּה but note 3:4 where it is מָגְדַּה. In that passage quite possibly the Caph comes from an original Beth.

d) 7:59 / מָגְדַּה / מָגְדַּה. It would seem that the reading of A developed from the reading מָגְדַּה which is preserved in L, by metathesis.

Variations of Beth and Mem. This mistake is quite like the one above as the confusion is between two labials which are related in pronunciation. Again, however, the variations are rare. It may possibly not be due to phonetic similarity at all, but to confusion with similar and more common names.

a) 10:7 מָגְדַּה 12:5 מָגְדַּה 12:17 (same man as 12:5) מָגְדַּה - all מָגְדַּה The only other occurrence of this name in Nehemiah is 12:41 מָגְדַּה. The LXX supports the Hebrew except in 12:17 and 12:41 where the major MSS. omit, but G has מָגְדַּה. This latter is poor LXX witness and
doubtless is an error of confusion with the name of the patriarch. Quite likely the Syriac error is due to the same cause. Perhaps the similarity in sound of the Beth and Mem assisted in causing the error. The error of 12:41 is interesting. Probably the Syriac Beth is an inner error for Nun/Yodh, a type of error amply illustrated above (p.35f).

The Lamedh for Mem has no other parallels.

b) 3:11 לֹאָ / לֹאָ This also may be a confusion with the rather common name לֹא / לֹא occurring in 8:5; 10:19; and 7:22.

4. Variations of Beth and Ayin. It is probable that these mistakes also should be considered here. There is considerable difference between A and L. The confusion is not very common and probably the similarity of these names to more common ones aided in causing the errors.


b) 12:19 לֹא / לֹא. The same man in 12:6 is לֹא / לֹא.

Cf. the change of the same name in another direction to: לֹא.

See above, p 83.

c) 3:20, 21 (bis) לֹא / לֹא Only L has the error as in 3:23 above.

d) 12:15 לֹא / לֹא An odd occurrence, discussed above (p38).
The only mistakes that seem to have been made in the names which should be classified here is the free variation of the Divine elements on the ends of the names. We may compare the tendency to change בֵּית to לֵו (cf. p. 119).


   a) Addition of the element -Yah

      11:9 לֶבֶן / לְבַן
      7:54 לֶבֶן / לְבַן

      8:8; 10:10 נִבְנֵי / לְבַן

      12:13 נִבְנֵי (not Ezra the scribe)/ לְבַן.

      12:5 נֵבְנֵי / לְבַן. But 12:18, the same man נִבְנֵי / לְבַן.

   b) Deletion of the final -Yah

      12:41 נְבִי / נֶבִי
      12:9 נְבִי / נֶבִי.

      11:17; 12:9 נְבִי / נֶבִי.

   c) Shortening of the initial element -יִהְיָה. This is not a mistake or irregularity for every name in Nehemiah which begins thus is shortened to ס and partial examination of the rest of the Peshitta would seem to indicate that this was the usual practice of the translators. Nöldeke gives examples of this tendency of an intervocalic He to drop out in expression and in the script — a tendency present also in Hebrew which often shortened this element to ס in Hebrew speech.
e) Interchange of the elements -Yah and -El

12:26 יִתְנַהֵה (the governor) / סֶרֶף cf. 7:7
12:33 יִתְנַהֵה / סֶרֶף
12:24 יִתְנַהֵה / סֶרֶף

This has been mentioned above (i) p. 63.

10:9; 12:8. ישׂיִים / סָרָן. This change is the reverse of the above three instances. In 9:4, 5; 12:24 it is סָרָשׁ. The name only occurs in these instances and once in Ezra. There is no name ישׂיִים in the Old Testament. In Ezr. 2:40 it is סָרָשׁ. Hawley discusses this instance attributing the error to a careless copying in which the final Lamedh was lost. But it is not so simple because the names ending in -א (which are few in Nehemiah) are transcribed almost every time with the ending סר - not just סר - . Also Hawley's suggestion would not at all fit the above cases of -Yah changing to -El.

It seems to do justice better to the whole situation to posit a free variation of the Divine elements.

f) Other instances of irregularity in treatment of final Lamedh.

(These are noted for comparison with the change of the element -א)

11:27 יִתְנַהֵה / סֶרֶף; this also in E Ch.4:23. The other two instances of its use (Jos.15:28; 19:3) have סָרָשׁ.

(3) op. cit. p 25
The word for "fox" in Syriac is spelled with a Tau. The Syriac root \( \text{ spd} \) is not common and means "to cough" which would not seem to be a suitable name. \( \text{ hld} \) however, means "hill" and this suitable meaning may have something to do with the mistake in this particular name.

In Ezr. 2:47 and Neh. 7:58 \( \text{ L } \) In Ezr. 2:56 As previously mentioned (p 88) the change of initial Simeq to Ayin is not without precedent and is doubtless an inner error of the Syriac. The change of final Lamedh to Aleph is not so easy. Possibly the name was changed because of another similar one nearby. In 7:51 we have \( \text{ L } \) whereas in 7:49 the phrase is \( \text{ L } \) whereas in 7:51 we have \( \text{ L } \) where the variation is probably caused by attraction to the similar name which immediately precedes, \( \text{ L } \) which certainly has influenced the reading of L. It is doubtful, therefore, whether this or the previous two instances give us much information concerning a special tendency of the final Lamedh to be lost, as Hawley's view suggests.

It would seem that the error of A here illustrated is a simple slip of the pen, a kind of haplography.
In this category will naturally fall those confusions of letters which look similar in Hebrew and were therefore apt to be mistaken in transcription. As remarked above the same thing was done by the LXX translators, but not so frequently.

1. Variations of Resh and Daleth. Nine cases were listed above as more probably due to copyists. The remaining examples of this frequent variation will be listed here. Reference to the Elephantine Papyri will show how easily one of these letters could be misread for the other. They are similar enough in printed Hebrew texts to confuse beginners.

a) 3:6 מְנָוֵל / מְנָוֵל 3:6
b) 3:3 מְנָוֵל / סְבַע 3:3
Cf. discussion above, (a) p 71.
c) 3:10 מְנָוֵל / סְבַע 3:10
These are also instances.
d) 7:18 מְנָוֵל / מְנָוֵל; Ezr. 2:13 has מְנָוֵל/מְנָוֵל
e) 7:42 דל / חֹי מְנָוֵל/מְנָוֵל Ezr. 2:39 has מְנָוֵל/מְנָוֵל.
f) 7:47 יָרֵא / יָרֵא Ezr. 2:44 יָרֵא / יָרֵא; Although the Peshitta reads Resh in both places there is no question about the correctness of MT. The LXX supports MT both in Ezr. and Neh.

g) 7:50 יָרֵא / יָרֵא Ezr. 2:43 יָרֵא / יָרֵא; Again the LXX supports MT in both passages. The famous king of Syria in Isaiah's day is always written מְנָוֵל.

4) For instance, ש in I Ch. 1 and 2 has only two misreadings of Daleth and Resh out of over 500 names – one sixth the frequency of this error in the Peshitta of Nehemiah.
have some explanation other than a simple misreading of the letters. There are other instances of the variation of Sadhe/Zayin and a few of the Goph/Heth, but they are rare and it is a good bit to posit three such mistakes in one word. However no other explanation seems to be available. The name לְסַזָּה is rare.

i) 10:5 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה

The variation in 3:18 is לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה.

In 3:24 and in the Syriac only of 3:30 it is לְסַזָּה.

k) 10:10 and 18 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה but 8:8; 9:5; & 10:13 have לְסַזָּה.

The change of initial He to Aleph is natural for Syriac, but it is not consistently followed.

l) 11:5 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה

and 12:19 (same man as 12:6) לְסַזָּה. These are also instances of the Daleth/Resh variation regardless of their other errors.

m) 11:17 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה

n) 11:17 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה Doubtless this also is a shift from Daleth to Resh combined with metathesis.

o) 11:29 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה

p) 11:25 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה

q) 11:30 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה For the change of Ayin to Aleph cf. p. 69.

r) 12:15 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה

s) 12:20 לְסַזָּה / לְסַזָּה The LXX omits except G סכאמג. נבכ.אסב

Kittel says: "G סכאמג but the Greek witness is poor. The Vg says Heber. Doubtless MT is correct.

24 are here listed and 3 more on p. 33. Also we should note that the LXX never supports the Peshitta, except possibly for the poor witness of (a) above. Although the LXX translators occasionally misread a Daleth of Resh, their errors were never as numerous as this. Either the Hebrew manuscripts used by the Peshitta translators of Nehemiah were quite poor or the translator was very careless in his reading of them.

2. Variations of Caph and Beth. These variations are surprisingly few considering the similarity of these two letters in both scripts. It may be remarked (cf. p. 78) that the preposition Caph is never mistaken for Beth which reads it as Caph. The same: mistknife for Beth. Of the names listed below, the Syriac form may be correct in one or two instances.

a) 3:4 מ"מ ינפוקנ / נקוקן The LXX agrees in the reading Caph. The Vg. mentions it in both places. It seems that in this instance we must have the LXX agrees in the reading Caph. The Vg. mentions it in both places. It seems that in this instance we must have

b) 7:16 י"ב / כ The LXX supports MT in Ezr. 2:11 מ'ל / כ The LXX supports MT which is clear.

Kittel-Kahle notes that a great many MSS read Beth in both Ezr. and Neh. In Nehemiah, Kittel-Kahle several MSS reading כ, but this only illustrates the ease with which these two letters could be mistaken for each other. MT is clearly right.

c) 9:5 י"ב / כ Kittel-Kahle notes that several MSS read it with Caph. The LXX omits. The Vg. reads Beth with MT. The evidence is also read it as Caph, but MT reads it as Beth and as to the true reading here is not too clear. Further light comes from 9:4 which probably mentions the same man ס"ב. MT is clearly right for all copyists and translators! Kittel-Kahle notes here that a great many MSS read Caph. As to the LXX,
The Syriac reading יפתא in 5:4 can be discounted, for it probably comes from the name יפתבש, in vs. 5. Also the reading יפתדיא surely comes from the following name יפתבש. We have then MT and the Vg. reading Beth in both verses. Scattered Ms. of the Hebrew read Caph in one verse or the other. The Syriac reads Caph in one verse and in the other verse probably its witness fails. The Greek reads Caph in the opposite verse and omits the other passage. The evidence is inconclusive, but it seems possible that MT has erred in this place by a confusion which is easily made in the Hebrew.

d) 12:14 יפתא/ יפתא Kittel-Kahle notes that a great many Ms read Caph. The LXX omits except for GL which reads it as Caph. The same man is mentioned in 12:3 where the name is spelled with a Caph, thus: יפתא/ יפתא Here the LXX agrees in the reading Caph. The Vg. reads as Feth in both places. It seems that in this instance we must correct MT in 12:14 and read Caph. This, therefore, is not a Syriac error.

e) 10:12 יפתא/ יפתא The LXX supports MT which is doubtless correct. The Syriac erred because of the presence of the similar name in vs.10.

f) 10:10 יפתא/ יפתא Kittel-Kahle notes that a great many Ms read a Caph, and GL also reads it as Caph, but Gez read it as Feth and doubtless MT is correct. The confusions of these two common names was obviously easy for all copyists and translators!
1. Variations of Nun and Zayin. There are not many of these variations, but the ones that do occur would seem to be due to the translators. In the Hebrew script of the early days of our era the Nun and Zayin resembled each other much more than they do in the Syriac script.

a) 7:13 נפ/י לוח. But cf. 10:14 נפ/י. See above (c) p. 23 for discussion.

b) 12:4 נפ/י See above (c) p. 23 for discussion.

4. Variations of Nun and Daleth. These few variations are not clear.

Possibly the Nun to Daleth shift of the first example was originally a misreading of the Nun as Zayin with a further shift to Daleth. Cf. above p. 74. But the Daleth to Nun shift could not be thus explained.

a) 7:50 נפ/י ב, (Ezr. 2:48 נפ/י, - ב, 7:62 נפ/י ב, (Ezr. 2:48 נפ/י, - ב, which the name only occurs these four places. The various treatment of may well have influenced the Syriac of 12:15. The LXX supports MT, the Nun would favor the above explanation, but other factors may be involved.

Syriac, but the spelling in 11:21 would seem to indicate that

b) 3:32 נפ/י ל, Probably this instance should not be relied upon to illustrate a Nun/Daleth shift. Unlike the other examples this is not a personal name, but the name of one of the gates of Jerusalem. "Exit gate" may simply be a free rendering. On the other hand there may have been an inner Syriac error caused by the similarity of נפ/י and ל, possibly have had a prothetic Aleph.

The LXX omits both except for ג נפ/י, which agrees with the usual places, as does also the Vg. It is probably impossible to tell and before the witness of נפ/י in which instance MT error. At least it was before the Syriac.

(7) op.cit. p. 23
as we class here those variations which are merely matters of variations of style between the Hebrew and Syriac. They are not to be considered as errors, usually, but are the natural result of transcribing the names from one language into another. Yet the resulting changes are not consistently applied for any Syricizing that was done was apparently more or less unconscious.

1. Variations in the use of the Prosthetic Aleph.

a) 7:45; 11:13 לָו הָאָדָם (וּלָּו הָאָדָם). F.D.P. argues that this is observed in probably a high instance of this prominent New an Aramaic name. In 12:25 it has the Aleph, not the ending: יָד. 

b) 3:8; 7:36 פֶּּנֶּס (This is the standard form in Joshua, etc.) would be a sign of the memory of a Christian copyist. (also p. 48). 

c) 12:12 מְנֵה / מְנֵה. But cf. the frequent מְנֵה / מְנֵה which variations of the stibilants. These variations are caused by the may well have influenced the Syriac of 12:12. The LXX supports MT. 

university of sound of the various stibilants. We may only wonder that 

d) 7:48 מְנֵה / מְנֵה. This name in 11:21 מְנֵה is omitted in the 

were no more such variations. In the great majority of cases 

Syriac. But the spelling in 11:21 would seem to indicate that 

transliterations are exact. Nöelke gives rules for the partial 

it did not have an initial consonant cluster and therefore should 

stiliblants, especially stibilants, to the 

not properly have had a prosthetic Aleph. 

e) 7:47 יָאָר / יָאָר. Here too the Aleph seems unnecessary. 

f) 10:25 יָאָר / יָאָר. Also 3:17 יָאָר / יָאָר; L יָאָר; Nöeldeke 

remarks particularly of the use of the Aleph before initial Resh. 

become noteless. Thus a Samech, before a voiceless consonant like 

In 12:25 is the name יָאָר / יָאָר; but the same man in 12:15 is 

On the other hand a Samech before Lamed will not be pronounced Zayin. 

called יָאָר / יָאָר. The LXX omits both except for G נְכָּא which agrees with 

MT in both places, as does also the Vg. It is probably impossible to 

decide in which instance MT erred. At least it was before the Syriac. 


(7) op.cit. p 35
This variation is particularly interesting as a case of dropping the Aleph (which here is not actually prosthetic) in contrast to usual Syriac practice. The name occurs many times in the Old Testament and is usually transcribed 

In Ezr. 10:25 also the Aleph is dropped. The inconsistent treatment of the name would seem to argue that it may have been done by a copyist. Note that in the Peshitta New Testament the name transcribed from the Greek is regularly The LXX of Neh. 12:42 omits, but in Ezr. 10:25 it is . What we observe is probably a back influence of this prominent New Testament name on the Old Testament Peshitta. On this view, it would be a slip of the memory of a Christian copyist (cf. also p. 60 (b)).

2. Variations of the Sibilants. These variations are caused by the similarity of sound of the various sibilants. We may only wonder that there were not more such variations. In the great majority of cases the transliterations are exact. Nöldeke gives rules for the partial assimilation of certain consonants, especially sibilants, to the following consonants. He says this tendency was particularly marked in the reading of the Scriptures but "in the writing these variations are seen only in occasional traces." A voiced consonant like Zayin will become voiceless, thus a Samech, before a voiceless consonant like Tau. On the other hand a Samech before Daleth will be pronounced Zayin. Probably some of the following variations are to be explained thus.

(3) Syr. Gram., p 14. He says "In der Schrift zeigen sich von diesen Veränderungen nur einzelne Spuren."
a) 8:17 2חנ[ב/א] 4 elsewhere 2חנ[ב/א] 5. The voiced lateral influenced the Gematria, but only in the one case.

b) 12:24 2חנ[ב/א] 6. This is the only occurrence in Nehemian, but in the numerous occurrences in Ezr., Hag., and Zech. it is also written 2חנ[ב/א]. However in 1 Ch. 5:40 and 41 it is 2חנ[ב/א]. The name does not occur elsewhere.


d) 11:13 2חנ[ב/א] 6. Apparently MT struggled with the individual "zebu" in Gen. 10:26 is written the name as did the Syriac text tradition. It would seem that the double sibilant is erroneous. The LXX uses only one Sigma for the name, but the Greek transliteration may not be too significant. Noth calls it "A combination of both orthographic variants אֵל הָאָב[ב] and אָבֶל." 9

e) 7:47 2חנ[ב/א] 4. Ezr. 2:44 has 2חנ[ב/א] miscopying Lamedh for Ayin. We know nothing about this name. It occurs only here.

f) 8:8 2חנ[ב/א] 4. But cf. the common 2חנ[ב/א] and 2חנ[ב/א].


g) 7:51 2חנ[ב/א] 4. The proximity of the Pe may have been the influence causing the change in the sibilant.


(9) M. Noth Die israelitischen Personennamen, (Stuttgart 1928) p.253 ("Kombination der beiden orthographischen Varianten אֵל הָאָב[ב] und אָבֶל")
9. Variations of Consonants which customarily shift according to phonetic law between Hebrew and Syriac.

a) Coph/Ayn 7:58 יִפְסָּף / ∂אוי; Ezr. 2:58 יְסָפְר. This seems to be really a misapplication of the later variation between Coph and Ayin within Aramaic. The name does not occur elsewhere.

b) Shin/Tau 9:32 סָמַך / סמא. The name of the kingdom of Assyria is written thus in Ezr. 4:2; 6:22; Gen. 2:14; 10:1f etc., but the individual "Assur" in Gen. 10:22 is written.

4. Miscellaneous confusions of similar sounding consonants.

a) Tau/Teth 2:1; 5:14; 13:6 נֵסָפְרָן / ḫs. Cf. above p.3. Confusion of this sort is expected with a foreign name. It is explained by the similarity of sounds.

b) Final Nun/Mem 3:15 סֵפָּך. LXX omits. Cf.3:12 כָּשָּׁך / ח. This example may argue that the confusion is due to a copyist since the two texts do not belong to the same edition.

Kittel notes that in 3:15 L.Mss read כָּשָּׁך and E.D.P. suggests that כָּשָּׁך should be read in 3:15 as well as in 3:16.

The two names are of different men, however. Vg. reads Siloe.

c) Pe/Mem 7:24 סֵפָּך / ח. The parallel in Ezr. 2:18 seems to be סֵפָּך / ח. It hardly seems necessary to posit a mistake in MT here. More likely there is an influence of the common name סָפְר / ח which could have affected also.

d) Be/Mem 3:9 סֵפָּך / ח. This is probably a better example of the confusion of the two labials because of their similar sound.

e) Coph/Heth 10:1 הָסָלָך / ח. Quite dubious because of the triple error.

11) Lust Gran. p.73
i) Nun/Lamedh 11:30 ל'ד / נ. The Peshitta nowhere else treats the name of the famous valley of refuse this way. Usually it is: נ'לד
d) Nun/Lamedh 2:13 ל'ד / נ. ל. This example may argue that the confusion is due to a抄ist since the two texts disagree. The reference is to the "dragon well".

k) Lamedh/Nun 11:2 ל'ד / נ. ל. The form of ל doubtless developed from that of ל by haplography of the stroke for Nun and further confusion of Lamedh and Ayin. Cf. also 8:8 which is נ'לד / נ and 10:10 נ'לד / נ. This last variation has no ready explanation.

5. Treatment of Final Nun. In several cases the ending סנ is either added or dropped. This ending seems to be preferred by the Syriac more than by the Hebrew. It is cited by 16th as a diminutive ending and is called the same by Noldeke.

a) Nun Added 9:10 נ'לד / (thus regularly also in Ex.)

7:57, 60; 11:3; 12:45 נ'לד (so usually elsewhere in the Old Testament.)

b) Nun Dropped 4:2 נ'לד / נ. The name of the city only occurs here in Nehemiah. Elsewhere it is usually נ. In the New Testament the usual form is נ. Cf. the

(10) cc. cit. p 33
(11) Syr. Gram 73
3) Nun Dropped, 12:22 לַקֵּץ / רָואֵן. Cf. above p.56 (a) for the Aleph.
6:7 מִזְרַע / שֶׁלֶשׁ. The Nun is similarly lost in this gentilic.

a. Miscellaneous Syriacizing of Names.

a) לַקֵּץ - By a partial assimilation this name is always written
הָקַע or קַע except 8:12 and 13:28: קַע

b) מִזְרַע - In 11:23, the only occurrence in Nemenian, it is מִזְרַע
and it is written thus also in all the other 12 places
in the Bible.

c) נָּחַל - In 11:32 written נָּחַל which is the usual transcription of נָּחַל.
Perhaps here there is a problem of MT. Kittel-Kahle notes
the Eem Nakhim Bible had נָּחַל which may be an orthographic
variant, merely. It seems clear that this town mentioned
in close connection with Bethel is the well-known town of
Nahal which is always used in MT with the article. Possibly
the translator understood the final He or Aleph to be the
Syriac definite state and therefore disregarded it as the
Syriac usually disregards the Hebrew article of נָּחַל.

d) Names with Aleph for initial Yodh. Cf. Maldeke \(^\text{12}\) for explanation
of this tendency. He remarks that the prefixing of the
Aleph was more common in early times than later.

10:2: 12:12 נָּחַל / לַקֵּץ
11:7 נָּחַל / מִזְרַע. Cf. the frequent מִזְרַע / מִזְרַע.
12:42 נָּחַל / מִזְרַע. But for the contrary, 10:9 נָּחַל / לַקֵּץ.

c. Variations are to Erroneous Translations of Judges.

1. Errors involving the consonants וב.

a) 6:8

The extra pronoun in the Syriac may be just a freedom of the translator, or it may be that he read the Waw of הובכ on the end of תול and then supplied a conjunction.

b) 9:4

is quite similar but reads שאריה and has the last phrase corrected וטש שאריה where has dropped one of the Sigmas.

is however almost identical to LT, except that it too translates every occurrence of וה. Note that the Syriac added an extra and supplied appropriate conjunctions in the series in order to secure the regularity of which it was fond.

c) 10:10 Here the reverse occurs with a common noun being taken for a

name: לֹא מְזִכֶּר מִן / וּלְפָנָיו הָיוּ הַנָּבִיאֶת.

d) 10:13

is substantially the same.

The Syriac has rather willfully treated the text, dropping one altogether and misreading מְזִכֶּר in such a way as to get a regular series.

The cases are discussed by , ICC Zera and箩annan, p 37, 38. named it as "highly probable that they were a branch of the Levitical remarks about the list of names of the Hethites that manbut 625 do not occur elsewhere and add "virtually we have a list of peculiar names...The foreign element in the names is a serious problem."
One is struck by the number of these variations and also by the fact that the Peshitta seldom agrees with the LXX in a variation, except that both versions frequently translate the consonants י"ע when MT takes them as a proper name. The Syriac never is preferable to MT, but usually shows a regularity artificially secured. It is interesting that several of these variations concern Joshua and Kadmiel. The Syriac translators may have unconsciously harmonized the phrases mentioning these men.

2. Misinterpretations of guild names.
   a) 11:35 בּוֹרָה לֶא יַחְדָו / לֶא יַחָד. Probably לֶא יַחָד is simply a mistake for לֶא יַחְדָו used elsewhere to translate י"ע. We have noted that the confusion of Heth and Yodh is quite common as an inner Syriac error. With regard to לֶא יַחְדָו, if this is a guild name for "craftsmen" (so J.P.S.), the Syriac equivalent would be לֶא יַחָד. But more likely the translators understood it as "forest". אַרְעָם The meaning "forest" was chosen in 7:61 where A has a translation and L does not: בּוֹרָה לֶא יַחְדָו. In 2:59 this name is לֶא יַחְדָו. Also in Ezr. 2:59 this name is לֶא יַחָד.
   b) The Nethinim. בּוֹרָה לְהוֹרִית is treated as a gentilic and written לֶא יַחְדָו in 4 out of 9 instances. In 7:45 it is לֶא יַחְדָו. In 10:28

(13) The Nethinim are discussed by Fatten, ICC 'Ezra and Nehemiah' p 87,38. He regards it as "highly probable that they were a branch of the Levitical body." He remarks about the lists of names of the Nethinim that many (28 out of 35) do not occur elsewhere and adds "virtually we have a long list of peculiar names...The foreign element in the names is a serious difficulty."
It is also in 11:8 it is and in 11:21 there are two occurrences of the word, but the context is confused. These translations are easily understandable in a time when the exact functions of this class of temple servants was no longer known. The LXX transliterates when it does not omit the word.
e) The Tirshatha. is twice translated

The plural is certain because a plural verb is used. In these passages no individual is named as the Tirshatha and the translators apparently envisaged a kind of Sanhedrin or presbytery. The parallel in Ezr. 2:63 says

In the other two instances Nehemiah is named as the Tirshatha and he is called in 3:3; 10:1

with and probably as doublets. Hawley’s remark on Ezr. 2:63 applies also to Nehemiah: “This is an unsuccessful attempt to explain a Persian word (tirshatha) which the translator did not know.” Notice, however that the translator of Nehemiah was inconsistent in his interpretation. The LXX transliterates in various ways, but omits the last two references. Fattan remarks on the word “The word is Persian, Tarshata, but the exact definition is not clear. Moss regards it as referring to a royal commissioner …Meyer holds that it is not the name of an office like governor, but rather a title “his Excellency”…or “his Reverence”.

(14) op.cit. p 29
(15) op.cit. p 97
5. Miscellaneous instances:

a) 7:61 \( \text{י"סנ} \quad \text{י"סנ} / \text{וכל} \quad \text{וכל} \quad \text{לXX ה específico} \quad \text{לאר} \quad \text{The parallel in Ezra 2:59 is } \text{י"סנ} / \text{וכל} \quad \text{Possibly } \text{י"סנ} \text{was first mistaken for the Aramaic } \text{י"סנ} \text{which was read } \text{י"סנ} \text{in Ezra and } \text{י"סנ} \text{in Nehemiah (cf. 4:15 where } \text{י"סנ} \text{is } \text{י"סנ} \text{but L } \text{י"סנ}. \text{The original consonants are probably as in Ezra, but MT and LXX are doubtless correct in taking them as names.}

b) 13:3 \( \text{י"סנ} \quad \text{LXX } \text{י"סנ} \quad \text{The form is admittedly difficult, but the Syriac is surely not justified in getting rid of the difficulty so easily. Note the Syriac also omits the preceding } \text{י"סנ} \text{in order to read the form as a proper name.}

c) 12:42 \( \text{י"סנ} \quad \text{The LXX omits much here, but probably supports MT. Probably the translator just misunderstood the musical term "sound aloud", "chant in unison" or some such meaning which is rare for the Hiphil of } \text{י"סנ}. \text{It may be surmised at the large number of variations in the contexts (1 Ch. 15:19 etc.).}

d) 7:55 \( \text{י"סנ} / \text{וכל} \quad \text{Ezr. 2:58 } \text{י"סנ} / \text{וכל}. \text{This name only occurs here and its meaning is not definitely known. The Syriac transmitted well. Even our earliest manuscripts have a long history of may be a mistake of a copyist, but also it may be due to an omission behind them. Nehemiah has suffered more than most desire to translate as "lightning".}

\text{We may note that in 1 Chronicles, chapter 1 there are about 40 significant variations in the 300 names of the Peshitta, as already mentioned in Gen.5 and 11 there are 10 errors in 100 names, one reason for the serious errors of Nehemiah is that there are so many names.
Conclusion.

By way of summary of the above material we may point out that by far the most common mistakes concern the Daleth/Resh variant and the variations of Nun/Yodh/Heth or their combinations. These make up over 60 names or about one fourth of the whole. Another group of variations cannot fairly be classed as errors, but must be considered as the natural result of transliterating names from Hebrew to Syriac where slightly different phonetic and stylistic rules apply. Such variations are the addition of prosthetic Aleph, the Zayin/Daleth variation, and the Syricizing of particular names in special ways. These account for about 40 variations and strictly speaking should be subtracted from the 220 observed variations to leave 180 instances of error. The remaining names which differ from MT are affected by miscellaneous mistakes such as naturally occur in copying such material, but no other type of variation exceeds ten in number.

We may be surprised at the large number of variations in the names of the Peshitta of Nehemiah - 220 out of 850 names. It seems evident that the translators were careless and the text was not transmitted well. Even our earliest manuscripts have a long history of poor transmission behind them. Nehemiah has suffered more than most books. We may note that in I Chronicles, chapter 1 there are about 40 significant variations in the 300 names of the Peshitta. As already mentioned, in Gen.5 and 11 there are 10 errors in 100 names. One reason for the numerous errors of Nehemiah doubtless is that there are so many names
together is tedious; the names have no special meaning to the translator and therefore they may be felt to be less important than other material; and it is easy to lose one’s place when copying a long list of names. Still Nehemiah seems not to have been translated so accurately or transmitted so carefully as even the lists of names in 1 Chronicles. Apparently this short book was not considered as important as many of the other books and therefore was not given equal care.

That there are no complete verses omitted in the translation and more than a word or two which is not represented in some way in explanation. Contrast with this about 25 verses omitted from the manuscripts of the LXX (chiefly in ch. 11 and 12), and many more of parts of verses. In short, the Syriac translation is free and sometimes poor, but it does in the main parallel the Hebrew text.

In this chapter the freedom exercised by the translator will be under three main heads: I Free translations occasioned by the sense of normal idioms in the Hebrew or Syriac, II Free renderings which factorially represent the Hebrew sense, but exhibit unnecessary departures from a literal rendering, III Conscious departures from the
Chapter V - The Character of the Translation

Probably we should be justified in applying to Nehemiah the remarks of Hawley on the Peshitta of Ezra. 1 Possibly, however, we should accuse the translator of Nehemiah of taking greater liberties than those Hawley alleges for Ezra. Obviously the translation was made for practical purposes and not for the special benefit of the textual critic. Considerable freedom is therefore exercised in rendering some passages. A few cases may even be cited of apparent ignorance of the meaning of the Hebrew. Unfortunately our own understanding of some of these difficult passages is none too clear. It can be said that there are no complete verses omitted in the translation and that variations can not always be classified with certainty. But only rarely more than a word or two which is not represented in some way in the Syriac. Likewise there are no insertions except a word or two at a time clearly for explanation. Contrast this with the about 25 verses omitted from the major manuscripts of the LXX (chiefly in ch. 11' and 12), and many more omissions of parts of verses. In short, the Syriac translation is free and idiomatic, sometimes poor, but it does in the main parallel the Hebrew text. The Verbal. The New Consecutive. It is to be expected that, in this chapter the freedom exercised by the translator will be exhibited under three main heads: I Free translations occasioned by the occurrence of normal idioms in the Hebrew or Syriac, II Free renderings which satisfactorily represent the Hebrew sense, but exhibit an unnecessary departure from a literal rendering, III Conscious departures from the

(1) vid. sup. p.12
Hebrew text in order to attempt to improve upon it or interpret it.

These conscious departures from the text may be in the way of: A. addition, B. omission, or C. variation. A later chapter will consider instances of variation of the Pesnitta from MT which seem to be due to an actual error made by the translator. Along with the latter category will be considered a few (very few) cases where possibly MT has suffered in later transmission.

It will easily be seen that in numbers of cases it will be difficult to tell whether a particular departure from MT is the result of conscious interpretative variation or of a corruption of text. The particular variations can not always be classified with certainty. But as would be expected, however, the Syriac had a tendency to an attempt will be made to list in the present chapter all departures more frequently than does the Hebrew and especially from MT due to idioms of the Syriac language or caused by the exegetical principles of the translator. All mistakes of translation will then be relegated to a later chapter. Mistakes of transmission have been considered already (Chapter III and part of Chapter IV).

I. Free translations due to normal idiomatic usage.

The Verb, The Waw Consecutive. It is to be expected that, although Syriac and Hebrew are closely related, some changes of expression will necessarily be made in translation. Thus the Hebrew Waw consec. with the Imperf. is by all odds most frequently translated by the Syriac Waw with the Pf., as we should expect. About 215 cases of such usage were noted.
In a few cases the Syriac Part. is used - 19 in all. Actually 11 of these
19 cases consist in ִּהָּלְךָ (לֹא לְךָ = מָלָךְ). In two anomalous cases (4:3 and 11:1)
the Impf. with Waw consecutive is translated by the Impf. ִּהָּלְךָ and it could then as well be a Part. In
any case the use of the Waw was most probably because of a desire to
here was not governed by the meaning of the Waw consecutive with the Impf.,
but freely interpreted the respective actions as continuing in past time. The remaining nine cases are really problem-
other than in Syriac. The four verses in 11:17 and 18 are

The Hebrew Waw consecutive with the Pf. is also accurately rendered
using the Syriac Waw with the Impf.

Other Tenses. Other tense equivalences are what would be expected.

The ordinary Hebrew Impf., Pf., and Part. are translated by the corresponding
form in Syriac. As would be expected, however, the Syriac had a tendency to
use the participle more frequently than does the Hebrew and especially to
employ paraphrastic constructions with the verb ִּהָּלְךָ to express nuances of
the Pass. Part. is used for the Pf.: 1:3 ִּהָּלְךָ; a few times the
Part. for the Hebrew Impf.: 6:9 ִּהָּלְךָ or for the Pf. with Waw
consecutive: 2:13 ִּהָּלְךָ. Cases of a Part. with ִּהָּלְךָ for the
Hebrew Pf. are rare and explainable by interpretation of the situation: 1:4
A few times the Syriac has a Pf. for the Hebrew
Part., but these are chiefly where the Part. has the article and the Syriac
turns it into a construction with the relative pronoun (the J.P.S. Version
does the same): ִּהָּלְךָ Certainly the translation is
fair and accurate.
of more interest are eleven places where the Syriac Pf. translates a plain Hebrew Impf. (2:20; 3:14 & 15 five times; 3:7, and 3:27 and 28 four times). In 2:20 probability the Paal pointing of L is wrong (the Paal meaning is "deliver") and it could then as well be understood as a Part. In 3:7 possibly the Syriac Pf. was used because of a desire to change the reference into past time. The remaining nine cases are really problems in the Hebrew rather than in Syriac. The four cases in 3:27 and 28 are interesting as showing in the prayer several Hebrew Impfs. which alternate in such a way with the Impf. with a Waw consecutive as to make one wonder about their syntax. In 3:14 and 15 the situation is similar. The same Hebrew verbs are used in the Impf., which in 7 exactly parallel cases in this chapter are Pf. or Waw consecutive with the Impf. Why there is this variation in the Hebrew is a question. At all events the Syriac translates these nine Impfs. by the Pf. tense (the J.P.S. Version uses the past) following the true meaning of the Hebrew and not being bound by formal rules of tense equivalence.

The Infinitive. Special attention may be paid to the translation of the infinitive inasmuch as Cornill accuses the Feshitta of Ezekiel of too great freedom in its treatment of נקוק. He says that it is omitted 4 times and paraphrased 10 times adding that נקוק is literally translated גנ Gavin only in the phrase נקוק 들어ו אללאו לải. In Nehemiah, however, the Inf. seems to be rather accurately represented. The Hebrew uses Lamedh with the Inf. about 75 times. Of these, 60 are quite literally represented in the Syriac by a

(2) "Zechiel" p 149
corresponding Inf. with Lamedh. In the 8 cases where  "'א" is used in Nehemiah, however, a Syriac Inf. is never used. Where the context indicates a Pl. subject of the phrase in question, the Syriac conjunction and Pl. Part. are used (א' ל"ו כ"ו). Where the Sing. is expected, the Syriac uses the conjunction with the Pf. (א' ל"ו כ"ו). This usage, far from being a freedom of the Syriac translator is a case of accuracy, for the Hebrew Inf.  'א" has an idiomatic force not found in the usual cases of the Inf. and it should be rendered differently. The Syriac does not prefer this particular idiom (although it is found in certain non-Biblical Aramaic) as collective and continuous Sing. in Hebrew, but

The seven or so remaining instances of the Hebrew Inf. with Lamedh are translated in special ways probably showing some slight freedom or error. Two are omitted by the Syriac and the rest rendered by a Pf. or Part. in a way not surprising in their contexts. We should conclude that the Lamedh with the Inf. is rather accurately rendered in Nehemiah.

There are also five cases of the Hebrew Inf. with Caph in a temporal clause which are all translated as we should expect by  ק with either the Perf. or Part. of the verb. One case of  ק with the Inf. is represented by  ק with the Syriac Part. Three cases of  ק with the Inf. are translated by  ק with the Perf. or Part. It would seem that in Nehemiah the Peshtitta has with few exceptions translated the Hebrew infinitives with real accuracy, nicely turning the Hebrew idioms into good Syriac which sometimes may be different in form, but is identical in meaning.

A further remark concerning the verb and its treatment may be made. The Syriac tendency to insert the copula 区块 or 卻 when the Hebrew nominal sentence dispenses with it, can be illustrated in Nehemiah. Eleven instances were noted with none where the Syriac would omit a copula found in the Hebrew.

Also we may note that occasionally the Syriac verb disagrees from its Hebrew original in number. In some ways this phenomenon could be considered under the treatment of nouns because one cause of the disagreement is a subject regarded as collective and construed Sing. in Hebrew, but regarded as Pl. in Syriac and necessitating a Pl. verb. Other factors also in enter, sometimes. Note 3:6, 女/ 却, where the subject is compound in both the Hebrew and Syriac contexts. On the other hand in 8:2 the subjects are again compound, but only the Syriac has a Pl. verb: 女/ 却. The fact is that neither Hebrew nor Syriac are consistent in the agreement of subject and predicate and we are therefore not surprised at some variation of this sort.

The Noun. There are of course any number of cases where the usual genitival paraphrase is used in Syriac to translate the simple Hebrew construct state. Frequently the nomen rectum has the pronominal suffix attached; more often it does not but is simply followed by Daleth. Likewise, the Hebrew article is regularly rendered by the Syriac emphatic state when the article is the ordinary sign of definiteness of the noun. However, the Hebrew article sometimes has other meanings and is then appropriately rendered in other ways. Thus it sometimes is used on quasi proper names or...
In gentiles where the Syriac does not need to express it. Again the
article may be used on a participle in the predicate position and be
properly translated by a relative particle used with a relative clause
in the Syriac. This is a matter of normal Syriac idiom and does not
warrant the charge of freedom in translation.

More serious is the matter of Syriac nouns which do not agree
in number with the corresponding Hebrew nouns. There are many cases
(over 60 were counted) where the disagreement is the natural consequence
of the Hebrew preferring a collective while the Syriac does not, or
vice versa. Cf. for example 1:6 יַּעַרְבָּד / יַעַרְבָּד. Interestingly, in the
similar phrase in 1:11 the Syriac has the Sing. like the Hebrew. Again in
5:17 the collective בַּּעַרְבָּד is rendered בַּּעַרְבָּד. In 7:61 the word יַעַרְבָּד becomes
(אָּהַרְבָּד). Likewise א is turned into the Fl. in 9:24. A regular variation
is לַּעַרְבָּד for "staircase" where the Hebrew has the Fl.וּניַּקְקָנִים (12:37 etc.).
Some of these instances are slightly interpretative as 12:85 יַעַרְבָּד / לַּעַרְבָּד.

On the other hand, the difference between many of these Syriac Fl. forms
and the Sing. is only the presence of Sejame, so the frequency of this
variation should not be emphasized as it is often merely editorial.

There are a few other cases beside these 60 where the difference
is a little wider and depends somewhat on interpretation. Again the difference
is often just in the use of Sejame so not too much should be built upon it.

Important departures of this sort are mentioned under II - Free renderings.
For instance, in 2:7 & 9 the translator took liberties in rendering "governors
beyond the river" מְנִיַּקְקָנִים by מְנִיַּקְקָנִים. In the same context he speaks of a
letter" from the king of Persia instead of in the Pl. Again in 3:18 ἁγιωτάν is rendered simply because it is obvious the leader of this portion of work did not build the wall by himself. The translator has adopted the viewpoint of an interpreter here. In 4:5 ἀντίστροφον is rendered ὁ φήμης ἡμέρας. This is likely not because "sin" is in itself collective, but the translator chose to emphasize the sins of Tobiah and Sanballat by using the Pl. phrases.

In a similar fashion pronouns show a variation of number. An example of a pronoun with a compound antecedent is found in 6:14 "Remember Tobiah and Sanballat ἔστιν ἡ ἤπειρος ἡμέρας." Another type of disagreement in the number of a pronoun is that in 8:17 ὁ δέκατος ὁ θεάτης ὁ νησιώτης πλησίον, where it is a question of viewpoint whether the translator should speak of every one and his roof or every man and their roofs. It is no great freedom.

Prepositions and the Conjunction. The Hebrew prepositions Beth, Lamedh, Caph, and Min and the conjunction Waw were compared with their Syriac equivalents in order to judge the degree of freedom with which they have been treated and the extent to which they have suffered in translation and subsequent copying. Statistics will be presented which may be useful in outlining the situation, especially since these particles are omitted from the Index when the correspondence of Hebrew and Syriac is exact. The statistics, however, must be regarded as approximate because it is often a question whether a given variation should be classified as due to legitimate idiomatic usage or is the result of freedom in translation or is a mistake. Those variations which recur regularly and rather frequently have been taken as legitimate idioms. The others have more usually been called free translations.
In about 245 cases the Hebrew Lamedh is translated by the Syriac Lamedh. In slightly more instances there is a divergence. The approximately 270 cases where the Hebrew Lamedh and the Syriac Lamedh are not equivalent were classified as follows: In 40 cases the Syriac Lamedh served as the sign of the accusative which was marked, generally, by the Hebrew י or י. In about 35 more cases it represented י in such phrases as "say unto", "hearken unto", etc., or in expressing motion toward an object. A similar usage was the 5 instances of translation of the locative Hebrew or adverbial accusative by the Syriac Lamedh. In about 35 more cases the Syriac uses ל instead to represent י. This is practically a compound preposition and a good equivalent of the Hebrew. Twenty more cases occur in Chapter 12:12-21 where the sons of the first generation of priests are listed each with a Lamedh of possession before his father's name in the Hebrew. The Syriac omits all these Lamedhs using a simple appositional construction. To summarize, out of 270 cases of non-equivalence, 125 are standard idioms which we naturally expect.

The remaining 145 cases of divergence are divided among less common idioms, instances of free rendering, mistakes occasioned by the corruption of the context, and mistakes in the use or transmission of the prepositions.

A very few instances may be cited for illustration. Probably idiomatic is 9:25 לבקשל והם ובש יין where the last word is rendered יין. Also 9:7 where God is addressed as the one יד בנות יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש יבש Yא. A free rendering may be illustrated by 9:15 where reference is made to the Law which יבש יבש יבש יבש Yא, of. 10:23 and 9:14.
where the same phrase is literally rendered. A mistake in the context which affects the preposition may be illustrated by 3:1 which refers to the settlement of the priests, etc. in their places: לַמְדָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. The Syriac renders it as if it were לַמְדָה יִשְׂרָאֵל and must change the preposition accordingly: לַמְדָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. Thus the Lamedh has been correctly treated in over 3/4 of the cases. Probably there are enough cases of true idiomatic usage among the remaining 145 cases of divergence to allow us to say that the mistreatment of the Lamedh occurs in about 15 or 20 per cent of the instances of its use.

Eith. There are 210 cases of exact equivalence of the Syriac and Hebrew preposition Eith and about 100 cases of divergence. Of these 100 cases perhaps half can be laid to idiomatic usage and the rest to free rendering or mistake, but these alleged idioms are not always so clear as those frequent ones noted for Lamedh. One frequent idiom is the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל for יִשְׂרָאֵל This recurs with slight variation 13 times. Also the date formulas show some divergence. 6:15 mentions "the fifteenth day of Elul" יִשְׂרָאֵל and there is similar variation in 3:3 and 9:1. Several times the Syriac adds an extra Eith with an extra pronoun which is unusual in Hebrew, but is regular in Syriac, thus: 13:1 יִשְׂרָאֵל / כָּלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל The usage with regard to this particular phrase varies somewhat. In the prophets Is. 4:2 and Am.9:11 add the preposition and pronoun. Is.4:1; 3:19 and a number of other places translate the Hebrew word for word without the addition.

A case of free rendering typical of several is 8:4 which says that Ezra stood to read יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, all of which is represented by
The meaning is approximately the same. A mistake in the context causing a mistake in the preposition may be illustrated again by the confusion of \( אב \) and \( יב \). In 4:12 we read: 
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which is rendered by the Syriac 

![Syriac text](syriac-url)

Some Greek evidence is lacking, but enough remains to support MT. Another frequent mistake or free rendering is the omission of a word carrying a preposition.

The preposition \( אב \) like the Lamedh is thus seen to be poorly handled in approximately 15 per cent of the instances of its use.

**Caph.** There are only 44 cases to consider here. In 39 the Caph is rendered literally by \( ג \) or, occasionally, by the adverb \( ל \). Ten more cases are accounted for by the use of \( ג \) plus the finite verb to represent Caph with the Hebrew Inf. Const. in a temporal clause. Twice in a similar way \( ג \) with the Pä. is so treated. Mistakes in the treatment of Caph are thus remarkably few especially considering its similarity to Beth in both Hebrew and Syriac scripts. The two cases of non-equivalence noted seem rather to be free renderings. They are: 4:12 \( ג \) / \( ל \) and 7:2 \( ג \) / \( ל \)

**Min.** Here the exact equivalences are about 90 and the divergences are about 25. About 10 of these divergences are idioms such as the partitive in 11:1 \( אב \) (in contrast to \( יב \) earlier in the verse) for \( יב \) cf. also 10:37 and 11:2. A few, the other fifteen, were classified as free renderings or mistakes. For instance \( ג \) is added with a pronoun freely in 6:14 where Nehemiah prays against his enemies and the prophets: \( ג \) / \( בא \). A pure
The LXX agrees with MT which is doubtless correct.

Apparently the Min is mishandled about 13% of the time—a figure agreeing rather closely with the percentages for Lamedh and Beth.

The Conjunction. The subject here is much larger and only an overall picture can be given. There are about 900 cases of exact equivalence of the Hebrew and Syriac conjunctions and 375 cases of disagreement. However, of these cases of divergence almost 200 can be singled out as frequent, rather regular, idioms. Thus there are about 45 cases where in a compound number the Syriac has a sequence like "one hundred and twenty, and five," whereas the Hebrew almost without exception would have "one hundred twenty and five." This Syriac usage agrees with that of other Old Testament books as, for instance, in Gen. 5 (although the Hebrew there differs from that in Nehemiah putting the hundreds at the end). Indeed with great regularity the Syriac of Nehemiah puts a conjunction on the second member of a series of three whereas the Hebrew omits this conjunction. In longer series the Syriac has a notable tendency to uniformity putting a conjunction before every member after the first. The Hebrew is much more irregular.

Over a hundred cases of such disagreements in series were noted. Miscellaneous idioms account for 25 more. As noted above (p 27) "and" is frequently translated אַל וּכְלָו or by a similar phrase. "and" is nine times translated הַיְמָנָה and there are about 12 cases of a Hebrew Waw of asseveration or of apodosis being omitted in the Syriac. 4:15 or 1:1 may be cited as examples.
There remain between 175 and 200 cases of disagreement of the conjunctions - a figure which is not so large as might be expected in view of the easy corruption of the Waw in both scripts and the freedom with which we might expect them to be treated in translation. A few of these remaining cases, about 40, can be classified as due to the loss or addition of words requiring a change in the conjunction. For instance, 6:12 reads:

Elsewhere also in the enumeration of Nehemiah's enemies תֶּבֶנֶּה is added freely. In about 40 additional cases a confusion of the context results in a recasting of the phrases, in which the conjunction suffers change. 5:7 and 8 is an instance. Probably due to homoioteleuton a clause from vs. 8 is placed in vs. 7. In the resulting confusion a Hebrew Waw is dropped and a Syriac Waw added in a different position.

An instance of freedom in the use of the conjunctions is the translation of יְהָאוֹר or יְהָאָה, which are translated the in 4 places, but לֵי is לֵי in 13:28. Also a case of freedom is 9:5 where a pair of exhortations are connected by the Syriac Waw when the Hebrew has no conjunction. The reverse situation is just the opposite in 8:2.

In many more cases - almost a hundred - the conjunctions seem to be handled with disregard for accuracy. The carelessness which we observe may have been due to the translator or may have been the result of errors in transmission. Probably both factors entered in. Reference to the collation (4) of p. 111 for discussion of this verse.
Thus we see that the conjunction, like the common prepositions is badly treated a little less than 15 per cent of the time. Indeed in concluding our study of the prepositions and the conjunction, we may say that their treatment is not as poor as might be supposed when we make proper allowance for regular differences in style and expression between the two languages. Also some of the discrepancies concern not these words as such, but rather are due to other more major discrepancies in the context which affect these words. There remain, however, between 10 and 15 per cent of cases where these words are treated with unjustifiable freedom or have suffered from mistakes in translation or copying. Since all the prepositions (except the seldom used Caph) which were studied above, and also the conjunction, agree rather closely in the percentage of error, it seems to be a fair conclusion that their mistreatment reflects in large measure the generally poor condition of the Syriac text and its carelessness in translation.

Other idiomatic translations. A few other idiomatic constructions which recur several times may be noted here. Especially we may call attention to the insertion of words like ר י and ל in places where the Hebrew has a mere copula or understands a verb. For instance, 1:1 יבשת י in which is translated מ in cf. also 4:3, 18; 5:16, etc. For the similar addition of ל in cf. 1:3; 9:37 etc.

Another idiom which only occurs once, yet is quite clear is 4:6 where it says the wall was being finished אספ ת in Another idiomatic translation which may be cited is 13:19 שנתי.
translated

where the active impersonal construction of the Hebrew is turned into a passive in Syriac with an appropriate subject supplied. A last idiom of several more which could doubtless be listed here is 13:24 ִּֽנְַּּר / ְִּֽנְַּּר, where the Pl. is used for the distributive. Other idioms similar to these, but perhaps reflecting a little greater freedom will be discussed in the following section.

II Free Renderings due to Ordinary Syriac Style.

The instances of free translation due to regular Syriac idiom which were discussed in the previous section, are found in any translation of a document where the work is faithful, but not stilted. Each language has its own idioms, and some minor changes of order and phraseology will be necessary unless a translation be given resembling that by Aquila. Of course for textual critical purposes we should prefer a translation like Aquila's, but the Peshitta of Nehemiah is far removed from that. Much greater freedom was exercised in the translation here than was necessary and instances of this freedom will now be given. This section will list the free renderings which satisfactorily represent the Hebrew sense, but are not literal translations. They do not show a conscious violation of the Hebrew text and yet they are more free than necessary and probably should not have been used if the translation were to be really accurate. These approximate translations
are used in most cases to improve the Syriac style and make the work more self-explanatory to the people for whom it was intended.

1:1 The Syriac month ܐܬܐ was December; ܘܒ were January. The Hebrew ܓܠ was November-December (E.B.E.) and therefore the translation here is good. In Zech.7:1 again translates ܓܠ and it is designated "the ninth month".

1:2 A fairly common translation.

1:3 The Hebrew has a construction analogous to the internal object. The Syriac avoids this repetition translating by Cornell remarks that in Ezekiel the internal object construction is avoided by the Syriac. Elsewhere in Nehemiah a true internal object construction is retained in the translation of 12:43 and is employed also in the translation of 5:1 where the Hebrew does not use one. On the other hand, in 13:13 where the subject and verb are from the same root, the Syriac avoids the redundancy just as it does in 1:3. Note also 6:7: We cannot say that in Nehemiah the internal object construction is avoided. The usage varies.

1:5 This is a free but correct interpretation of the interjection. Likewise in 1:11 the particle of entreaty is rendered .

1:6 places the mention of "ears" after "eyes" in the petition which - - - - - - - - - - -

(5) op.cit. p. 149.
reads מַאֲכָלָה לְהֵרֵבָה לְעֵינָיו לְעָדָה בָּיִם. This transposition is made in the Syriac because the petition proceeds with the verb "to hear".

LXX has the order of MT. The Syriac smoothed things out.

1:6 מַאֲכָלָה לְהֵרֵבָה לְעֵינָיו לְעָדָה בָּיִם. The Syriac freely recasts the expression, but the sense is not altered.

1:11 מַאֲכָלָה לְהֵרֵבָה LXX. The Syriac uses the pronoun for variety as the sentence just previously used מַאֲכָלָה LXX. translated

2:6 מַאֲכָלָה לְהֵרֵבָה לְעֵינָיו LXX. The Syriac is briefer, simpler, and gives the Hebrew sense, but it is somewhat free.

3:2 מַאֲכָלָה LXX. Throughout this chapter, this phrase of simply מַאֲכָלָה is used for מַאֲכָלָה מַאֲכָלָה or מַאֲכָלָה. This is quite a legitimate translation as מַאֲכָלָה may be used to mean "place" (cf. B.D.R. p. 680). We may remark that the J.P. S. Version puts it similarly "next unto him" etc., but the LXX treats it very literally מַאֲכָלָה מַאֲכָלָה.

4:3 מַאֲכָלָה לְהֵרֵבָה LXX. This seems to be a minor but curious variation of expression. It is the familiar Semitic genitive construction with adjectival force. Both expressions mean "their stone wall".

4:7 מַאֲכָלָה לְהֵרֵבָה LXX. This is a free translation, but an accurate representation of the Hebrew meaning. The LXX, however, translates quite literally מַאֲכָלָה מַאֲכָלָה מַאֲכָלָה. The rendering for clarification.
This transposition is made in the Syriac because the petition proceeds with the verb "to hear". The LXX has the order of MT. The Syriac smoothed things out.

1:6 The Syriac freely recasts the expression, but the sense is not altered.

1:11 The Syriac uses the pronoun for variety as the sentence just previously used. The translated

2:6 The Syriac is briefer, simpler, and gives the Hebrew sense, but it is somewhat free.

Throughout this chapter this phrase, or simply, is used for translated

This is quite a legitimate translation as may be used to mean "place" (cf. B.D.E. p. 330). We may remark that the J.P.S. Version puts it similarly "next unto him" etc., but the LXX treats it very literally .

This seems to be a minor but curious variation of expression. It is the familiar Semitic genitival construction with adjectival force. Both expressions mean "their stone wall."

This is a free translation, but an accurate representation of the Hebrew meaning. The LXX, however, translates quite literally .

This is just a more specific rendering for clarification.
This case of free translation may be likened to that in 4:7 above. The Syriac represents the Hebrew, but not literally. The LXX has an interesting attempt at a single Syriac word, but it does not fully appreciate the Hebrew idiom;

The translation is in accord with the purpose of the translator to produce a practical version. He evidently translated the month designations into those common among his contemporaries. Cf. 1:1 above, but in 8:3 this same phrase is rendered which is a free but correct rendering.

This is the usual translation for this phrase occurring also in 8:9 and 9:3. The plain word כִּיֵּה is translated literally in 7 instances. It is expanded by the word כִּיֵּה in 8:3; by כִּיֵּה in 13:3; and by כִּיֵּה in 10:34. The Syriac is rendered כִּיֵּה כִּיֵּה in 9:10 and 14. Apparently a degree of freedom was allowed in the translation, but the usual phrase for the sacred volume was כִּיֵּה כִּיֵּה. The first impression of the translator seems to have been not quite accurate. Elsewhere in Nehemiah it is poorly treated. In 1:5 it is rendered כִּיֵּה and in 13:28 by mistake כִּיֵּה. The phrase כִּיֵּה in Genesis is regularly כִּיֵּה in the sense of refusing God's law.

The Syriac has used a more abstract idiom, but the meaning is the same.
The Syriac interpretation here perhaps is not justified, but it seems possible and the Hebrew is not too clear. E.D.E. (p. 53) says "fixed provision".

11:25 to 30 The single Syriac word ְִּֽמַּץֹּ is used to translate the various Hebrew words for "suburbs": ְִּֽמַּץֹּ (11:25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31), ְִּֽמַּץֹּ (11:25, 30) and ְִּֽמַּץֹּ (11:30).

13:18 ְִּֽמַּץֹּ The single Syriac word ְִּֽמַּץֹּ is used to translate the various Hebrew words for "suburbs": ְִּֽמַּץֹּ (11:25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31), ְִּֽמַּץֹּ (11:25, 30) and ְִּֽמַּץֹּ (11:30).

13:13 ְִּֽמַּץֹּ/ This could easily be a mistake in copying. In 13:2 the same word is ְִּֽמַּץֹּ in A but ְִּֽמַּץֹּ in L. Some freedom was apparently felt in the use of the divine names. Cf. p. 119 for data on the variation between ְִּֽמַּץֹּ and ְִּֽמַּץֹּ.

13:19 ְִּֽמַּץֹּ/ ְִּֽמַּץֹּ which is a free but correct rendering. The same word is ְִּֽמַּץֹּ in A but ְִּֽמַּץֹּ in L. Some freedom was apparently felt in the use of the divine names. Cf. p. 119 for data on the variation between ְִּֽמַּץֹּ and ְִּֽמַּץֹּ.

13:20 ְִּֽמַּץֹּ In the context, mention is made of the merchants staying outside the city wall with the gates shut against them. According to the basic meaning of ְִּֽמַּץֹּ this meant they passed a couple of nights thus and therefore the Syriac ְִּֽמַּץֹּ freely says that it happened a day or two. It seems from the context, however, that it happened on a couple of successive Sabbaths. The first impression of the translator seems to have been not quite accurate. This addition for emphasis is also found in v. 14 after ְִּֽמַּץֹּ. This addition for emphasis is also found in v. 14 after ְִּֽמַּץֹּ. It is added again before ְִּֽמַּץֹּ.
III. Conscious Interpretative Departures from the Hebrew.

The extent of freedom exercised by the translator of Nehemiah may be shown very well by the frequency of his conscious departures from MT. He did not hesitate to amplify, change, or subtract from the text which he had before him. We may certainly say that he took liberties with his original which were not justified and which show that he acted to some extent as a reviser as well as a translator.

In this section the modifications of the text of an exegetical nature will be listed as additions, omissions, and variations. Those departures from MT now to be considered are distinguished from not legitimate free renderings already discussed and from actual mistakes of translation which will be taken up in the following chapter.

4. Additions.

A minor addition of no special significance.

A similar clause is found in the preceding verse and is added here to make more definite the unexpressed subject of the verb.

This addition for emphasis is also found before נו in vs. 4 after יבשנ.

added for emphasis. It is added again before גת. ————

*Text continues...*
The translator felt that the extra word was needed for smoothness.

The following Hebrew phrase probably suggested the insertion. Probably with the guild names we should understand the word as merely "belonging to."

Note that the same phrase in vss. 26 and 27 is translated literally both times. The insertion in 3:25 was possibly to distinguish that reference from the two which follow which were presumed to be different. Burrows feels that the "tower that projects from the upper house of the king" of vs. 25 is not a part of the wall itself, but near it and that it is probably different from the tower mentioned in vss. 26 and 27, but he is not positive. In this report Burrows has given an exhaustive analysis of the towers and gates mentioned in Neh. 3. He feels that little definite can be concluded as to their locations, but argues that the "water gate to the East" was probably in the eastern wall and on the northern section thus opening into the upper Kidron valley. The enumeration of the portions of the wall, he thinks, is counterclockwise. He somewhat prefers the view that Nehemiah's wall included only the southeastern hill of Jerusalem, but admits that a larger area could have been included. He concludes "Evidently assuming that his readers were acquainted with the points named, the writer has neglected to give us sufficient data for locating exactly any one of them."

(6) Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research No. XIV pp 127
(7) op. cit. p 140 cf. the whole report pp 115 - 140 cf. also his discussion of "Nehemiah's Tour of Inspection" in E.A.S.O.R. No. 64 (1936) pp 11-21.
4:15 אֲנָחַת / + simply supplying a subject for the impersonal passive verb. Cf. 6:1 where the same thing is done.

4:15 אֲנָחַת / + adds רֵאֶה after it just to make the sentence more explicit.

4:22 יְבִלָּה / + This is probably a slight interpretation. The Hebrew contrasts lodging within Jerusalem with camping outside. The Syriac seems to contrast lodging in the streets of Jerusalem as guards and sentries with going into the houses at night to sleep.

5:3 יָבִיט וְמֵעָמ / + This is added under the influence of לֶשֶׁכֶן in a similar situation at the end of vs. 2. In the same way לֶשֶׁכֶן is added at the end of vs. 4.

5:4 יָבִיט וְמֵעָמ / + This recasts the Hebrew sentence מַגְּשָׂה מַגְּשָׂה to make it read: יָבִיט וְמֵעָמ The translator added מַגְּשָׂה and changed the preposition לֶשֶׁכֶן to מַגְּשָׂה. The Hebrew is elliptic, but the Syriac seems clearly to have altered the sense and given an illogical interpretation.

5:5 יָבִיט וְמֵעָמ / + The addition is free, but easily explainable. The verb which the Hebrew understands is made explicit in the Syriac and the extra noun is added to the items listed to make the list more inclusive.
5:13 These words are added in view of the following mention of Divine worship. Apparently the custom of the captives returning "from Tel Lea" and "to Sanballat in Damascus (10:8) and to Charan. This is probably wrong and indicates an abrupt change of subject. The Syriac phrase is: They evidently read as a verb and supplied the name of the king. The Hebrew clearly says that Nehemiah was accused of reigning. Note the evidence that the translator's LXX was unpunctuated. The LXX supports MT. which was probably all too accurate! In the same way there is added at the end of the verse: Scroll, to emphasize Sanballat's sins.

5:16 These words were added as an interpretation of the phrase explicit.

5:17 The Syriac phrase is: The phrase is turned into a verbal construction in the Syriac.

5:18 This is simply adding freely the contents of the oath mentioned in the Hebrew.
the translator of Ezr. 2:59. Elsewhere there is not much evidence of harmonizing this chapter, chiefly names, with its parallel in Ezr. 2 and this instance may not be conscious harmonizing but simply may reflect a similar geographical interpretation. The Syriac reading has the captives returning "from Tel Melah" and "to Tel Haresha (A has לְמֵאָה) and to Cherub." This is probably wrong and Hawley remarks on the Ezra passage "Evidently the translator knew nothing of the geography of this region." 8 Unfortunately, we know but little more! On the form ֶלְמֵאָה found in A, cf. p. 63 (a).

7:66 יִנָּהוּ / + אָלֵג An interpretative addition caused by assigning this priest to the Urim and Thummim.

7:70 יִנָּהוּ / + אָלֵג This is doubtless a wrong addition because the work at that time was upon the wall.

8:4 יֵתַר יִנָּהוּ / + אָלֵג A simple addition to make the phrase explicit.

9:1 Before the phrase יֵתַר יִנָּהוּ the Syriac adds the verb לָכַּז/ו for clarity from a parallel expression in the preceding verse, which is probably to be understood in the Hebrew.

9:8 יֵתַר יִנָּהוּ / + אָלֵג This name is added among the well-known list of the nations of Canaan to make the total of seven. Other instances will be cited to show that the translators were thoroughly familiar with the rest of the Old Testament and occasionally harmonized, unconsciously their readings to other Biblical passages.

(8) op. cit. p. 28.

9:10 Freely added for emphasis.

At the end of vs. 28 this word is used in a similar manner and it was a natural addition here. Cf. 11:9 above.
A simple addition to make the phrase explicit.

A quotation from Ex. 32:5. Also is added before so as to read: In both cases the additions are unconscious harmonizations to the original passage and illustrate the translator's Biblical knowledge. cf. 9:8 above.

Also adds before. Probably we should not think of a doublet here, but only consider the addition as a verb supplied where the Hebrew understands a copula.

Also adds at the beginning of the verse for smoothness. The Hebrew verb (which is translated literally) comes at the end of a long clause and the translator felt the need to supply a verb earlier.

The Hebrew is somewhat elliptical and the Syriac is more explicit. This is omitted because the verse is interpreted differently. The verb is simply repeated for clarity from a parallel expression in the preceding verse.

Like above, this is repeated from the instance earlier in the verse.

On the contrary cf. 13:7 where is omitted from the phrase in which the Hebrew just dropped one.

This is a surprisingly rare addition.

Freely added for emphasis.

At the end of vs.25 this word is used in a similar expression and it was a natural addition here. Cf. 11:9 above.
probably relieved the trouble by another easy omission. We cannot be sure, however, that the omission is not connected with the confused state of the text in the first part of the verse. The LXX also omits this phrase, but follows MT closely in the first part of the verse.

5:12 סולג נַתְיָה לְנֶבֶּה / S. omits. This omission seems probably to be due to the confused state of the previous context. Possibly it was omitted because it was felt to be redundant. The Hebrew continues:

6:3 מִיָּה / S. omits as unnecessary. The pronoun contained in the verb sufficiently expresses the sense.

6:5 נַמְל / S. omits. The translator may have not only considered the word unnecessary, but thought that such a letter would not naturally be "open".

6:11 נַמְל נַמְל / S. omits the whole phrase. This is in connection with substituting מָלַת for מָלַת. The synonyms and repeated expressions are very freely treated.

7:33 נַמְל / S. omits this designation of נַמְל and also in vs. 34 the similar designation of נַמְל. It is not a usual use of נַמְל and the Syriac solves the difficulty again by an easy omission. What the true text was is not so easy to say. In Ezr. 2:29 MT omits נַמְל after Nebo, but not after Elam. After Elam the LXX in Nehemiah says נַמְל which doubtless transliterates נַמְל. After Nebo G^NA has εὐαγγελον while G^P here has נַמְל. This probably developed from נַמְל and gave rise to the other reading נַמְל. If this be true the LXX supports MT.

According to Kittel 26 MSS read נַמְל in vs. 33 and 9 do so in vs. 34. There seems to be no reason to doubt MT.
8:11 סותה ...תליכת / S. omits both of these words just retaining their corresponding verbs: עָלָּהוּ. The translator may have thought the words unnecessary. However, because of other somewhat parallel cases we may think the omission was because of the similar phraseology of the next verse 13.

9:25 הָעֲרוּס / S omits as unnecessary making the previous verb הָעֲרוּס govern all the objects listed.

11:3 הנבון (in MT this is early in vs. 4). S. omits this word and the conjunction on the previous word הנבון which is then kept with the preceding verse. The result is a change in the sense of the passage and a poor connection for the following words. It is a rather violent change. The reason for it also, is not apparent.

12:25 סותה מתויספ יִשְׂרָאֵל / S omits these three words surely by homoioteleuton as the next word is הנבון. The homoioteleuton would be even easier if it occurred during the copying of the Syriac because the words for "porter" and "gate" differ only in the vowels and the article is not expressed in the Syriac as it is in the Hebrew here.


13:4 סותה פֶּסְחוּת / S. omits all this. There is no other omission by the translator this long and it may be that a confusion arose with הנבון 7 for הנבון for (or הנבון).

13:18 סותה פֶּסְחוּת / S omits probably because of the difficulty occasioned by the confused context. Cf. "Mistakes of the translator p.12"
1. : This was felt to agree better with the subject. The mention of the speaker comes later.

2. The phrase was expanded to be more explicit. The LXX has ἐν ὑπομονῇ ἀρετήματος. The explanation of this variation is not clear. The LXX agrees with M.T. Perhaps it is just a free expression, taking the Hebrew to mean "capital city," but the similar expression in 2:5 is literally translated.

2:3 The translator has substituted a more general word.

2:6 According to the Sæmæs, the Syriac now takes the epithet to apply to both Sanballat and Tobiah.

2:14 The order of words is peculiar in the Hebrew to express "for the beast under me to pass." But the LXX agrees with M.T. Perhaps the Syriac translator, feeling the difficulty just omitted מִלָּה and freely supplied מִלָּה.

3:15 The translator apparently misunderstood the proper name of the "pool of Shelah" and took it as a common noun. In this way he solved the difficulty of the Lamedh of מִלָּה which
really gives a double terminus to this section of the wall. The Syriac interprets the passage thus: "and the wall of the pools of the exit of waters to the garden of the king." Probably the interpretation is wrong, and the name of the pool should be connected with the spring or with the tunnel of Siloam. Elsewhere, as in Is. 8:6, מַשׁיָּהַ is taken as a proper name. Furrows calculates 9 that if Nehemiah's walls did not include the southwestern hill, the Pool of Shelah would fall near the traditional Pool of Siloam. The translator probably made this identification, as a pool at the end of the famous tunnel would best fit the phrase לְשֵׁלָה. Probably the Lamedh of לְשֵׁלָה should be taken as "belonging to" so as to locate the pool in relation to the garden. The J.P.S. version says "by"; Fattan (in loc.) "at".

3:20 ַם / לָשׁוֹנָה The translator thought the context indicated a different interpretation and felt quite free to make the change.

3:23 מַשׁיָּה / מַשׁיָּה The previous מַשׁיָּה was rendered מַשׁיָּה; and therefore the singular suffix was required.

4:2 מַשׁיָּה / מַשׁיָּה This gives the general idea of Tobian's sarcasm, but is not a true translation.

4:3 מַשׁיָּה / מַשׁיָּה Note the avoidance of the conditional מַשׁיָּה and cf. Cornill's observations of a similar tendency in Ezekiel. 10 Yet in the other ten times מַשׁיָּה is used it is 8 times translated by מַשׁיָּה or a compound like מַשׁיָּה and the other two times (after verbs of swearing) it

(g) Annual p. 138.
(10) op. cit. p. 113.
Evidently the preposition was interpreted to be "over us" instead of "against them" and the different pronoun was used because of the different interpretation of ל. Many examples could be given of just this attitude on the part of the translator. Instead of choosing his interpretation of the main words of a sentence in such a way as to allow accurate rendering of the prepositions, pronouns, etc., he would first decide what the passage meant by cursory examination of the main words and then would alter the minor words freely so as to fit his opinion.

The Syriac adds some words and interprets: יִּתְנֶשֶׁת בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה הַקְּדָשִּׁים בְּאֹרֶץ לֵבָנָן, לֹא. At first sight this seems to be mention of three halves! Doubtless the first לֹא is to be considered as all-inclusive and should be translated "there was a dividing of the people." The following section is then only slightly free.

A free interpretation of the place of the trumpeters.

A free, and rather natural, treatment of the pronouns after יִּתְנֶשֶׁת.

The exegesis is not strictly accurate and the insertion of the extra
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The customs of the nations are called a "reproach" in MT, but the derogatory figure is dropped in the translation.
The translator renders a difficult verse somewhat freely. Batten (in loc.) remarks "The ancients were puzzled by the passage." The J.P.S. version reads "I likewise, and my brethren, and my servants, might exact of them money and corn: I pray you, let us leave off this usury." The Syriac is approximately like the Hebrew as far as לָּכִי. The last part is evidently an exhortation to the nobles to give to the poor, instead of to remit the levy as MT has it.

5:11 The Hebrew in the relative clause refers again to the heavy exactions of the nobles. Perhaps the final clause in the Syriac does not come from the Hebrew at all, but is a free repetition of the concluding thought of the Syriac of vs. 10.

Perhaps the translator felt this change was necessary because these men are mentioned as coming from the nations around.

6:8 A toning down of a derogatory expression.

6:17 The noun is substituted for the relative pronoun to be more definite. The meaning is not changed.

7:5 This is a free treatment of the conjunction, but it alters the sense of the passage.
The series of Imps. is reduced into a series of Hts. with a change of
the pronoun to match. (The LXX agrees with MT).

9:18 Note the translator's strong
tendency to regularize and simplify expressions.

9:17 Probably the Syriac is merely using a bold paraphrase to translate
the first part of the passage, but is translating the last two words
literally. The LXX agrees with the Hebrew except that it reads "in
Egypt" for the last word. Kittel-Kahle notes several Hebrew Hts. w
which agree in this reading. Num. 14:4 has a similar phrase using
which Kittel-Kahle, perhaps correctly, adopts also here the
reading מְדַבֵּרָא.

9:21 At the end of the verse מְדַבֵּרָא is rendered
by: בְּכָרָא. This seems definitely to be a
reminiscence of Dt. 29:5 where in a similar context there is a
reference to sandals not growing old. Cf. 9:18 (p. 92) for a similar
equivalent in the translator's knowledge of the rest of the Old Testament.

9:30 The word מְדַבֵּר here needs something to complete the
meaning and probably we should understand מְדַבֵּר. The Syriac has not
followed this Hebrew idiom, it seems, but translated freely as if
the reading were מְדַבֵּר. The LXX follows MT literally.

9:38 Note the variation of the
pronouns and conjunctions in the series typical of the freedom used.
of MT were disregarded in order to secure a smoother reading
felt to be more in harmony with the context.

11:12 and 13 The pronouns on the initial words are reversed in the
translation: פֶּהַלְגִּילוֹת — יִשְׂרָאֵל An inaccurate
translation, but not serious. We may be surprised that the reading
"their brethren" was not adopted in both cases. The LXX agrees with MT.

11:24 It seems that the variation is due to paraphrase. The first part is
an extension and explanation of the phrase פֶּהַלְגִּילוֹת, taking וְכַל properly in the sense of "power" or "authority". The last four
words of the Syriac are a fair rendering.

12:27 This more definite and explicit translation was
doubtless suggested by the first word of vs. 28 מְצַר אֲשֶׁר
12:29 This may be a variation due to topographical
considerations.

12:31 Substitutes לֶדְךָ; לֶדְךָ for the name of the dung gate — מְצַר אֲשֶׁר.
Cf. 12:37 where לֶדְךָ; לֶדְךָ stands for the water gate — מְצַר אֲשֶׁר,
12:38 where לֶדְךָ; לֶדְךָ stands for the tower of the furnaces- מְצַר אֲשֶׁר,
12:39 where לֶדְךָ; לֶדְךָ stands for the prison gate — מְצַר אֲשֶׁר, and
12:39 where לֶדְךָ; לֶדְךָ stands for the tower of Hezekiah — מְצַר אֲשֶׁר.
(But cf. the discussion of this last instance on p. 27).
Strangely, all the gates referred to above have their appropriate
Syriac equivalents in chapter 3 where they all appear except the
"prison gate", which is nowhere else referred to. In 12:37-39 the
designations of the "Fountain gate", the "gate of Ephraim", the
"old gate", the "fish gate", the "tower of Hananeel", and the "sheep
gate" are all rendered accurately. It is hard indeed to account
for this variety of treatment of the different gates and even the
same gate in different contexts. There was apparently a tendency to
be not too specific of geographical details. Cf. 12:29 above. 11

12:40 מָצְבַּח לֹא This change makes the verb agree with the
translator's interpretation of the route of the dedicatory
procession. Note that the following preposition is therefore
changed from בְּ to סְדָד.

13:13 פַּלּוֹת מָתָא עָשָׂר לָכֵן פֶּתַּחֶם The
odd usage of בֵּית was interpreted freely, but satisfactorily. The
LXX renders it word for word מִקְסַמְתְּנִי תָּאָבִים מִן אֶלֶף אָבִים. 13:18 לֶאָה נְנָה מָחֵשׁ לָכֵן סְפָר קָדוֹשׁ נְנָה Note the avoidance
of the rhetorical question and cf. 4:2; 5:9; 13:23,27 for similar
treatment. It appears that the translator always avoided a
rhetorical question even though it became necessary to make
rather radical changes to do so. Other types of questions are
correctly handled.

The evidence presented in the above three sections of this
passage would seem to support the assertion that our translation is
and idiomatic, sometimes poor, but it does in the main parallel the
original text. (See p. 22). The translator habitually smoothed over the
colloquialism and made the indefinite expressions more explicit. We would
expect the translators to do this, had they not been careful to maintain the
freedom which recasts the expression completely. The freedom

(11) Furrowes, op. cit., gives further discussion.
text before him, we may say that he gave the general sense usually pretty well. He did not hesitate, however, to change the forms of expression or the pronouns, prepositions, etc., to suit his purposes. The LXX seems to be much more literal in its renderings. On the other hand, the LXX omits much more—as has been mentioned, about 25 whole verses but also many phrases and major parts of other verses.

There does not seem to be any tendential exegesis discernible in the translation. Traces of Jewish or Christian feeling do not seem to appear. Important anthropomorphisms do not occur in Nehemiah, but the ears and eyes of God are mentioned in 1:6 and correctly translated (though the order is reversed). Also God’s good hand is said to be upon Nehemiah in 2:9 etc., and this is literally rendered. These instances do not prove much, for the LXX also translates these passages literally. But there does not seem to be any extreme avoidance of anthropomorphism. Nor is Midrashic addition found. Several passages have been noted (9:8, 18, 21) where the translator definitely shows a good knowledge of the text of the rest of the Old Testament. More instances of this will be given under the “Mistakes of the Translator” in Chapter VI. There seem to be no discernible influences of the New Testament upon the translation although two instances have been alleged (pp. 57, 65) of a copyist’s error resulting from New Testament influence.

In short, the translation is reasonably good, but very free and can be used by the textual critic only with great care and after due allowances are made for its approximations in translation.
Chapter VI - Mistakes of the Translators.

After allowance is made for the natural alteration of the Hebrew idiom in translation, and for the freedom exercised by the translator, and also for changes in the Peshitta text through vicissitudes of transmission, there still remain to be studied many cases of divergence of the Hebrew and Syriac text. A few of these are probably due to errors which have crept into the Hebrew in the course of centuries. The great majority are doubtless errors made by the translator of the Peshitta of Nehemiah either because of ignorance, carelessness, or a faulty Hebrew text which he was using. In the present chapter as we study these remaining discrepancies we should approach a conclusion as to the value of the Peshitta to the textual critic of the Hebrew of Nehemiah. The mistakes will be listed in the order of their occurrence with brief discussion of the probable causes of error.

2:6 וְהָאָמָרָה / לְךָ This curious mistake may well have been caused by a misinterpretation of אַרְבָּאָשׁ, a rare word probably meaning "queen consort" taking it as from אָשׁ "ravish", a word considered obscene by the Masoretes (cf. E.D.E.). לְךָ is then a free paraphrase to avoid the difficulty.

2:12 יְמֵנָה / לַחַד LXX ἐξόα, Vg. Deus. This is a minor discrepancy with no apparent reason as far as the Syriac
is concerned. In view of the united testimony of the versions, we may wonder if MT here has not dropped the final stem of מִנְיָם in the course of later transmission. It would have been a very easy mistake to make, especially in view of the practice of abbreviating the Divine names.  

2:20 יִשְׂרָאֵל/ יַעֲקֹב ה LXX πατερ οὐ του. This appears to be carelessness in translation. The two following words are participles and it was natural for the pronoun מִנְיָם to be taken with all three words and have all of them treated as participles.

3:1,2 There is some confusion in the treatment of הָעֵשֶׁה. In vs.1 מִנְיָם is translated מַשָּׁה. This is probably an error of the original Peshitta for it includes the addition of the preposition מ thus: מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה for: מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה... מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה. In vs. 2 מִנְיָם is omitted entirely, מַשָּׁה is translated מַשָּׁה and finally מִנְיָם is omitted in A and rendered מַשָּׁה in L. As to the LXX, it follows MT closely in vs. 1. In vs. 2 it translates מַשָּׁה and מִנְיָם as מַשָּׁה and מַשָּׁה properly. We doubtless should conclude that the errors of the Syriac were due to carelessness or to a poor manuscript. Cf. p.62 for numerous instances of mistreatment of the consonants מ occurring in connection with names.

3:6 הָעֵשֶׁה / בָּשָׂר LXX: גּוֹ�ֲ יַמָּן סְנָא נאָא אָוָם. It appears to be a simple misreading for בָּשָׂר. In an unpointed text a mistake like this would be relatively easy, but the Yodh which the Syriac dropped was already read by the LXX translators.

(1) Perles,Analecten p.16 ff.
4:2 A group of mistakes stem from the words: הָעֵשֶׁב לְכָל מַחְיֶה וּמַהְיָה which is translated: מַחְיֶה וּמַהְיָה. Apparently מַחְיֶה was wrongly taken in its usual meaning "leave". (Cf. 3:8 above). Then, as usual, the interrogative was removed, it being a rhetorical question (cf. p. 102). Finally מַחְיֶה was taken as if it were מַחְיֶה, reading מַחְיֶה with the following. The LXX omits this part of the verse entirely. The Vg. supports MT. It is possible that in this instance MT is wrong and the Aleph was dropped by mistake. However in view of the adjacent corruption of the Peshitta and its generally poor condition, it is far more likely that the translator erred.

4:4 רָעְשֵׁנו The LXX supports MT. Kittel-Kahle notes that to the Syriac) also reads the first verse as 2 masc. pl., but many MSS read מַחְיֶה. There seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt the usual MT reading. The Hebrew MSS with which the Peshitta agrees were likely supplying a pronoun which is desired in this context, just as the Peshitta did.
The first part of the Syriac here is probably a free addition in this confused context, but in the last part מְיָדִים seems clearly to be read as מֶיָּדִים. This is understandable and witnesses to an unpointed text being before the translator, but his rendering of מְיָדִים by מְיָדוֹ is inexcusable. The presence of this preposition should have warned him against reading מְיָדִים. The LXX omits מְיָדִים but renders מְיָדִים by מְיָדִים. The whole verse is difficult in MT and something must be supplied. The J.P.S. version has supplied "they will be upon us", which is similar in sense to what the Syriac supplies.

This verse is much confused. Batten (in loc.) says "Here again we have a hopeless text." The LXX supports MT in general throughout the verse except that לִי reads the verb both times as if it were מִיָּדִים. The Syriac reads the same in the case of the first verb, but omits the second. Batten (without reference to the Syriac) also reads the first verb as 3 masc. pl., but leaves the second in the first person. The Syriac, taking its cue from the 3rd. masc.pl. (real or supposed) of the verb מִיָּדִים made the verse into a description of the enemy attack instead of Nehemiah's preparation for defense. Also the word מִיָּדִים (יָדִים) is translated מִיָּדָה as if it were מִיָּדָה. The Syriac here deals with a difficult word by a convenient metathesis.
4:14 נְקִôt הַכּוֹכָב / יַעֲקֹב as if from נְקִôt. The LXX supports MT. This only a difference of pointing and will naturally happen in translating an unpointed text. The reading נְקִות is, moreover, more natural to the Peshitta interpretation of the preceding verse. Note that in this ambiguous form the Syriac and LXX disagree.

4:16 בֵּית הָנֹלֶל / לִבְיָתְנֵי Apparently the translator read the form as if it were בֵּית נֹלֶל from נֹלֶל . Note, however, that the regular Hebrew word for the Levitical singers is the Polel form בֵּית נֹלֶל .

4:23 גֶּשֶם / גֶּשֶם omit the difficult phrase. The Syriac does not give any good evidence of a different Hebrew text. It apparently read בֵּית נֹלֶל for בֵּית נֹלֶל and interprets לִבְיָתְנֵי by לִבְיָתְנֵי . The rest was then filled in to make a passable translation.

5:2 תֶּלֶת / (ו)ו. The LXX supports MT. The reading (ו)ו is quite natural after the mention of sons and daughters and it is probably a careless slip of the translators suggested by the very similar word 'we'. It would seem to be equally possible that it is an inner Syriac error with (ו)ו changing to (ו)ו.

5:5 פִּסְמָה / פִּסְמָה This is an error of translation. The Hebrew idiom is rather well established being used five times in the Bible. The LXX interprets it here correctly. In Gen.31:29; Dt. 28:32; and Pro.3:27 the Peshitta interprets it correctly.

But in Micah 2:1 the Peshitta treats the expression somewhat as in Nehemiah 5:5. The misunderstanding causes other trouble:

(ו)ו is added. The suffix יִה is changed to (ו)ו.
This is evidently a case of mistranslation. The meaning of צו in the Hiphil "to counsel" is not used elsewhere in Hebrew and, though they knew it in Syriac, the translator did not feel justified in interpreting it so when translating Hebrew. Instead they made a bad guess.

5:7 and 8. A major dislocation has taken place, and the text in general is corrupt. The Hebrew has דיבר דברי in the middle of vs. 7 and again at the beginning of vs. 8. The Syriac has taken the clause which in MT follows the second דיבר דברי and has placed it after the first one, thus it has misplaced the entire passage:

It is, of course, possible that this dislocation is the error of a copyist. Other mistakes concern misreadings of the Hebrew text:

First, מֵנתָן is read מִנָּן in the idiom meaning "to be longsuffering." Apparently the translator misread the Beth as a Caph for the form מֵנתָן < מִנָּן. The LXX supports MT.

Second, מֵסְפִּי....ומָא is read מֵסְפִּי as if from מָא. The LXX reads אָפִּי...אָפִּי which probably supports MT. The difference was due to their use of an unpointed text.

Third, מִלּו The word is used again in Dt. 32:4 where the Peshitta renders it properly. In Neh, the LXX supports the Hebrew. Probably the translator read מִלּו. It is also possible that it is an inner Syriac error of מִלּו for מִלּו.

Finally, מֵסָפִי This phrase is part of the passage that is dislocated and perhaps a major confusion here was part of that misplacement. No good explanation is available.
be a mistranslation, but the details are not so easily accounted for. \[
\text{\ldots would very well translate \textit{\ldots}. Perhaps \textit{\ldots},}
\]
"small one" or "common people" could translate \(\textit{\ldots}\) which in the Arabic cognate means "to rear children" (E.D.F.). The Syriac as it stands seems to mean "and also the servants of the common people", but this does not suit the context very well. \(\textit{\ldots}\), in the next verse is translated properly. The LXX supports MT.

It seems impossible to tell how the Syriac arrived at this curious reading.

5:14 בִּרְלֵי בָּנֹי. The Syriac has a rather long addition thus:

\[
\text{\ldots}
\]

The LXX supports MT though translating a little freely. The Syriac first read \(\text{\ldots}\) as \(\text{\ldots}\). Then the phrase \(\text{\ldots}\) is expanded by a proverbial clause, the first part of which is quite like Samuel's self defense in I Sam. 12:3 or like Num.16:15.

5:15 בִּרְלֵי בָּנֹי This is apparently a smoothing out of a difficult word, but there seems to be no justification for it.

The LXX supports MT.

5:16 בִּרְלֵי בָּנֹי The LXX supports the Syriac as does also the Vg.

Kittel-Kahle notes that several MSS. read \(\text{\ldots}\). Possibly MT is wrong in writing the Pl., but the Pl. is the \textit{lectio difficilior} and the disagreeing witnesses may have all smoothed out the translation. It may be a case of the free use of persons which is notable in Biblical Hebrew.
5:17. The change in the pronoun was occasioned by the interpretation of אב as "gift" -ות. In the Syriac also means either "table" or "gift".

5:16. The error probably arose from taking ל as מ. The rest is free interpretation, influenced by the exegesis of the previous verse which, in the Syriac, represents others a bringing supplies to Nehemiah.

6:2. The first part of the translation probably is a free interpretation. To "meet together" and to "live together" are near enough to suit our translator. It is another question where he gets לא. Apparently the Beth was misread as the preposition Caph. לא could be pointed לא "a band of robbers", or לא "a wife's sister's husband". Probably the latter is intended in this context. But it is difficult to see how this was read from ל"ו. The LXX supports MT.

6:3. Apparently the translators read their unpointed text as לא. The LXX, like MT, reads the pronoun object auto (neuter to agree with the Greek antecedent).

6:12. Probably this was read as לא. This is freely interpreted as passive because the verbs before and after are passive. This necessitates a change in number also. Just before this word A wrongly adds פפ, perhaps as a kind of doublet. agrees with MT.

7:1. This is freely interpreted as passive because the verbs before and after are passive. This necessitates a change in number also. Just before this word A wrongly adds פפ, perhaps as a kind of doublet. agrees with MT.

7:2.
of a righteous man is practically taken over from Jos 1:1 etc.

Cf. 5:14 above for another reference to a familiar Old Testament

passage.

7:3 Apparently כה was misread in an unpointed text as ס cria. The LXX follows MT.

7:34 The two expressions are nearly equivalent.

the Syriac translation was perhaps influenced by השנ in vs.32.

7:13 There is a metathesis in the number. כב omits the final "five", but כא support MT. There are four other mistakes in numbers in the chapter. 7:15 has 644 for MT 648. 7:30 has 721 for MT 621.

7:63 has 42,470 total for MT 42,360. One might think that in this case the Syriac total has been adjusted to give the total of the Syriac figures, but both totals are far off from the sum of the figures given. Finally 7:67 has 7,333 for MT 7,337. In all of these places the LXX agrees with MT except in details where the Syriac agrees with MT. All or some of these errors may be chargeable to Syriac copyists, but it would be hard to prove the translator innocent. The first and third mistakes could be well explained as mistakes occasioned by the use of figures or letters to write the numbers. The second, fourth, and fifth mistake could as easily be explained as occurring in a text with the numbers written out as words.

7:85 The LXX has φησιν omitted the second member of the pair. The Syriac free rendering is rather good, calling attention as it does to their use in learning the Divine will.
The Syriac translator confused the Greek coin with the Persian daric which was more familiar to him.

8:1 ἀγαθή / ἀγαθόν. The Syriac, reading from an unpunctuated text takes the verb as ἀγαθόν. In this translation, they were wrong as is seen from the later word ἀγαθόν which the Syriac has to alter to ἀγαθόν. The LXX follows the pointing of MT. L has a variant ἀγαθόν.

8:5 ἀγάθος / ἀγαθόν. The LXX omits. The Vg. like the Syriac takes it as ἀγαθός.

8:11 ἀγαθή / ἀγαθόν. The LXX places ἀγαθοῦν in the previous verse. The interpretation differs only slightly from MT which makes "the joy of the Lord" be the subject of the clause.

8:13 Here in the series of different kinds of trees the equivalent of ὅδε, "myrtle", is ἄγαθον, "palm". Next in the series ὅδε, "palm", is translated ὅδε, "orange" or "citron". This is clearly a misunderstanding of ὅδε and a transposition of the word for "palm".

9:4 ἀγάθος / ἀγαθόν. The LXX follows MT and the Syriac seems to be a free translation not witnessing to any misreading of the letters. Elsewhere, as in 3:15 ἄγαθος is properly rendered "stairs" ἄγαθος, but the translator did not know of any such "stairs" as those here named. In struggling with the difficulty he supposed a meaning of "over officers" for ἄγαθος.

9:5 ἐπιθύμειται / ἐπιθύμειν. The exhortations are recast into statements of fact. As a consequence, later ἐπιθύμειται becomes ἐπιθύμειν, and ἔστω is ἐστιν.
According to Kittel-Kahle, several Mss omit the conjunction which in fact poses a problem. The LXX and Vg. with the Syriac also omit it and possibly here MT is wrong.

The LXX says: συν συνειδήματος σου πολλοῖς. The fact that both the Peshitta and LXX take γίνεται with μικρότερον need not mean that either read a different text, but only that both were struggling with the same difficulty. Note that the LXX omits ἀλλὰ entirely. The reading of these versions naturally would be influenced by the phrase ἀλλὰ μικρότερον in the previous verse.

The LXX reads: καὶ αὐτοὶ εὖ εὐπορικῶς σου. The case rather like the one just above, except that here Kittel-Kahle notes that Mss and the Arabic version agreeing with the Greek and Syriac in the reading "thy". Still the MT has the lectio difficultior which is probably to be preferred. Because "τασοτέρον" may be a superfluous word. The next clause in the Syriac may be a doublet and the Peshtita adds the extra verb ὁμολογεῖν further to clarify and in this does not agree with the LXX.

The LXX and Vg. also drop the Waw. Kittel-Kahle notes that many Mss lack it, and it does seem to be quite out of place. Quite likely, MT here is wrong.

Active instead of passive due probably to the use of an unpointed text by the translator. The LXX takes it as passive.
10:31 The Peshitta in this verse departs considerably from MT. The LXX agrees with MT throughout. It is not a case of textual variation, but of bold paraphrase. The Hebrew of the verse is as follows:

The Syriac has expanded the Hebrew somewhat and we may well wonder if the doublets presented here do not arise from two Syriac text traditions interwoven. The first error is a substitution of מ for ל. This may be a case of freedom for the Syriac would be expected to repeat the later מ or its equivalent, for regularity's sake, after every thing the people promised not to do. The next clause had to be changed and expanded because מ was read "to hire". The next clause in the Syriac may be a doublet on מ, although it must be admitted that elsewhere this is most often translated מ. In the Joseph story, מ is used of the sacks carrying the grain. The last part is treated rather well except that the two clauses are reversed. Finally מ is rendered rather well.
the Syriac has properly used the same expression to translate מְנַבַּעַת and here there is surely a contamination from that first occurrence. In fact the error may well have been made by a copyist. In 10:39 שָׁבָּה הִנֶּה is rendered לָכֵי The LXX reads οἱ ἰσραήλ καὶ οἱ λειτουργιοι in an interpretation which agrees with the Syriac in the insertion of the conjunction, but differs in detail.

10:39 שָׁבָּה הִנֶּה / מְנַבַּעַת Evidently the Peshitta misread מְנַבַּעַת as מְנַבַּעַת. The LXX supports MT.

11:17 לאו fn / לאו The Syriac has quite naturally taken this unusual form of the Hiph. Impf. and translated it as if it were the national name. The pointing of MT is difficult and may not be right. The LXX omits except for מַאֲשֵׁרמִית sup. which reads לָוָא. Perhaps it should be read as the name of an individual.

11:21 אין המים / אין המים. The Syriac omits much of the verse: מֹסָרָה מָזוֹן מֻבְּשֵׁר. The translation מָזוֹן for מֻבְּשֵׁר is not surprising for it is thus translated in 10:29 also. In 7:46 it is translated מַעַּל (which may be an inner error for מַעַּל, cf. p.24).

In 11:3 it is rendered וָא, elsewhere in Nehemiah: וָא. As to the remainder of the verse, we may compare Neh.3:26 which reads וָא בָּשָׁמְיָהוֹן . This is translated accurately except that וָא is rendered by metathesis וָא. Outside of Nehemiah where this word refers to a spot in a city it is
translated אֶֽרֶן "sanctuary" in Is. 63:14; אֶֽמֶּר "darkness" (as from הֵנָּה) in Mic. 4:8; and אֶֽמֶּר "it was finished" (possibly as from הֵנָּה) in 2 Chron. 27:3. Apparently there was a tendency to translate the word, and here in Neh. 11:21 it seems that it was translated as if metathesis had taken place and it was read בָּֽעֵד. בָּֽעַד "to plow" seems to be a doublet, but its explanation is very difficult. Also we do not find a reason for the omission of נְדֵנִים and נְדֵנִים leaders of the Nethinim. The LXX omits the whole verse except for קָנָה,inf. which supports MT.

12:24 בָּֽעַד The variation of the Divine names occurs in 4:15; 8:17,19; 10:23,25 bis; 11:11,13,22; 12:40,43 & 13:1,7,9,11. Together to mean that the men concerned were designating certain of the king's storehouses for the collection of the offerings. The word בָּֽעַד is not so interpreted in 13:12.

12:31 בָּֽעַד The change of number of the first two verbs is probably a free translation due to the previous mention of the priests and Levites as more or less being in charge. As to בָּֽעַד, there is probably a reflection of the reading בָּֽעַד. The LXX omits except for קָנָה, which agrees with the Syriac: κατὰ δικαιῶν. The Vg. also agrees on the reading בָּֽעַד, having "etierunt". The second "thanksgiving choir" is described in vs. 38 as בָּֽעַד, having "etierunt". The second translation of אֶֽמֶּר from which Kittel-Kahle conjectures אָֽמֶר for vs. 31.

12:38 בָּֽעַד The problems of this verse are somewhat similar to those of vs. 31. In that verse the translator did not distinguish the first
company from the second and so here he omits the word רַעֲשֵׁי. Strangely, he reads רַעֲשֵׁי as if it were רַעֲשֵׁי although the word is correctly rendered in vss. 31 and 40. The rest of the translation seems to have arisen by taking לַעֲשֵׁי in the sense of מָעָשֵׁי. The LXX omits the verse except for מ. This error of מ. which supports MT. Kittel-Kahle and most others consider מ. as an error for מ. Note the ל. of vs. 31.

12:44 This verse is quite freely interpreted. The part concerned is: Apparently the words רַעֲשֵׁי נוּנָאָב and סֵפִּי רַעֲשֵׁי were taken together to mean that the men concerned were designating certain of the king’s storehouses for the collection of the offerings. The word מ. is not so interpreted in 13:12, however. The two words מ. מ. were represented by the one word מ. This is natural for the first of these words is rendered מ. in 10:40 and 13:5; the latter is so rendered in 10:38. Finally the מ. is translated as if it were מ. In this latter reading the Syriac agrees with the LXX and Vg. Kittel-Kahle notes also several Mss with this reading and it probably is correct.

12:46 מ. מ. This is probably a free translation of a difficult phrase. The LXX translates literally.

13:18 מ. מ. This verse is quite freely interpreted. The part concerned is:
13:15 לַעֲמֹד

Probably the two Syriac words are an idiomatic translation of לַעֲמֹד taking it to mean "travellers". The word לַעֲמֹד would then have been passed over entirely. לַעֲמֹד in the sense of "read" is elsewhere translated by לַעֲמֹד. There is also a possibility that there is an inner error of לַעֲמֹד for לַעֲמֹד which means "threshing floor" and could be a translation of לַעֲמֹד. It must be confessed, however, that elsewhere לַעֲמֹד is never translated by לַעֲמֹד. In Joel 4:13 it is לַעֲמֹד in Song of Songs 1:15 and 8:2 it is לַעֲמֹד; elsewhere it is transliterated לַעֲמֹד.

13:15 לַעֲמֹד / לַעֲמֹד Probably this is a careless translation in view of the use of לַעֲמֹד elsewhere after לַעֲמֹד. On the other hand, it may be a mistaken reading for לַעֲמֹד. The LXX supports MT.

13:16 לַעֲמֹד יֵשְׁבָה בְּכָלַיְהוֹם בְּכָלַיְהוֹם אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם The Syriac is much confused, reading: לַעֲמֹד. The LXX also omits לַעֲמֹד and we might think of a ditto in MT for לַעֲמֹד of the preceding verse, but the LXX omits that also whereas the Peshitta includes it. Probably both the LXX and Syriac were translating freely. As to לַעֲמֹד, the Syriac interprets the noun and participle as if they were two verbs, one in the Qal "buy", the other in the Piel "sell". Such a distinction in the use of לַעֲמֹד is not found in Hebrew.

13:22 לַעֲמֹד יֵשְׁבָה בְּכָלַיְהוֹם The present Syriac text takes לַעֲמֹד as לַעֲמֹד which could easily be ascribed to the use of an unpointed text. The Syriac words for "gates" and...
"porters" have the same consonants and it is possible that the
original Syriac reading agreed with MT, but that a later copyist
inserted the conjunction.

13:25 They translator was probably influenced in
misreading his text by the previous word which he translated

The Hebrew is rather clearly misinterpreted. As usual, the rhetorical question
is changed to an assertion. This gives an opportunity to take
the 1st.Pl. Impf. Qal as a 3rd Masc. Sing. Pf. Niphal. The word
is then supplied by paraphrase to suit the new context.

The LXX supports MT.

13:29 The reason for this strange rendering is obscure. The first
which is elsewhere frequently used as a translation of הָעַר "act as kinsman".
("defile" is translated מָכַר, וּמַכַּר, מָכַּר, וּמַכַּר, and מָכַּר). Perhaps more likely the second מַכַּר is an inner error for מַכַּר
which is used to translate מַכַּר in Neh. 1:5. The first מַכַּר
would then be a mistaken repetition of the second one.

The mistakes of the translator listed above are numerous and
in some cases rather serious. Many of them are due to the use of an
unpointed text, many are due to the translator's unfamiliarity with
rare Hebrew words or expressions. The majority are probably due to
"porters" have the same consonants and it is possible that the original Syriac reading agreed with MT, but that a later copyist inserted the conjunction.

13:25 אֱלֹהִים The translator was probably influenced in misreading his text by the previous word which he translated אֱלֹהִים. The LXX omits this word אֱלֹהִים.

13:27 אֱלֹהִים The Hebrew is rather clearly misinterpreted. As usual, the rhetorical question is changed to an assertion. This gives an opportunity to take the 1st Pl. Impf. Qal as a 3rd Masc. Sing. Pf. Niphal. The word אֱלֹהִים is then supplied by paraphrase to suit the new context. The LXX supports MT.

The reason for this strange rendering is obscure. The first אֱלֹהִים might possibly be an inner error for אֱלֹהִים which is elsewhere frequently used as a translation of אֱלֹהִים "act as kinsman". (אֱלֹהִים "defile" is translated †אֶלֹהִים, דִּבְרָה, אֹלָה, and פָּדָה). Perhaps more likely the second אֱלֹהִים is an inner error for אֱלֹהִים which is used to translate אֱלֹהִים in Neh. 1:5. The first אֱלֹהִים would then be a mistaken repetition of the second one.

The mistakes of the translator listed above are numerous and in some cases rather serious. Many of them are due to the use of an unpointed text, many are due to the translator's unfamiliarity with rare Hebrew words or expressions. The majority are probably due to
carelessness. The impression is gained from going over his work that the translator was working with an unpointed Hebrew manuscript whose consonants were almost identical with those of our MT, but that he was in rather a hurry to be through. He was satisfied with approximations or paraphrases and would not stop to investigate a Hebrew word of rare occurrence. One error which occurs several times and is typical of the translator's work concerns Hebrew words having both a common usage and a rare usage in a different sense. Our translator would almost always use the common meaning and alter the context accordingly.

Our translator would almost always use the common meaning and alter the context accordingly.

Nothing is to be learned on our subject from the class of Syrian variations from MT which result from the translator's use of normal Syrian idiom. These were discussed in Chapter V. Naturally some Hebrew idiom will be smoothed out in a similar way by both the Syrian and LXX, but such cases are without real significance. Both versions may agree in the rendering of the idiom, but in the remainder

(1) See the summaries of opinion on p. 72ff.
Chapter VII - The Relation of the Peshitta of Nehemiah to the Other Versions

The principal subject of this chapter is the relation of the Peshitta of Nehemiah to the Septuagint. There are practically no Hexaplaric fragments of the minor Greek versions, nor is there any Targum to Nehemiah. The Vulgate was clearly done later, so it need not concern us.

For the other books of the Bible the relation of the Peshitta to the LXX has been discussed in several studies \(^1\) and various conclusions have been drawn. In Nehemiah there seems to be no appreciable LXX influence on the Leshitta. Much of the detailed evidence has been cited already in the previous pages of this work in connection with problems of particular verses. A summary of the material will now be sufficient. In the main the Peshitta follows MT avoiding the serious lacunae of the LXX. The question to be considered now is whether in detail the Peshitta shows traces of LXX influence.

Not much is to be learned on our subject from the class of Syriac variations from MT which result from the translator's use of normal Syriac idiom. These were discussed in Chapter V. Naturally some Hebrew idioms will be smoothed out in a similar way by both the Syriac and LXX, but such cases are without real significance. Both versions may agree in the rendering of the idiom, but in the remainder

\(^1\) See the summaries of opinion on p. 7ff.
of the passage each version goes its own way. An example is 5:17 where
the collective צְמִיתִים is properly rendered רַגְלֶים in the Syriac and
אֵדְרִים in the LXX. But in the immediate context the men referred to
are called בָּנָיָיו / רַגְלֶים / בָּנָיָיו. There is no interdependence
of the versions here.

Two typical examples may be given briefly, of the relation
of the free renderings cited in Chapter V and their treatment in the LXX.
In 1:5 where the Syriac has reversed the Hebrew order placing "ears"
after "eyes" because of the context, the LXX retains the Hebrew order.
Again in Neh. 3, throughout the chapter the frequent phrase יַעֲדוּ בָּעָל
or בָּעֲדוּ בָּעֲדוּ is more literally rendered by the LXX: אֶשָּׁה חַסֱפָה or
a similar phrase, instead of the Syriac: אֶשָּׁה חַסֱפָה. There seem to
be no cases where the Syriac free renderings are influenced by the LXX.

The same is true of conscious additions to and omissions
from the text. A typical example is 3:25 אֲרֵגָה אֲשֶׁר לִבְנֵי
which is rendered accurately by the LXX אֲרֵגָה לִבְנֵי
The Peshitta, however, inserts Lameds thus changing the sense
considerably:

In section III. C of Chapter V where there were listed
conscious variations from the text, introduced by the translators of
the Peshitta for smoothness, etc., a considerable amount of comparison
LXX text and witness is uncertain. In the large majority of cases —
with the LXX has already been given. In the great majority of cases, the LXX follows MT against the Peshitta. In the few cases where the Peshitta and LXX agree in details, the Peshitta is still clearly independent. For instance, in 4:16, MT has a difficult expression: 

The Syriac in simple smoothing out of a difficulty removes the conjunction from the first of the series of four weapons and places it on the second member of the series. The LXX translates בורין by ἀντιαχώροντα "withdraw", passages where the LXX agrees with the Hebrew vocalization, but the Peshitta does not though its reading is based on the same Hebrew with the following clause. The Vg. agrees with the LXX in this context. A clear example is 4:14 אֹֽאֹל, LXX was alone but the Peshitta reads אֹֽאֳל, as if from אֹל. Again 4:1 לְשׁ, LXX was of MT, but at least the Peshitta is quite independent of the LXX. This is apparently true in every such instance.

A further intersection point of evidence is given by a few other instances listed in Chapter IV on Names. There, the agreements of the LXX and Syriac against MT were always noted and discussed. But there are only two or three clear cases and these strengthen the impression of independence of the two versions. They probably are instances where MT is wrong and the two versions preserve the correct text. They will be listed with other such instances in the next chapter.

The instances listed in Chapter VI as mistakes of the Syriac translator furnish further interesting and positive evidence for the above conclusion. Among variations of the Syriac there listed, only eight show agreement with the LXX against MT and in some of these the LXX text and witness is uncertain. In the large majority of cases -
over 35 - the LXX agrees with IT against the Peshitta. In several more cases the LXX quite the phrase concerned. The eight significant cases have already been discussed and only the references will be given here: 2:13; 4:13; 5:13; 9:19; 28; 35; 12:31, 44. Study of these passages show that in some cases the LXX and Peshitta agree in preserving the correct text and that in any case the agreements of these versions do not imply interdependence.

A further interesting point of evidence is given by a few passages where the LXX agrees with the Hebrew vocalization, but the Peshitta does not though its reading is based on the same Hebrew consonants. A clear example is 4:14 ΕνΝι, LXX και ειδον, but the Peshitta reads Ενηοι as if from ΕνΝι. Again 8:1 ΗΗη, LXX και εμαθεσαν, but the Syriac reads καθεσον as if from ΗΗη.

To conclude, there is no evidence whatever that the Syriac of Nehemiah was influenced by the LXX either in general style or in particular contacts. On the other hand, much positive evidence points to the conclusion that it was quite independent of it. The Syriac translator hardly seems to have been familiar enough with the LXX to allow incidental reminiscences to creep in. If any isolated LXX influence might yet be found it would be suspect of having entered through copyists who knew the Syro-Hexaplar or who were thinking of some Septuagintal quotation in the New Testament.

With regard to the minor Greek versions, there are only five passages that can be gleaned from Field's Hexapla for our consideration. In four of these a version is cited as Αλλος; in a fifth a passage is
given as under the asterisk. No dependence of the Peshitta is seen in these few scattered instances. The evidence may be tabulated:

In two instances the Peshitta, MT and minor Greek version agree:

7:72 בֵּית הַשֵּׁבַע ← מֵלֶךְ שְׁבָע / καὶ εὔονον (alía καὶ οὖν ἑυονον) —
    διήκονεν / αὐτόν
9:17 διήκονεν / ἄλλος ἑλάσσον. ἄλλος αἴτιο / 

In two instances the Greek goes with MT against the Peshitta:

3:8 παλαιά / ἄλλος τοῦ παλαιᾶ / 
12:42 παλαιά / ἄλλος επενεργήσαν / 

In the last instance all three witnesses disagree:

7:85 בֵּית הַשֵּׁבַע ← מֵלֶךְ שְׁבָע / ἄλλος τοῦ παλαιᾶ / 

Theoretically, the way to use the Peshitta as a textual witness is to combine its evidence with that of the other versions.

It cannot be too greatly emphasized that care must be used in inferring a Hebrew original from the Peshitta — or any other version. We must be sure that the reading of the version has not suffered in transmission and that it is not simply due to a vagary of the translator. After these allowances are made, we may say that usually in Nehemiah two witness of the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and MT agree. Frequently the LXX is against all these three witnesses and then we have an early

(1) op.cit., p.43.
(2) vio.cit., p.7.
Chapter VIII - The Witness of the Peshitta to the Original Hebrew Text

There should be noted a word of caution suggested by Montgomery in his review of Hawley's book on Ezra.\(^1\) He remarks that if the Syriac be indeed an independent witness it "becomes of prime importance for the text of the Hebrew, at the age when S was translated (this caution should be observed!)." If the arguments of Eurkitt be admitted, the Peshitta was translated before the end of the 2nd century. At least Nehemiah was translated before the 4th century, having been known to Aphraates.\(^2\) Therefore we have an independent witness to MT in the form which it held perhaps as early as the 2nd century. In Nehemiah this fact is slightly more significant than in other books for there is no Targum to Nehemiah and the minor Greek versions are practically lacking.

Theoretically, the way to use the Peshitta as a textual witness is to combine its evidence with that of the other versions. It cannot be too greatly emphasized that care must be used in inferring a Hebrew original from the Peshitta - or any other version. We must be sure that the reading of the version has not suffered in transmission and that it is not simply due to a vagary of the translator. After these allowances are made, we may say that usually in Nehemiah the witness of the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and MT agree. Frequently the LXX is against all these three witnesses and then we have an early

\(^{1}\) op.cit. p.432.

\(^{2}\) vid.sup. p.7.
reading to balance against a later reading which is testified to by three late witnesses. Intrinsic evidence then should decide the true original reading. If, however, the Peshitta agrees with the LXX against MT, the strength of the early reading of the LXX would seem to be considerably increased. Because we would have a second check on the reading of the original Hebrew inferred from the Greek, and also of the Peshitta to the variations of Care and Kethib should be studied. That reading would apparently have persisted till late times. Now in a number of such variations there is no difference in meaning and because of the inherent excellency of MT and the care with which it therefore it can not be decided whether a translation favors one or was transmitted, especially after it was standardized about 70 A.D., the other reading. The rest of the Care - Petinh variations of this situation occurs very rarely. A third possibility, namely of the agreement of the LXX and MT against the Peshitta would be theoretically impossible, because this would mean that a very early reading witnessed to by the LXX was changed to a later reading witnessed to by the Peshitta then was changed back again to the early reading which persists in MT. Theoretically, if the Peshitta goes against both the LXX and MT it is because of some vagary of the Peshitta and the witness should be discounted. However, if the LXX witness is divided or questionable, the Peshitta may help to indicate a true early reading.

Of course the above discussion applies to the consonantal text only, for the LXX and Peshitta may agree in the reading of the Hebrew consonants and differ in the vowels they read with the consonants. Such an apparent disagreement which is really an agreement on the Hebrew consonants would be cogent testimony. We may conclude that the Peshitta is of value as a textual witness only where the LXX already
differs from MT. It may be of limited value where the LXX evidence is lacking or confused. Positively, the Peshitta witnesses to the correctness of the view that MT was standardized at an early date - the end of the first century - and kept practically inviolate thereafter.

Before the listing of alleged mistakes in MT, the relation of the Peshitta to the variations of Ḥere and Kethibh should be studied. In a number of such variations there is no difference in meaning and therefore it can not be decided whether a translation favors one or the other reading. The rest of the Ḥere - Kethibh variations of Nehemiah are given herewith with the Peshitta readings:

a) 3:15 Ḥere ידעיו / מִקוֹמָה
   Peshitta לֹ֣א/ גָּנוּן
b) 3:20 Ḥere יִוְיָמָה / קָרָא
   Peshitta קָרָא/ נַכְשָׁבוּ
c) 3:30 Ḥere תַּנּוֹרָה / סְרָה (In the context ס is correct)
   Peshitta סְרָה/ נַכְשָׁבוּ
d) 3:31 Ḥere נָּשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת
e) 5:7 Ḥere נָשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת
f) 5:9 Ḥere נָשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת
g) 7:3 Ḥere נָּשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת
h) 7:43 Ḥere נָּשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת
i) 7:52 Ḥere נָּשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת
j) 9:17 Ḥere נָּשָׁת / מִקֵּשׁ
   Peshitta מִקֵּשׁ/ נָּשָׁת / Context confused, but conjunction omitted.

In all cases where the Peshitta does not show uniform preference for either the Ḥere or Kethibh, the LXX and Vg. agree with the Peshitta and perhaps MT has justly final form. The LXX evidence is not decisive, but perhaps we should take it as of some Hebrew Mas.
In the above list of variants it seems that the Peshitta goes with the Cere nine times and with the Kethibh seven times. Perhaps (k) and (o) are indeterminate and should not be counted. Many of the above cases are names and the differences between the two forms are slight. Perhaps there is not enough material in the list to indicate a definite conclusion. We may say, however, that the translator does not show a uniform preference for either the Cere or Kethibh.

In Namaanian there seems to be about eight instances where we can say with some degree of certainty that the Peshitta has preserved the correct form or a nearly correct form by which MT is in error, although the Peshitta joins in the mistake. Others of the following possible instances have been mentioned in the preceding pages and may here be gathered together with the references to the discussions that have been given. As can be seen, there are very few cases where we can with any certainty emend MT on the basis of the Peshitta.

a) 2:12 נָמַג/ נָמַג Cf. p.105. The LXX and Vg. agree with the Peshitta and perhaps MT has lost the final Mem.

b) 3:14 נָמַג/ נָמַג Cf. p.107. Perhaps we should read נָמַג.

c) 3:14 נָמַג/ נָמַג Cf. p.107. Perhaps we should read נָמַג.
In the above list of variants it seems that the Peshitta goes with the Qere nine times and with the Kethibh seven times. Perhaps (k) and (o) are indeterminate and should not be counted. Many of the above cases are names and the differences between the two forms are slight. Perhaps there is not enough material in the list to indicate a definite conclusion. We may say, however, that the translator does not show a uniform preference for either the Qere or Kethibh.

With regard to instances where the Peshitta may be of use in correcting MT, the following possible instances have been mentioned in the preceding pages and may here be gathered together with the references to the discussions that have been given. As can be seen, there are very few cases where we can with any certainty emend MT on the basis of the Peshitta.

a) 2:12 מִּית / מְתִית Cf. p.105. The LXX and Vg. agree with the Peshitta and perhaps MT has lost the final Mem.

b) 3:8 מֹּרֶם / מֹּרֶם Cf. p.42. The LXX evidence is not complete, but perhaps we should read with many Hebrew Mss. מֹּרֶם.

c) 3:14 מָּצָב / מָּצָב Cf. p.107. Perhaps we should read מָּצָב.
(1) 6:16  יְהוָ֣ה לֹ֖א לְךָ׃ p. 12 (1) Here MT is rather clearly wrong. The correct reading is יְהוָ֥ה.

e) 4:13  רַעְשְׁנֶּֽךָ / ּ֨בּוּדָּה Cf. p.109. The situation is uncertain as the LXX evidence is divided and the Syriac context corrupt.

f) 5:16  רַעְשַׁנֶּֽךָ / ּ֨ידָךְ Cf. p.112. The situation is uncertain. All the versions translate as a singular, but this may be only interpretative.

e) 9:19  רַעְשַׁנֶּֽךָ / ּ֨מַלְעַק Cf. p.113. Probably MT is wrong here and the conjunction should be omitted.

g) 12:14  רַעְשַׁנֶּֽךָ / ּ֨יָדָךְ Cf. p.53f. Also 9:4 and 5 may have erred in this name. Probably it should be read with Caph at least in 12:14.

h) 12:31  רַעְשַׁנֶּֽךָ / ּ֨יָדָךְ Cf. p.119. Probably MT is in error.

i) 12:44  רַעְשַׁנֶּֽךָ / ּ֨יָדָךְ Cf. p. 120. The true reading is doubtless.

In Nehemiah there thus seem to be about eight instances where we can say with some degree of certainty that the Peshitta has preserved the correct form or a nearly correct form by which MT can be corrected. (3)

(3) Three more instances may be of interest where it seems that MT is in error, although the Peshitta joins in the mistake. Others of course are doubtless, but these were encountered in the Peshitta study:

a) 9:17  יִמְּצֶֽה / ּ֨יָמָה Cf. p.100. Probably the true reading is יִמְּצֶֽה.

b) 12:15  יִמְּצֶֽה / ּ֨יָמָה Cf. p.53. There has been a mistake by metathesis either here or in the same name of 12:3 יִמְּצֶֽה, but the error antedates our witnesses.
(note (3) continued)

c) 7:68 is omitted in the Syriac, but it appears in Ezr. 2:66 thus:

\[ \text{Note: The translation is uncertain.} \]

Kittel-Kahle notes that several manuscripts of the Hebrew have this portion, but that it is lacking in the best texts. \( ^\text{CA} \) is defective here, but \( ^\text{CA} \) has the portion as it is in Ezr. 2:66. We note that the Peshitta follows the major \( ^\text{CA} \) of the Hebrew and thus agrees with them in the omission. But it appears that the omission is an error. Comparison with Ezr. 2:66 shows that the Hebrew of Neh. 7:68 has dropped seven words rather clearly by homoioteleuton. The complete section is:

\[ \text{Note: The translation is uncertain.} \]

From the second occurrence of \( ^\text{CA} \) is omitted in Nehemiah.

It seems clear that the words once stood in Nehemiah's text, because...

\[ \text{Note: The translation is uncertain.} \]

...and of the horses. It is an ancient error in MT such as we have met repeatedly in the Syriac of Nehemiah.
c) 7:88 is omitted in the Syriac, but it appears in Ezr. 2:68 thus:

Kittel-Kahle notes that several manuscripts of the Hebrew have this portion, but that it is lacking in the best texts. G\textsuperscript{EN}, is defective here, but GA has the portion as it is in Ezr. 2:68. We note that the Pesnitta follows the major Mss of the Hebrew and thus agrees with them in the omission. But it appears that the omission is an error.

Comparison with Ezr. 2:66 shows that the Hebrew of Neh. 7:63 has dropped seven words rather clearly by homoioteleuton. The complete section is:

From the second occurrence of אֶלְכּוּ to the second occurrence of אֶלְכּוּ is omitted in Nehemiah.

It seems clear that the words once stood in Nehemiah's text, because of the horses. It is an ancient error in MT such as we have met repeatedly in the Syriac of Nehemiah.
Chapter IV - Conclusion

By way of a conclusion to the discussion presented in the preceding chapters, we may now briefly summarize the character, state of the text, and textual critical value of the Peshitta of Nehemiah. As to who did the translation, we may not be able to come to definite conclusions as to whether he was Jewish or Christian, but some general indications may be seen that he was the latter. Two places probably the influence if Christian copyists slight deviations, but 3:17 and 20 badly confuse some unusual
is evident.

Examples of this sort can be multiplied by referring to the translation of Nehemiah is certainly not slavishly literal. It seems, though, that there was an attempt to render the text with fair accuracy, into the normal Syriac idiom. The frequent departures of a petty nature may be explained as due to natural desire for a smoother style which, as Pinkerton observes,

The translation of Nehemiah is more characteristic of the Syriac than of Hebrew. Though this was poor, his manuscript was blurred and defective in spots. probably both circumstances were present, but more especially the

Though this latter is more characteristic of the Syriac than of Hebrew. Though this tendency toward freedom may be distressing to the student who is unfamiliar with the English language or translations, it was naturally a translator who was not just working freely, but he does not seem to have

The same tendency toward freedom may be observed in the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament of 1946 which is meant to be not as literal a version as were the revisions of 1861 and 1901.

(1) Cf. the discussion of Eliezer on p.57 and of Samaria on p.60.
(2) op. cit. p.14.
(3) Weigle in Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, p.53 ff. gives illustrations of literalness and freedom in the translations of 1611, 1901, and 1946. He says "...the major defect of the English Revised Version and of its variant, the American Standard Version, is that these are literal, word-for-word translations, which follow the order of the Greek words wherever possible, rather than the order which is natural to English." p.53.
It seems to be true, however, that the translator of
Hebrew can be charged with much more freedom than these English
Versions indulged in. The Syriac is also freer than the LXX. The
impression is gained that the translator would follow a dozen or so
verses with fair accuracy and then come to one or two which would be
somewhat ill treated. Thus Nehemiah 1:1 to 2:3 is a good translation,
fairly close to the Hebrew, but in 2:4-6 are found several cases of
freedom and of mistake. Again 3:1-15 follows MT with relatively
slight deviations, but 3:16 and 20 badly confuse some unusual words.
Examples of this sort can be multiplied by referring to the preceding
pages, especially Chapter VI "Mistakes of the Translator". It would
seem to indicate that the aim of the translator was to produce a good
idiomatic translation from MT, but either his knowledge of Hebrew
was poor, or his manuscript was blurred and defective in spots.
Probably both circumstances were present, but more especially the
former, as these verses where considerable confusion occurs usually
contain unfamiliar Hebrew words or expressions. Apparently the
translator was not just working freely, but he does not seem to have
had the information, linguistic and historical, necessary to cope
with a difficult passage. His intentions were good, but his
equipment was poor! From this character of the translation we are
led to think more readily of a Christian than of a Jewish translator
for Nehemiah, but the evidence is not positive. One passage was
noted which possibly betrays Christian authorship.

(4) Cf. p.117, last passage discussed.
It may be emphasized that Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles were not clearly in the Eclesiastic canon and therefore our conclusion as to the style of the translation would be less expected to agree with the rest of the Peshitta than if we were working with a book like Isaiah. Again Nehemiah, being an unimportant book and apparently not greatly used, we may expect that the translation was done less carefully than was true for other books. It does seem, however, that the major faults of the Peshitta of this book are due not only to carelessness, but also to unfamiliarity with the Hebrew language, customs, and history.

Finally as to the present state of the text, the statistics on the personal names speak for themselves. One fourth of the names have suffered some change and a good half of these variations seem to be due to copyists' errors. Though the narrative material has naturally been better preserved than the personal names, there are serious faults in it too. It was calculated that the prepositions and conjunction are poorly treated in about 10 or 15 per cent of the cases. Probably more of such errors are the result of careless copying than can now be proved. As far as the errors of transmission are concerned, Codex A, though better than L, is still far from perfect. It would seem that a considerable history of manuscript copying lay back of the sixth century Codex A which we are following. It would be a welcome find indeed if some less corrupted text, possibly of consistent Nestorian affinity should yet be discovered in some

---

(6) vid sup. p.81.
Eastern monastery. It is not impossible. Such further witness can not be counted upon, however, and at present we must simply confess that our text has been much corrupted and must make due allowances when citing its witness. The text in Codex A does not seem to be appreciably contaminated by later revision on the basis of the LXX or MT. Such error in A as can be suspected as due to copyists is apparently the result of normal mistakes of the eye, ear, pen, etc. In Nehemiah, the Syriac which we possess is, though corrupt, an independent witness to the original Hebrew of the early years of our era.

Finally as to the value of the Peshitta of Nehemiah in criticism of the Hebrew text, we may confess that its value is not too great. A few cases were listed in Chapter VIII where it is probable that the Peshitta is of use in restoring the true Hebrew reading, but such cases are few. It may be remembered, however, that it is an office of textual criticism to indicate the correctness of a text as well as to remove the errors where possible. From this viewpoint, we should say that the net result of our study is to validate our Masoretic Text, as far as it is possible to do so by the use of the poor translation at our disposal.
Index and Appendices

A Syriac-Hebrew index, referred to in the body of the thesis, for the Book of Nehemiah has been completely prepared on file cards. These cards have been filed according to the variants of the Syriac from the Hebrew and thus have been of great use in the preparation of the thesis. They will now be filed alphabetically and the references copied in manuscript form suitable to attach to the thesis when it is published.

A collation of Lee with Codex Ambrosianus has also been made and entered on the margin of the author’s copy of Lee’s edition where it has been constantly used in the work. This too will be copied in manuscript form together with the two pages of the collations by Thorndike to be appended to the published thesis.