INTRODUCTION TO THE TRANSLATION

BY ROBERT P. GORDON

The Books of Chronicles

The two books of Chronicles recount the history of Israel from the death of Saul and the transference of rule to David down to the Babylonian captivity.¹ While estimates of the date of their composition have ranged from the late sixth century down to the mid-fourth century BCE, the case for a dating nearer the end of this time frame seems strongest. Chronicles is an ‘alternative’ history in the sense that its focus on Judah, the southern of the two Israelite states following the division of the Solomonic kingdom, is more pronounced than that of Samuel–Kings. The affairs of the two kingdoms are not told in alternating panels, as in Kings, but are woven together in what is essentially a continuous account of Judah. That does not mean that northern Israel is unimportant to ‘the Chronicler’. On the contrary, one of his aims is to present Israel as a single entity which, in the circumstances of the later Persian period, is viewed as encompassing all the descendants of Israel, the eponymous father of the nation (cf. 1 Chronicles 2:1). To this end, the genealogies that occupy the first eight chapters, stretching right back to the strictly pre-Israelite Adam in 1 Chronicles 1:1, make their contribution, creating a sense of continuity and inclusiveness that has not always been associated with Chronicles because of its traditional linking with the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, in which a more exclusive definition of Israel and of what it is to be Israelite is reflected.

The role of David and Solomon in the founding of the kingdom, and in the establishing of the temple worship of Israel, is much expanded in Chronicles, this reflecting circumstances in the fourth century when the second temple was acquiring a new kind of symbolical as well as ritual importance in the community. There is a discernible idealizing of David and

¹ The mention of Cyrus’ decree in 2 Chronicles 36:22–23 replicates part of the longer notice in Ezra 1:1–4.

Solomon: little of David's failings or of Solomon's foreign wives strays into Chronicles (contrast Nehemiah 13:26). There are indications, indeed, that the figure of David had acquired something of a quasi-messianic significance. This depiction of David provoked Julius Wellhausen's celebrated complaint that the dynast's 'clearly cut figure' had become 'a feeble holy picture, seen through a cloud of incense'.² The mere fact that the genealogical data on the house of David continues down into the fourth century may testify to this messianic-cum-eschatological tilt within Chronicles, with emphasis on the enduring character of the dynastic promises covenanted to David and celebrated in court and cult, and now specially in the latter. This seems a more likely reading of the evidence than the main alternative view, according to which the temple and the ordering of its personnel and worship had come to represent the 'Davidic hope'. In this version of 'realized eschatology', the hope of a restoration of the Davidic kingdom has been cognitively transposed into the dignifying of the temple order as the palpable fulfilment of the older royalist expectation.

The longstanding neglect of Chronicles as both an historical and theological document of great importance is reflected already in the title 'Paraleipomenōn' given the books in the Greek Bible ('Septuagint'). These were the 'books of the things left out' — left out, that is, by the writers of Samuel–Kings. The Vulgate 'Paralipomenon' follows the Greek tradition, but Jerome talks in his *Prologus Galeatus* to Samuel–Kings of a *chronikon* of all sacred history, and hence ultimately the name 'Chronicles' in the English Bible tradition.³ In the modern period, the status of Chronicles has suffered somewhat with the increasing recognition of the plasticity of the Chronicler's historical sources in his work of composition. Chronicles, in other words, was deemed less 'historical' than its Samuel–Kings counterpart, and was therefore liable to neglect.

The special problems that relate to the rendering of the books of Chronicles in the Peshiṭta version (hereafter PChron) might at first blush seem to anticipate the historic 'neglect' of these books, as if the translator had given them less effort and attention than was required. In such a case, Jerome's claim to have translated the books of Tobit and Judith during the course of a day and a night respectively, thereby reflecting their lowlier

² J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (trans. J.S. Black and A. Menzies; Edinburgh, 1885), 182.

³ At some point the title *dibrê hayyāmîm* ('The Accounts of the Days', 'Annals'; cf. 1 27:24) attached itself to the Hebrew text of Chronicles (cf. also the longer Targumic title in the same vein). Jerome may already have been aware of such a tradition on the Hebrew side.

status as canonically second-order, might offer an analogy.⁴ However, the issue in PChron seems to be one of difficulty rather than neglect. There is evidence that, where the translator's *Vorlage* may have been clear and legible, his work was done satisfactorily, even if somewhat freely. As we shall see, the peculiar character of PChron may be attributable to the poor condition of the manuscript with which the translator was working. That also could, of course, be cited as evidence of the neglect of Chronicles — whether in the continuing circulation of such a text, or in the translator's choice of it, if an alternative might have been obtainable — but that is a different matter from neglect by careless translation.

The Peshiṭta of Chronicles

While the manuscript corpus for the Peshiṭta of 1 and 2 Chronicles includes only a few texts originating before the twelfth century, the incomplete Additional MS. 17.104 of the British Library (= Ms 6h13 of the Leiden edition), containing only the books of Chronicles and with several sizeable sections of the text missing, dates from the sixth century, and provides a *terminus ante quem* for the rendering of Chronicles into Syriac. The generally Jewish stamp of the translation would support a date somewhat earlier than this. On the basis of an apparent quotation from the Qaddish in 1 Chronicles 29:19 (see below), Weitzman proposed a date not earlier than 200 CE for PChron. At the same time, the conservatism of its lexical stock suggests that it cannot have been translated more than about fifty years after the earlier books, which Weitzman had already dated to around 150 CE.⁵ A date close to 200 CE therefore commended itself to Weitzman.

As with other volumes in this series, it is the Mosul text that forms the basis of this translation into English.

PChron occupies a special position among the books of the Old Testament Peshiṭta because of the unusual freedom with which the translator handled his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Although, on any reckoning, the translation was made before the standard Masoretic tradition was established, it is reasonable to assume that the basic text available to the translator corresponded quite closely to what became the Masoretic Text (MT). References to the MT in this volume should be read in that light.

⁴ See B.M. Metzger, *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions* (Grand Rapids, 2001), 34.

⁵ M.P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 1999), 256, 258.

The essentially Jewish character of PChron has long been apparent. In the nineteenth century, Joseph Perles noted, in his doctoral dissertation on the Peshitta, that PChron contains a number of rabbinic and Targumic elements.⁶ Theodor Nöldeke made observations of a similar sort in his survey of Old Testament literature published in 1868, and these proved influential in subsequent discussion.⁷ Nöldeke remarked on the many additions, paraphrases, and rabbinic interpretations, and on the avoidance of anthropomorphisms, in the translation, and described it as basically a Jewish Targum. This evaluation in terms of ‘Targum’ was repeated and developed by Siegmund Fraenkel in two articles published in 1879.⁸ For Fraenkel, PChron was a ‘pure, unadulterated Jewish Targum’.⁹ From this time on, description of the ‘Targumic’ characteristics of PChron became commonplace in academic literature.¹⁰ Growing interest in the manuscript evidence for the Peshitta as a whole led a few years after Fraenkel to the publication by W.E. Barnes of a critical apparatus for PChron.¹¹ Barnes claims that his was the first critical apparatus for PChron to be published since Herbert Thorndike’s in volume 6 of the London Polyglot of 1657.¹² It is based on five MSS whose dates range from the sixth to the twelfth centuries.¹³

Other studies in the intervening period have included P.B. Dirksen’s essay on translation technique in PChron,¹⁴ and several important articles by David Phillips dealing with various aspects of these books.¹⁵ A

⁶ J. Perles, *Meletemata Peschitthoniana* (Breslau, 1859), 15–16.

⁷ Th. Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1868), 263–64.

⁸ S. Fraenkel, ‘Die syrische Uebersetzung zu den Büchern der Chronik’, *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 5 (1879), 508–36, 720–59.

⁹ ‘Die syrische Uebersetzung’, 754–58 (756); cf. p. 508.

¹⁰ For example, in the standard work by B.J. Roberts, *The Old Testament and Versions: The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions* (Cardiff, 1951), 221–22, on PChron as ‘containing Midrashic elements and exhibiting many of the characters (sic) of a Targum’.

¹¹ W.E. Barnes, *An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version: With a Discussion of the Value of the Codex Ambrosianus* (Cambridge, 1897).

¹² Barnes, *An Apparatus Criticus*, vii.

¹³ Barnes (p. xxxiii) dated Codex Ambrosianus, as well as Additional MS. 17.104 of the British Library, to the sixth century.

¹⁴ P.B. Dirksen, ‘Some Aspects of the Translation Technique in P-Chronicles’, in P.B. Dirksen and A. van der Kooij (eds), *The Peshitta as a Translation: Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 19–21 August 1993* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden, 8; Leiden, 1995), 17–23.

¹⁵ D. Phillips, ‘The Importance of the Peshitta in Syriac Tradition: The Example of the Peshitta to I Chronicles 29’, *The Harp* (Kottayam) 5 (1992), 67–91; idem, ‘Musical Instruments in the Peshitta to Chronicles and Contacts with the Peshitta to Ben Sira’, *L*

substantial amount of attention is also given to PChron in M.P. Weitzman's landmark volume, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, published posthumously in 1999.

Provenance

Various features of the translation support the view that it originated in Jewish circles. First, there are some impressive correspondences with rabbinic interpretation as found in the Mishnah and the Babylonian Talmud.¹⁶ Secondly, there is the expansion in the Syriac at 1 Chronicles 29:19 that closely resembles the opening lines of the Qaddish: 'For your great name will be hallowed and praised in the world that you have created, in the presence of those who fear you.' The sentence in the Qaddish reads: 'May his great name be magnified and sanctified in the world that he created according to his will.' As Weitzman notes, this provides the earliest evidence for the existence of this part of the Qaddish, significantly antedating its next attestation, in the ninth-century *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*.¹⁷

Thirdly, other translational embellishments in PChron relate God, Israel, and 'the fathers' in ways that most naturally suggest a Jewish connexion. At 2 Chronicles 7:8 Solomon observes the festival of Tabernacles 'before the Lord our God' for seven days. The phrase in quotes is an expansion of the Hebrew and suggests a translator who stands in the same tradition as the worshippers whom he describes. Again, according to 2 Chronicles 19:4, Jehoshaphat went to the hill country of Ephraim and brought the local population back to the worship of 'the Lord God of our fathers'.¹⁸ While the expression 'our fathers' can be used in the New Testament for past generations of Jews, even when a mixed Jewish-Gentile readership is being addressed (1 Corinthians 10:1), in the New Testament most occurrences of 'our fathers' are found in addresses to Jewish audiences (e.g., Acts 3:13; 5:30). There is also the very Jewish-sounding statement in 2 Chronicles 6:18, 'For in faithfulness the Lord has made his presence rest upon his people on earth', which converts the rhetorical question of the MT into an assertion of historical fact. Here,

Muséon 108: 1–2 (1995), 49–67; idem, 'The Reception of Peshitta Chronicles: Some Elements for Investigation', in R.B. ter Haar Romeny (ed.), *The Peshitta: Its Use in Literature and Liturgy. Papers Read at the Third Peshitta Symposium* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden, 15: Leiden, 2006), 259–95 (including quotations from Chronicles in Patristic authors [pp. 269–77]).

¹⁶ See Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, 111–12.

¹⁷ *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, 212.

¹⁸ So the Mosul text; many MSS have 'their fathers'.

moreover, the concept of the Shekinah is introduced in a way that is more characteristic of the Targums and rabbinic writings in general.¹⁹ Whether the instance of translator scruple at 2 Chronicles 29:23 qualifies as a particularly Jewish type of intervention is less certain. According to the MT, the goats for the sin-offering in Hezekiah's purification ceremony were brought 'before the king and the congregation'. PChron makes a corrective insertion: '*before the Lord*, and before the king and before the people of Israel'.

There are other possible indications of Jewish origin. The messianic reference at 1 Chronicles 5:2 is best understood in the light of Jewish expectation: 'from Judah the King Messiah will come forth, and the birthright will be given to Joseph'. The mention of the messiah is an innovation in the Syriac, and corresponds to the figure of the Judahite ruler in the MT. The majority of the PChron MSS also have the future tense ('will come forth'), and the clause represents the Jewish perspective on the messiah as not yet having come.²⁰ One MS (Or. MS 58 of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence [= MS 9a1 of the Leiden edition]) and its dependants have the perfect tense ('has come forth'), which may express a Christian viewpoint, and the reading is almost certainly secondary. For it is less likely that a reading that originally expressed a Christian viewpoint would, in transmission, be altered to express a Jewish perspective on, of all possible topics, the messiah. A rather less certain indicator is the association of prayer with the third, sixth, and ninth hours at 1 Chronicles 15:21. These hours are not prescribed in this way in rabbinic sources; and yet it could be argued that their observance in later Christian worship was a continuation of originally Jewish practice (see already Acts 3:1; 10:2–3, 9, 30).

At the same time, there are surprising instances of translator ignorance in PChron, especially if it is to be viewed as Jewish in origin. Two such relating to the great annual festivals stand out. First, in the account of the dedication of Solomon's temple, the Syriac has the king dismiss the people at full moon in the month of Tishri (2 Chronicles 7:10), which is just when the festival week would be expected to begin. Secondly, there is an even more puzzling confusion at 2 Chronicles 8:13, where the annual fast of Yom Kippur takes its place with Unleavened Bread and Tabernacles,

¹⁹ See, for example, B.D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOTSS 23; Sheffield, 1983), 69–75; cf. Phillips, 'Musical Instruments in the Peshitta to Chronicles and Contacts with the Peshitta to Ben Sira', 53–55.

²⁰ See, already, Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur*, 264. Since the MT has a verbless clause ('from him...a ruler'), the translator's choice of tense is all the more significant.

replacing the festival of Weeks (or, Pentecost) as one of the three annual pilgrim festivals ('Regalim') of ancient Israel.

PChron as a Translation

The free and occasionally intractable nature of PChron as a translation is well known. Fraenkel appears to have been the first to appeal to a defective Hebrew *Vorlage* by way of explanation,²¹ and the variability in the quality of the translation may support the view that something other than the translator's competence is involved. At the same time, Dirksen has noted that, even where the translator has not been experiencing difficulty, he can exhibit 'a good measure of liberty over against the Hebrew text'.²² The following paragraphs will variously illustrate *Vorlage* issues, probable ignorance on the part of the translator, and on occasion his happy collusion with his difficult text insofar as it gave him opportunity to introduce, or at least underline, themes that were especially important to him. Only sample cases can be cited, since the relationship of PChron to its *Vorlage* calls for fine judgment at very many points, and this can properly be achieved only after detailed investigation of the text and painstaking comparison with the MT. The dangers in short-circuiting the process are very apparent in Fraenkel's two 1879 articles noted above.

At 1 Chronicles 5:22 MT 'from God' has become, by metathesis of **מהאלהים** to **מהאלהים**, 'from the(ir) tents', producing the unlikely statement that many slain 'fell from their tents'.²³ At 1 Chronicles 9:11 the noun *nāgīd* ('prince') is misread as the preposition *neged* ('in front of'), so that a statement about Azariah being the chief official of the house of God is replaced by one that locates his own private dwelling opposite the house of the Lord. At 1 Chronicles 9:31 the flat (?) cakes of the MT become 'secret matters', presumably because the root **חבא** ('hide') was suspected in MT **החבתים** ('the cakes'). At 2 Chronicles 33:11 the word **חח** ('hook') was not recognized: instead, the translator represents BH **חיים** ('life'), with the result that MT 'they took Manasseh with hooks' becomes 'they took Manasseh alive (lit. 'in his life')'.

²¹ 'Die syrische Uebersetzung', 508, 753–54. He comments on the 'carelessness' with which the ancient biblical texts were copied and translated (p. 508).

²² 'Some Aspects of the Translation Technique in P-Chronicles', 18–19 (19); Dirksen cites 1 Chronicles 12:1, where a reasonable paraphrase of the Hebrew is followed by an expansion that the translator himself has introduced.

²³ In the translation section a tolerable sense has been obtained at the cost of implicit emendation: 'For many from the (lit. 'their') tents fell slain in the battle'.

In theory, either ignorance of the required nuance or theological scruple could be responsible at 1 Chronicles 21:15, where PChron has, ‘The Lord sent an angel to Jerusalem to destroy it and, while he was destroying it, the Lord saw him *and was comforted because of the evil.*’ The verb in the MT is נחם, which, though sometimes translatable by ‘comfort’, in this context clearly has the meaning ‘repent, relent’: ‘the Lord saw it and relented concerning the disaster’ (NIV). The translator could, of course, have been aware of נחם in the sense of ‘repent, relent’, in which case he may simply have wished to avoid saying that God ‘repented’ of what he had been doing (see 1 Samuel 15:29). Sibilant confusion at 1 Chronicles 15:23 explains the transformation of MT’s ‘Berekiah and Elkanah were doorkeepers (שערים) for the ark’ into ‘Berechiah and Elkanah were doing (שערו) whatever was required for the ark’. And since a verb שער/שער cognate with Syriac ܫܥܪ is weakly attested in BH, if at all (see commentaries on Deuteronomy 32:17), the translator appears to have resorted to a ‘false friend’ of his own making. In 1 Chronicles 26:17 the rare form אספִּים, from the root אסף and with the meaning ‘store’, is rendered by סף (‘thresholds’; cf. BH סף II). The name Asaph in 2 Chronicles 35:15 is misread as an occurrence of the verb אסף (‘gather’), with resultant confusion for both the syntax and the sense.²⁴

Sometimes the sense becomes confused when the translator stumbles over phrasing in the Hebrew that would normally be within his range of competence. There is a simple example of blurred vision leading to confusion at 2 Chronicles 19:9, where the Syriac says that Jehoshaphat ‘returned to Jerusalem’, even though the preceding verse has him already in residence in the city and engaged in assigning judicial responsibilities to certain Levites, priests, and clan heads. The Hebrew underlying ‘returned to Jerusalem’ is in the MT of verse 8, and says, ‘and *they* returned to Jerusalem’, which has the appointees for subject.²⁵ Again, it is surprising to find in 2 Chronicles 35:4 the instruction: ‘Prepare your heart and the heart of your fathers.’ It appears that the translator found BH לב (‘heart’) in MT לבית (‘according to the house of’), but why he should have gone that route, and why he tolerated the resultant sense, remains puzzling, even if his *Vorlage* was deficient.

²⁴ For other examples of proper nouns being translated, see Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, 49–50.

²⁵ Sometimes the MT is treated as suspect and emendation or, at the least, revocalization preferred. Thus BHS emends to ‘(and for the lawsuits of) the inhabitants of Jerusalem’, citing the LXX and Vulgate. Some modern translations simply reposit the verb and render ‘And they lived in Jerusalem’ (NIV), ‘They had their seat at Jerusalem’ (NRSV, ESV).

As to whether PChron is describable as a ‘Targum’, there are several factors that need to be weighed. First, the free composition that is a feature of PChron is hardly comparable with the paraphrastic expansions that are characteristic of the Targums; if the Syriac translator was working with a defective Hebrew text, his tendency towards free composition may owe little or nothing to Targumic influence. The omissions and expansions in which PChron frequently indulges would merely reflect the translator’s attempts to compensate for the deficiencies of his *Vorlage*. Secondly, it is true that the translator tends to overwork a few serviceable terms (cf. Weitzman’s ‘drudge words’) though ‘and all the workers of the works for works’ in 2 Chronicles 34:13, translated in this volume ‘and all the workmen responsible for the work’, is extreme and partly provoked by the underlying Hebrew (cf. also MT Numbers 4:47). However, while a comparison with the Targumic ‘standard translations’ might suggest itself, the comparison is slight and hardly indicative. Nor, thirdly, would PChron’s aversion to anthropomorphisms justify describing it as ‘Targumic’, since the anti-anthropomorphic tendency is not limited to the Targumic genre. Fourthly, as Weitzman has demonstrated, most of the midrashic features in PChron are not paralleled in rabbinic sources.²⁶ And, finally, correspondences with the actual Targum to Chronicles are rare and easily accounted for.²⁷

Themes

The Bible translators of antiquity had fewer inhibitions than their modern counterparts about introducing their own ideas into their work, and, if the translator of PChron was labouring under the burden of a damaged *Vorlage*, there was added opportunity and temptation to indulge the inclination. So we may explain, for example, the innovative references to the poor and needy in a couple of texts. At 1 Chronicles 23:5, the statement in the MT about David’s organization of the Levites talks rather, in the Syriac, of his appointing commissioners to provide for the needs of the poor:

so that they should oversee the building and should be eager to help with their wealth, their resources, their property, their accounts, their goods, and their alms, to provide for the poor. David appointed stewards and superintendents in charge of the poor and needy, to feed

²⁶ *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, 111–13.

²⁷ Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, 119. See also his essay, ‘Is the Peshitta of Chronicles a Targum?’, in P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum Studies, Volume 2: Targum and Peshitta* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, 165; Atlanta, 1998), 159–93.

and provide for the poor — one for every ten — and they were not to let any of them go short.

A special provision for the poor is likewise introduced at 2 Chronicles 31:10, where the MT reports a surplus from the popular tithes: ‘Eat and be satisfied, and give what is left over from them to the poor and needy.’ The theme of ‘virtuous poverty’ is associated with David in 1 Chronicles 29:3, where he twice says that he made preparations for the building of the temple ‘out of my poverty’. The genesis of this idea is evidently in 1 Chronicles 22:14 where, also in the first person, David claims to have made these preparations ‘in my trouble’ (‘poverty’ KJVMg), though the wealth mentioned in the same verse belies any such claim, and the translator appears to have relocated the affliction-poverty motif to 1 Chronicles 29:3.²⁸

Conversely, it was the acquisition of riches that contributed to the downfall of Uzziah: ‘But when he became rich in possessions, he became very conceited’ (2 Chronicles 26:16; MT ‘when he became strong’). At the same time, the translator honours his *Vorlage* in its various attributions of kingly wealth and prosperity to God. When he says in 1 Chronicles 29:28 that David ‘excelled in the riches of the world and its honour’, he may be qualifying his praise,²⁹ but in other places such wealth is said to come from the beneficence of God (1 Chronicles 29:12; 2 Chronicles 1:12; 9:22; 17:12; 18:1). The amassing of riches, especially by unjust means, is frequently criticized in the Targums, often obliquely in occurrences of such negatively charged expressions as ‘the rich in possessions’ and ‘the mammon of deceit’.³⁰ PChron, in fact, is less disdainful of wealth than are the Targums in general.³¹

There are also frequent references to prayer in PChron, though many of these are attributable to the substitution of ‘pray’ and ‘prayer’ for terms in the biblical text such as ‘seek’ and ‘turn to’, used in the context of worship.³² The fact that references to prayer are more frequent in the

²⁸ For the same association of giving and (deep) poverty see 2 Corinthians 8:2.

²⁹ Note, however, the addition of ‘the world’ at 2 Chronicles 13:12 (MT ‘you will not succeed’).

³⁰ On this latter, see B.D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus’ Own Interpretation of Isaiah* (London, 1984), 117–23.

³¹ *pace* Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, 234. Most MSS of the Peshitta of Proverbs 22:7, on the other hand, invert the sentiment of the biblical text, in saying that the poor will have ascendancy over the rich.

³² See Phillips, ‘Musical Instruments in the Peshitta to Chronicles and Contacts with the Peshitta to Ben Sira’, 55–56.

Targums than in the parent Hebrew text provides a parallel, but is not an argument for dependence by PChron on a Targum or even on Targumic tradition more broadly, since the pietistic extension of biblical expressions in the direction of prayer followed very easily in the afterlife of the biblical text. An especially striking instance of prayer being exalted above other expressions of cultic worship comes in a text that at the same time reflects an aversion to musical instruments worthy of the author of ‘Paradise Lost’, who envisaged worship in Eden itself as ‘More tuneable than needed lute or harp/To add more sweetness...’ (John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, V:151–52). The passage in question is 1 Chronicles 16:42, which reads in the MT: ‘Heman and Jeduthun had with them trumpets and cymbals for the music, and instruments for sacred song’ (NRSV). The Syriac translator, however, produces what surely qualifies as ‘converse translation’, turning the biblical text through 180 degrees:

These righteous ones were giving praise: not with instruments of praise, nor with tambourines, nor with tabors, nor with curved or straight horns, nor with cymbals, were they giving praise, but with a pleasing mouth and with prayer that was pure and perfected, and in righteousness and integrity, to the Lord God Almighty, the Lord of Israel, the Lord of all deeds.³³

The translator remains consistent on the point, playing down the role of musical instruments in some other texts, whether by curtailing the number mentioned or by outright omission (see 1 Chronicles 15:28; 16:5; 2 Chronicles 29:25, 27; 30:21). Phillips has noted a similar tendency in the Peshitta of Ben Sira.³⁴

PChron also shows itself jealous of its heroes, and of David in particular. Dirksen has commented on the translator’s presentation of David ‘more or less as a religious example’, and has pointed to several elements in the Syriac that support this view.³⁵ Thus, for all his elaboration on David’s oppressive measures against the Ammonites in 1 Chronicles

³³ There is a case of virtual ‘converse translation’ in the preceding verse where the MT’s ‘those chosen and *expressly named* to render thanks’ becomes ‘the righteous ones whose names have been *concealed*’. At 1 Chronicles 23:26 the MT’s statement that the Levites no longer were required to carry the tabernacle or its accoutrements is converted into a requirement that they do precisely that (‘Moreover, the Levites will carry the tent and all the vessels of its service’).

³⁴ ‘Musical Instruments in the Peshitta to Chronicles and Contacts with the Peshitta to Ben Sira’, 56–67 (65–66).

³⁵ Dirksen, ‘Some Aspects of the Translation Technique in P-Chronicles’, 22–23.

20:3, the translator inserts the defensive comment, ‘but he did not kill any of them’. The omission of the items that Hiram made for the temple in 2 Chronicles 4:11–17 may, or may not, belong here. Perhaps this is just one of those omissions that happen from time to time in PChron, possibly because the translator’s *Vorlage* was especially illegible at such points. Moreover, the section has various names and technical terms, as have verses 19–22, which are also omitted. On the other hand, by omitting these verses and jumping to verse 18, the translator has noted only those activities and artefacts connected with the temple that are attributed directly to Solomon himself. The effect of the omission is *ad maiorem gloriam Salomonis*, whatever its explanation.

The Text

There are many points at which PChron does not reproduce material that is in the Hebrew text. The creative tendencies of the translator mask some of these. It should also be noted that the versification, whether of PChron in general or the Mosul text in particular, sometimes dignifies as ‘verses’ short phrases or longer runs of text that correspond to nothing in the MT for the verse in question. The opposite can also happen, as at 1 Chronicles 5:15, which is partly represented in the Syriac, but without a corresponding verse number in the Mosul text. Similarly, in 2 Chronicles 3 there is no verse 9 in the Mosul text, whereas the last clause in verse 8 is marked as verse 9 in the Leiden edition, and with some justification from the MT. Again, at some points the Mosul text offers a form of words significantly different from the majority MS tradition. All this, and much more, is deserving of investigation beyond what has already been undertaken in the past century and a half.

There are clearer cases of omission at the following places: 1 Chronicles 2:23, 45, 47–49, 53; 4:7–8, 13–14, 16–18, 34–37; 5:13; 12:23; 24:27–31; 25:5–6; 2 Chronicles 4:3, 11–17, 19–22; 5:12–13; 9:25, 29; 13:13–14; 20:22–23; 24:13–14; 25:22; 26:6b–8a; 27:8 (omitted and v. 9 numbered as v. 8); 29:10–19.

The following are also omissions, although the Mosul numbering does not represent the correspondence between the text and the MT material with full accuracy: 1 Chronicles 4:22–24; 8:8–9, 17–23, 26–27; 2 Chronicles 33:4–5. In 1 Chronicles 7, the Mosul text has verses numbered to verse 35, but omits almost everything corresponding to MT verses 34–39. In 2 Chronicles 29 the text mistakenly numbers verse 24 as a second verse 23, resulting in two identically numbered verses.

In some cases, verses are rearranged, as in other PChron texts: for example, 1 Chronicles 24:26b, 30, 31 comes between 1 Chronicles 25:1a

and 1b, and 2 Chronicles 28:23–25 comes between verses 15 and 16 of the chapter in question.³⁶

As in other PChron texts, use is made of the text of Kings for material about Rehoboam and Jeroboam: 2 Chronicles 10:19 is followed by 1 Kings 12:21–30; 13:34; 14:1–9, with the Chronicles text resuming at 2 Chronicles 12:13.

Defective readings in the Mosul text are corrected in the footnotes to the translation at 1 Chronicles 4:41; 6:20; 16:39; 25:1; 2 Chronicles 1:3, 13 (x 2); 9:24; 13:18; 18:32; 23:8; 24:7; 31:10. At 2 Chronicles 20:12 an erroneous reading has already been corrected by the scribe. Cases where the Mosul text has the singular where the plural would be expected, or vice versa, are noted (e.g., 1 Chronicles 9:1, 5, 18).

Translation Policy

This translation of PChron aims to steer a course between the woodenly literal and the freer paraphrastic extremes. When, in the interests of clarity and readability, a degree of freedom has been exercised, this has generally been indicated in the footnotes, where both the preferred rendering and the ‘literal’ one are given. In keeping with the general series policy, some freedom has been exercised in, for example, the treatment of the conjunction *naw* (‘and’), which is sometimes represented by another conjunction such as ‘then’ or ‘so’ (e.g., 1 Chronicles 1:44) and is occasionally omitted, in the interests of a more readable style (e.g., 1 Chronicles 1:7, 35, 39). Finally, where there is repetitious use of proper names in the Syriac, the appropriate pronoun has been substituted for the sake of readability (e.g., 1 Chronicles 11:8; ‘he’ replaces ‘David’).

Translator’s Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jerry Lund for his careful reading of the manuscript and for his valuable suggestions and corrections.

Addenda

In each case, the several Addenda that follow give only a sample selection of the features indicated for 1–2 Chronicles.

³⁶ Here the versification differs from that in the Leiden edition of PChron.

Addendum 1: Variant Vorlagen, Doublets, and Mistranslations

1 Chronicles

- 5:1 **ܠܒܪܟܬܐ** reflects BH **ברכה** ('blessing'), while the Syriac also represents BH **בכרה** ('birthright') correctly in vv. 1–2 (LXX renders twice by 'blessing').
- 5:22 **ܡܢ ܡܥܬܬܐܬܐܝܬܐ** ('from their tents') involves metathesis of MT **מהאלהים** ('from God') to **מאהליהם/מהאהלים**.
- 7:25 The verse's preoccupation with healing follows from verse 24 in the Syriac, but may also reflect a misreading of MT **ורפח** (n. pr.) as if from BH **רפא** ('heal').
- 7:28 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('and their beds' > 'and their settlements') may represent **ומשכבותם** rather than MT **ומשבותם** ('and their settlements'); see, however, footnote *ad loc.*
- 8:40 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('and they taught') attributes to MT **ומרבים** ('and multiplying; having many') the Aramaic-Syriac meaning, 'bringing up; educating' (**ܐܬܪܒܐ**, Pael). The following mention of children and grandchildren will have encouraged this interpretation of the Hebrew.
- 9:11 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('over against') reflects **נגד** for MT **נגיד** ('chief officer').
- 9:31 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('secret matters') appears to find the root **חבא** ('hide') in MT **החבתים** ('the cakes').
- 9:33 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('officiants') treats MT **המשררים** ('singers') as if **משרתים** ('servants; ministers').
- 12:18 (MT 19) **ܠܗ ܗܝܝ** ('Press on!') is a doublet on MT **לך** ('yours'), combining the imperative **ל** ('Come!'; cf. LXX) and the suffixed preposition **ܗܝܝ** (lit. 'for yourself').
- 12:22 (MT 23) **ܠܗܝܝܐ** ('bread') may derive from the letters **ח-מ-ל** in MT **עד-למחנה**.
- 14:15 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('(the sound of) shouting') may reflect **צעקה** for MT **צעדה** ('marching'); cf. Targum 2 Samuel 5:24 in this respect.
- 15:22 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('established'), like the whole phrase 'a place had been established for him', reflects **מכין** ('[was] establishing') for MT **מבין** ('[was] understanding [it]').
- 15:23 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('[were] doing') for MT **שערים** ('gatekeepers') assumes a Hebrew verb **שער/שער** cognate with Syriac **ܫܥܪ**, though such a verb is at best weakly attested in BH (see commentaries on Deut. 32:17).
- 16:7 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('and the chiefs of') and **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('first of the hymns') form a doublet on MT **בראש** ('first').
- 17:17 **ܡܢ ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ** ('who are doing your fear' > 'who show you reverence') represents BH **ירא** ('fear') for MT **וראתני**, from BH **ראה** ('see'; but the text is corrupt).

- 20:6,8 **חַרְפָּא** ('the Insolent'), corresponding to MT **הַרְפָּא**, may be based on BH **חָרַף** ('reproach; scorn').
- 23:28 **חַצְצְרוֹת** ('[on] horns') treats MT **הַחֲצָרוֹת** ('the courts') as 'the horns'.
- 23:28 **כְּלֵי** ('vessels of') represents **כָּלִי** rather than MT **כָּלִל** ('all').
- 24:6 **אֶחָד...אֶחָד** ('one...one') represents **אֶחָד...אֶחָד** instead of MT **אֶחָד...אֶחָד** ('chosen...chosen'). **מִבְּחֵל** ['first'] translates MT **אֶחָד**.
- 24:6 **אֲחֵר** ('other' > 'next') renders MT **אֶחָד** ('chosen' [2^o]) as if **אֲחֵר**.
- 26:16 [MT 15], 17 **חֶמְלָה** ('threshold area'; cf. BH **סָף** II) renders the rare form **אֲסָפִים** (from the root **אָסַף** and with the meaning 'storehouse').
- 29:5 **בְּחֹדֶשָׁה** ('in its month') reads **בְּחֹדֶשָׁה** (or similar) for MT **בְּיַד חֲרָשִׁים** ('by craftsmen').

2 Chronicles

- 2:7 (MT 6), 14 (MT 13) **לַחֲכִיכָה מִכְתָּבָא** ('to cast keys'/'to make keys') renders BH **פָּתַח** II ('engrave') in the MT as if **פָּתַח** I ('open' [of doors, gates]).
- 2:10 (MT 9) **מִכְתָּבָא** ('provisions') possibly reads MT **מִכְתָּבָא** (meaning uncertain) as **מִכְתָּבָא** (cf. 1 Kgs 5:25).
- 6:18 **חֲסִידָא** ('in faithfulness') has read MT **הָאֱמִנָּה** ('indeed') as **הָאֱמוּנָה** ('faith; faithfulness').
- 13:11 **וְלִנְיָא** ('[and] a young [lamp-keeper]') perhaps represents a doublet on MT **לְבָאֵר** ('burn'), referring to the youth (BH **נֶעֱר**) who was thought to light the sanctuary lamps.
- 14:7 (MT 6) **וְהִנְחִיחָנוּ** ('and he has encouraged us') construes MT **וַיִּבְנוּ** ('and they built') as if from a verb cognate with Syriac **חָלַל** (Pael; 'console; comfort').
- 16:9 **חֲסִידָא** ('Consider') gives MT **נִסְכַּלְתָּ** ('you have been foolish') a sense closer to BH **שָׁכַל** I ('give attention to; be prudent') than to BH **סָכַל** ('be foolish'), and one that is more suited to the translator's positive recasting of the verse. In post-biblical Hebrew both **שָׁכַל** and **סָכַל** can mean 'look; look towards' (cf. modern Hebrew **הִסְתַּכַּל**, 'look').
- 16:10 **וַיִּסָּחֵף** ('ran away [from]') arises from a misunderstanding of the MT, which features BH **רָצַץ** ('oppress') and not BH **רָוַץ** ('run').
- 19:3 **לֹא** ('you have [not] shed') may correspond to MT **הָאֲשֵׁרוֹת**, albeit the verb **לֹא** ('shed') exists in Aramaic and Syriac rather than Hebrew.
- 20:6 **וְאֵין** ('and I') represents **וְאֵין** rather than MT **וְאֵין** ('and there is none').
- 21:11 **וְיַיִן** ('and...wine') may correspond to MT **וְיַיִן**, read as **וְיַיִן** ('and wine'). At the same time, the sentence 'and made the Nazirites of Jerusalem drink wine' is imported from Amos 2:12.

- 25:8 **וְלֹא חָסַד** ('for you have not given praise') for MT **יֵשׁ כֹּחַ** ('there is power') possibly represents the Hebrew verb **שָׁבַח** ('praise').
- 30:3 **וְהַמְלִיכִים וְהַמְלִיכִים** ('and the teachers of the people' > 'and those instructing the people') corresponds to MT **לְמַדֵּי וְהָעָם** ('sufficiently; and the people'); the translator associates **לְמַדֵּי** with the root **לָמַד** ('learn' > 'teach') and connects it with **וְהָעָם** as if the two were in construct relationship.
- 31:3 **וְלֹאֵל וְלֹאֵל** ('of bulls for morning') is a doublet on MT **הַבֹּקֶר** explained as both *bāqār* ('cattle; cow; bull') and *bōqer* ('morning').
- 31:19 **בְּחַיֵּיהֶם** ('their flesh' > 'their bodies') reflects BH **בָּשָׂר** ('flesh') rather than MT **בְּשָׂדֵי** ('in the fields of').
- 33:11 **בְּחַיֵּיהֶם** ('in his life' > 'alive') reads MT **בְּחֻמִּים** ('with hooks') as if deriving from BH **חַיִּים** ('life'), with the result that MT 'they took Manasseh with hooks' becomes 'they took Manasseh alive (lit. 'in his life')'.
- 34:6 **בְּחַיֵּיהֶם** ('in their streets' > 'in their squares') appears to find BH **רְחוּב** ('street') in MT **בְּהַר בְּתֵיהֶם** (text uncertain).
- 35:4 **וְהַלֵּב** ('and the heart [of your fathers]') misconstrues MT **לְבֵית** ('according to the house of') from BH **לֵב** ('heart'). The translator tries to temper the misconstrual by prefixing 'your heart': 'Establish your heart and the heart of your fathers'.
- 35:14 (MT 15) **וְהַמְלִיכִים** ('who were ministering'): see on 1 Chronicles 9:33.
- 35:25 **וְהַנְּשִׂאִים הַיְשָׁרִים** ('[you] righteous men and righteous women') represents **הַיְשָׁרִים וְהַשֹּׁמְרִים** ('the upright men and upright women') for MT **הַשֹּׁמְרִים וְהַשֹּׁמְרִים** ('the singing men and singing women').
- 36:15 **חֲתָן** ('the flock') for MT **מְעוֹנֵי** ('his dwelling') perhaps assumes a Hebrew cognate of **חֲתָן** underlying the MT.

Addendum 2: Clarifying Renderings and Additions

1 Chronicles

- 2:15 'Eliho the seventh, and David the eighth': correcting MT 'David the seventh' in accordance with 1 Samuel 16:10 (cf. 1 27:18).
- 3:1 'from Mount Carmel': explicatory of MT 'the Carmelite'.
- 8:34 'lame in his feet': an addition derived from 2 Samuel 4:4; 9:3.
- 9:16 '(son of) Elkanah, who lived in Ramah': for MT '(son of) Elkanah who lived in the villages of the Netophathites'. See 1 Samuel 1:1; 2:11.
- 10:6 'that day': an addition based on 1 Samuel 31:6.
- 12:15 (MT 16) 'the month of Nisan': for MT 'the first month'.
- 12:15 (MT 16) 'They put to flight...the whole army that was encamped in the valley': for MT 'They put to flight all the valleys'.

- 18:12 ‘the brother of Joab’: an addition (cf. 1 Sam. 26:6 [etc.]).
- 21:26 ‘and fire came down...that were upon the altar’: the Syriac explains how the Lord ‘answered him with fire from heaven’ (MT).
- 26:10 ‘His eldest son died, and his father appointed the one next after him as leader, but did not give him a title of seniority’: the Syriac explains how a son who was not a firstborn became leader.
- 29:1 ‘because he is a wise and perceptive boy’: the Syriac enhances Solomon’s suitability by adding this clause.

2 Chronicles

- 1:15; 9:27 ‘like the sand upon the seashore’: the Syriac substitutes a more familiar simile for MT ‘like the sycamores in the Shephelah’.
- 20:35 ‘than all the kings of Israel’: added explanatorily to ‘did more evil deeds’.
- 33:14 ‘the river (ܝܝܫܘ) Gihon’: for MT ‘Gihon in the valley’; see Genesis 2:13 (‘and the name of the second river [*nāḥār*] is Gihon’).
- 34:32 ‘crossed over into the covenant’: for the expression see Deuteronomy 29:11 (ET 12).

Addendum 3: Exegetical Parallels

1 Chronicles

- 12:18 ‘the spirit of might’ (MT ‘the Spirit’): see Targum 1 Chronicles 12:19 (ed. Le Déaut and Robert, II, p. 42).
- 14:12 ‘and scatter their dust in the wind’: see m. Abodah Zarah 3:3.
- 15:28 (*et passim*) ‘horns both straight and curved’: see m. Rosh ha-Shanah 3:3–4.
- 16:42 ‘not with instruments of praise’: see m. Sotah 9:11.
- 17:27 ‘the houses of the righteous’: for the reference to the righteous see the parallel text in Targum 2 Samuel 7:29.
- 29:19 ‘so that your great name...in the presence of those who fear you’: cf. the Qaddish, as in *Seder Amram Gaon* (ed. Hedegård, p. 17 [Heb.]).

2 Chronicles

- 6:14 ‘who dwells in heaven above, and your purposes are fulfilled upon the earth below’: cf. Targum 1 Kings 8:23 ‘whose presence is in the heavens above and (who) rules over the earth beneath’.
- 28:24 ‘the inner and outer doors in the house of the Lord’: see m. Middoth 4:1.
- 33:6 ‘closed eyes’ > ‘engaged in magic arts’: see *Sifre* on Deuteronomy 18:10 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 219).
- 33:7 ‘four-faced image’: see b. Sanhedrin 103b.

Addendum 4: Exegetical Contrasts

2 Chronicles

- 4:9 ‘one great court for the priests and Levites’: m. Middoth 2:5, 6 connects the musical performances of the Levites with the Court of the Israelites.
- 8:13 ‘the festivals three times in the year — the Festival of Unleavened Bread, the Festival of the Fast...’: here the annual fast of Yom Kippur unaccountably replaces the Festival of Weeks (Pentecost).
- 35:13 ‘in the fire’: since the following reference to pots implies boiling, and not roasting over a fire (cf. Exod. 12:9), this phrase is inappropriate, and some Syriac Mss omit it.
- 35:23 ‘Pharaoh the Lame shot Josiah with two arrows’: b. Taanith 22b refers to Josiah’s body as having been riddled like a sieve.

Addendum 5: Treatment of Select Names

1 Chronicles

- 4:42 (etc.) Gebel translates Seir; see Palestinian Targums (e.g., Gen 14:6, Fragment-Targum).
- 6:45 (MT 31) Nator, for MT Shemer, substitutes the Aramaic root נטר (‘keep’) for its commonest Hebrew equivalent (שמר).
- 7:24 MT שארה is treated as a verb form (‘[who] was left’ > ‘[who] survived’).
- 8:32 MT שמאה is represented by ܫܠܐ, which could be translated ‘a hundred’.
- 8:33 Jashwi, for MT Abinadab, is influenced by 1 Samuel 14:49.
- 8:38 Azrikam is divided into two names: Azri his firstborn, Kim his second (cf. 1 9:44).
- 9:8 Elah is confused with BH אלה (‘these’).
- 9:17 Ahihom misunderstands MT [ו]אחיהם (‘[and] their brother’) as a proper name.
- 9:30 The additional clause ‘and the gift was given by the Levites’ at the end of this verse perhaps arose as an interpretation of the name Mattithiah (‘Gift of YHWH’) occurring at the beginning of the next verse.
- 11:12 ܕܕܕܐ (‘[son of] his uncle’ > ‘his cousin’) treats the proper name ‘Dodo’ in MT ‘son of Dodo’ as a common noun.
- 11:27, 34, 35 In each occurrence of MT Harorite/Hararite the Syriac ܕܗܪ finds the noun ܗܪ (‘hill; mountain’): ‘King’s Hill’ (v. 27), ‘Mount Carmel’ (v. 34), ‘Hill of the House’ (v. 35).

- 12:8 (MT 9) Mazruth represents MT '(to the) stronghold' (לְמִצְדָּה) as a proper noun.
- 13:5 Hamath is contemporized to Antioch (cf. 1 18:9; 2 7:8; 8:3).
- 18:1 'The Measuring Line' represents a translation of MT Metheg-Ha'ammah in the parallel passage in 2 Samuel 8:1. The name is not original to 1 Chronicles 18:1, but has been introduced there by the Syriac translator.
- 18:9 Zobah is contemporized as Nisibis (cf. 1 Chronicles 19:6).
- 19:6 Aram-maacah is identified with Har(r)an.
- 23:17 Ribī misunderstands MT רבו ('were numerous') as a proper noun.
- 25:29 רבאי ('Rabai') represents MT גדלתי (n. pr.) with an equivalent Syriac root (cf. BH גדל, Syriac ܕܠ; ['be great']).

2 Chronicles

- 26:6 Gaza represents MT Jabneh: see Targum Chronicles, *ad loc.* (ed. Le Déaut and Robert, II, p. 139).
- 35:15 The second occurrence of Asaph is misread as an occurrence of the verb אסף ('gather, assemble'): 'He assembled Heman and Iruthun, the king's seers.'
- 35:20 Carchemish is contemporized as Mabbug.

Addendum 6: Inner-Syriac Corruptions

1 Chronicles

- 16:39 'high place': the Mosul text (and others) has ܕܡܥܬܐ ('banquet') by metathesis for ܕܡܥܬܐ ('altar, high place'; cf. 2 14:3). See also 2 1:3, 13.
- 18:15 ܡܚܕܝܐ ('leader'; 'governor') is possibly a corruption of the more strongly attested reading ܡܚܕܝܐ ('who was recording' > 'recorder'; cf. MT מזכיר).

2 Chronicles

- 9:24 ܩܬܠܐ ('reptiles') is inferior to the majority reading ܩܬܠܐ ('horses').
- 18:9 ܕܠܐ ('speckled; coloured') may be a corruption of an original ܕܠܐ ('at the threshing floor'; cf. MT בגרן).
- 20:25 ܫܦܬܝܐ ('and bridles') is possibly a corruption of ܫܦܬܝܐ ('and bodies'; cf. MT ܫܦܬܝܐ), albeit the Syriac has a mention of horses immediately afterwards. A few Hebrew Mss have ܫܦܬܝܐ ('and garments').
- 21:19 ܐܡܢܐ ('honour') may have replaced an original ܡܠܐ ('burning'; cf. MT שרפה).

- 23:11 ܡܥܬܪܐ ('globe', but possibly 'crown'; cf. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 1205; Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon*, 421b) may be a corruption of the majority reading ܡܥܬܪܐ ('tiara; diadem').
- 24:7 ܡܥܬܪܐ, although having Ms support, appears to be a corruption of the majority reading ܡܥܬܪܐ ('sons'), corresponding to MT' בניה ('her sons').

Addendum 7: Other Defective Readings in the Mosul Text

1 Chronicles

- 4:41 'came': the Mosul text has 'brought'. Some other texts have 'came' (cf. MT).
- 6:20 'Libni': added in translation (cf. v. 17; and see MT v. 5).
- 25:1a 'army chiefs': the required construct form ܡܥܬܪܐ is found in other texts.

2 Chronicles

- 1:13 'from': Peshitta and MT 'to' is in error (LXX 'from').
- 9:4 'fare': the Mosul text has ܡܥܬܪܐ (cf. ܡܥܬܪܐ [?]), but other texts have the expected form ܡܥܬܪܐ.
- 13:18 'grew stronger': the Mosul text has the singular, whereas other texts have the plural.
- 18:32 ܡܥܬܪܐ is a mistake for ܡܥܬܪܐ (lit. 'and it was, came to pass').
- 23:8 'did not': the insertion of the negative is required, and is supported by some MSS (cf. MT).
- 31:10 '[and said] to him': the Mosul text has 'to them', but the majority reading is 'to him'.