

THE SYRO-HEXAPLARIC HEADINGS OF THE PSALMS IN MANUSCRIPT 12T3*

Harry F. van Rooy

Potchefstroom Campus, North-West University, South Africa

Introduction

In a paper read at the meeting of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies in Oslo in 1998¹ it was pointed out that one manuscript of the Syro-Hexapla (12t3²) contains many unique variant readings in the headings of the Psalms. This manuscript contains the text of the Psalms according to the Peshitta, but has variants from the Syro-Hexapla added between lines. In the case of the headings of the Psalms, it does not contain any of the headings that do occur in manuscripts of the Peshitta. The Psalms in Peshitta manuscripts do not have headings corresponding to the headings of the Hebrew original, but either do not have any headings at all, or headings unrelated to the headings of the Masoretic text.³ In his study of the headings of the Psalms in the East Syriac Church Bloemendaal distinguishes

*This paper is a revised version of a paper read at the meeting of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, in Boston, November 1999.

¹H.F. van Rooy, 'The Headings of the Psalms in Book 1 of the Psalms in the Syro-Hexapla', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo 1998*. (SBLSCS, 51; Atlanta: SBL, 2001), pp. 373-392.

²12t3 is the number assigned to this manuscript in the edition of the Peshitta published in Leiden. See Peshitta Institute, *List of Old Testament Peshitta Manuscripts (Preliminary Issue)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961). For other Peshitta manuscripts the number of this list is used as well, if that manuscript is mentioned in the list.

³See W. Bloemendaal. *The Headings of the Psalms in the East Syriac Church* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1961), p. 1.

four different groups of headings that do occur in manuscripts or editions of the Psalms in Syriac, viz., the headings of the East Syriac church, headings related to those of the *Codex Ambrosianus* (the West Syrian tradition), the headings in the editions of Sionita, Lee and the Polyglots, and manuscripts with a mixture of Eastern and Western headings.⁴

In his study of the Eastern tradition, Bloemendaal used eight manuscripts, as well as three editions containing the East Syrian headings.⁵ Only one of the eight manuscripts (6t1) is not classified by Walter as a Nestorian manuscript.⁶ Of the other seven used by Bloemendaal Walter used five (12t1, 13t1-3 and 17t2) in his edition of the Psalms, excluding only 9m1 and the Manuscript Mingana 428. In his edition Walter classified fourteen of the manuscripts that he used as Nestorian manuscripts.⁷ Five of them were used by Bloemendaal in his edition of the East Syrian headings. Of the other nine manuscripts, only 12t3 has the headings of the Syro-Hexapla. The usual East Syrian headings occur in 12t4, 13t4, 16t2, 17t1, 17t3 and 18>8dt1. 16t3 does not have headings at all, while 16t6 has the East Syrian heading for Psalm 1, but either no headings (usually) or headings unrelated to the other traditions for the other Psalms. One would expect the headings of the Eastern tradition in 12t3, but in their place this manuscript has the headings of the Syro-Hexapla, in full, not between the lines as is the case for the Psalms themselves. In this sense the headings in this manuscript are unique.

It became clear in the previous paper that the relationship between this manuscript and the other manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla needs more study, since this manuscript can not readily be classified with any of the groups of the Syro-Hexaplaric Psalter distinguished by Hiebert.⁸ The Psalms in the Syro-Hexapla differ from the rest of the Syro-Hexapla in the sense that the Psalms do not reflect a true hexaplaric text. The debate about the original Greek *Vorlage* of the Syro-Hexapla is still not settled. The relationship between the different manuscripts of the Syro-Hexaplaric Psalter is another matter under

⁴Bloemendaal, *Headings*, pp. 2-3.

⁵Bloemendaal, *Headings*, pp. 12-15.

⁶D.M. Walter, *The Book of Psalms* (The Old Testament in Syriac, II.3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), p. viii.

⁷Walter, *Psalms*, p. xxvi.

⁸R.J.V. Hiebert, *The 'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

discussion. Up to now the view of Hiebert is the most convincing. He distinguishes three groups of manuscripts, to which he gave the names SyrPs, SyrPs^a and SyrPs^b. These manuscripts and the groups are discussed in more detail in the next section. He regards SyrPs as a revision of the Philoxenian Psalter, probably done by Paul of Tella. SyrPs^a he regards as a different revision of the Philoxenian Psalter, perhaps by Thomas of Harkel. SyrPs^b reflects some of the features of SyrPs^a, but is closely related to SyrPs. It could be a light revision of SyrPs based on SyrPs^a.⁹

A study must be made of all the variants in 12t3 (f according to the system used by Hiebert), and not only those in the headings, to determine the relationship between its version of the Syro-Hexapla and the text in the other manuscripts. The headings must, however, be considered on their own, as the headings can in some cases reflect a different tradition from that contained in the Psalms themselves. It also became clear from the previous study of the headings of the first 40 Psalms that influences from other directions must also be taken into consideration with regard to the headings in 12t3, as in the case of the heading of Psalm 12,¹⁰ where an addition may be linked to the East-Syriac heading of Psalm 3. This manuscript also had unique variants for the Hebrew לרוד in many instances.¹¹

This paper will present a survey of the variants in the headings of the Psalms in different manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla and then look in detail at all the headings in manuscript 12t3.¹² This manuscript contains more than 60 unique variants. One must take in consideration those cases as well where this manuscript agrees with the Ambrosian Syro-Hexapla when other manuscripts have variants. All the variants were studied and the readings of 12t3 compared with that of all the other manuscripts. It is impossible to discuss all the variants in detail, but the variants that are important for the relation of 12t3 to the other

⁹Cf. Hiebert, 'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter, pp. 247-260.

¹⁰The numbers of the Psalms are those of the Syro-Hexapla.

¹¹For example, in Psalms 10 (11), 15 (14), 20 (19), 22 (21) and 33 (32) it omits the reference to David altogether. In Psalm 30 (29) it is the only manuscript reading לרוד in stead of לרוד. For other examples, cf. Van Rooy, 'The Headings of the Psalms', pp. 384-387.

¹²The following works were used for the different headings:

Hebrew: K. Elliger & W. Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984); LXX: A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 10; 3rd edn; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); Syro-Hexapla: Hiebert, 'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter.

manuscripts will be dealt with in more detail. In his study Hiebert did not deal with the headings on their own, and with the number of unique variants in 12t3.

The Manuscripts Used in this Study

In his study of the Syro-Hexaplaric, Psalter Hiebert used ten manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla.¹³ One of his manuscripts (d) does not have headings. Of his manuscript k only a few fragments remain, containing parts of Psalms 70, 73, 77 and 79, but unfortunately no heading is part of the text available. Hiebert regarded his manuscripts a-g as representatives of his SyrPs, while h and j contain SyrPs^a (h 1.5–27.6; j 1.1–27.6) and SyrPs^b (from 27.7 onwards).¹⁴ Manuscript k contains only parts of the Psalter, but these correspond with SyrPs^b.¹⁵ The following is a list of the manuscripts relevant to this paper:

- a Milan Ambrosian Library, C. 313 Inf. This manuscript was also used by Baars in his edition of the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms (9SH1)¹⁶
- b British Museum Additional Manuscript 14.434 f. 1-79 (8SH1)
- c British Museum Additional Manuscript 14.434 f. 80-128
- e Cambridge University Library Oriental 929 (14SH1)
- f Baghdad Chaldean Patriarchate 211 (12t3)
- g Vatican Library Borghiani siriaci 113 f. 1-135
- h Baghdad Chaldean Patriarchate 1112 (15/12SH1)
- j Paris, National Library Syr 9 (13SH1)¹⁷

¹³Cf. Hiebert, '*Syrohexaplaric*' *Psalter*, pp. 5-13 for a full discussion of the manuscripts.

¹⁴Hiebert, '*Syrohexaplaric*' *Psalter*, pp. 247-260, distinguishes three different traditions with regard to the Psalms in Syro-Hexaplaric manuscripts. SyrPs is the revision ascribed to Paul of Tella, while he ascribes SyrPs^a to Thomas of Harkel. SyrPs^b contains features of the previous two revisions.

¹⁵Hiebert, '*Syrohexaplaric*' *Psalter*, pp. 5-13.

¹⁶W. Baars, *Apocryphal Psalms* (The Old Testament in Syriac, IV.6; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972). The notations in brackets following this and some of the following manuscripts are those used by Baars in his edition of the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms.

¹⁷Baars, *Apocryphal Psalms*, p. ix, says that j (=his 13SH1) was edited (he only treats Psalm 151) to bring its linguistic usage in accordance with the style of the Syro-Hexapla. The same is not true of Psalm 151 in h, because this Psalm is part of the later addition to this manuscript. This later addition has the normal SyrPs text.

Manuscript g is a copy of f¹⁸ and its variants will not be dealt with separately in this discussion. Hiebert's Manuscript f is designated 12t3 in the notation used for the Leiden Peshitta. In the list of manuscripts used for the Leiden Peshitta¹⁹ this manuscript is dated to AD 1126. It contains the Psalms in the version of the Peshitta, as well as the Odes and other texts.²⁰ It is an important Nestorian manuscript.²¹ In addition to the text of the Peshitta it has many important marginal readings,²² as well as the text of the Syro-Hexapla in interlinear fashion when the Syro-Hexapla differs from the Peshitta.²³

A Survey of Variants in the Different Manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla

This discussion is directed at the variants in manuscript 12t3 (f of Hiebert). Consequently, the variants in the other manuscripts will not be discussed extensively, except where they are important for the variants in f (12t3).²⁴ Two Psalms do not have headings in the Syro-Hexapla,²⁵ while a number of Psalms do not contain any variants on the headings.²⁶ In a previous study²⁷ I examined the headings of the Psalms in the first Book of the Psalms in the Syro-Hexapla. That study demonstrated that Hiebert's distinction between SyrPs on the one hand and SyrPs^a and SyrPs^b on the other was also valid for the headings in the Psalms in the first book, with the exception of manuscript f, the subject of this paper. The manuscripts of SyrPs (a, b, c and e) contain only a few variants, and none that are very important. His manuscripts h and j do contain a number of important variants that clearly distinguish them from SyrPs.

¹⁸Hiebert, '*Syrohexaplaric*' *Psalter*, pp. 9-10.

¹⁹Peshitta Institute, *List*, p. 31.

²⁰Hiebert, '*Syrohexaplaric*' *Psalter*, p. 9.

²¹Walter, *Psalms*, p. xxvi.

²²Walter, *Psalms*, p. xxvi.

²³Hiebert, '*Syrohexaplaric*' *Psalter*, p. 8. This manuscript is described by Baars in his dissertation as well. Cf. W. Baars, *New Syro-Hexaplaric texts: edited, commented upon and compared with the Septuagint* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 12-13, 16, 29 and 35. He did not, however, deal with the text of the *Psalter* in his work.

²⁴To facilitate references to Hiebert's work, the letter f will henceforth be used for this manuscript.

²⁵Psalms 1 and 2.

²⁶Psalms 5, 22, 24, 25, 27, 42, 48, 57, 63, 65, 68, 69, 72, 77, 78, 80, 85, 89, 92, 94, 96, 97, 98, 100, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 129, 137, 138, 139, 141, 143, 146 and 150.

²⁷See note 1.

When the headings of all the Psalms are taken into consideration the picture differs to some extent from that in Book 1 of the Psalms. Manuscript b has only four variants in comparison with a²⁸ and c has only seven variants.²⁹ This demonstrates again that these three manuscripts belong to the same tradition as far as the headings are concerned.

The picture is somewhat different with regard to e. This manuscript is a polyglot from the fourteenth century, containing the Psalms and Odes in Greek, Hebrew, Arabic and in the version of the Syro-Hexapla.³⁰ It has the same variants as b in Psalms 53 and 93. It has the same variants as c in Psalms 45 and 70. It shares some variants with other manuscripts as well. In Psalm 45 it shares a variant with c, h and j, with f, j and h in Psalms 82, 119, 144 and 64, with f and h in Psalm 59, with h and j in Psalm 50 and with f in Psalms 38, 64, 71, 99, 132 and 142 and with j in Psalm 107. Most of these variants are not really important, e.g., related to seyame or different pointing (Psalms 53, 59, 82, 93 and 119) or the spelling of proper nouns (Psalms 38, 50 and 142). Important variants occur in Psalm 132, where e and f omit the name of David and in Psalm 107, where e and j omit ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ.

In addition to this e contains a large number of unique variants, with only a few in the first Book of the Psalms. Many of these variants are also not very important:

1. The reading ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ (against the normal ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ) in Psalms 104, 105, 106, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 134, 135, 145, 147 and 148;
2. The spelling of proper nouns: ܫܪܝܘܠܐ for ܫܪܝܘܠ in Psalms 41, 83, 84, 86 and 87, ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ for ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ in Psalm 59, ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ for ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ in Psalm 76 and ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ for ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ in Psalm 140 (cf. also Psalms 87 [ܕܡܠܟܐ for ܕܡܠܟܐ and ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ for ܠܕܘܠܘܬܐ] and 88 in this regard).
3. Pointing: Psalms 45, 56, 87 and 120.

In a number of cases the variants are more important. Unique plusses occur in Psalms 30, 70 and 102. The plus in Psalm 30 is very

²⁸In Psalms 9 (agreeing with h), 53 (agreeing with e), 87 and 93 (agreeing with e); only 87 is unique.

²⁹In Psalms 16, 37 (agreeing with f, h and j), 44, 45 (agreeing with e, h and j), 47, 53 (agreeing with h) and 70 (agreeing with e); only 16, 44 and 47 are unique.

³⁰Hiebert, 'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter, p. 10.

59. In the Masoretic Psalm 60 the heading states at the end that Joab struck Edom in the Valley of Salt. This reference to Edom is omitted by many witnesses to the Septuagint and all the other manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla. Manuscript e has this reference, agreeing with the Latin of R, Augustine, the Vulgate, Theodoret and a number of Lucianic manuscripts. From this discussion it is evident that e contains a large number of unique variants, frequently influenced by the Hebrew or the Septuagint, especially the Lucianic recension. It does, however, still belong to the same tradition as a, b and c, as can be seen by the lack of agreement with the variants in h and j.

The relatively large number of variants common to h and j supports Hiebert's distinction between SyrPs and SyrPs^a and SyrPs^b. The larger frequency of these variants in the first book of the Psalms also supports the distinction between SyrPs^a and SyrPs^b. It is not necessary to discuss all the variants in h and j for the purpose of this paper.

The most obvious example is the rendering of the Hebrew term לַמְנַצֵּחַ. This term is traditionally understood as 'für die Musikmeister'.³⁴ In the Psalms in the first book of the Psalms it occurs in Psalms 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 30, 35, 38, 39 and 40. The LXX translates this with εἰς τὸ τέλος in every instance. This translation probably connected the Hebrew word to the noun נֶצַח, a temporal expression well known in the phrase לַנְצִיחַ.³⁵ The Greek phrase is omitted by fewer than 16 Lucianic manuscripts and 1219 in Psalm 30 and by fewer than 16 Lucianic manuscripts and 55 in Psalm 40. The Syro-Hexapla usually translates this with ܘܠܘܘܬܐ (at the end³⁶). In only two instances it has ܘܠܘܘܬܐ, in Psalms 5 and 6. Manuscript h and j have ܘܠܘܘܬܐ in the following instances: Psalms 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 (only j, as this Psalm is missing from h), 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21. In Psalms 30, 35, 38 39 and 40 they have ܘܠܘܘܬܐ, as have manuscripts a, b, c and e.

Although cases of the independent possessive pronoun (with suffix added to ܘܟܝܘܢ) and the proleptic suffix occur infrequently in the headings, h and j differ from the other manuscripts in the few instances that do occur.³⁷

³⁴L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, III (3rd edn; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983), p. 676.

³⁵Koehler & Baumgartner, *Lexikon*, p. 676.

³⁶See J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), p. 565.

³⁷Cf. e.g. Psalms 7, 16, 17 and 51.

Some of the variants are very important because they demonstrate that f is unique in many respects. With regard to ܠܘܠܐ in SyrPs the variant that appears frequently in h and j (ܠܘܠܐ) has already been noted. ܠܘܠܐ also occurs in f in Psalms 9, 10, 18 and 19. In some other instances f has a related, but somewhat different, variant. It has a unique reading, ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ, in Psalm 8. In Psalm 11 it has a heading different from all the other manuscripts: ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ. As far as the rendering of the term εἰς τὸ τέλος is concerned, it has ܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܐ. The same rendering occurs very frequently in f, in Psalms 12, 13, 20, 21, 30, 35, 38, 39 and 40 in the first book of Psalms. The noun ܠܘܠܐ is etymologically related to the Hebrew noun נצח, but has the meaning 'victory'.³⁸ The Syriac phrase of f means 'till the completion of the victory'.³⁹ This is a very interesting variant in f. It can be compared to some of the other Greek renderings of this word. Aquila usually has τῷ νικοποιῶ, Symmachus has ἐπινίκιος and Theodotion has εἰς νίκος or εἰς τὸ νίκος. The Gallicanum follows the LXX (in finem) while the Vulgate has victori.⁴⁰ One can perhaps say that f shows some Hexaplaric influence in this instance. In the other books of the Psalms this variant occurs only in the second Book of the Psalms in Psalms 41, 43, 45, 46, 50 and 61. This variant does not occur in f in the last three Books of the Psalter.

The spread of this variant is very important for defining the relationship of f to the other manuscripts. As far as the rendering of the term εἰς τὸ τέλος is concerned, it shows an affinity with h and j in their parts belonging to SyrPs^a, but continues with the same variant when h and j switched to SyrPs^b in the first book of the Psalms and in six instances in the second book of the Psalms. It also demonstrates knowledge of the Hebrew term translated by the LXX as εἰς τὸ τέλος, and differently in some of the other Greek versions.

It is impossible to discuss all the variants in f in detail in this paper. A selection will be treated under a number of groups of variants that occur in this manuscript. Some of these groups are important for the relation of f to the other manuscripts and some are not that important.

³⁸This word appears in the East Syriac heading of Psalm 47 (= 46 of the Syro-Hexapla), and also in the West Syrian headings of Psalm 44 (43) and 54 (53).

³⁹See J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, p. 348.

⁴⁰See Origenes, *Hexaplorum quae supersunt* PG XVI (1) cols. 583-586 and 635-638.

Omissions in f

A number of omissions occur in f. In quite a number of instances the reference to David as author of the Psalm is omitted, in Psalms 19, 95, 130 and 132. In Psalm 19 it agrees with h and j, in Psalm 130 with a large number of witnesses to the Septuagint⁴¹ and in Psalm 132 with e and a number of witnesses of the Septuagint.⁴² In the last two instances it follows *inter alia* the so-called Lucianic tradition. In Psalm 95 the omission is unique to f. In this instance the Masoretic text has no heading at all. In the case of two Psalms it omits the heading 𐤒𐤋𐤍𐤏 (106 and 115). In another three cases it omits 𐤒𐤋𐤍𐤏 (Psalms 41, 43 and 70). In Psalm 41 it agrees with the Masoretic text and many witnesses of the Septuagint. In Psalm 70 the Masoretic text has no heading and the omission in f agrees with a number of witnesses to the Septuagint, excluding the Lucianic tradition. In Psalm 43 it agrees with the Masoretic text against the Septuagint. The omission of the name of the prophet Nathan in Psalm 50 is unique. The heading of Psalm 50 is indeed very short in f: 𐤒𐤋𐤍𐤏 𐤁 𐤋𐤍𐤏 𐤒𐤋𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏. It can be regarded as a summary of the usual heading.

With regard to these omissions, no fixed pattern of agreement with a certain group of witnesses can be determined.

Variants related to word order in f

Variants related to two consecutive words or phrases changing position occur in Psalms 14, 35, 39 and 64. This is unique in the case of Psalms 14 and 35. It agrees with a number of witnesses to the Septuagint in Psalm 39 and with one manuscript of the Septuagint (S) in Psalm 64.

Variants related to suffixes and the construction of the genitive in f

In a number of instances f has 𐤁𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 for 𐤁𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏 (e.g. Psalms 41, 43, 47), but in the majority of instances it agrees with the other manuscripts. In the case of Psalms 9 and 33 the proleptic suffix is added to a noun before 𐤁.

Variants related to spelling, pointing and synonyms in f

In a number of instances f has variants in the spelling of personal names, frequently related to the addition of vowel letters, like an 𐤒 in the name 𐤋𐤍𐤏 (cf. Psalms 3, 38, 51, 59 and 142). Psalm 7 has a

⁴¹Bo^P, Sa-2017, Ga, L', 1219'; cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, p. 312.

⁴²Bo, Sa-2017, L', 55; cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, p. 314.

very interesting variant. The name Cush (כוש in Hebrew) is rendered by Χουσι in the Septuagint. The other manuscripts have **כוש**, but f has **כוש**, agreeing with the Hebrew. Variants related to pointing (e.g. words with or without seyame) occur in Psalms 87, 93, 107, 119 and 133. In some instances f has variants that are no more than the use of synonyms for the reading in the other manuscripts (Psalm 37, 45, 59 and 66). There are also examples where f omitted the hexaplaric signs like an asterisk (e.g. Psalms 109 and 110).

Variants related to particles in f

Quite a number of examples occur where f contains variants related to **ו** and prepositions. In Psalm 3 it reads **אמרו, היום, היום** for **אמרו, היום**. In Psalms 8 and 9 it reads **אלה** for **אלה**. It has **למה** for **למה** in Psalms 26, 109 and 121 and **למה** for **למה** in Psalms 29 and 90. It has prepositions in the place of **ו** in Psalms 29, 49 and 53, and **ו** for a preposition in Psalms 71, 74 and 93. It omits **ו** in Psalms 28, 118 and 144, and adds **ו** in Psalm 131.

Important variants in f

Some of the variants discussed above are very important for the evaluation of the headings in f, in relation to the headings in the other manuscripts, pointing to the uniqueness of f in many ways. Some of the variants are particularly important on account of their complexity. In this section ten of them will be discussed in more detail.

Manuscript f has a heading to Psalm 6 that differs from that found in the other manuscripts in a number of respects. The other ones have the following heading: **למה אמר בלבבו של אדם חסדו ורחמי**. f has a related but different heading: **למה אמר בלבבו של אדם חסדו ורחמי**. This unique variant is probably an explanatory expansion of the heading in the other manuscripts.

At the end of the heading of Psalm 9 f has an important addition. The heading in the other manuscripts is (with a few minor variants): **למה אמר בלבבו של אדם חסדו ורחמי**.

To this f adds: **אלה בלבבו של אדם חסדו ורחמי**. This is a messianic addition from a typical Christian perspective (About the youth of the son and his death). The heading in the Masoretic text has a number of text-critical problems, related especially to the word **על מות**. If the text is read as two words **על מות**, it would indeed be possible to link the addition in f with the Masoretic heading. It can,

however, be read as one word, as proposed by the critical note 1a in the BHS (על-עלמון). This reading could be the basis for the translation of the Septuagint (secrets, *κρυφίων*), followed by the Syro-Hexapla. It is interesting to note that the complicated Syriac word **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ** that is not listed by Payne-Smith, sounds somewhat like the Hebrew variant mentioned above. The margin of a has a note that the heading of this Psalm by Aquila has a reading **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ**. This makes it possible that the reading in f could somehow be related to the heading in Aquila that could in its turn be related to a Hebrew *Vorlage* similar to the proposal of the BHS.

In Psalm 12 the LXX has no variants. Manuscript f has a long addition at the end of the heading: **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**. This addition can be compared to the East Syrian heading for Psalm 3 in the Peshitta⁴³ for the reference to David's persecution by Absalom and to the East Syrian heading of Psalm 13 (12 in the Septuagint and Syro-Hexapla) for the reference to David's sin.⁴⁴ The heading of f is therefore a combination of headings from the Syro-Hexapla and the East Syrian tradition.

In Psalm 11 f, h and j each has its own variant. The other manuscripts have **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**. The following variants appear in f, h and j:

f: **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**

h: **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**

j: **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**

Manuscripts f and h omit the name of David. The remainder of the variant readings are all unique and the origin of the variants is unknown.

In Psalm 31 the other manuscripts have **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ**. Manuscript f inserts a synonym for this word and then explains the insertion by adding the word that appears in the other manuscripts: **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**.

In Psalm 51 the other manuscripts follow the Septuagint by reading **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**. Manuscript f agrees with the Masoretic text and with marginal readings in a, b, c and j by reading **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ**.

In Psalm 53 f has a heading deviating from that of the other manuscripts. They have, with some minor variations: **ܟܘܒܘܕܟܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ**

⁴³See Bloemendaal, *Headings*, p. 35.

⁴⁴See Bloemendaal, *Headings*, p. 39.

This heading is a combination of the normal heading of the Syro-Hexapla and the heading of Aquila.

With regard to the headings in f, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. As far as the rendering of εἰς το τέλος in the Septuagint is concerned, f shows some affinity with the reading in h and j, but continues with this variant longer than they do. It demonstrates some knowledge of the Hebrew term used in the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint as well.
2. Omissions in f are mostly related to the omission of the name of David or the word for 'A Psalm'. No pattern of agreement with a certain tradition or group of witnesses can be determined.
3. In the case of some of the variants, f has unique readings, with the origin of the variant unclear, such as in Psalms 6 and 53.
4. Some of the headings in f show affinity with some of the other versions. Psalm 9 has an addition from a typical Christian perspective that may be related to the heading of Aquila in some way. The heading of Psalm 12 is a combination of the heading of the Syro-Hexapla and a heading from the East Syrian tradition of the Peshitta. The heading of Psalm 55 is related to the headings of Symmachus and Aquila. In Psalm 108 the heading of f is a combination of the normal heading of the Syro-Hexapla and the heading of Aquila.

The Spread of Variants in the Different Manuscripts

In the following table all the variants appearing in all the manuscripts are given in order to show their appearance in the different traditions, especially in relation to manuscript f. Manuscript e does not have all the headings, but usually agrees with manuscripts a, b, c and d. Where Hiebert has only one variant in a specific heading, the variant is referred to by the number of the Psalm. Where more than one variant occur, the different variants are distinguished by a, b, c etc. added to the number of the Psalm and in the order presented by Hiebert. Where the variant has suf added, it means that the variant is related to a suffix and not listed in Hiebert's apparatus.⁴⁷

⁴⁷Hiebert, *'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter*, p. 15-19.

f unique	3c 6a 7b 8b 9b 9c 9e 11 12b 14b 14c 19b 21b 21c 23b 26 29a 29b 30a 31b 32 33a 35 37a 38a 39a 39b 40 41a 43 45a 45b 46 47b 49 50a 50b 50c 51c 51d 51e(=a ^{mg} b ^{mg} c ^{mg} j ^{mg}) 53b 54a 55a 59a 61b 64b 66 70a 74 89 90 93b 95b 96b 103a 103b 108 (= Aquila in a ^{mg} f ^{mg}) 109 118b 121 130 133 136 (corr in mg)
f ^{mg} unique; another variant hj	52a
f ^{mg} unique; another variant e	137a
fabcd (e where ex- tant); hj together a unique variant	3b 4 7a 7 suf 17a 17b 17c 17sufa 17sufb 20b 35 suf 61c 86suf 126 142 suf
fabcdhj (e variant)	41b
fabcd; e a different variant; hj still an- other variant	30b
fabdhj	16 31a 44 47a 70b (e agrees with c)
d unique	60 61a 62a 102a
fabcdh	14a 23a 51b 53a 53c 55b 56b 58a 67 73 81 83a (j has a correction) 87b (j has a correction) 128 (j has a correction) 145b (j has a correction)
fabcdj	6b 15 17d 34 52b 54c 58b 64a 95a 142 (h has a correction) 149
fabcd (ehj differ)	50c
fabd (cehj differ)	45c
facdhj (be differ)	93a
fa*	36
fe	38b (e ^{txt} ; e* has another variant) 71 (e ^{mg} has an- other variant) 99b 132 142a
fhj	3d 7c 9a 10a 18 19a 33b 110b (e has unique read- ing)
fehj	64c (hj without ⚡) 82 (h has ⚡ without dot) 119 144
feh	59e
fchj	37b
fh	8c 10b
fj	59b
f ^{mg} a ^{mg} b ^{mg}	3a
f one variant, hj an- other variant	8a 12a 20a 21a 87f 131b

f one variant, j another variant	13 28
f one variant, h another variant	51a
f one variant be, another variant, ch another variant	53d
f one variant, e another variant	87d 106 115 148a
f one variant, e another variant, j another variant	59b
facdj	9d
e unique	56a 59c 62b 70c 75 (e* correction by first hand) 76 (correct reading in e ^{mg} , another variant in hj) 83b 84 86 87a (e has a correction) 87c (hj have another variant) 87e (a ^{mg} b ^{mg} another variant) 88 96a 101 (hj another variant) 102b 104 105 107b (correction in margin) 110b (cf note at fhj) 111a 111b (efhj sine notis) 112 113 114 116 117 118a 134 135 145a 147 148b ⁴⁸ 131a (adsignatur ebr in a ^{mg} f ^{mg} g ^{mg}) 137b 140
e ^{mg} unique	91 110a
eh one variant, j another	96a
ej	107a
g unique	79 (with correction in g)
e ^{mg} unique	54b 99a (correction)

Conclusions

With regard to Hiebert's SyrPs, with a as basic text, very few variants appear in manuscripts b and c. These three manuscripts clearly reflect the same tradition, also with regard to the headings. Manuscript b has only four variants and c has only seven. These two manuscripts do not share any variants, confirming that these three manuscripts represent the same tradition. Manuscripts h and j represent a different tradition

⁴⁸111a 112 113 114 116 117 118a 134 135 145a 147 have the variant ܡܘܠܠܡ for ܠܘܠܡ .

than that of a, b and c with regard to the headings as well, as can be seen from the large number of shared variants.

Manuscript e goes its own way in many respects. It is closer to the tradition of a, b and c, but has a large number of unique variants. Many of these variants could perhaps be related to the fact that this manuscript is a polyglot, with influence on the Syro-Hexapla column from the side of the Hebrew and Greek columns. It frequently shows evidence of Lucianic influence. It does, however, still belong to the same broad tradition as a, b and c.

The variants in f were treated in more detail in this paper. It has quite a number of unique variants. Striking examples are the shortened form of the heading of Psalm 50, the expanded heading of Psalm 6, the messianic addition at the end of the heading of Psalm 11, the East Syrian addition to the heading of Psalm 12 and the headings influenced by Aquila and Symmachus in Psalms 55 and 108.

The same trends as in the first book of the Psalms can be distinguished. Some of the variants show hexaplaric influence, others agree with Aquila and Symmachus and influence from other Syriac traditions of the headings to the Psalms can also be found. This manuscript is unique in the sense that it is a Peshitta manuscript with the Syro-Hexaplaric headings. The headings frequently demonstrate an independent tradition as well. This study dealt only with headings of the Psalms. It would be interesting to see whether the interlinear glosses in the body of the Psalter in this manuscript have the same trends, but that must be the subject of a next study.