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This dissertation examines the translational goals of LXX Ezekiel 40-48 in the light of two major developments in textual criticism in the past half-century: 1) the recognition that biblical corpora existed in variant literary editions in antiquity, associated with Eugene Ulrich, among others; and 2) the development of a bifurcated approach to Septuagint studies, in which one camp focuses on the reception-history of the Septuagint while the other focuses on the translator’s translation technique. The adoption of a functional theory of translation sketched by Reiß and Vermeer (*Skopostheorie*) helps to mend this rift by focusing on the translator’s goals in rendering his source text for a specific community. Ezekiel 40-48 is seen as an *operative* text intended to persuade its readers of the truth it communicates. I argue that the translator rendered his source text with attention to its linguistic, grammatical and semantical structures, in a way meant to help his readers understand the Hebrew work (*philological* translation). The rhetorical
effect of this method of translation stressed the distance and authority of Ezekiel’s culminating prophecy. On the other hand, his task of persuasion compelled the translator to accommodate certain cultural aspects of Ezekiel’s vision to the Hellenistic tastes of his target readership, especially concerning architecture and proselytism. Despite this accommodation, I find no evidence for the actualizing exegesis sometimes discovered in LXX Ezekiel 40-48.

Study of the translator’s method of rendering his source text suggests that pluses are to be attributed to the translator’s source text and not his own intervention unless suggested by weighty evidence. Based on this principle, analysis of the Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40-48 concludes that it preserves numerous secondary readings that harmonize Ezekiel’s final vision with his earlier ones and thereby interpret Ezekiel in terms of the prophet’s unique theology. This interpretation stands in contrast to the canonical interpretation of MT Ezekiel described by Jake Stromberg. On the other hand, a number of modernizing supplements bring the Hebrew text of Ezekiel 40-48 into conversation with developing Palestinian merkabah traditions (LXX Ezek 43:2-3) and the architecture of the Second Temple (LXX Ezek 40:38-40). Further study will be needed to determine how the generally shorter and earlier Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 1-39 is to be related to the fuller and later Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40-48, but the minimum conclusion that can be drawn is that the LXX Vorlage of these chapters was the focus of intensive study in the last few centuries B.C.E.
To Jamie

For her love and constant support
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .............................................................................................................. vi

List of Tables ..................................................................................................................... ix

List of Abbreviations .........................................................................................................x

Chapter One: Prolegomena ...............................................................................................1

1.1 Introduction ..............................................................................................................1

1.2 Greek Ezekiel in Scholarly Perspective and the Distribution of Divine Names .................................................................................................................. 3

1.2.1 The Number of Translators .............................................................................3

1.2.2 Variant Literary Editions of Ezekiel and ψ 967 ................................................12

1.2.2.1 The Absence of Ezek 36:23c-38 in ψ 967 ..................................................14

1.2.2.2 The Greek and Hebrew Versions of Ezek 36:23c-38 and Their Affinities .......................................................... 16

1.2.2.3 The Order of ψ 967 and Its Significance ..................................................19

1.2.2.4 The Origins and Purpose of the Proto-Masoretic Order .....................24

1.2.3 Recent Contributions to Ezekiel in μ and σ ..............................................28

1.2.3.1 Each Witness on Its Own Terms: Ashley Crane .................................28

1.2.3.2 μ Ezekiel in Contextual Perspective: Jake Stromberg ......................30

1.2.4 The Need for the Present Work .................................................................30

1.3 Skopostheorie and Evaluation of Translation ......................................................33

1.3.1 A Brief Description of the Theory ..............................................................33

1.3.2 Skopostheorie and Greek Ezekiel ..............................................................38

1.4 The Scope of This Study ..................................................................................43

Chapter Two: Toward the Übersetzungsweise of the Translator .................................47

2.1 Non-Intentional Divergences in σV .................................................................50

2.1.1 Ambiguities in Reconstructing the Vorlage...............................................50

2.1.2 Mechanical and Accidental Divergences ..................................................53

2.1.2.1 Confusion of Similar Letters ..............................................................54

2.1.2.2 False Word Division ...........................................................................55

2.1.2.3 Metathesis .........................................................................................55

2.1.2.4 Parablepsis .......................................................................................55

2.2 σ Ezekiel 40-48 As a Philological Translation .................................................55
2.2.1 Grammatical and Syntactical Concerns .................................................................57
  2.2.1.1 Participium Coniunctum ..................................................................................57
  2.2.1.2 Infinitives........................................................................................................60
  2.2.1.3 Pleonastic Uses of the Pronoun in Relative Clauses ......................................65
  2.2.1.4 Postpositive Participles and Genitives Absolute ..............................................67
  2.2.1.5 Word Order in Ezekiel 40-48 .......................................................................70
  2.2.2 Summary and Conclusions .............................................................................72

2.3 Accuracy and Comprehensibility in Ezekiel 40-48 .................................................73
  2.3.1 The Use of the Verb ἔχειν ..................................................................................73
  2.3.2 Suitable Free Renderings and the Historical Present ........................................75
  2.3.3 Conclusion .........................................................................................................76

2.4 Lexical Interpretation ..............................................................................................77
  2.4.1 The Translator’s Freedom in Rendering Vocabulary .........................................77
  2.4.2 Transliterations ..................................................................................................81
     2.4.2.1 αιλ ..............................................................................................................83
     2.4.2.2 αιλαμ ........................................................................................................84
     2.4.2.3 αιλαμω ......................................................................................................86
     2.4.2.4 αιλευ ..........................................................................................................87
     2.4.2.5 αρτη ...........................................................................................................87
     2.4.2.6 θαιηλαθα ..................................................................................................88
     2.4.2.7 θευ .............................................................................................................89
     2.4.2.8 θεε(ε)ιμ ...................................................... .......................................................................................90
  2.4.2.9 θρακ .............................................................................................................90

2.5 Conclusions ............................................................................................................92

Chapter Three: The Vorlage of Ezekiel 40-48: Harmonization and Modernization ....94
  3.1 Harmonistic Readings in the Vorlage ....................................................................95
     3.1.1 Readings Reflecting the Wider Context of Ezekiel ........................................95
        3.1.1.1 Ἐρακος, ἐν ἀνθρώπων; ...............................................................96
        3.1.1.2 In Seven Steps (40:6) ..............................................................................99
        3.1.1.3 The Eastward-Looking Gate (40:20-21) .................................................101
        3.1.1.4 Inner Hall and the Increased Adytum (41:1-4) .....................................102
        3.1.1.5 The Zadokite Priests (42:13) .............................................................107
        3.1.1.6 Ezekiel 42:15-20 .................................................................................108
        3.1.1.7 And I Stood (43:6) .............................................................................119
        3.1.1.8 Conclusions .........................................................................................120
     3.1.2 Pentateuchal Influence in Ezekiel’s Temple Law ............................................121
        3.1.2.1 Ezek 45:15 and the Tithe .......................................................................123
        3.1.2.2 Ezekiel 44:13 ......................................................................................127
        3.1.2.3 Ezek 44:24 and Capital Cases .................................................................130
        3.1.2.4 And His House (45:22a) .......................................................................134
        3.1.2.5 Ezekiel 45:18-20 ..................................................................................140
        3.1.2.6 Two Spotless Goats (43:22) .................................................................144
        3.1.2.7 Summary and Conclusions ..................................................................147
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Modernizing Readings in $\phi^V$</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 The Temple Drain (40:38-40)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 The Influence of Mysticism and Apocalyptic Eschatology</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.1 Like Gleaming Bronze (40:3)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.2 The Return of the Glory (42:2-3)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Conclusion</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Four: Near and Far Contexts in the Rendering of $\phi$ Ezekiel 40-48</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The Translator and Cultic Purity</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 The Interval ($\delta\alpha\tau\mu\alpha$)</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 The Partition ($\tau\delta\thetai\zeta\nu\nu$)</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3 Intervening Space ($\tau\delta\alpha\pi\lambda\iota\nu\nu$)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Sacrificial Terminology in $\phi$ Ezekiel 40-48</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five: The Translator and his Target Readership</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The Translator and Hellenistic Temples</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1 $\Sigma\tau\alpha$ / $\Pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\tau\mu\lambda\nu$ (40:17-18; 42:3-5)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2 $\Pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\iota\lambda\omicron$ / $\Pi\rho\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ (40:5; 42:20)</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3 $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\acute{\nu}$ (40:44-46; 41:10; 42:1-14; 44:19; 46:19-23)</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4 $\Pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\tau\alpha\varsigma$ 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.5 The $\alpha\iota\theta\iota\rho\iota\nu$ (40:14, 15 [bis], 19 [bis]; 47:1)</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.6 Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 The Translator, Gentiles, and Inclusion</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 $\phi$ Ezekiel 47:13, 21-23 (The Tribe of Proselytes)</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 $\phi$ Ezekiel 47:8 ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\beta}\acute{i}\acute{\alpha}$ and $\Gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\alpha\alpha$)</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3 Conclusions</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Six: Leadership and Actualizing Exegesis in $\phi$ Ezekiel 40-48</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The Translator and Leadership</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Leadership and Actualizing Exegesis in $\phi$ Ezekiel 40-48?</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Summary</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Diagrams: The Temple Layout, the $\O\acute{i}koc$, and the East Gate</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Examples of Divergence in Word Order in $\phi$ Ezekiel 40-48</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Select Technical Terms and the Translator’s Lexical Flexibility</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In many respects, the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame is an ideal place to conduct research, given the combination of its uniquely talented and collegial faculty with its cadre of insightful and charitable graduate students. I am most grateful to the University and the Department of Theology for their unwavering support during the years of my studies, from my first tentative days as a masters’ student to my more recent (and less tentative) days struggling to unlock the secrets of Ezekiel’s restorative vision. The Department of Theology and the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts have also been quite generous in supporting presentation of portions of this dissertation at learned societies, a support for which I am extremely thankful.

All the members of my committee deserve my deepest appreciation and the warmest thanks. My advisor, Gary Anderson, is an intellectual and spiritual model for whose interest and careful reading I am in the profoundest debt. His incisive and constructive acuity can be felt throughout the pages that follow, and I can be confident that despite the defects that remain, it would be a much poorer study had he not given so generously of his keen eye and enormous breadth of knowledge. In the same way, Eugene Ulrich has challenged me to be a more critical reader of biblical texts, especially the Septuagint. His encouragement to distinguish carefully between the levels of
production of the Septuagint (*Vorlage*, translation and transmission) is responsible for much that is beneficial here. It was in his Text and Canon seminar that I took my first tentative steps toward LXX Ezekiel, although he should probably not be held responsible for this. His encouragement and his constructive criticism over the course of writing this dissertation have been enormous boons. Finally, Jim VanderKam has an admirable ability for clear-headed thinking and expression that I have come to realize is not nearly as easy as he makes it look. Several times when writing this study, I have asked myself, “How would Jim write this sentence?” or “What would Jim say about this?” (Of course, this fact is not meant to associate him with any of the imperfections to follow.) All three of these men embody the best of humane and intelligent scholarship, and set a high standard for their students to emulate.

Besides my committee members, many other colleagues and teachers at the Department of Theology have made invaluable contributions to my progress, and unfortunately only some of them can be named here. Prof. Avi Winitzer kindly gave of his scarce time to read Akkadian texts in the midst of a busy teaching and publishing schedule, and also took the time to meet with our periodic modern Hebrew reading group. His enthusiasm was a great supplement when my own began to wane. Josephine Dru and Brandon Bruning read through a rough draft of this dissertation and made substantive comments, and I am thankful for their insights, as well as conversations on all things Septuagint. I look forward to their own unique contributions in the field. Molly Zahn and Brad Gregory have been constantly stimulating colleagues as well as great friends, and I am grateful to have gone through the program in their company. Carolyn Gamble’s
knowledge of departmental processes has proven invaluable in making sure I met the requisite deadlines.

I am grateful especially to Herb Bateman for introducing me to biblical Greek and conveying his enthusiasm for a deep understanding of Scripture through a thorough grounding in language and history. More than simply conveying enthusiasm, however, he served as a true mentor in every sense of the term, allowing me to see firsthand the joy of new discovery as well as the painstaking process of revision, rethinking and rewriting that makes such discoveries relevant. More than anyone, he is responsible for starting me on the path to biblical studies. Brent Sandy likewise recognized my penchant for biblical study early on and nurtured me through my first forays into teaching and publication. His continued friendship and graciousness continue to humble and inspire me.

Without a doubt, the most gratitude goes to my family, including my parents, Michael and Lesle O’Hare, and my in-laws, Ralph and Kim Benjamin, for their support. I am most grateful to my children, Ian, Aidan and Mara, and to Jamie, the love of my life. It has been harder than I ever thought possible, and much more rewarding, thanks to all of you. Without Jamie’s help (quite the understatement!) and constant companionship, none of my academic progress would have been possible, least of all this dissertation. I am deeply thankful for her wisdom, insight, and true beauty. Her daily sacrifices have enabled me to pursue my intellectual interests and goals with the most freedom possible, and it is to her that I dedicate this work.
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Thackeray’s View of Translators in § Ezekiel ...................................................3
Table 1.3.2: Goals of the Translation of § Ezekiel 40-48 ..................................................42
Table 2.2.1.3: Omission/ Retention of Pleonastic Pronouns in § Pentateuch .............66
Table 2.4: Percentage of Literal Lexical Renderings in Select Books ..................79
Table 5.2.1: The Reserved Area (תרומת) in Ezekiel 48:10-22 .................................227
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in addition to those given in P. H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.

1º  First instance of a word or phrase in a given verse

2º  Second instance of a word or phrase in a given verse

A  Codex Alexandrinus; 5th century uncial manuscript

B  Codex Vaticanus; 4th century uncial manuscript often containing a very early text of Ἐκκλησία; this and its 9670 are the most important witnesses to Ezek α′

κ  Codex Sinaiticus; 4th century uncial manuscript

bis  A given term appears twice in a specified verse

Ezek α′  Ezekiel 1-27 (Thackeray’s designation)

Ezek β′  Ezekiel 28-39 (Thackeray’s designation)

Ezek γ′  Ezekiel 40-48 (Thackeray’s designation)

∅  Septuagint (Old Greek): the oldest recoverable translation of Ezekiel into Greek


∅^{V}  Reconstructed Vorlage of the Septuagint

∅^{V*}  Reconstructed Vorlage of the Septuagint (questionable)

∅^{(V)}  Reading which may have existed either at the level of the Vorlage or may have been introduced by the translator

∅^{*}  Reconstructed original translation of the Septuagint
Reading from the post-translation transmission of the Septuagint


*Italic* Translated term implied but not present in the original language

*JSJSup* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods

\( \text{\textbullet} \) Old Latin

\( \text{\textbullet}^W \) Wirtenburgensis; a 6\textsuperscript{th} century Old Latin manuscript

\( \text{\textbullet} \) Masoretic Text

\( \text{\textbullet}^K \) Kethib Reading of the Masoretic Text

\( \text{\textbullet}^Q \) Qere Reading of the Masoretic Text


\( \Phi^{967} \) Papyrus 967 (late 2\textsuperscript{nd}/ early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century C.E. papyrus preserving the oldest extant version of Ezekiel and many aspects of the earliest Greek translation of Ezekiel)

*tris* A given term appears three times in a specified verse

\( \text{\textbullet} \) Targum

\( \text{\textbullet} \) Vulgate

\( \text{\textbullet} \) Peshitta
CHAPTER ONE:
PROLEGOMENA

1.1 Introduction

If the state of Indiana advertises itself as the “Crossroads of America,” presumably because all roads meet here (and by implication everyone leaves as quickly as possible), then it might seem appropriate for the book of Ezekiel to be known as the “Crossroads of the Hebrew Bible.” By this, I mean that the book of Ezekiel combines a priestly outlook with prophetic inspiration, law with persuasive discourse, and tendentious accounts of the past with no less clearly delineated hopes for the future. Almost every perspective (with the exception of the sapiential) from which the deeper questions of meaning are addressed in the Hebrew Bible is represented in this fascinating book. No doubt this explains, at least partially, the generous share of scholarly attention the book has received.¹

On the other hand, major textual differences in the versions provide an important point of departure in pursuing understanding of how biblical books came to be, as

¹ The most up-to-date survey of research on Ezekiel available is Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, Ezechiel: Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008). In addition to this, see the somewhat dated but still valuable survey in L. R. Kohn, “Ezekiel at the Turn of the Century,” Currents in Research: Biblical Studies 2 (2003): 9-31; in addition to the selective one in Daniel M. O’Hare and D. Brent Sandy, Prophecy and Apocalyptic: An Annotated Bibliography (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 131-37.
scholars have increasingly recognized in recent times.\textsuperscript{2} In the book of Ezekiel in particular, differences between the Septuagint (\(\mathbb{L}\)) and Masoretic Text (\(\mathbb{S}\)) are persistent and occasionally striking. Moreover, such differences furnish evidence for the continued redaction of the book of Ezekiel after the period when the process of translating the Scriptures into Greek had begun. Contemporary research on the Septuagint has thus advanced far beyond the point where independent readings can be mined for their contributions toward other questions, as if they existed independently of the larger issues surrounding the translation of any given book or pericope, and so critical methodologies appropriate to the study of larger units of translation must be employed as well. Consequently, the purpose throughout what follows is twofold: 1) to identify and illustrate the goals of the translation of \(\mathbb{L}\) Ezek 40-48; and 2) to distinguish the translator’s Vorlage from his own contributions to the extent possible. It will quickly become apparent that both goals are deeply intertwined.

The balance of this chapter introduces the state of scholarship on Greek Ezekiel. Two major issues serve as a convenient entrée into this scholarship: 1) the number of translators, which in the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century was linked strongly to the uneven distribution of the doubled divine name (אֱלֹהִים נְצָהָ) in \(\mathbb{S}\) Ezekiel; and 2) the alternative order preserved in one very early witness to Greek Ezekiel (𝔓\textsuperscript{967}). After this

\textsuperscript{2} For an excellent illustration and development of this idea, see Kristin De Troyer, \textit{Die Septuaginta und die Endgestalt des Alten Testaments} (trans. G. S. Robinson; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005). See also Adrian Schenker’s studies comparing the texts of Kings in \(\mathbb{S}\) and \(\mathbb{L}\): \textit{Alteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher} (OBO 199; Fribourg/ Göttingen: Academic Press/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004); \textit{idem}, \textit{Septante et texte massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2-14} (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000). A more collaborative effort is found in Dominique Barthélémy et al., eds., \textit{The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture} (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1986).
Forschungsbericht, a brief introduction to one functional theory of translation (Skopostheorie) will provide the theoretical grounding for the approach in this study. A brief sketch of the plan for the rest of the work will follow thereafter.

1.2 Greek Ezekiel in Scholarly Perspective

1.2.1 The Number of Translators and the Distribution of Divine Names

H. St. J. Thackeray pioneered a new trail in the investigation of Ἔζηκης. His conclusion that most of the Septuagint of Jeremiah (with the exception of the final chapter) could be attributed to two translators (one who rendered chaps. 1-28 and a second who rendered 29-51) led him to examine the Septuagint of Ezekiel.³ Here he arrived at similar results.⁴ Comparison of the rendering of words and phrases in Ἔζηκης convinced him that two translators were operative throughout the book, but he nevertheless separated the book into three sections, as illustrated below.

TABLE 1.1

THACKERAY’S VIEW OF TRANSLATORS IN ἜΖΗΚΗΣ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Division</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section α’ (chaps. 1-27)</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section β’ (chaps. 28-39)</td>
<td>Follower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section γ’ (chaps. 40-48)</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Thackeray brought many arguments to justify this division of Ezekiel among the translators, two have proven especially compelling. First is the translation of the city-


name of Tyre: this proper noun is rendered with a native Greek term (Τύρος) in 28:2, 12; 29:18, 20 and as a transliteration from the Hebrew (סור = סור) in Section β’. 5 Thackeray explained the overlap between the end of Section α’ and Section β’, in which the subordinate translator follows his leader in translating Tyre as Τύρος, as representing co-operation between the two translators. 6 A second major argument supporting Thackeray’s case comes from the divergent rendering of the common Ezekielian phrase רדש ר אונ. The phrase is rendered ἐπιγνώσονται κτιστὸν ἐνῷ Κύριος up to 26:6 with minor variations but with a characteristic lack of εἶμι. From 28:23 to 39:28, however, the rendering of the formula changes to γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Κύριος, again with minor variations but with the distinctive presence of the copulative verb.

Thackeray’s portrait of the translators is also worth noting. As in Jeremiah, the translator of Sections α’ and γ’ in Ezekiel is seen being in charge of the process of translation. “The translator who undertook the earlier part of each book appears to have been the recognized leader and the more competent of the two.” 7 The fact that he took for himself the harder sections of the book, the inaugural chariot vision and the vision of restoration, speaks to his superior ability.

5 Ezek 26:3, 4, 7, 15; 27:2, 3, 8.

6 “The second translator, before beginning his own work, read over the last portion of the work of his predecessor, starting not unnaturally at the opening of the denunciation upon Tyre, the translation of which had been left for him to complete. While reading over these pages, he introduced some corrections of his own; in particular, he was something of a stylist with a nice ear for order of words, and objected to the too frequent conclusion of a clause with a genitive pronoun” (Thackeray, “Translators of Ezekiel,” 406). Thackeray of course provided more examples to substantiate his case.

Thackeray’s contribution situates Ezekiel within a larger translational corpus. He recognized that the second translator of Jeremiah could not have been responsible for Ezekiel β’. Nevertheless, the Septuagint of Jeremiah α’ (chaps. 1-28), Ezekiel α’ and γ’, and the Minor Prophets exhibited such a similarity in vocabulary that they were likely to have been produced around the same time, if not actually by the same translator.\(^8\) If one translator could not be seen behind the translation, Thackeray was at least concerned to see a “small group of collaborateurs” at work.\(^9\)

One problem for Thackeray’s delineation of the translators in Ezekiel, which was to re-surface soon after his series of articles was published, concerned the distribution of divine names in the book. The divine epithet ὁ θεός Κυρίου is very frequent throughout Ezekiel, but is treated differently in Sections α’ and γ’ and in different Greek manuscripts. In B, Section α’ s usual rendering for the epithet is κύριος, but it also renders the epithet as κύριος κύριος about 15 times, as well as κύριος ὁ θεός υμῶν in 20:5; 21:24, 26. Section γ’ agreed with α’ in rendering the epithet as κύριος, but also added the unique rendering κύριος (ὁ) θεός about 16 times.\(^10\) Here Thackeray followed Cornill, who had already noted this problem and hypothesized that κύριος (ὁ) θεός in section γ’ rendered not Κυρίος ἄλλης θεός but Κυρίος ἄλλης, thereby intending to recall Genesis 2-3,


\(^10\) See the chart in Thackeray, “Translators of Ezekiel,” 405.
in which the same distinctive combination of names appeared. Thackeray’s delineation of the translators in Ezekiel is still the foundation upon which critical work on Ezekiel is based, though it by no means represents the last word on the subject. Within a few years his tidy analysis would be called into serious question.

In two articles, Herrmann argued that Ezekiel in fact was the work of three translators, based on the distribution of the divine name, though he maintained the divisions suggested by Thackeray. Herrmann argued that the use of the combined divine name אדני יהוה and the tetragrammaton alone were limited to certain carefully prescribed situations, and that these limitations suggested that the distribution of divine names in Ezekiel was original. His later article argued the case more completely by

---


13 Herrmann, “Gottesnamen,” 76-80. With a few exceptions, Herrmann finds that Ezekiel used the double name in three situations characteristic of his prophecy: 1) in the introductory formula שבע אימים הפך אלים אדני יהוה; 2) in the concluding formula; and 3) in addresses to the Godhead by name. 1) Of the 122 times where the introductory formula appears, only in four counter-examples does it occur with the formula אדני יהוה (11:5; 21:8; 21:14; 30:6). 2) Of the 81 times in which the concluding formula occurs, only in four counter-examples does it occur with the formula אדני יהוה (30:3; 36:7; 16:58; 37:14).

The use of the tetragrammaton alone, too, is limited to specific situations. 1) 87 times the formula appears in the self-designation אדני יהוה, and 66 of these occur in the statement והיה אלים אדני יהוה (either 2nd sg or pl); only five times does the statement והיה אלים אדני יהוה occur (13:9; 23:49; 24:24; 28:24; 29:16). 2) The single tetragrammaton appears frequently following a noun in the construct state, 57 times with אדני יהוה and 37 times elsewhere. Five counter-examples with both divine names can be found, as well as four cases in
adducing examples of different translations of Hebrew terms in the different sections he found in Ezekiel. Of course, Herrmann’s observations about the situations in which הוהי appears can be perfectly valid without implying anything about originality.

Nonetheless, his conclusions found acceptance by scholars of his time, sometimes with modifications.¹⁴

The discovery of μ ῶ (for the details of which, see below) made Herrmann’s endorsement of the originality of the double divine name in μ problematic. Out of 82 times where μ ῶ is extant and μ reads μ, μ ῶ witnesses a similar use of a doubled divine name (♀♂ ♂♂ ) only six times. “The almost total absence of double divine name forms in the earliest, apparently most reliable, Greek manuscript strongly suggested that the double readings in other manuscripts were later expansions, added to bring the LXX into line with a Hebrew text similar to the MT.”¹⁵ As a result, the criterion of renderings of the double divine name for establishing the number of translators of μ Ezekiel was for the most part invalidated.

which the construct is used with μ (18:25, 29; 33:17, 20), the only instances in which this divine name appears alone in Ezekiel. 3) The tetragrammaton appears alone in 37 cases as either the subject or object.


Though $\Psi^967$ undoubtedly furnishes crucial testimony concerning the earliest text of $\S$ Ezekiel, it cannot be read simply as if it preserved the original Greek translation of the book, as Ziegler indicates.\(^{16}\)


Ziegler drew attention to the fact that in many instances, $\Psi^967$ witnesses a closer connection to the proto-datable text than do other manuscripts (esp. B). Nevertheless, this witness showed that all of the Greek witnesses have been subjected to a lengthy process of correction and cross-contamination, as evidenced by the widespread use of the double divine name in most manuscripts.

Ziegler also introduced a further methodological consideration. He wrote:\(^{17}\)

Wichtig für die Textgestaltung ist eine gründliche Einsicht in die Art und Weise der Ez.-Übersetzung. Man muss untersuchen, ob der Übersetzer gebunden oder frei übersetzt. Von vornherein ist anzunehmen, dass er keine starre Konsequenz in der Wiedergabe der gleichen Wörter und Wendungen zeigt; diese ist ein Kennzeichen des Aquila. Bei Ez. wird die Untersuchung der Übersetzungsmanier dadurch erschwert, dass manche Wiedergaben auf verschiedene Übersetzer hinweisen…. Trotzdem kann die These von drei Übersetzern nicht aufrecht erhalten werden, wie vor allem die Untersuchungen zum Pap. 967 zeigen...


Ziegler provided examples of terms that were rendered differently in the course of a few verses, calling into question the assumption that a translator would always or even usually represent a certain Hebrew term with one Greek equivalent.\textsuperscript{18} Katz accepted Ziegler’s methodology as more persuasive than that of Thackeray.\textsuperscript{19} Ziegler’s insight did not stop Turner from proposing a new variation of the three translator theory, in which the division between the first and second translator occurs between Ezek 25 and 26,\textsuperscript{20} but it did pose serious problems for the mechanical process he and others had used to determine such questions.

In his groundbreaking work on Greek translations of the Scriptures, Barthélemy suggested that Ezek β’, along with a portion of Psalms and all of 2 Paraleipomena (Chronicles), could be understood as a recension that occurred before the Kaige. He based this suggestion on the non-systematic rendering of δα as καὶ γάρ, but did not argue his suggestion at length.\textsuperscript{21} Another recensional view of the translation of Ezekiel was suggested by Emanuel Tov. Tov argued that Jeremiah α’ represented the Old Greek translation of Jeremiah, while Jeremiah β’ represented a revision of the Old Greek. Further, he noted that similarities with Jeremiah α’ and the Minor Prophets were concentrated in Ezek α’. As a result, Tov postulated that Ezek α’ contained the Old Greek

\textsuperscript{18} We will have occasion to furnish many such examples of this phenomenon in Appendix C below.


\textsuperscript{21} Dominique Barthélemy, \textit{Les Devanciers d’Aquila} (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 42, 47.
text of Ezekiel, while Ezek ß′ and γ′ were of another text type, possibly recensional.\textsuperscript{22} This suggestion is unlikely, as may be discerned from the use of the historical present (πᾶσαι) in both Ezek α′ and γ′ to render the Hebrew עָשָׂה (see §2.3.2 below).\textsuperscript{23}

More recently, Leslie McGregor took up the question of the number of translators in Θ Ezekiel and subjected it to more rigorous methodology.\textsuperscript{24} He isolated six factors that could account for a “deviation from the ‘normal’ rendering of a given term”: 1) the Vorlage; 2) contextual considerations; 3) textual integrity; 4) distribution and frequency of the terms; 5) the translator’s vocabulary; 6) the progression of the translation (i.e. arbitrary change by the translator in the midst of his/her task).\textsuperscript{25} Elimination of these characteristics as causing variation is called filtration, and the process of detecting a pattern formed by the filtered examples is called correlation. McGregor begins with the assumption that a single translator is responsible for all of Θ Ezekiel, and then proceeds to accumulate examples that prove otherwise. To disprove the assumption of a single translator, “we must first provide sufficient counter-examples which agree in pointing to a discontinuity in the Greek text of Ezekiel as we now have it.”\textsuperscript{26} He does not define the standard that constitutes “sufficient” counter-examples.

\textsuperscript{22} Emanuel Tov, \textit{The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8} (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1976), 150.

\textsuperscript{23} Note that Ψ\textsuperscript{967} renders בָּאָשׁ with an aorist (ἠπεσον) instead of a historical present in Ezek 43:3, further evidence that Ψ\textsuperscript{967} back-corrects toward a current Hebrew text.

\textsuperscript{24} McGregor, \textit{Greek Text of Ezekiel}.

\textsuperscript{25} McGregor, \textit{Greek Text}, 49.

\textsuperscript{26} McGregor, \textit{Greek Text}, 55.
By examining what is universally acknowledged as a homogeneous section, McGregor was able to quantify the following kinds of lexical renderings: 1) those which are stereotyped; 2) those which are generally stereotyped but subject to contextual influence; 3) change without apparent cause between two or more renderings; 4) change between two or more renderings but with a preference for one of them; 5) renderings that change little by little from one equivalent to another; 6) renderings that change suddenly from one equivalent to another; and 7) renderings that fluctuate according to contextual needs.\textsuperscript{27} This variation within one homogeneous section means for McGregor “that a multiple translator hypothesis cannot be dismissed just by citing several examples showing inconsistencies in the renderings of certain terms and then inferring, as did Ziegler (1953), that any other cases of translation change in the text must be the result of inconsistency in the ‘translator.’”\textsuperscript{28}

Based on this methodology, McGregor is able to confirm Thackeray’s two-translator hypothesis, albeit with some hesitation. Unlike Thackeray, however, McGregor follows Turner in seeing the break from the first to the second translators as occurring after Ezek 25, not after Ezek 27. That Ezek 40-48 was translated by the same individual as Ezek 1-25 is likely, although it is difficult to be certain due to the limited vocabulary in Ezek 40-48, as well as its change in subject-matter.\textsuperscript{29} With McGregor’s analysis, we have come full circle to a modified version of Thackeray’s view of the translation of ø Ezekiel.

\textsuperscript{27} McGregor, \textit{Greek Text}, 194.

\textsuperscript{28} McGregor, \textit{Greek Text}, 194-95.

\textsuperscript{29} McGregor, \textit{Greek Text}, 197-99.
More pressing than the number of translators, however, is the discovery of \( \Phi \)\textsuperscript{967} and what it means for the possibility of variant literary editions of the book of Ezekiel, a question of increasing importance in the inquiry into the development of the book of Ezekiel.

### 1.2.2 Variant Literary Editions of Ezekiel and \( \Phi \textsuperscript{967} \)

Discovered in the 1930’s, \( \Phi \textsuperscript{967} \) dates to the late second or early third century C.E. and is of Egyptian provenance; as such, it is the earliest extant witness to the Septuagint of Ezekiel. It originally contained Ezekiel, Daniel, Susanna and Bel, and finally Esther.\textsuperscript{30} The manuscript is housed in different places, among them the John H. Scheide collection at Princeton University, which preserves 21 leaves (42 sides) covering the majority of Ezek 19-39.\textsuperscript{31} A comparable portion comprising 8 leaves (16 sides), from the Chester Beatty collection in Dublin, preserves most of Ezek 11:25-17:21.\textsuperscript{32} Both of these collections were at the disposal of Joseph Ziegler in his editing of the Göttingen edition.

Fragments of \( \Phi \textsuperscript{967} \) housed at Cologne were published by Jahn; they preserve the readings of the manuscript from Ezek 43:9 to the end of the book.\textsuperscript{33} Other fragments of the manuscript, including Ezek 40:1-43:9, are located in Madrid and were published by


\textsuperscript{33} L. G. Jahn, *Der Griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 15; Bonn: Habelt, 1972). For the rest of the contents of \( \Phi \textsuperscript{967} \) from the Cologne fragments, see Detlef Fraenkel’s “Nachtrag” in Ziegler’s *Ezechiel*, 2-3.
Fernández Galiano. Variants from both of these publications were not available to Ziegler and were collated by Detlef Fraenkel in a supplement to Ziegler’s critical edition.

Besides its obvious importance due to its early date, $\Psi^{967}$ has attracted attention for another reason: it preserves a different order in Ezek 36-39, in which Ezek 37:1-4 follows Ezek 39 and Ezek 36:23c-38 is lacking. In both of these respects, $\Psi^{967}$ is unique among all extant Hebrew and Greek witnesses. A sixth century C.E. Old Latin manuscript called Wirtenburgensis ($\varepsilon W$), which “represents, along with Tyconius, the earliest and best preserved form of the Vetus Latina of Ezekiel,” does witness $\Psi^{967}$’s unique order. Since $\varepsilon W$ does not follow $\Psi^{967}$ in its many errors of parablepsis, it can be considered an independent witness to the order preserved in $\Psi^{967}$. These two independent witnesses raise the possibility that Ezekiel, like other biblical books, can be identified as existing in different versions that grew over time.

Eugene Ulrich has persuasively made the case that many Scriptural books existed in variant literary editions in antiquity. Tov has identified Ezekiel as one of these books, given that $\varepsilon$ Ezekiel is 4-5% shorter than $\pi$ Ezekiel and preserves an apparently earlier

---


37 The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids/ Leiden: Eerdmans/ Brill, 1999), 3-120.
version of Ezek 7.\textsuperscript{38} As will be shown in chapter 3 below, however, $\phi^V$ Ezek 40-48 represents a relatively fuller and more developed version of these chapters compared to $\textit{m}$, and so the question of the relationship of these two distinct portions of the \textit{Vorlage} of $\phi$ Ezekiel remains to be further explained.

But it is not at all obvious that the order of Ezekiel preserved in $\psi^967$ represents an earlier order, especially in view of the scribe’s tendency toward carelessness.\textsuperscript{39} Consideration of the significance of $\psi^967$ involves discussion of several related issues, including the absence of Ezek 36:23c-38 in this manuscript, its different order of Ezek 36-39, and evidence that distinguishes the Greek and Hebrew versions of Ezek 36:23c-38 from the larger context of this passage. In all, the evidence supports the theory that $\psi^967$ and $\chi^W$ represent an earlier version of Ezekiel than that preserved in the rest of the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts.

\textit{1.2.2.1 The Absence of Ezek 36:23c-38 in $\psi^967$}

As already intimated, the scribe of $\psi^967$ displayed a tendency toward parablepsis. In the period directly after the discovery of this witness, the absence of Ezek 38:23c-38 in $\psi^967$ was attributed to this tendency. Advocates of this thesis generally hold that the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item In his publication of the Scheide material, Johnson found 17 examples of parablepsis or homoiooteleuton, including 36:23c-38 (Johnson, Gehman and Kase, \textit{John Scheide Biblical Papyri}, 7-8). See also Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 519 n. 14, for further examples.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
scribe’s eye jumped ahead from καὶ γνώσονται\(^{40}\) τὰ ἔθνη ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος in Ezek 36:23c to the final phrase (καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος) in 36:38, with the result that the scribe of \(\text{𝔓}^{967}\) wrote καὶ γνώσονται τὰ ἔθνη ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος. Johnson suggested that this section comprised an entire leaf in the scribe’s master copy that was inadvertentlty omitted.\(^{41}\) Filson speculated: “Either the open codex presented several columns, within which the omitted section was contained, or a page was turned by error, or a sheet was lost.”\(^{42}\) Yet any statement that the loss of this text was caused by accidental circumstances, such as the misplacement of a leaf, is sheer speculation.\(^{43}\) This leaves parablepsis as the only plausible explanation for the accidental omission of this section by the scribe.

Yet this explanation, too, is unconvincing. The omission would consist of 1451 letters, while the usual length of such omissions is approximately 20 letters.\(^{44}\) Aside from this proposed omission, the largest parablepsis (12:26-28) in \(\text{𝔓}^{967}\) would consist of 266 letters, and even this supposed parablepsis may reflect an earlier text in which Ezek

---

\(^{40}\) Ziegler’s reading γνώσονται is more likely original than the more grammatically correct reading γνώσεται preferred by Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 520 n. 16. Гνώσεται is witnessed by \(\text{𝔓}^{967}\), L\(^{\prime}\), \(\text{Thtp}\), and is evidently influenced by the desire for better Greek, as is characteristic of the Lucianic and Antiochene recensions, and perhaps the recension of \(\text{𝔓}^{967}\) as well.

\(^{41}\) Johnson, Gehman and Kase, John Scheide Biblical Papyri, 8.


\(^{43}\) W. A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezekiel: An Inductive Study (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1943), 63 argued that the omitted text would have constituted only 1 ¾ sides, and so the entire leaf would have contained more text than was omitted.

\(^{44}\) Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 520.
12:26-28 had not yet been added. Moreover, the correspondence between Ezek 36:23c and 36:38 is not especially tight.

Ezek 36:23c καὶ γνώσονται τὰ ἑθη ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί κύριος

Ezek 36:38 καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος

Nor is this phrase the last part of Ezek 36:23, but is concluded by ἐν τῷ ἁγιασθήναι με ἐν ύμῖν καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν. Perhaps the most telling argument against the supposition of parablepsis on the part of the scribe is the fact that when he resumed copying, the scribe began not with 37:1 but with 38:1. At the least, this means that one cannot consider the absence of Ezek 36:23c-38 apart from the related question of the difference in the order of Ezek 36-39 in $\Phi$. Finally, none of the theories of accidental omission explain how the independent witness $\varepsilon^W$ can be said to have lost this text. Such considerations strongly suggest that the scribe did not accidentally omit Ezek 36:23c-38, but instead did not find it in his source text. In this view, Ezek 36:23c-38 is a addition meant to serve as a transition in the later Masoretic ordering of these chapters (for which, see §1.2.2.4 below). This hypothesis is further supported by the unique features of this pericope in both Hebrew and Greek.

---

45 For this possibility, see Johan Lust, “Major Divergences between LXX and MT Ezekiel,” in the Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered (SBLSCS 52; ed. Adrian Schenker; Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 85-86.

46 Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 520.
1.2.2.2 The Greek and Hebrew Versions of Ezek 36:23c-38 and Their Affinities

The distinctive flavor of the Greek of Ezek 36:23c-38 has been recognized ever since Thackeray.47 Three examples serve to illustrate the distinctive readings of this section in the Greek witnesses.

1) In Ἑκεζ 36:24, the verb ἀθροίζω renders קָבָּם for the only time in Greek Ezekiel, which prefers סְנָאָה and εἰσδέχομαι.48 ἀθροίζω is the preferred rendering for קָבָּם in Theodotion (e.g. Ezek 20:34).

2) The plural of ἀριθμός is rendered with the rare plural γαῖων in Ezek 36:24. This Greek rendering is also used by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion at Ezek 29:12.

3) In Ezek 36:33, 37, the rendering ἀδωναί κύριος for θεὸς ἡμῶν (as witnessed in B and many other manuscripts)49 is unparalleled elsewhere in Greek Ezekiel. Besides these verses, the transliteration is also inserted by a corrector of B in v. 32, whose original text reads κύριος κύριος. The use of the transliteration ἀδωναί is typical for Theodotion.

In noting these differences, Thackeray presented different theories about their significance, but the conclusion that Ezek 36:23c-38 was taken from a Greek translation

47 “Greek Translators,” 407-08; idem, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins (Schweich Lectures 1920) (London: Oxford University Press, 1921), 125-26; Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 521; McGregor, Greek Text, 190-91.


49 The critical reading selected by Ziegler (simple κύριος) in Ezek 36:33 is witnessed only by the Bohairic translation.
with similarities to Theodotion appears inescapable. We must also take note of unique features of the Hebrew of this section, as Lust has noted. Most striking is the employment of the long form of the first person singular personal pronoun (יונני; v. 28), in contrast to the short form (אני) used throughout the rest of Ezekiel. This and many other phrases in this pericope show the influence of the Deuteronomic portions of Jeremiah. The verb מָטַע מִים as its object in v. 25 seems to aim at the purification of the people, which has in mind the figure of menstrual impurity in Ezek 36:17. Such a pairing of מָטַע מִים and מָטַע מִים occurs elsewhere only at Num 19:13, 20, where it is part of the remedy for corpse impurity and uses similar vocabulary. In Ezek 36:25, 29, the plural of נָמָא appears in place of the singular preferred elsewhere. These and other unique features of this passage in the Hebrew suggest that it is a late addition to Ezekiel, even if it is thoroughly imbued with the prophet’s spirit. On the other hand, Ezek 36:23c-38,

50 Thackeray proposed first that “a very early version of this section, resembling that of Theodotion and used for lectionary purposes in the Jewish synagogue, was incorporated by the translators,” (“Greek Translators,” 408). Later, he offered an alternative suggestion: “…in some unexplained way, early in our era a later version of this lectionary passage supplanted that of the original Alexandrian company in the parent MS. from which all our MSS. are descended” (Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 129).


53 “Therefore… I contend that even if data from Papyrus 967 were to be embraced, which argues that Ezekiel 36:23c-38 was composed around 200 C.E., this move would not discount Ezekiel 36:23c-38 as an authentic voice of the Ezekelian tradition because this passage summarizes an essential dynamic
like other late pluses in מ, views Ezekiel’s message from a wider canonical perspective, as is evident from its appropriation of Jeremiah’s language.54

For these reasons, Ezek 36:23c-38 seems not to have been present in the earliest Septuagint manuscripts. As a result, it is unsurprising that it was translated only after the main body of Ezekiel was rendered, in an effort to make the Greek witnesses conform more closely to the Hebrew. In speaking of this passage, Tov writes:55

This late intrusion in the Hebrew book of Ez. was subsequently also added in the Greek textual tradition. Thus the pre-hexaplaric witnesses such as the Chester Beatty papyrus reflect the short original text, while the expanded text is found in the post-hexaplaric Greek sources. If evidence of the Chester Beatty papyrus and the Old Latin [τ W] can indeed be trusted, the Old Greek translation lacked a section which is secondary in the Hebrew text of Ez. and this information is essential for our understanding of the literary growth of the book.

1.2.2.3 The Order of 967 and Its Significance

If the text of Ezek 36:23c-38 in both its Hebrew and Greek versions is likely to be secondary, what can be said about the unique order of 967 and τ W? Several scholars theorize that the unique order in these two witnesses is the result of accidental damage,56 but these proposals are less than compelling because they require us to posit independent

---

54 For other pluses in מ Ezek that reflect this same perspective, see Jake Stromberg, “Observations on Inner-Scriptural Scribal Expansion in MT Ezekiel,” VT 58 (2008): 68-86.

55 “Recensional Differences,” 100-01.

damage to two witnesses ( witnesses that resulted in an identical order. They also presuppose an unreasonably incompetent copyist or a highly problematic source manuscript.

The alternative is to recognize instead that the order in represented the original order of Ezekiel, which proceeded as follows: Ezek 34; 35; 36:1-23b; 38-39; 37; 40. Lust found an inner unity in the order of that he described in the following chiastic structure.

A  34 The Lord heals Israel, personified as a flock, and defends the weak. He promises a Davidic savior and a covenant of peace.
   B  34:28-31 Israel dwells in safety.
   C  35-36 God promises to avenge his holy name against Edom, a mythologized enemy.
   C’ 38-39 God promises to avenge his holy name against Gog/Magog, a mythological enemy.
   B’ 39:26-29 Israel dwells in safety.
A’ 37 The Lord revitalizes Israel, giving his spirit to the bones. He promises a Davidic savior and a covenant of peace.

To be sure, the presence of chiasmus does not prove the originality of the order of ; what it does suggest is its literary artistry. As is common in prophetic literature, a catchword connection has been discovered by Lust between the Gog/Magog pericope and Ezek 35-36. Both share the terms (35:12; 36:1-8; 39:8), (36:2; 39:27)


and רוח (36:5; 38:16).\textsuperscript{59} The transition from the Gog/ Magog pericope (chaps. 38-39) to chap. 37 (B’ to A’) is more problematic, especially given the translational and redactional issues raised by Ezek 39:29.

\begin{align*}
\text{מ} \text{Ezek 39:29} & \\
ולא enquiries יתמה פי מחק\textsuperscript{60} אושר שפכת אטריהו \textsuperscript{62} על בית ישראל, \textsuperscript{61} נאם יוהו אלהים

\text{מ} \text{Ezek 39:29} & \\
ולא אסתרי עד פי מחק אושר שפכת אטריהו על בית ישראל, נאם יוהו אלהים

\text{ס} \text{Ezek 39:29} & \\
καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψω οὐκέτι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἀνθ’ ὄν \textsuperscript{61} ἔξεχεα τὸν θυμόν μου ἐπί τὸν οἶκον Ισραήλ, λέγει κύριος.

And I will no longer turn away my face from them since I poured out my wrath on the house of Israel, says the Lord.

And I will no longer hide my face from them since\textsuperscript{61} I have poured out my spirit on the house of Israel—an oracle of the Lord God.

The disagreement between the two versions consists in what is poured out: \text{מ} testifies that God has poured out his spirit, while \text{ס} instead pictures him as pouring out his wrath.

Citing the multi-referentiality of the term רוח, Wong suggests that the translator’s \textit{Vorlage} was identical to \text{מ} at this point and that the rendering θύμος represents the translator’s interpretation of this Hebrew term.\textsuperscript{62} Lust rejects this argument, concluding that the \text{ס} \textit{Vorlage} read not רוח but רוחה, which appears frequently throughout Ezekiel as

\textsuperscript{59} Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 529.

\textsuperscript{60} Lust, “Spirit of the Lord,” 153-54 suggests that the translator’s \textit{Vorlage} read ἡ ἁγία, given that ἀνθ’ ὄν usually renders ἡ ἁγία or ἡ ἁγία.


\textsuperscript{62} Wong, “Ezekiel 39,21-29,” 143-45. For potential examples of this point, see Job 15:3; Prov 18:14; 29:11; Isa 59:19; Zech 6:8.
the object of שֶׁפֶך. The major support for this argument is the original order of 967, as Lust understands it: “[I]f in the Vorlage of the translator chapter 37 followed upon chapter 39, as indeed it does in 967, and given that the donation of the רוח, meaning ‘spirit, breath’, plays an important role in chapter 38, it is highly unlikely that he would have rendered רוח by θύμος ‘wrath, anger.’” Both Wong and Lust agree, however, that the order presented by 967 is original and then emphasize contextual considerations that arise from that order.

Clear contextual connections exist between Ezek 37, especially 37:24-28, and Ezek 40-48 that further support the hypothesis that 967 preserves the earliest extant order of Ezekiel’s text. Dwelling in the land, expressed pre-eminently by the use of יש in three times in Ezek 37:25, reappears in the Septuagint Vorlage at 45:5, which depicts the cities assigned to the Levites (עירים לשבת). This theme forms the climax of Ezek 40-48 in the re-apportioning of the land (Ezek 47:13-48:29). The forthcoming covenant of peace (Ezek 37:26), which will be made with David calls to mind the regulations for the נשא, who represents a modest return of Davidic rule over the land of promise.

---


64 “Spirit of the Lord,” 153. He also notes that he expression שֶׁפֶך רוח always has to do with the divine spirit and not his fury (Joel 3:1; Zech 12:10). The translator(s) of Ezekiel do not use the rendering רוח for θύμος elsewhere in Ezekiel, despite their common use of the term (52 times).

65 υ reads in place of it’s יערים לשבת, reflecting the wider context of the vision (45:6-7; 48:20-22). υ here represents the original reading, as recognized by the commentators.

66 But see §3.1.2.7 below.
The heart of the promise in Ezek 37:24-28 is the Deity’s own residence in the land. In v. 26b the Deity promises to place his sanctuary (מַשְׁמַר) in the midst of Israel forever, which is taken up in the second temple vision (Ezek 44:9, 16). Outside Ezek 37:24-28 and 40-48, there is no mention of rebuilding the Temple in the rest of the book. Though the noun משכן is used of the Deity’s dwelling in Ezekiel only at 37:27, it reflects the use of the related verb שָׁבַע, which expresses the habitation of the Deity in the midst of Israel (43:7, 9). As a corollary of the divine presence in the land, punctilious obedience to the commands (משatonin) and ordinances (חקות) becomes a matter of utmost importance (37:24), just as it does in Ezek 44:24 and throughout Ezekiel’s law code (Ezek 43:13-46:24). In summarizing the relationship of ג and ה Ezek 37:24-28 to Ezek 40-48, Rudnig’s assessment is accurate: 68

Verheißen wird Israel ewiges Wohnen im Lande, verheißen wird David als משכן auf ewig, verheißen wird die Präsenz von Jahwes Heiligtum auf ewig; mit diesen Verheißungen werden zugleich (die) drei zentrale(n) Themenbereiche des Verfassungsentwurfes angesprochen!

In my opinion, the most coherent objection to the theory that ג and ה represent the earlier order of Ezekiel 36-40 takes its cue from the fact that these witnesses provide a more logical order to Ezekiel’s final events than does ג. Thus it might seem that a scribe would be more likely to change the order in ג to the order in ג than vice versa.


versa. The major drawback to this theory is that no scribe is likely to have purposefully omitted the theologically rich and canonically sensitive pericope Ezek 36:23c-38, no matter how logical the result. Nor is it always the case that the more logical order is necessarily later. Lust adduces the examples of 1 Enoch, whose Apocalypse of Ten Weeks possesses a more logical order in the older manuscripts found at Qumran than in the more recent Ethiopic version.69

1.2.2.4 The Origins and Purpose of the Proto-Masoretic Order

If \( \Psi ^{967} \) and \( \xi ^{W} \) indeed preserve the earlier order for Ezek 36-39, how did these chapters come to their present arrangement in \( \pi \) and the vast majority of Septuagint manuscripts? Lust argued that with the advent of apocalyptic eschatology, the order of Ezek 36-39 aroused increased interest. For those more inclined toward apocalyptic eschatology, the battle against Gog indicated the final struggle against cosmic evil at the end of the present order, and the vision of renewal in Ezek 37 indicated the renewal of the order that followed upon the resurrection of the just (compare Daniel). When the Pharisees came to power, they attempted to downplay or marginalize this perspective.70

According to their view, the restoration of Israel and the coming of the Messiah would precede the final events, all of this belonging to the history of the world. In this perspective, the vision of the dry bones had to follow upon the oracles relating Israel’s exile. It referred to the restoration of Israel after its captivity and not to a resurrection strictly speaking.

69 Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 531.

70 Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 531-32 (quotation from 532).
Ezek 36:23c-38 was added in order to smooth the transition between Ezek 36 and the newly positioned Ezek 37, by suggesting that the “dead bones” were spiritually or morally caused, and are not to be literally understood.\footnote{Lust, “Major Divergences,” 90.}

According to Lust, similar concerns can be detected in other short pluses throughout Ezekiel, such as in \textit{m} Ezek 7; 12:26-28; and 32:25-26.\footnote{Lust, “Major Divergences.”} Lust argues that these passages evidence concern with Ezekiel’s susceptibility to a reading informed by apocalyptic eschatology. Ezek 12:26-28 was added to emphasize that Ezekiel’s words were not intended for an apocalyptic future but for the present, which thus “‘historicizes’ Ezekiel’s preaching.”\footnote{Lust, “Major Divergences,” 86.} The editors of \textit{m} Ezek 32:25-26 attempted to de-mythologize Aššur and Elam and to portray them instead as historical enemies.\footnote{Lust, “Major Divergences,” 88.} Finally, the unique mention of the \textit{מְתִיר} in \textit{m} Ezek 7 may be indebted to the \textit{מְתִיר} in Dan 8:5, which alludes to Alexander and the Diadochoi. Lust argues that \textit{m} Ezek 7 attempts to re-read the older version preserved in the Septuagint historically, thus downplaying the eschatological accents.

Needless to say, much of Lust’s argumentation is tenuous, as he himself seems to recognize.\footnote{Lust concludes “Major Divergences” by stating that the pluses in \textit{m} are “somehow connected with the editor’s opinions concerning eschatology and apocalypticism” (92). In what follows, only the most}
apocalypticism ignores the plus in מ Ezek 1:24, which seems to bring these commonalities to the forefront. Block also objected to the hypothesis of a Pharisaic redaction of Ezekiel, noting the lack of “an objective evidential basis” for such activity.\textsuperscript{76}

In his response to Block’s criticisms, Lust acknowledges that the assignment of such redaction to the Pharisees is “highly hypothetical” and that it is independent from his proposal about the editing and order of \( \Psi \).\textsuperscript{77} For his part, Block provides an alternative account of the order of \( \Psi \):\textsuperscript{78}

…the growth of apocalypticism in the late intertestamental period stimulated the rearrangement of oracles in this text-form \( [\Psi] \), so that the resurrection of the dead is seen as the final eschatological event prior to the reestablishment of a spiritual Israel, rather than simply a metaphor for the restoration of the nation from exile.

Block’s thesis is quite as hypothetical as he accuses Lust’s of being. Again, Block provides no convincing explanation for why Ezek 36:23c-38 would be deleted if \( \Psi \) represents the secondary order and מ the primary. Thus, on the balance of probabilities, it is unlikely that Block’s arguments concerning the priority of מ should be accepted. His critique of Lust about the party responsible for the redaction in מ, on the other hand is cogent: there is simply no evidence of Pharisaic involvement in producing the order

significant of Block’s objections and Lust’s counter-explanations will be treated. For all of Block’s objections, Lust’s defense, and Crane’s lengthy treatment of the debate, see Block, \textit{Ezekiel 25-48}, 339-43; Lust, “Stepbrothers,” 28-31; and Crane, \textit{Restoration of Israel}, 235-45.

\textsuperscript{76} Block, \textit{Ezekiel 25-38}, 341.

\textsuperscript{77} “Stepbrothers,” 30.

\textsuperscript{78} Block, \textit{Ezekiel 25-38}, 341.
known from most Greek and Hebrew manuscripts. Indeed, the fragments of Ezekiel from Masada, which date to the second half of the first century B.C.E. and support the order of ה, render this hypothesis highly problematic.

Both Lust and Block are guilty of oversimplification, in that both of them posit a two-stage process for the redaction of Ezekiel (though they disagree about which version emerged first). Such a two-stage process is insufficient to explain the development of Ezekiel. Codex B, for example, preserves the earlier readings of the Septuagint Vorlage in Ezek 1:24; 7:3-6 but also witnesses ה’s later order in Ezek 36-40, as well as the readings in the Septuagint Vorlage of Ezek 43:2-3, which were added after the separation of the common ancestor of א and proto-ה (see §3.2.2.2 below). \(\Psi^{967}\) also witnesses this secondary reading in Ezek 43:2-3 (albeit with a parablepsis from ה קדמ 1° \(\cap\) 2° in Ezek 42:3), showing that the plus almost certainly was added in the Old Greek Vorlage after its separation from the ancestor of the proto-ה manuscripts. The intent of these scattered observations is to point out that the history of the redaction of Ezekiel still remains to be charted precisely, and that it is unlikely that a simple two-stage evolutionary process is sufficient to describe the growth of the book in view of our present manuscript evidence. Nevertheless, on the balance of probabilities, \(\Psi^{967}\) may be given the priority on the question of the earlier order of Ezek 36-40, and proto-ה may accordingly be judged to be

---

\(^{79}\) Crane, *Restoration of Israel*, 242-43 is noncommittal about identifying the redaction of ה with the Pharisees.

a redaction of the earlier order evident in $\Psi^{967}$. While Lust’s contribution toward explaining the Masoretic redaction is not without its problems (chiefly due to lack of evidence), it represents a solid basis for further investigation. Against Lust’s eschatological explanation for the later order of proto-$\text{MT}$, Crane suggests that $\text{MT}$’s order is designed to inspire its readers “to militarily rise [sic] against their enemies, even as a call to arms.” Whatever the basis for the order of $\text{MT}$, when coupled with the other manuscript testimony, $\Psi^{967}$ furnishes clear evidence that the redaction of Ezekiel was ongoing in the last few centuries B.C.E. and perhaps even into the common era.

1.2.3 Recent Contributions to Ezekiel in $\text{MT}$ and $\text{LXX}$

1.2.3.1 Each Witness On Its Own Terms: Ashley Crane

Building on the trends of previous scholarship on $\text{LXX}$ Ezekiel, Crane advocated an approach to comparing the Greek and Hebrew versions of Ezekiel that did not privilege the older readings but sought to understand the interpretive trajectory of individual manuscripts. He proposes a two-fold methodology. Crane begins with $\text{MT}$, and then proceeds to compare three Septuagint manuscripts (A, B, and $\Psi^{967}$) simultaneously with $\text{MT}$ and with each other. The selection of these manuscripts qualifies to some extent Crane’s insistence on the equal validity of the readings in all witnesses, since he chooses

81 For the question of external support for the order of $\Psi^{967}$, see Crane, Restoration of Israel, 245-50 and the literature cited there. In my opinion, much of the evidence adduced by Crane and Lust in this portion is equivocal.

82 Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 253-57 (at 254).

83 Crane, Israel’s Restoration.

84 Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 24.
to explore the oldest manuscripts of Greek Ezekiel. Those variants without discernible interpretive intent are attributed to scribal error, while the ones demonstrating such intent are explored for their contributions. Especially important for Crane are the different indications of “sense-division breaks” in the different manuscripts, which itself is the subject of early Jewish interpretation. Crane calls this the _textual-comparative_ methodology, and envisions it as complementary to the establishment of the more original reading, as in traditional textual criticism. “The purpose of this methodology is to give each textual witness equal status, with none considered ‘superior’ to the others. It accords each textual witness the ability to be ‘heard’ in its own right (Hebrew and/ or Greek).”\(^85\) Crane hopes through this methodology to gain insight into early Jewish interpretations of Ezekiel concerning the restoration of Israel which are preserved in different manuscripts. As a result, he applied this methodology to the study of Ezekiel 36-39.

Crane’s examples of early Jewish interpretations are not always convincing, since it is difficult to leave the realm of the subjective in evaluating individual readings. For example, A Ezek 36:2 reads εὐγε εὐγε, where ℞\(^96\) and B read a single εὐγε. The extra εὐγε may indeed “emphasize the ‘snort’ of the enemy against the mountains of Israel,” but this remains only a suggestion.\(^86\) More interesting and trustworthy are the larger trends Crane isolates in the Greek witnesses: they interpret the action of in,\(^87\) interpret in’s

\(^85\) Crane, _Israel’s Restoration_, 2.

\(^86\) Crane, _Israel’s Restoration_, 37.

\(^87\) Ezek 36:3; 37:8; 39:4, 11, 23.
metaphors,\textsuperscript{88} clarify \textit{m,}\textsuperscript{89} change \textit{m} in light of cultural attitudes,\textsuperscript{90} and use the passive to draw attention to feelings of being abused by surrounding nations.\textsuperscript{91} Crane concludes that frequently $\textit{m}$\textsuperscript{967} is closer to \textit{m} in thought or syntax than B and A, and that paragraphs are more firmly fixed in the Masoretic tradition than in the Septuagint manuscripts.

\textit{1.2.3.2 Ezekiel in Contextual Perspective: Jake Stromberg}

Quite recently, Jake Stromberg examined pluses in \textit{m} Ezek from the perspective of their canonical influence on the Masoretic version of this book.\textsuperscript{92} He discussed the influence of the Pentateuch, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, and the cherubim on the Ark of the Covenant on the addition of secondary pluses in \textit{m} Ezek 1-39. Among other insights, Stromberg emphasizes that \textit{m} Ezekiel was redacted with an eye toward its place in the larger canon, and that even where evidence of multiple literary editions is not extant, other books may have been subject to the same kind of editing under canonical pressures (e.g. the end of Malachi and Deut 34).\textsuperscript{93} He also contends that the influence of Scripture itself may have been a primary factor in bringing about the editorial manipulation of sacred texts. “In short, Scripture was not only adapted to the changing world of the

\textsuperscript{88} Ezek 36:13-16; 37:19; 38:4, 12.
\textsuperscript{89} Ezek 36:3, 8; 37:1; 39:11.
\textsuperscript{90} Ezek 36:17.
\textsuperscript{91} Ezek 36:1-15. The previous examples are given in Crane, \textit{Israel’s Restoration}, 266.
\textsuperscript{92} “Scribal Expansion.”
\textsuperscript{93} Stromberg, “Scribal Expansions,” 85.
community, but also to Scripture itself, because in large part it created that world (i.e. world view).”

1.2.4 The Need for the Present Work

Commentaries and monographs treating Ezekiel 40-48 have generally not availed themselves of recent advances in Septuagint studies. The usual text-critical employment of the Septuagint by both holistic and redaction-critical scholars generally mines it and the other versions for readings when \( \text{it} \) is felt to be inadequate. Such a piecemeal approach to \( \text{it} \) falters for several reasons. Most basically, recent research on \( \text{it} \) has emphasized that close acquaintance with a specific translator’s way of proceeding (Übersetzungsweise)\(^95\) is an indispensable prerequisite for textual criticism.\(^96\) As we will see throughout the following pages, such familiarity is generally lacking in previous studies on Ezekiel 40-48. Some studies reflexively assert that the translator is misunderstanding \( \text{it} \) without understanding the translator’s normal course of action or

---

\(^{94}\) Stromberg, “Scribal Expansions,” 86.

\(^{95}\) Translation technique is best understood as “a collective name for all the different renderings used by a translator” (Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Author,” in On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays [Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993], 65-76 [69]). In this essay, Aejmelaeus emphasizes the intuition and lack of system characteristic of Septuagint translators as a whole. For this reason, she feels that “translation technique” gives an inappropriate sense of a scientific approach, and so prefers the term Übersetzungsweise to describe the translator’s approach to his source text.

\(^{96}\) “The text-critical use of data in the LXX can proceed profitably only if the analysis of the translation technique of each individual translation unit is taken into account” (Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 18 [italics in original]).
acknowledging the possibility that his *Vorlage* is different.\(^{97}\) A further reason why this project is valuable to all students of Ezekiel 40-48 is the insight it lends into the theological and literary concerns expressed by both the translator and his *Vorlage* (\(^{98}\)), which allow divergences to be seen as part of a pattern and not in isolation. Once again, the old model of independent readings preserved in sources (along with a not-too-carefully concealed predisposition toward \(^{98}\)) still predominates in exegetical analysis. On the other hand, those who have analyzed \(\text{\$}\) Ezekiel with appropriate methodologies have generally avoided its final chapters.\(^{98}\) They have often noted the unique character of Ezek 40-48, which presents a stiff challenge to the translator based on the somewhat pedantic style and the technical vocabulary of his source text. Galen Marquis is representative, noting that \(\text{\$}\) Ezekiel 40-48 possesses a “special character” and evidences a “possibly different approach of the translator (not necessarily a different one)” to his task in these chapters.\(^{99}\) Given the disagreement as to the number of translators in \(\text{\$}\) Ezekiel, which will probably not be superseded until major refinements in methodology present themselves, it seems prudent to investigate the translation of chapters 40-48 independently of the wider context in \(\text{\$}\) Ezekiel. Any such investigation must take into account the *Vorlage* rendered by the translator, as well as his purpose in making such a rendering available. Questions of the translator’s transformation of his

\(^{97}\) Most prominent in this approach is the foundational study of Hartmut Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40-48) traditionsgeschichtlich Untersucht* (BHT 25; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1957).

\(^{98}\) I am not aware of any study specifically dedicated to the Übersetzungsweise of \(\text{\$}\) Ezek 40-48.

source text must be subjected to thorough inquiry to distinguish his contribution from that of his *Vorlage* and later vagaries of transmission.¹⁰⁰

1.3 Skopostheorie and Evaluation of Translation

The scope of the proposed investigation requires not only familiarity with past scholarship on Ezekiel, but also a basic understanding of how the investigation of Ezekiel 40-48 fits into the larger theories of the nature of translation. The task of what follows is the elaboration of one recently described theory (*Skopostheorie*) and its contributions to the present task.

1.3.1 A Brief Description of the Theory

As described by Reiß and Vermeer, *Skopostheorie* is a functional theory of translation that takes its point of departure from the idea that translation is bound up inextricably with the transfer of culture from the source text (*Ausgangstext*) to the receptor text (*Zieltext*) and its readers (*Zielrezipienten*).¹⁰¹ Translation is thus “...
Sondersorte kulturbedingter Textologie (Textherstellung).” As is evident from the theory’s name, *Skopostheorie* (from σκόπος, “goal”) is based on the recognition that the purpose of the translation determines the manner in which it will be carried out. As such, *Skopostheorie* understands translation as a sub-set of the more general theory of action, which it understands in dynamic terms.

The difference between a general action theory and a translation theory (one of the former) is as follows: The action theory starts from a given situation; this is evaluated by a person in a certain way; thereafter the person acts so that his action can be justified with his evaluation….A translation theory as a special action theory starts from a situation, in which an original text is already present as “primary action”; the question is not: whether and how to act, but whether, what and how to further act (translated/delivered) should be done. From this viewpoint, a translation theory is also a complex action theory. Translation decisions therefore depend on a dominating basic rule; whether and what is transferred, is decided by it as well as the how, the translation strategy.

Since it is impossible to retain all of the information present in the *Ausgangstext*, the goal of the translator is to mediate those facets of the text to his intended readers that coincide with his actual purpose.

Es ist nicht möglich, Translation als Transkodierung toute simple der/ einer Bedeutung… eines Textes zu verstehen. Translation setzt Verstehen eines Textes, damit Interpretation des Gegenstandes “Text” in einer Situation voraus. Damit ist

---

102 Katharina Reiß and Hans J. Vermeer, *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (Linguistische Arbeiten 147; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1984), 2. In what follows, I will not attempt to reproduce the emphases in the type face of the original.

103 Reiß and Vermeer, *Grundlegung*, 95.

104 Reiß and Vermeer, *Grundlegung*, 58.
Translation nicht nur an Bedeutung, sondern an Sinn/Gemeintes..., also in Textsinn-in-Situation, gebunden.

A key facet of *Skopostheorie* is that translations are generally made for situations and recipients that differ at least in some respects, and occasionally to a great extent, from the purpose for which the *Ausgangstext* was composed.\(^{105}\)

Entscheidend für unsere Theorie als einheitlicher Translationstheorie ist, daß jedes Translat (Übersetzung und Verdolmetschung) unabhängig von seiner Funktion... und Textsorte als Informationsangebot in einer Zielsprache und deren -kultur (IA\(_Z\)) über ein Informationsangebot aus einer Ausgangsprache und deren -kultur (IA\(_A\)) gefaßt wird.

\[ \text{Trl.} = \text{IA}\(_Z\) (\text{IA}\(_A\)) \]

As a result of his mediation between two cultures, the translator must of necessity be bilingual. When differences between two cultures prove too great, the translator is obliged to bridge the distance by changing his source text in a way that suggests an analogous situation in the recipients’ culture. Thus, information in the translation is not coextensive with the information in the source text, but contains instead a set of information that is culturally relevant to the intended audience and is also in harmony with the translator’s goals. Reiß and Vermeer adduce the example of battle-literature, which in modern European cultures usually involves a description of the situation that led to conflict. In the Middle Ages and among Semitic peoples, on the other hand, such descriptions are

---

\(^{105}\) Reiß and Vermeer, *Grundlegung*, 76.
less common. “Beibehaltung der Ausgangsform ändert also den Stellenwert und damit die Wirkung in der Zielkultur.”

Skopostheorie also contributes toward the definition of two slippery terms in translation theory: equivalence and appropriateness. Reiß and Vermeer understand the appropriateness of a translation in terms of its overall purpose: “Every time a translator takes a decision, the dominant factor is the purpose of the translation, so translational decisions must be appropriate for this purpose.”

Equivalence is based on two criteria: 1) the principle of selection, and 2) the hierarchical principle.

Selection is made by the translator when he elicits, by analysis of the source text, the characteristic elements of a particular text. These are then set in a hierarchy, in which priority is given to certain elements which are to be kept at the expense of others in the receptor language. What matters here is the function of the individual text elements in what they contribute to the meaning of the text as a whole, and the function of the text itself in the communicative event.

Equivalence is thus a dynamic process that can be judged on the basis of the extent to which the translator realizes his or her goals overall in his rendering of the text, as well as in specific instances. The translator’s hierarchical set of rules will determine that in each particular instance the major purpose for translation will be achieved, along with as many sub-goals as possible. Choices made by the translator are always guided by the signs present in the source text, so that the translator’s choices may not be regarded as totally

106 Reiß and Vermeer, Grundlegung, 28.
arbitrary. Thus equivalence is an elastic concept, which is defined by the functional equivalence of the source and receptor texts.\textsuperscript{109}

As developed by Reiß and Vermeer, \textit{Skopostheorie} recognizes four major forms of translations.\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Interlinear} (word-for-word) translations operate on the basis of individual words, and thus are far from achieving the same effect in the target language as the original text had in the source language. \textit{Literal} translations reproduce appropriate words and grammatical formations from the source text in the translation. The major focus of literal translations is on the sentence level, not on the individual words as in interlinear translations. However, such translations are far from producing a text equivalent to the source text in the target language, since texts do not consist of a disconnected series of sentences. Literal translations are generally produced by students in the beginning stages of learning a foreign language. "For a \textit{philological translation}, the translator chooses the appropriate words, the appropriate grammatical structures, and the appropriate stylistic level in the receptor language."\textsuperscript{111} Philological translations thus have two characteristics: 1) they enable “the reader to recognize in the receptor language text the linguistic and thought structures of the original author”;\textsuperscript{112} and 2) they choose a level of diction appropriate for the purpose of the translation. Such a categorization is appropriate for \textit{Èzekiel 40-48}, in which the translator adopts a faithful approach to his

\textsuperscript{109} "Equivalence between source and receptor language texts, in any particular case, consists in setting up functionally relevant equivalent relations of text content(s) and form(s), in their functions of contributing to and understanding the meaning of the text" (Reiss, “Adequacy and Equivalence,” 308).

\textsuperscript{110} Reiss, “Adequacy and Equivalence,” 302; Reiß and Vermeer, \textit{Grundlegung}, 133-36.

\textsuperscript{111} Reiss, “Adequacy and Equivalence,” 302.

\textsuperscript{112} Reiss, “Adequacy and Equivalence,” 302.
source text to reproduce the thought structures of the original text as closely as possible. Philological translations help someone whose understanding of the source language is inadequate to comprehend the subtleties of the source text more fully. It is not equivalent to a text freely composed in the target language, and thus would not appear “natural” to a native reader. Finally, *communicative* translations are immediately comprehensible in the target language, and though not exactly the same as the source text, they serve as a functional equivalent to it on as many levels (syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic) as possible. According to Reiß and Vermeer, only communicative translations are equivalent to the original in terms of the whole text.

In addition to the four major types of translation, Reiß and Vermeer isolate three types of global classifications of text (*Texttyp*): the informative, the expressive, and the operative.\(^{113}\) As might be inferred, in *informative* texts, the communication of information engenders the most concern as far as questions of equivalence between the source and receptor texts are concerned. Such texts might include tax documents, law collections, or boundary-lists. *Expressive* texts emphasize equivalence to the source text primarily on the level of artistic form and meter. Poetry serves as a good example of an expressive text. Finally, *operative* texts highlight the persuasive elements in the language and formation of the source text. In this kind of text, “[k]onnative und assoziative Elemente sind ranghöher anzusetzen als denotativ-referentielle Textelemente.”\(^ {114}\) Election speeches serve as a handy example of an operative text.

---

\(^{113}\) For these definitions, see Reiß and Vermeer, *Grundlegung*, 157. For the differentiation of *Texttyp* from other classifications of texts in *Skopostheorie*, see pp. 172-73.

1.3.2 Skopostheorie and Greek Ezekiel

How, then, does Skopostheorie help with the investigation of the translation of Ezekiel 40-48 in the Septuagint? We may suggest three ways, all of which are interrelated.

Most generally, Skopostheorie helps to draw together the two complementary approaches toward academic study of the Septuagint current among biblical scholars. The first approach is concerned with reconstructing how the translator understood and rendered his source text (e.g. New English Translation of the Septuagint), while the second places more emphasis on the reception of the Septuagint translation as a work in itself by its early readers (e.g. La Bible d’Alexandrie). Carsten Ziegert has drawn attention to how Skopostheorie can serve as a mediating approach between these two extremes.

Focusing on the translator’s purpose in his rendering the set of data in his source text into a set of data comprehensible for his readership helps to unify both of these links in the chain by focusing on their mutual connection in the person of the translator. By


privileging the translator’s intention in this way, the Septuagint texts do not depend on their source texts for their value, but can be evaluated on their own terms for how well they achieve their apparent goals in translation. Contemporary scholars also benefit in attempting their own modern translations of the Septuagint by recognizing the purpose for the original translation of each specific book or translational unit.117

Secondly, *Skopostheorie* helps to clarify the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Ezekiel, as well as the relationship of Greek Ezekiel to other Septuagint translations. By this I mean that by identifying the type of translation represented by Ἁζ 40-48, we may suggest something about its goals and, by extension, its intended readership relative to the other translational units in the Septuagint. I will argue that Ἁζ 40-48 can be classified as a *philological translation*. Through the generous use of transliterations and relatively faithful rendering of terms and grammatical structures, the translator tried to maintain the essence of the original as closely as possible and to draw readers back to the original. No doubt this faithfulness stemmed in part from what Barr has called “easy technique.”118 On the other hand, by close adherence to the prophetic word as it was preserved in his source text, the translator produced a text whose style and diction were immediately recognizable as Scriptural, and thus authoritative and persuasive. Through this relatively faithful rendering, the translator presented his source text in the target language as a link in a long-standing theological tradition, much as when believers today pray using archaic language (e.g. “Thee” or “Thou”). This translational


idiom is naturally most visible at the level of individual sentences and words. As we will see, however, the translator’s concern to transmit the text to his readers clearly occasionally supersedes the level of individual words and grammatical constructions. The presence of a small number of relatively free renderings of certain phrases (§2.3.2 below), combined with two generalizing translations at Ezek 43:9 (ἡριμὸν ἐνσχηκεν μεθ’ ὑμῖν // καὶ τῶν φῶν τῶν ἠγομένων αὐτῶν) and Ezek 45:9 (ἐξάρατε καταδυναστεύαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ μου) are suggestive both for their presence and their rarity. Such freer translations, while relatively rare, still indicate that the translator’s faithful rendering was deliberate, rather than imposed by ignorance.119 The rendering of Ezek 47:13 (ὡς Ἰωάννης // πρόσθεσις σχοινίσματος; §5.2.1), the expression of the term αἰθριόν (§5.1.5), and the creation of an inclusio between Ezek 40:5 and 42:20 (§5.1.2) all suggest that the translator is concerned for meaning that transcends the sentence level. All of this evidence is consistent with what Skopostheorie terms a philological translation. In this philological translation, the translator reproduces the thought of the original faithfully and so chooses a level of diction whose effect is to stress the divine origin of the sacred text.

Thirdly, Skopostheorie helps us to judge individual translations in light of the translator’s larger purpose in the work. These purposes vary considerably among the library of translations contained in the Septuagint. Like many prophetic texts, the primary intention of the book of Ezekiel is not to disclose information (informative texts) or to

119 The renderings in Ezek 43:9 and 45:9 are both discussed in §6.2 below.
mediate poetry (*expressive* texts), although Ezekiel contains a good deal of both information and artistic expression. Instead, Ezekiel as a whole, and chapters 40-48 in particular, should be understood as an *operative* text, because the primary purpose of this prophetic text is to persuade the audience of the relevance of hearing and obeying a specific divine word or collection of divine words.  

According to *Skopostheorie*, this determination should lead us to expect the translator to highlight the persuasive aspects of his source text. As the forms and content of persuasion are deeply cultural, we should expect that the methods of persuasion in the translation may differ with respect to the culture of the intended recipients of the translation, and in this expectation we will not be disappointed. One of the goals of the translation of Ezek 40-48 in the Septuagint is to transform certain aspects of Ezekiel’s vision to resonate with Hellenistic tastes. The translator resorts to several means, which can prove surprising occasionally from the perspective of modern readers, in order to accomplish this goal.

---

TABLE 1.3.2:
GOALS OF THE TRANSLATION OF ḫ EZK 40-48

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Accurately and comprehensibly render Ezekiel 40-48 into Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Convey the substance of Ezekiel’s prophecy using a style and diction that signal the translator is transmitting an authoritative divine word (philological translation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Accommodate certain cultural aspects of Ezekiel’s vision to the Hellenistic tastes of his target readership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above chart summarizes the goals for the translation of ḫ Ezek 40-48 as I understand them, in descending order of importance. Each one of the goals contributes toward the persuasive effect of the translation. It bears repeating at this point that while we may delineate the translator’s goals in this way, we cannot expect the translator to have executed his purpose using a completely logical or deductive methodology, but rather an intuitive one. Nevertheless, the value in identifying these goals and describing them using Skopostheorie inheres in their contribution toward understanding ḫ Ezek 40-48 as an operative text. While the translator’s first and second goals lead his readers back towards the Hebrew source text and elucidate it, his third goal assists him in the opposite endeavor, namely bringing Ezekiel’s source text closer toward his intended readership. As suggested by Skopostheorie, both movements are complementary and facilitate the persuasion which informed the translator in his endeavor. Unfortunately, we have little
direct evidence to envision the audience to whom the translation was directed, their level of fluency in Greek, or their expectations for translated Scriptures.

1.4 The Scope of This Study

The following study is grounded in two important questions. 1) Is the Vorlage of Œ Ezek 40-48 different from Ṣ Ezek 40-48, and if so, to what degree can such differences be reconstructed? 2) How does the translator implement his goals in translation? In other words, the present analysis of Œ Ezek 40-48 must deal seriously with the reality that Ezekiel existed in variant literary editions in antiquity, with the result that that divergences between Ṣ and Œ Ezek 40-48 do not necessarily contribute to the knowledge of the translator or his purpose. Acknowledging this state of affairs allows scholars to gauge the extent to which the translator’s objectives in translation tally with those of the scribes who supplemented Ezekiel’s text.

The first task is to provide an overview of the translator’s relatively faithful way of translation (Übersetzungsweise), which is illustrated on several fronts: etymological analysis, adherence to Hebrew word-order, and quantitative representation (chapter 2). The choice of lexical equivalents is harder to quantify as literal, but here more of the translator’s contextual reasoning can be isolated and analyzed. Even on the level of lexical choice, the translator reproduces many Hebrew terms in Greek (transliterations), evidence of his desire to preserve the source text precisely. The translator’s concern to adhere closely to his source text, which somewhat paradoxically creates rhetorical distance, marks Œ Ezek 40-48 as a philological translation. As such, Œ Ezek 40-48 highlights the source text’s authority and persuasiveness in its translation (goal 2).
aspect of the translator’s Übersetzungsweise makes it problematic to assume that he would have added long pluses to his source text in the absence of compelling evidence.

Yet it is possible to judge how the translator achieved his goals only when we can be sure of what was present in his Vorlage (chapter 3). The Vorlage of ο Ezek 40-48 can be shown to contain several secondary pluses that interpret or expand certain verses in light of the larger context of Ezekiel’s final vision or the book of Ezekiel as a whole. Likewise, in Ezekiel’s law code, there are several indications that pentateuchal analogues helped scribes to make sense of certain puzzling aspects of Ezekiel’s law. On the other hand, there are also certain modernizing pluses in these chapters that helped to explain Ezekiel’s prophecies in light of developing esoteric traditions or aspects of apocalyptic eschatology. Thus, the Vorlage of ο Ezek 40-48 seems to represent a version with a concentration of secondary readings compared to the rest of θV Ezek, which in general witnesses a shorter and earlier text than ρ.

Following this analysis, it remains to illustrate the translator’s conception of accuracy and its importance (goal 1) in light of pressures from the literary context of Ezekiel and beyond (chapter 4). The translator interprets several problematic terms in Ezekiel’s temple description in light of the overarching theme of maintaining appropriate ritual separation and distance. Clarification can also be observed in the translator’s rendering of sacrificial terminology. While the translator is familiar with the terminology of the Greek Pentateuch and employs such terminology without variation in some instances, more frequently he begins with pentateuchal vocabulary but varies it in line with his own understanding of individual passages and offerings.
Finally, in chapter five attention turns to the translator’s attempts to target specific aspects of Ezekiel’s vision to his intended readership (goal 3). Two chapters examine legitimate and illegitimate inferences concerning the translator’s updating of his source text. Chapter five examines the translator’s updating of select cultural aspects that proved problematic in his source text, especially concerning architecture and proselytism. In his rendering of Ezekiel’s tour of the temple, the translator brings to the fore numerous elements of Hellenistic temples, such as stoas and peristyles. This inclusion of many of the elements of Hellenistic temples represents one of the significant ways in which the translator takes account of the artistic and architectural tastes of his time. Proselytes receive a share within the land of promise itself (Ezek 47:21-23), though their origins are not undone, in line with the larger ideas inherent in Ezekiel’s utopian delineation of the tribal allotments.

What I am calling an illegitimate inference concerning the translator’s source text has to do with perceived actualizing exegesis in the Septuagint translation of Ezekiel 40-48, especially in the context of Jewish leadership in the second century B.C.E. (chapter 6). Despite the proposals of Johan Lust and Arie van der Kooij, there is obvious actualizing exegesis in these chapters, especially as it pertains to the leadership of Judah in this era, in the Septuagint translation of Ezekiel 40-48. Despite the indeterminacy of the terms for leadership in this section of Ezekiel, the advocacy of Zadokite priestly leadership in the translation of these chapters is unambiguous.
CHAPTER TWO:
TOWARD THE ÜBERSETZUNGSWEISE OF THE TRANSLATOR

In his description of the manner of translation of the various books of the
Septuagint a century ago, Henry St. James Thackeray classified Ἡ Ezekiel as “indifferent
Greek” along with portions of Kingdoms, Paraleipomena, Jeremiah α’ (chaps. 1-28),
Psalms, Sirach and Judith. 121 More recently, Tov characterized the translation of Ezekiel
as follows: “The Greek translation of Ezekiel is relatively literal, so that it is reasonable
to assume that its minuses vis-à-vis מ כ ב ו reflect a shorter Hebrew parent text.” 122 While
Tov’s comments represent an improvement upon those of his predecessor, he intends
only to give a general overall estimate of the manner of translation represented by Ἡ
Ezekiel, not a detailed assessment. It thus falls to the present investigation to present the
beginnings of such an assessment.

Before beginning, it is imperative to consider a few terminological questions.
Translation technique is a commonly used catch-all term to describe the translator’s
approach to his Vorlage. One misleading aspect of this term is that it fails to consider the

121 A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, Vol. I: Introduction,

122 Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 333. The identical characterization is repeated in
idem, The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 250.
different levels of contextual and linguistic interpretation operative in translation, flattening them instead.\textsuperscript{123} Another major reservation with this term is that it implies that Septuagint translators had a specific methodology in translation, whereas their actual practice was much less reflective: “But in fact, these translators never paused to consider their aims any more than the methods by which best to attain them. Their work is characterized by intuition and spontaneity more than conscious deliberation and technique.”\textsuperscript{124} Aejmelaeus notes that the juxtaposition of periphrastic and “helplessly literal, Hebraistic renderings of one and the same Hebrew expression” demonstrates that the translators approached their task with no fixed methodology in mind.\textsuperscript{125} An alternative to “translation technique” can be found in the more neutral German \textit{Übersetzungsweise} (manner of translation), which does not imply a fixed system or program.\textsuperscript{126}

Barr’s excellent observation that literalism in the Septuagint is only an “easy technique,” and that it becomes a conscious goal only in the later contributions of Aquila and Theodotion, deserves to be repeated.\textsuperscript{127} Also worthy of repetition is his insight that

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{123} For translation as involving linguistic and contextual exegesis, see Tov, \textit{Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint}, 45; Barr, \textit{Typology of Literalism}, 17; Ronald L. Troxel, \textit{LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah} (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 73.
\item\textsuperscript{124} Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique,” 66.
\item\textsuperscript{125} Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique,” 67. Compare also Barr, \textit{Typology of Literalism}, 7: “Rather than follow a definite policy, translators often seem to have worked in an \textit{ad hoc} manner and at any particular point to have opted for a literal or free rendering, whichever seemed to work out according to the character of the original text and its immediate context.”
\item\textsuperscript{126} Adopted by Troxel, \textit{LXX-Isaiah}.
\item\textsuperscript{127} Barr, \textit{Typology of Literalism}, 26, 50.
\end{itemize}
translations can be both free and literal on different levels at the same time, and that literal renderings, even when they are clearly inadequate by modern standards, frequently show a tight and comprehensible relation to their source text.\textsuperscript{128} With these points in mind, a more fruitful analysis of the Übersetzungsweise of Ezekiel 40-48 is possible. The goal is not an exhaustive analysis but an acquaintance with the translator’s tendencies that will enable us to explore both his source text and his own proclivities more knowledgeably.

Ezekiel 40-48 is in many respects a problematic corpus for investigating the Übersetzungsweise of any translator, and its peculiarities should be borne in mind throughout the following discussion. Most obviously, it is a very small corpus with which to work. However, the lack of agreement over the number of translators for Ezekiel as a whole, coupled with the lack of a comprehensive investigation of the Übersetzungsweise of Ezekiel,\textsuperscript{129} makes it desirable to begin with this relatively restricted corpus. In my judgment, it is better to begin from the ground up and risk an incomplete picture of the translator’s Übersetzungsweise than to skew the evidence by introducing irrelevant data. A second reason why Ezekiel 40-48 is problematic is because of its unique subject-matter, which requires the translator to navigate a puzzling architectural plan, a law-code and a cartographic representation of the restored land within the course of nine chapters. One should remember that the translator might take measures here that he would not

\textsuperscript{128} Barr, Typology of Literalism, 15.

\textsuperscript{129} Galen Marquis devoted an M.A. thesis written at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem under Emanuel Tov to this question, but I have not seen his study.
consider elsewhere. On the other hand, precisely because of such challenges, the translator is forced to call on the full scope of his virtuosity.

2.1 Non-Intentional Divergences in $\phi^V$

2.1.1 Ambiguities in Reconstructing the Vorlage

“All we know about the Vorlage is thus in fact second-hand knowledge, and that is the problem.” With this succinct statement, Aejmelaeus sums up the challenges inherent in a coherent investigation of the Vorlage of Ezekiel 40-48. Knowledge of the Vorlage of any Septuagint translator, even that of the most doggedly literalistic one, is only partial. Many of the areas in which ambiguity concerning the translator’s Vorlage cannot be eliminated concern small points of grammar and syntax. For example, in certain cases it is impossible to be certain whether the translator omitted the introductory waw deliberately or accidentally, or whether it was simply not present in his source text. On other occasions, $\phi$ witnesses a waw where $\pi$ does not, especially in date formulae.

Ezek 41:19 // πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου
Ezek 42:20 // καὶ περιβολον αὐτῶ κύκλῳ
Ezek 43:10 // καὶ οὕ, ὅπε ἀνθρώπου

---

130 The structure of this section is indebted to the discussion in Tov, Text-Critical Use, 154-62.

131 Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?” in On the Trail of the Septuagint Translator (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 77.


133 The date formulae in $\phi$ are much fuller than in $\pi$ and are generally secondary; see Gese, Der Verfassungsentwurf, 8 n. 1.
Relatively frequently, especially in Ezekiel’s law code, verbs differ in person and number in מ and ס.\textsuperscript{134} At times this is due to the use of a collective noun (as in Ezek 46:3 below). It is generally difficult to determine whether the changes originate in the Vorlage or from the hand of the translator, although sometimes reasons for such changes can be suggested when the priority of one version is clear.\textsuperscript{135} Ziegler’s comment about variations in person between ס and מ Ezekiel is worth bearing in mind.\textsuperscript{136}

Man könnte gewiss in der LXX nachträgliche Angleichung an die gleiche Person in nämlichen oder vorausgehenden Vers annehmen, aber man muss sich auch fragen, ob nicht bereits die Vorlage von LXX bereits [sic] anders gelesen hat als unser M [מ].

\textsuperscript{134} Also noticed by Ziegler, “Zur Textgestaltung,” 440.

\textsuperscript{135} E.g. Ezek 43:18-27; see the commentaries.

\textsuperscript{136} Ziegler, “Zur Textgestaltung,” 438.
Likewise, differences in pronouns can be attributable to a difference in Vorlage or to the translator’s interpretive efforts.

Ezek 43:8 // ἐν τῷ τίθεναι αὐτῶς τὸ προθύρον μου ἐν τοῖς προθύροις αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς φλίας μου ἔχομένας τῶν φλιῶν αὐτῶν
Ezek 44:7 // ἐν τῷ προσφέρειν ὑμᾶς ἄρτος
Ezek 44:30 // καὶ τὰ πρωτογενήματα ὑμῶν δώσετε τῷ ιερεί τοῦ θείναι εὐλογίας ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἴκους ὑμῶν
Ezek 45:4 // ἀφωρισμένους τῷ ἀγιασμῷ αὐτῶν
Ezek 46:22 // μέτρον ἐν ταῖς τέσσαρις
Ezek 47:14 // εἰς ἣν ἦρα τὴν χεῖρά μου τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτήν τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν
Ezek 47:21 // καὶ διαμερίσθη τὴν γῆν ταύτην αὐτοῖς

Similarly, prepositions can be the cause for confusion, since they cover different semantic ground in the source and receptor languages.

Ezek 41:6 // ἐν τοῖς πλευροῖς κύκλῳ
Ezek 42:10 // κατὰ τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ περιπάτου
Ezek 44:24 // καὶ κατὰ πάντα τὰ νόμιμα αὐτῶν
Ezek 44:28 // ὅτι ἐγὼ κατάσχεσις αὐτῶν
Ezek 45:8 // καὶ τὴν γῆν κατακληρονομήσουσιν οἶκος Ἰσραήλ
Ezek 45:8 // κατὰ φυλὰς αὐτῶν
Ezek 45:17 // καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἀφηγουμένου (?)
Ezek 46:3 // κατὰ τὰ πρόθυρα τῆς πύλης ἐκείνης

Differences between the active and passive voices of verbs are likewise ambiguous.

137 Reading withmeg.
138 Perhaps a harmonization toward Lev 25:33-34 on the part of the translator or his Vorlage.
Ezek 40:43 // ἓνεκα τοῦ δεῖξαι σοι εἰσελήλυθας
Ezek 44:14 // καὶ εἰς πάντα ὅσα ἐν ποιήσωσιν
Ezek 47:11 // καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑγιάσωσιν

Variations in rendering the article may reflect the translator’s preference in a given situation or his Vorlage.

Ezek 40:43 // καὶ παλαιστὶν ἐξουσιασθεὶς
Ezek 41:21-22 // ως ὁ ψυχικός θυσιαστήριον ξυλίνου
Ezek 47:13 // ταῦτα (=τῷ) τὰ ὁρια

Despite these limits to our access of the Hebrew text used by the translator, the situation is not especially grave. While such ambiguities are inevitable and widespread, they concern mainly minor divergences, while the target of most scholars’ interests is more substantive variation between the versions. Before such issues can be addressed, however, it is necessary to take up the pressing issue of mechanical and accidental divergences.

2.1.2 Mechanical and Accidental Divergences

The manuscripts from Qumran offer a starting point for envisioning the scrolls from which the translator worked. Such manuscripts offer well-known examples of misreading, confusion of similar letters and other occasions of accidental divergence between ש and ש. Difficulty in reading and transmission seems to have been especially pervasive in Ezek 47:13-48:35.

139 Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know,” 77.
2.1.2.1 Confusion of Similar Letters

The term on the left represents the reading in Ἰ, while the term on the right is what the translator read.

1 / ו
See the discussion of the transliteration ἀλαμ in §2.4.2.2 below.

1 / ו
Ezek 47:13 // τάυτα (=וז) τὰ ὁρία

1 / ו
Ezek 43:12 // καὶ τὴν (=את) διαγραφὴν τοῦ οἴκου

ב / מ
Ezek 48:28 // καὶ ὁδατὸς Μαριμωθ Καδής (see also 47:19)

ב / מ
Ezek 47:22 // και ἁμεθνὶς υἱὸν φάγονται (=כנל) ἐν κληρονομίᾳ

ד / ר
Ezek 42:11 // κατὰ τὰ μέτρα (=כמרא)
Ezek 48:14 // οὐδὲ καταμετρηθήσεται (=יומד)

ג / נ
Ezek 40:44 // δῦο (=שירות) ἐξέδραται

ז / צ
Ezek 43:12 // καὶ τὴν διαγραφὴν (=צורת) τοῦ οἴκου

Examples of confusion of more than one letter include the following.

Ezek 43:7 // ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν (=בתוכם)
Ezek 47:15 // τῆς καταβαίνουσας (=הרדר) καὶ περιστοχεύουσας τῆς εἰσόδου Ἡμᾶθ Σεδδαδά. 142

---

141 Cf. Ἰ Ezek 47:18-19, where θανί is a scribal error for θαν.

142 Περισχεῖω is only used here and at 48:1, where it is also used to render τῆς ἡμῶν ad sensum.
Ezek 48:21 // ἐπὶ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι χιλιάδας μηκὸς (=דֶּשָׁם).

2.1.2.2 False Word Division

Ezek 48:11 // τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις (מַכְרֶשׁ) υἱοὶς Σαδδουκ (cf. 45:4)

2.1.2.3 Metathesis

Ezek 42:3 // αἱ πύλαι (השערים)
Ezek 43:11 // καὶ διαγράψεις (ה得好)

2.1.2.4 Parablepsis

At Ezek 40:30, the eye of the translator or a copyist jumped from the first word of the verse (דֶּשָׁם) to the first word of 40:31 (דֶּשָׁם), with the result that Ezek 40:30 was omitted.

2.2 Ezekiel 40-48 As a Philological Translation

In his discussion of the differences between “free” and “literal” translations preserved in the Septuagint, Troxel distinguishes four characteristics of literal translations: 143 1) consistent representation of one term in the Hebrew with a corresponding term in the Greek, with relatively little concern for context (stereotyped lexical equivalents); 2) etymological analysis, or the preservation of each significant element in a Hebrew word with a corresponding Greek term, as in Ezek 44:19 // ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦς; 3) adherence to the word-order of the Hebrew; and 4) preservation of each distinct lexeme in the source text with one word in the translated text.

143 Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation, 88.
(quantitative representation), except in such cases as etymological analysis proves necessary. In what follows, etymological analysis, concern with Hebrew word-order and quantitative representation will all prove significant for the attempt to flesh out Tov’s qualification of Ezekiel’s translator as “relatively literal.” Anticipating the results of this and the next section somewhat, it can be stated that the close fidelity in grammatical and semantic matters that characterizes of the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 stands in contrast to his freer approach to lexical issues.

In this choice of fidelity in his translation, the translator chooses the appropriate terms, grammatical structures, and stylistic level congruent with a philological translation. The intent of this type of a translation is to move the readers toward the source text by reproducing its linguistic structures, thus laying bare in important respects the organization of the source text in the target language. This section is geared toward examination of significant text-linguistic, grammatical and syntactical indications of the nature of the translation of 6 Ezek 40-48. This examination will highlight the translator’s close attention to reproducing his source text. After demonstrating this fidelity, counter-examples will be produced in which the translator exhibits a somewhat freer approach to his source text, revealing that the translator’s faithful approach to his source text was not the only possibility for his rendering. Finally, the translator’s characteristic freedom in lexical selection will be highlighted. As will be demonstrated below, this lexical freedom constitutes the primary avenue for the translator to interpret his source text.
2.2.1 Grammatical and Syntactical Concerns

Many examples of the translator’s fidelity to grammar and syntax of his source text could be highlighted, but in what follows I will limit myself to five: *participium coniunctum*, infinitives, the pleonastic use of the pronoun in relative clauses, postpositive particles and genitives absolute. In addition to these strictly grammatical and syntactical concerns, word order may be treated here briefly in view of the fact that in large part, the translator has chosen to reproduce the grammatical and syntactical structures of his source text rather than adapt them to the requirements of his target language. Such considerations support viewing 6 Ezek 40-48 as a philological translation, which takes the reader back toward the source text.

2.2.1.1 Participium Coniunctum

The *participium coniunctum* may be understood as a participle that agrees with its antecedent in case, number, and gender, thus including most participles (with the exception of substantival participles). Aejmelaeus has speculated on the reasons for the relative neglect of the Greek participle by the Septuagint translators as follows: “That the *part. coni.* [= *participium coniunctum*] is relatively uncommon in the Septuagint is due precisely to the fact that no common Hebrew structure could easily and appropriately be rendered by it.”\(^{144}\) She distinguishes five uses, focusing primarily on the Greek Pentateuch:\(^{145}\) 1) use of a participle as the rendering of the infinitive absolute with a main

\(^{144}\) Anneli Aejmelaeus, “*Participium coniunctum* as a Criterion of Translation Technique,” VT 32 (1982): 385-93; repr. in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 7-16 (7-8).

\(^{145}\) Aejmelaeus, “*Participium coniunctum*,” 8-11.
verb; 2) as λέγων corresponding to לאמר; 3) rendering asyndetic pairs of verbs; 4) as an equivalent to the Hebrew participle; and 5) as the rendering of the Hebrew construction ב + infinitive construct.

By far, the most common use for the participium coniunctum in Ezek 40-48 is as a rendering for Hebrew participles.

Ezek 40:45 // τοῖς ἱερεύσι τοῖς φυλάσσουσι τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ οἴκου

Ezek 40:46 // τοῖς ἱερεύσι τοῖς φυλάσσουσι τὴν φυλακὴν τοῦ θυσιαστήριου

Ezek 41:18 // γεγλυμμένα χερουβίν

Ezek 41:19 // διαγεγλυμμένος ὁ λόσος ὁ οἴκος κυκλώθην

Ezek 41:20 // καὶ οἱ φοίνικες διαγεγλυμμένοι

Ezek 44:2 // ἡ πύλη αὐτὴ κεκλεισμένη ἦσται ... καὶ ἔσται κεκλεισμένη

Ezek 44:11 // καὶ ἔσονται ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις μονοις λειτουργοῦντες θυρωροὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν τοῦ οἴκου καὶ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ οἴκῳ

Ezek 44:22 // καὶ χήραν καὶ ἐκβεβλημένην οὐ λήψονται έαυτοῖς

Ezek 45:4 // ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἔσται τοῖς ἱερεύσι τοῖς λειτουργοῦσιν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ

Ezek 45:5 // τοῖς Λευίταις τοῖς λειτουργοῦσιν τῷ οἴκῳ

Ezek 46:23 // καὶ μαγειρεῖα γεγονότα ὑποκάτω τῶν ἔξεδρῶν κύκλῳ

Ezek 46:24 // οὐ ἐψήσοσιν ἐκεῖ οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ οἴκῳ τὰ θύματα τοῦ λαοῦ

Ezek 47:8 // Τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαΐαν τὴν πρὸς ἀνατολάς

146 Another interesting indication of a relatively literalistic translation is the translator’s retention of the cognate accusative.

147 The translator takes the first word in מ (שד) with the preceding verse.
On the other hand, the translator did not always render a Hebrew participle with a Greek one. From time to time the translator used a finite verb to render the Hebrew participle of immediate future.\footnote{At Ezek 40:3 //καὶ αὐτὸς εἰστήκει ἐπὶ τῆς πύλης, the translator understood the unpointed Hebrew as a perfect where the Masoretic tradition pointed it as a participle, and so it is not counted among our examples.}

\begin{align*}
\text{Ezek 40:4a} & // 
\text{אשֶר-אֵין} \\
\text{Ezek 40:4b} & // 
\text{כָּל-אָשֶׁר-אָצַרְתָּ הַבָּהָר-יִשְׂרָאֵל} \\
\text{Ezek 44:5} & // 
\text{שָׁמְעָתָֽו} \\
\end{align*}

Occasionally a \textit{participium coniunctum} in \textit{6} Ezek 40-48 reflects the verbal idea inherent in a noun. In the following example, it is possible that the translator interpreted \textit{אָבְנִי נוֹרָה} as an Aramaic \textit{G} passive participle.\footnote{Suggested to me by Brandon Bruning, personal communication.}

\begin{align*}
\text{Ezek 40:42} & // 
\text{אָבְנִי נוֹרָה} \\
\end{align*}

The \textit{participium coniunctum} is used for the only occurrence of an infinitive absolute.

\begin{align*}
\text{Ezek 44:20} & // 
\text{καλύπτοντες} \textit{καλύφουσιν} \textit{τὰς} \textit{κεφαλὰς} \textit{αὐτῶν} \\
\end{align*}

\footnote{Apparently the translator read \textit{כָּסָם} (so G. A. Cooke, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel} [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936], 492).}
The use of the *participium coniunctum* in Ω Ezek 40-48 thus does not reflect the range of its usage in the Greek Pentateuch, as might be expected given the limited range of the corpus. A wider variety of usages of the Greek participle is visible when Ezek α’ and β’ are taken into account.\(^{151}\) What is instructive about the *participium coniunctum* in Ω Ezek 40-48 is the close correspondence between Hebrew participles and the translator’s use of Greek participles. Although contextual considerations remain paramount in each case, it seems in general the translator rendered a Hebrew participle in which the verbal idea was paramount with a Greek adverbial participle, a feature of relative fidelity.

2.2.1.2 *Infinitives*\(^ {152}\)

Infinitives in Ω Ezek 40-48 generally correspond to infinitives in מ. Where the infinitive construct is used with an introductory *lamed*, the translator often reproduces this by prefacing the Greek infinitive with a genitive article (τοῦ) that gives the infinitive a purposive significance. This tendency is a clear example of quantitative representation where the Greek τοῦ replaces Hebrew -ֵ, though the lack of this article at Ezek 40:46b; 45:4; 46:9 and elsewhere marks this technique as a general principle, not a hard and fast rule.

Ezek 40:46b

\[\text{הנה בן Zubok הקרבוס מבני לי-יהוה יהורתי} \]

\[\text{Σαδδουκ οἱ ἐγγιζόντες ἐκ τοῦ Λευι πρὸς κύριον λειτουργεῖν αὐτῷ} \]

\(^{151}\) Examples for all of Aejmelaeus’ uses of adverbial participles in the Greek Pentateuch can be found with the exception of her final category of rendering  כ with the infinitive construct. Participles rendering the infinitive absolute when it is used with a main verb can be seen in Ezek 44:20 as well as in 14:3; 24:5; 28:9. The use of λέγων to render לְמַמְר occurs in 9:1; 12:1, 8, 17 et passim. Participial rendering of asyndetic verbs occurs in Ezek 9:7 // ἔκπορευόμενοι καὶ κόπτετε.

\(^{152}\) For a treatment of infinitives in Ω broadly, see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965).
Ezek 42:20 // τοῦ διαστέλλειν ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ προτειχίσματος
Ezek 43:18 // τοῦ ἀναφέρειν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ὀλοκληρώματα καὶ προσχέειν πρὸς αὐτό αἵμα
Ezek 43:19 // τοῦ λειτουργεῖν μοι
Ezek 44:3 // οὕτως καθήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦ φαγείν ἀρτον
Ezek 44:7 // τοῦ γίνεσθαι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις μου καὶ εβεβήλουν αὐτά
Ezek 44:11 // καὶ οὕτωι στήσονται ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ λειτουργεῖν αὐτοῖς
Ezek 44:13 // καὶ οὗ ἐγγίζουσι πρὸς με τοῦ ἱερατεύειν μοι οὐδὲ τοῦ προσάγειν πρὸς τὰ ἁγία υἱῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
Ezek 44:24 // καὶ ἐπὶ κρίσιν αἵματος οὕτωι ἐπιστήσονται τοῦ διακρίνειν
Ezek 44:25 // οὕτω εἰσελύοντοι τοῦ μιανθήναι
Ezek 44:27 // καὶ ἢ αὐ τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι ... τοῦ λειτουργεῖν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ
Ezek 44:30 // καὶ τὰ πρωτογενήματα υἱῶν δώσετε τῷ ἱερεί τοῦ θείναι εὐλογίας υἱῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἴκους υἱῶν
Ezek 45:4 // καὶ ἔσται τοῖς ἐγγίζοσι λειτουργεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ
Ezek 45:11 // ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ κυρίου τῶν ἁγίων // τὸ μέτρον καὶ ἡ χοίριν ὁμοίως μία ἔσται τοῦ λαμβάνειν
Ezek 45:15 // τοῦ ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ υἱῶν
Ezek 45:17 // τοῦ ἐξιλάσκεσθαι υπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ
Ezek 46:9 // ὁ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ... προσκυνεῖν
Ezek 46:14 // τοῦ ἀναμείξαι τὸ σεμίδαλιν
Ezek 46:18 // καὶ οὗ μὴ λάβῃ ὁ ἀφηγούμενος ἐκ τῆς κληρονομίας τοῦ λαοῦ καταδυναστεύσαι αὐτοῦς

153 Reading with מ.  
154 The translator apparently interpreted the proleptic suffix as an indication this was an indicative form (a perfect) instead of an infinitive, despite the presence of the lamed marking the form as an infinitive construct.  
155 Reading with ו.  
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Commonly, Hebrew infinitives construct are broken down into their component parts, and each component is rendered with its usual Greek hyponym (etymological analysis). Word order in Greek remains the same as in Heb.

**ב + Infinitive Construct rendered as ἐν τῷ + infinitive**

Ezek 43:8: ἐν τῷ θυσίαν αὐτοῦς
Ezek 44:7: ἐν τῷ προσφέρειν ὑμᾶς
Ezek 44:10: ἐν τῷ πλανάσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ
Ezek 44:15: ἐν τῷ πλανάσθαι οἶκον Ἰσραήλ
Ezek 44:17: ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦς... ἐν τῷ λειτουργεῖν αὐτοῦς
Ezek 44:19: ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦς
Ezek 44:21: ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦς
Ezek 45:1: καὶ ἐν τῷ καταμετρεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς
Ezek 46:8: καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι τὸν ἀφηγούμενον
Ezek 46:10: ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦς... καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῦς

**ב + Infinitive Construct with other renderings**

Ezek 42:12: ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι δὶς αὐτῶν
Ezek 43:23: ἐν τῷ συντελέσαι σε τὸν ἐξιλασμὸν

**לְמַע + Infinitive Construct**

Ezek 40:4: ἐνεκα τοῦ δειξάι σοι

**אַחְרֵ + Infinitive Construct**

Ezek 46:12: μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτῶν
Infinitives construct in Hebrew are sometimes converted into adverbial phrases introduced with a Greek particle.

Ezek 40:39 // ὅπως σφάζωσιν ἐν αὐτῇ
Ezek 43:3 // ὅτε εἰσεπορεύομην τοῦ χρίσαι

On occasion, infinitives construct are rendered with a participle or, more commonly, with a noun.

Ezek 43:17 // μὴ γίνηται κατὰ ἀνατολάς
Ezek 43:18 // ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ποιήσεως αὐτοῦ
Ezek 43:23 // καὶ μετὰ τὸ συντελέσαι σε τὸν ἐξιλασμόν
Ezek 47:3 // καθὼς ἔξοδος ἀνδρὸς ἐξ ἑναντίας
Ezek 47:7 // ἐν τῇ ἐπιστροφῇ μου
Ezek 47:15 // τῆς εἰσόδου (cf. also 47:20; 48:1)
Ezek 48:11 // ἐν τῇ πλανήσει νῦν Ἰσραήλ

Very seldom, infinitives construct are treated as finite verbs.

Ezek 42:14 // οὐκ εἰσελέυσονταί ἐκεῖ πάρεξ τῶν ἱερέων

The opposite situation, in which a finite verb in Hebrew is converted to an infinitive, also occurs rarely.

Ezek 45:18 // τοῦ ἐξιλάσσασθαι τὸν ἅγιον

On occasion, circumstantial clauses are converted into infinitival phrases in Greek, resulting in more natural Greek. The translator prefers to render adverbial clauses with ἀνερ in this way, perhaps understanding the following examples as infinitive phrases.

---

156 In this example, the translation of the infinitive as a finite verb is probably due to the presence of the conjunction following the infinitive construct, which seems to have made the significance of the infinitive construct problematic.
Only one infinitive absolute appears in Ezek 40-48, where the translator renders it with a participle, a technique also present in Ezekiel α’ and β’.\textsuperscript{157}

Ezek 44:20 // καλύπτοντες καλύψουσιν τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν

In Ezekiel as a whole, Soisalon-Soinanen counts 127 instances of the use of β + infinitive construct, of which 88 are translated with ἐν τῷ + infinitive, the most of any book in δ.\textsuperscript{158} By way of comparison, he cites only three instances of ἐν τῷ + infinitive rendering the same construction in Jeremiah, and only one in Isaiah. This rendering of β + infinitive construct places Ezekiel in the same category of books as 1 and 2 Par, 3 Kgdms, 4 Kgdms and Psalms. δ Ezek 40-48 shows two of the three characteristics of expressions with the infinitive in translation Greek that Soisalon-Soinanen identified: ἐν τῷ + infinitive and τοῦ + infinitive (omitting ὡστε + infinitive). These constructions are relatively uncommon in native Greek works such as 2-4 Macc, Odes, Wisd, EpJer and

\textsuperscript{157} In Ezek α’, infinitives absolute are ignored (Ezek 1:2; 17:10; 20:32; 25:12), rendered with a cognate noun (especially for iterations of ἐν τῷ as θανάτῳ θανατοθήκῃ and similar cases: Ezek 3:18, 21; 16:4 [his]; 18:9, 13, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28), rendered with a related participle (14:3; 24:5), rendered as a main verb (16:49; 21:20; 21:31; 23:30; 24:10) or imperative (23:46 [his], 47; 24:2 [reading with ἢ]). At 21:24, the infinitive absolute is read as ἐν τῷ δύο δύο twice. In Ezek β’, infinitives absolute are rendered with a related participle (28:9), ignored (31:11; 33:16), rendered with a cognate noun (33:8, 14, 15), or translated with an infinitive (36:3).

\textsuperscript{158} Soisalon-Soinanen, Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta, 188. Nine are translated by ἐν with a substantive, three with an infinitive with another preposition, and three by an infinitive alone. ὡς clauses render 12 cases, and ἢᾳ clauses render two. Genitive absolutes, adverbial participles and other translations make up the rest of the cases.
Sus.\textsuperscript{159} The constructions ἐν τῷ + infinitive and τῷ + infinitive thus provide 6 Ezek 40-48 with one of its characteristically literal elements.

2.2.1.3 Pleonastic Uses of the Pronoun in Relative Clauses

The translator of 6 Ezek 40-48 reproduced pleonastic uses of the pronoun in relative clauses in the majority of such instances in which such cases occurred in 6\textsuperscript{V}.\textsuperscript{160} This corresponds to what Soisalon-Soininen has observed as the natural inclination of translators to render word for word, but was probably a feature of the spoken language of Greek even outside translated texts.\textsuperscript{161}

Ezek 40:42 // ἐν οἷς οὐ θεσαλών ηυθὲν βοῦ
Ezek 40:49 // ἐπὶ δέκα ἀναβαθμῶν ἀνέβαινον ἐπʼ αὐτὸ
Ezek 42:13 // ἐν οἷς φάγονται ἐκεῖ ὁ ἱερεῖς
Ezek 42:14 // ἐν οἷς λειτουργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς
Ezek 44:19 // ἐν αἷς αὐτοὶ λειτουργοῦσιν ἐν αὐταῖς
Ezek 46:20 // οὐ ἔψησον εἰς εἰς ὁ ἱερεῖς τὰ ὑπὲρ ἄγνοιας
Ezek 46:24 // οὐ οὐ θεσαλων ἐκεῖ ὁ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ οὐκ ὑπὸ τὰ θύματα τοῦ λαοῦ
Ezek 47:9 // ἐφ᾿ ὁ ὁ ἐπέλθη ἐκεῖ ὁ ποταμός, ζήσεται

In two instances, the translator did not preserve the pleonastic use of the Hebrew pronoun.

\textsuperscript{159} Soisalon-Soinenen, \textit{Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta}, 193.

\textsuperscript{160} In addition, compare Ezek 43:7. This verse contains a relative clause with a word which is pointed in ἐν as a pleonastic particle (ὡ), but which is interpreted by the Septuagint translator as the word ὡς.

Ezek 44:14 // καὶ εἰς πάντα, δόσα ἂν ποιήσωσιν
Ezek 46:9 // οὐκ ἀναστρέψει κατὰ τὴν πύλην, ἢν εἰσελήλυθεν

Soisalon-Soininen remarks: “The use of the pleonastic pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch varies so extensively from book to book that this variation may be considered significant,” giving the ratio of omissions of the pleonastic pronoun to examples of its retention as follows.\(^{162}\)

### TABLE 2.2.1.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>Retentions</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55% retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.7% retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75.4% retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87.2% retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81.3% retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3% retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{162}\) Ezek 40-48 retains the pleonastic pronoun 80% of the time, compared with 81.3% in Ezek \(\alpha\)' (chaps. 1-27) and 100% in Ezek \(\beta\)' (chaps. 28-39).\(^{163}\) Altogether the translator(s) of Ezekiel retain 30 of 35 instances of the pleonastic pronoun (85.7%). Such

---

\(^{162}\) Soisalon-Soininen, “Hebrew Relative Clause,” 61.

\(^{163}\) Ezek \(\alpha\): the pleonastic pronoun is retained in Ezek 5:9; 6:9, 13; 11:16, 17; 12:16; 13:20; 14:22; 18:24; 20:34, 41, 43; 24:6; and omitted in 3:15; 8:3; 9:6 (retained in 81.3% of cases). In 18:31 the translator read מְנַשֶּׁה in place of מְנַשֶׁה. Ezek \(\beta\): the pleonastic pronoun is retained in 28:25; 29:13; 34:12; 36:20, 21, 22; 37:21 [all of which concern the Judeans’ being scattered in foreign lands], as well as 37:23, 25 (retained in 100% of cases).
considerations support the faithful approach of the translators of Ezekiel to their source text.

2.2.1.4 Postpositive Particles and Genitives Absolute

Postpositive particles occur rather infrequently in the book as a whole. ἐπί is used only three times in the book (at 12:19; 31:17; 39:16) and is absent from chapters 40-48. This is comparable with the use of this particle in 1 Par, Jeremiah, 1-3 Kgdms, Eccl and Zech, against freer books such as Isa and the Pentateuch. Nor does the particle οὖν occur in the book. Δέ is more frequent, commonly used following a personal pronoun, the article, or in accompaniment to εἰς. It appears 36 times in the book as a whole, at a rate comparable to Jer, 2 Kgdms, Amos and Zech. Similarly, ο ἐ Ezek’s single use of τε at 40:20 is comparable to the frequency of this term in other books. The use of these postpositive and conjunctive particles indicates that, with the exception

164 In 1 Par, ἐπί makes up 0.006% of words in the book, in Jer 0.007%, in 1 Kgdms and Ezek 0.01%, in Zech 0.02%, in Ecc and 2 Kgdms 0.022%, and in 2 Par 0.042%. On the other end of the spectrum, in decreasing order, are Job (1.261% of words), Prov (0.914%), Isa (0.68%), Est (0.428%), Exod (0.375%), Gen (0.322%), Lev (0.189%), Dan (0.176%) and Deut (0.17%).

165 This particle also does not occur in Jer, 1 Par, 3 Kgdms or Zech. It is most common in Est (0.188% of words), Gen (0.129%), Exod (0.117%), and Job (0.088%).

166 ἡμεῖς: 3:21; 28:2, 9; 33:9; ἡμεῖς: 11:3; ἡμεῖς: 21:22. It is used after the substantivizing use of the article (6:12; 7:15), and is common after an adjectival article as well (3:7; 10:13; 14:16; 18:5, 18, 20 [bix]; 30:25; 33:8; 34:8; 48:13, 15, 19, 21). It appears with εἰς at 14:21; 16:27; 18:14; 22:13; 33:9; 46:12, 17. For analysis of ἐκ in 6 Ezek 40-48, see below.

167 Δέ is least common in 2 Par (0.009% of words), Neh (0.013%), 4 Kgdms (0.048%), 1 Kgdms (0.05%), Ezra (0.054%), 1 Par (0.068%), Jdg (0.077%), 3 Kgdms and Zeph (0.082%), Lam (0.084%), Jer (0.09%), 2 Kgdms (0.106%), Ezek (0.121%), Amos (0.156%) and Zech (0.161%). It is most common in Job (5.457% of words), Prov (5.043%), Gen (2.625%), Est (1.78%), Exod (1.62%), Ruth (1.062%) and Lev (0.66%).

168 Τό is least common in Ezek (0.003% of words), Isa (0.004%), 4 Kgdms (0.005%), Psal (0.006%), 1 Par (0.006%) and Josh (0.007%). It is most common in Est (0.274% of words), Job (0.14%), Prov (0.116%), Ezra (0.072%), Lev (0.052%) and Gen (0.049%).
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of δέ, employment of postpositive particles occurred only sporadically, in keeping with the translators’ relatively literalistic Übersetzungsweise.

Grammatically, the particle δέ is always used to mark a contrast between elements that are distinguished in some way. Interestingly, in every instance in which it is used in ḫ Ezek 40-48 with the exception of one (Ezek 40:44, below), the use of δέ provides an example of quantitative representation, since it furnishes a method by which to indicate the presence of the connecting waw in situations where the normal rendering by καί would be inappropriate or awkward. In these situations, then, the use of δέ could be considered evidence for literalistic translation.

In another instance, the translator inserts δέ where there is no corresponding term in his source text, presumably because he felt the need for an adversative.

In general, then, the employment of δέ in ḫ Ezek 40-48 tends to support rather than undermine the contention that this section of Ezekiel is, by and large, a faithful one.
A similar situation results from the consideration of the presence of genitives absolute. Soisalon-Soinanen argues that even sporadic uses of the genitive absolute should be given weight, since appropriate circumstances for their use were present only under certain conditions. The genitive absolute occurs only occasionally in \( \) Ezek, and not at all in Ezek \( \gamma' \).

- Ezek 9:5 // καὶ τούτοις εἶπεν ἀκοὐντός μου
- Ezek 10:13 // άκοουντός μου
- Ezek 15:5 // σοδε ἐτὶ αὐτοῦ ὄντος ὀλοκλήρου
- Ezek 26:10 // εἰσπορευομένου αὐτοῦ τὰς πύλας σου

All four of the genitives absolute in \( \) Ezekiel carry a temporal nuance, in keeping with their most common classification elsewhere in the Septuagint. The proportion of genitives absolute in both Ezek \( \gamma' \) and \( \) Ezek as a whole is slightly lower than corresponding uses of the genitive absolute in other books with similar ways of rendering syntactical features. This offers more corroboration of the translator’s faithful approach.

---


171 “Beinahe alle gen. abs. in der Septuaginta haben temporale Bedeutung…” according to Soinanen-Soisalon, “Gebrauch des genetivus absolutus,” 177.

172 There are 3 genitives absolute in 1 Par (11:2; 12:1; 18:3); 1 in Zech (14:12); 7 in 2 Par (15:3; 18:34; 20:10, 25; 21:5; 23:7; 36:10); 14 in Jer (15:9, 11, 17; 33:8; 35:9; 38:32; 43:2, 13, 23; 48:4, 7; 49:18; 52:1, 31); 11 in 2 Kgdms (3:13, 35; 5:2; 6:16; 8:3; 11:1; 12:21; 13:30; 18:5, 14; 19:18); and 13 in 1 Kgdms (3:11; 9:5, 11, 14, 27; 11:9; 13:15; 15:2; 20:14; 22:4; 25:7, 20; 30:1). When compared with the number of verses in each respective book (an arbitrary but accurate method of comparison), the following proportions result: 1 Par and Ezek (0.003% of verses have a genitive absolute), Zech (0.005%), 2 Par (0.009%), Jer (0.011%), 2 Kgdms (0.016%), 1 Kgdms (0.017%).
2.2.1.5 Word Order in ơ Ezekiel 40-48

Reproduction of the word order of the source text has generally been regarded a significant criterion, perhaps even the definitive criterion, of a literal translation.173 Galen Marquis has provided a stimulating consideration of the fidelity of the translator of Ezekiel 1-39, though he leaves aside Ezek 40-48 due to their “special character and the possibly different approach of the translator (not necessarily a different one) to their translation.”174 He finds 100 instances of deviation in word order in Ezek 1-39, making the translator dependent on the word-order of his source text in 90.1% of cases. His statistics are based on tallies of verses which agree or disagree between ır and ơ instead of the actual words themselves, and so may be considered helpful approximations. The figure of 90.1% agreement in Ezek 1-39 compares with 89.8% agreement in word order in Jeremiah, 92.2% in 1 Kgdms, and 97.3% for 4 Kgdms.175 This relatively high percentage in Ezekiel, compared to the 53.8% agreement in Job 1-30 and 66.4% in Isa 1-30, substantiates the relatively literal character of Ezek ơβ’.176

When one turns to examine Ezek ơ’, he or she notices that, like the preceding sections, many of the changes in word-order here can be attributed to a preference for

---


175 Marquis, “Word Order,” 64.

176 See also the examples of deviation from the Hebrew in Cornill, Ezechiel, 97-98. As can be seen in comparison with our list, Cornill’s list is incomplete.
Greek language and style. Appendix B cites 52 examples of divergence in word order in Ezek γ’, more than half the number of examples (100) cited by Marquis for Ezek αβ’. Marquis contends that cases in which numbers are combined with nouns, such as those in the category “Numerals and Measurements” in Appendix B, provide a useful index for assessing the translator’s “policy” about following the word-order of his source text, citing Ezek 29:17. A summary declaration that the translator of Ezek γ’ is much less literal than those operative in the rest of the book would be hasty, however, given the differences in content provided by the detailed measurements in the temple description. If one eliminates the variation between the translator’s preference for placing the unit of measurement before its numerical value, in contrast to θ’, there would be only ten examples of divergence in word order. This would represent a higher ratio of agreement with the source text than that preserved in Ezek αβ’ (96.3%). Including the incidences of the translator’s preference for designating the unit before its value, one arrives at a lower percentage of agreement (80.7%), which is still much higher than the values Marquis gives for Job 1-30 (53.8%) and Isaiah 1-30 (66.4%). More than reliance on such statistics, one should remember that apart from a few select but rather common situations described above, the translator follows the word order of his source text, an index of his literalistic approach. On the other hand, the translator’s consistency in varying the word order of his source text in favor of one more natural in Greek, especially when providing

---

177 My investigation of many of these terms is based on observations Marquis made in his article “Word Order.”

178 Marquis, “Word Order,” 74. Of course, the translator is not likely to have had an explicit or perhaps even conscious “policy” that controlled his rendering.
measurements, provides a small but suggestive example of the translator’s third goal: accommodating his source text to his target readership in specific ways.

2.2.2 Summary and Conclusions

The examination of some aspects of the grammar and syntax of the Septuagint translator has put us in a position to agree heartily with Soisalon-Soininen’s statement about the quality of the Septuagint translation: “Die Septuaginta ist nicht eine Übersetzung eines Griechen für Griechen, sondern eines griechisch sprechenden Juden für Juden.” Many features of the grammar and syntax of Ḫ Ezek 40-48 would have seemed barbaric or even incomprehensible to a non-Jewish Greek speaker, as the polemics against the Septuagint as a whole were quick to point out. Yet these translators should not be dismissed as incompetent, especially in view of the fact that the Septuagint represents the first large-scale translation in the ancient world, even if it proceeded in fits and starts. In fact, the translator of Ḫ Ezek 40-48 is capable of several excellent free renderings that would meet modern standards of idiomatic translation, as will become clear. Despite these occasionally inspired moments, however, it is clear that the translator for the most part kept solidly to the tenets of etymological analysis, concern with Hebrew word-order and quantitative representation, while lexical rendering was more fluid. It is equally clear that this was not a systematic process but an “easy technique.”

179 Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax, 176.

How should this tendency toward literal renderings be evaluated? I suggest that Ezek 40-48 should be seen as a philological translation, in which the authoritative linguistic, grammatical and syntactical structures, not just the individual words, create a style immediately recognizable to the acculturated ear as possessing divine authority. If this suggestion is adopted, then the literalistic Übersetzungsweise itself encodes and expresses the distance between the original oracles and the translator’s circumstances. The probability of this suggestion increases when it becomes clear that the translator was capable on occasion of much freer renderings.

2.3 Accuracy and Comprehensibility in Ezekiel 40-48

2.3.1 The Use of the Verb Ḫειν

The use of the verb Ḫειν poses problems of syntax and style for investigation of the Übersetzungsweise of the Septuagint translators, not to mention the verb’s lexicographical difficulties. The root of the problem is the fact that Hebrew, like related Semitic languages, has no verb for possession, relying instead on the constructions ל-י and /-י. Greek could indicate ownership with the expression εἶναι τινί, which is similar to the aforementioned Hebrew constructions, but may not be completely interchangeable for them in every instance. Possession could also be indicated using the simple dative case where ש or רה was not explicit, as the representative examples below show.

While ἐξεῖν is common in Ezek α’ and γ’, it is used only once in Ezek β’ (at 34:4, where τὸ κακῶς ἔχον renders ἁλατ-החלות), perhaps in part due to the difference in subject-matter.182

One significant use of ἐξεῖν in θ Ezekiel is to indicate a direction opposite or next to the speaker, an idiomatic rendering of ἀνατέλλειν, ἐνδεικνύεται, and ἀντίλειμα.183

In other instances, ἐξεῖν corresponds to Hebrew constructions of possession.184

182 Of course the distribution of ἐξεῖν also supports Thackeray’s theory of different translators for these sections.

183 See also Ezek 43:8; 48:18, 21. Ezek α’ provides parallel uses in Ezek 1:15, 19; 3:13; 9:2; 10:6, 9 [bis], 16, 19; 11:22. For a native Greek use of ἐξεῖν in this sense, see Herodotus 1.64, 180, 191; 2.17; 5.81.

184 See Ezek 17:3 // ἀνεστήσατο ἐξεῖν. For the impetus behind the translator’s rendering in this verse, see Carl H. Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel (Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1886), 272-73 and G. Jahn, Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der Septuaginta hergestellt, übersetzt und kritisch erklärt (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1905), 116.
Occasionally, the translator will use ἐχεῖν in other instances where it seems appropriate. ¹⁸⁵

Ezek 44:18 // καὶ κιδάρεις λινάς ἔξωσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ περισκελὴ λινά ἔξωσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ὀσφύας αὐτῶν

The use of ἐχεῖν in the directional sense identified above occurs in the Pentateuch in the description of the construction of the tabernacle and elsewhere in the priestly literature. ¹⁸⁶

Like sacrificial terminology (see §4.2 below), the use of ἐχεῖν in this directional sense may reflect the translator’s consultation of the Pentateuch as a kind of working manual for his own translational needs.

2.3.2 Suitable Free Renderings and the Historical Present

The following examples of free renderings in 6 Ezekiel 40-48 can be given.

While such renderings abandon the general practice of quantitative representation, they prove most accurate and are the more noteworthy for their rarity.

Ezek 40:5 κην ἀνέθη // ἵσον τῷ καλάμῳ
Ezek 40:44 ὁμιλεῖ δρόμος // φέρουσα πρὸς νότον
Ezek 40:47 μερίσθη // ἐπὶ τὰ τέσσαρα μέρη αὐτῆς
Ezek 41:8 μαλε τὸν ἄνθρωπον // ἵσον τῷ καλάμῳ
Ezek 44:17 ἀλα-ὑπῆλθ ὄλῳς γεμάτος // καὶ οὐκ ἐνδύσονται ἑρεά

¹⁸⁵ See Ezek 8:11; 9:1 ἢ αἷστος θυματήριον αὐτοῦ ἐθέσεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ; 9:3 οὐκ ἔπει τῆς τῶν ὀσφυῶν αὐτοῦ τήν ζωήν.

¹⁸⁶ Exod 26:3; Lev 6:3; Num 2:2, 5, 7, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22, 27, 29, 34; 22:5, 11, 29; 34:3. Outside of P, this term occurs also at Gen 41:23 and Deut 11:30.
In addition to these more periphrastic renderings, the use of the historical present (καὶ πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου) as the rendering of the phrase אַלְמָלֵי נִי should be mentioned (43:3; 44:4). The rendering of this phrase with the historical present tallies with the identical translation in Ezek α’, where the same rendering appears in the prophet’s visions. The use of the historical present in the identical phrase provides a small clue that the same translator is at work in Ezekiel α’ and γ’.

2.3.3 Conclusion

The preceding considerations demonstrate that, occasionally, the translator was capable of freer usages than was his general practice. These sporadic free usages suggest that where comprehensibility or accuracy was at stake, the translator could express his source text in idiomatic Greek. That the normal practice of literalistic translation was occasionally and briefly suspended suggests that comprehensibility was (in general) seen as more of a concern than maintaining a philological translation. It also suggests that the philological translation of the rest was the translator’s choice on some level, and as such was not the only possible treatment of his source text. This validates the hierarchy of translational goals identified in Chapter One, in which comprehensibility and accuracy outranked philological translation as the most important of the translator’s goals.

2.4 Lexical Interpretation

2.4.1 The Translator’s Freedom in Rendering Vocabulary

The final criterion of literal translations identified above concerned the degree to which one Hebrew term is rendered by one Greek term irrespective of contextual requirements (stereotyped lexical equivalents). Unlike the features adduced to this point, lexical interpretation does not encompass simple grammatical or syntactical questions, but is bound up with larger contextual considerations, which are imperative in the evaluation of whether a particular Greek term suitably expresses the Hebrew original. Yet while stereotyped lexical equivalents may be a feature of extremely literal translation, variation in rendering a term cannot be construed as an *a priori* indication of free translation. More than one equivalent may be needed to express a Hebrew term, since the semantic range of no two words in the same language is coterminous, let alone the semantic range between two words in languages as different as Hebrew and Greek.

The category in which Ezekiel’s translator(s) consistently shows the most freedom is in the selection of such equivalents. In the middle of the last century, Ziegler had already noted this: “Von vornherein ist anzunehmen, dass er [der Übersetzer] keine starre Konsequenz in der Wiedergabe der gleichen Wörter und Wendungen zeigt; diese ist ein Kennzeichen des Aquila.” Ziegler drew attention to the translator’s flexibility in lexical rendering primarily in an effort to discredit the common practice of discerning different translators based on changes in such rendering. In a later study with more tightly controlled methodology, McGregor isolated at least seven different types of lexical...

---

rendering in LXX Ezekiel. The variation he discovered within one homogeneous section means for McGregor “that a multiple translator hypothesis cannot be dismissed just by citing several examples showing inconsistencies in the renderings of certain terms and then inferring, as did Ziegler (1953), that any other cases of translation change in the text must be the result of inconsistency in the ‘translator.’” While McGregor rejected Ziegler’s finding of a single translator, like Ziegler he stressed the freedom with which the translator rendered the vocabulary of his source text.

Galen Marquis has articulated a methodology that takes into account the difference between consistency in lexical translation and literal translation. For Marquis, consistency refers to any occasion in which a translator renders a Hebrew word with the same Greek term more than once. All such uses belong to a “glossary,” which may have been either physical or (more likely) mental, and all are considered literal. Literal translations are those that reflect the source text. Renderings of a particular term which occur only once in a translator’s corpus are called singular translations. Marquis supposes that the percentage of these singular translations that reflect the source abstractly, as opposed to those which do not reflect the source at all, is roughly equivalent

189 McGregor isolated the following types of renderings: 1) those which are stereotyped; 2) those which are generally stereotyped but subject to contextual influence; 3) change without apparent cause between two or more renderings; 4) change between two or more renderings but with a preference for one of them; 5) renderings that change little by little from one equivalent to another; 6) renderings that change suddenly from one equivalent to another; and 7) renderings that fluctuate according to contextual needs (McGregor, The Greek Text of Ezekiel, 194).

190 McGregor, Greek Text, 194-95.

to the percentage of literal or consistent translations. For example, in Ezek α’, יֶבֶר is rendered by the terms διέρχομαι, διοδεύων, πάροδος, ἐπάγω and διάγω more than once, and by διαπορεύομαι, πορεύομαι, ἀποτροπιάζω and ἀφορισμός once each.¹⁹² The consistent translations (those that appear more than once) constitute 13 of the 17 total uses of יֶבֶר in Ezek α’, or 77%. By Marquis’ reasoning, 77% of the singular readings should reflect the source and thus be considered literal. Thus, 77% of the 23% of singular translations, or 18% of the total translations, are assumed to represent the source abstractly. As a result, only 5% of the renderings of יֶבֶר could reflect either a variant Vorlage or the free rendering of the author. Working through the entire corpus of Ezekiel, Marquis arrives at the following percentages of literalness for Ezek α’, β’ and γ’, as well as for other Septuagint books.¹⁹³

TABLE 2.4:

PERCENTAGE OF LITERAL LEXICAL RENDERINGS IN SELECT BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation Unit</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezek α’</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek β’</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek γ’</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kgdms</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Such statistics place Ezek γ’ in the company of the very literal 4 Kgdms, and show a sharp contrast with the freer δ Isaiah.

Though Marquis’ observations provide a starting-point for the investigation of lexical translation, his methodology should not be allowed to obscure the frequent variation in lexical equivalents characteristic of Ezek γ’. From time to time, the translator changes his rendering midstream without any obvious motivation, as can be seen in his rendering of מנהרה with θεσσά (42:13; 44:29; 45:15, 17 [bis], 24; 46:5b) and then μαναα (45:25; 46:5a, 7, 11, 14 [bis], 15, 20). Similarly אסף is rendered by μετρον in Ezek 45:13a and then with the transliteration ουφι in Ezek 45:13b, all in the course of half a verse. Even these small examples suggest that it is in his lexical choices that the translator makes his most distinctive contribution to the meaning of his translation.

The translator’s freedom in rendering specific lexemes is characteristic of many books and corpora in the Septuagint, and Ezek γ’ is no exception. Appendix C provides illustrations of this lexical freedom in Ezek γ’, featuring key architectural and liturgical elements. These examples, some of which will prove significant in the following chapters, demonstrate that the translator shows no reservations in varying his lexical equivalents, even where the underlying Hebrew term represents a significant architectural feature or an element of the Temple liturgy. In sum, unlike the other three identifying traits of literal translations adduced above, the use of stereotyped lexical equivalents is not characteristic of Ezek γ’. This readiness to vary terminology represents one avenue

---

for the translator to create meaning for his readers. A counterbalance to the translator’s lexical variation can be found in his extensive use of transliterations.

### 2.4.2 Transliterations

Transliterations have long been recognized as clues to the history and nature of Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures. Thackeray proposed four major categories of transliterations: 1) terms unique to Judaism with no equivalent in Greek; 2) geographical terms and instances in which an appellative is mistaken for a proper noun; 3) words of which the translators were ignorant; and 4) doublets.\(^{195}\) He also described “Hellenized Hebrew” words such as σάββατον. Walters sought to refine Thackeray’s categories,\(^{196}\) but suffered criticism for his failure to distinguish homophones from homographs and for his tendency toward emendation.\(^{197}\) Caird sought to enrich the discussion of transliterations in the Greek versions by positing five kinds of “homeophony,” of which the first concerned transliterations.\(^{198}\) Such transliterations could be considered evidence of the translator shirking his assigned task. Perhaps a more helpful classification of such transliterations was provided by Tov, who divided transliterations into 1) proper nouns; 2) Semitic loan-words into Greek; 3) puns; 4) natural/guided choice (when the Hebrew/Aramaic word resembles its most obvious Greek counterpart phonologically); 5) mistranslations caused by homophony. G. B. Caird, “Homoeophony in the Septuagint,” in *Greeks, Jews and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies* (ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs; SJLA 21; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 74-88.

---

\(^{195}\) Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 31-38, esp. 32.


\(^{198}\) The types of homophony proposed by Caird include 1) transliterations; 2) Semitic loan-words into Greek; 3) puns; 4) natural/guided choice (when the Hebrew/Aramaic word resembles its most obvious Greek counterpart phonologically); 5) mistranslations caused by homophony. G. B. Caird, “Homoeophony in the Septuagint,” in *Greeks, Jews and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies* (ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs; SJLA 21; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 74-88.
2) technical terms involving either a) religion; b) measures or weights; or c) unknown words. Transliterations may have been caused by the ignorance of the translator or by concern for preserving the exact nuance of the source text; by their nature they were especially susceptible to the intervention of Greek scribes. Tov also provided a list of transliterations in εικος probably caused by the ignorance of translators.

εικος Ezekiel 40-48 has more than its fair share of transliterations, due no doubt to the opacity of the prophecy it mediates. Lust has provided a helpful catalogue of these transliterations in εικος Ezekiel as well as in Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus. Of the 31 transliterations in εικος Ezekiel Lust has identified, 17 occur in Ezekiel 40-48. In addition, two homophones in εικος Ezek 47:8 should be added to Lust’s list, where εικος ed gives Γαλιλαία as the hyponym to μ’s Ινδια and ‘Αραβία as the hyponym for ציבר. Of the 19 total transliterations that occur in εικος Ezekiel 40-48, eight are unique to the translator of

---


202 These transliterations include αιλ (40:48); αλαμ (8:16; 40:6, 7, 9, and passim); αλαμμο (40:21, 22 [2x], 24 and passim); αλευ (40:9, 21, 24, and passim); θητελαθα (40:7); θεε (1 Kgs 14:28; Ezek 40:7, 8, 10 [2x] and passim); θειμ (40:12, 14, 16); θραγ (41:8); γομορ (Exod 16:16, 18, 32; Ezek 45:11 [3x], and passim); ιυ (Exod 29:40; 30:24; Lev 23:13; Ezek 4:11; 45:24; 46:5, 7 and passim); αφι (Lev 5:11; 6:20; 1 Kgs 1:24; Ezek 45:13); μανακ (2 Kgs 8:8, 9; 17:3, 4; 2 Chr 7:7; Ezek 45:25; 46:5, 7, 11 and passim); παγκα (Exod 12:11, 21, 27, 43; Ezek 45:21); σαββαγ (Ezek 20:12, 13, 16; 44:24; 45:17; 46:1 and passim); χερουβ (Ezek 9:3; 10:1, 2, 3; 41:18, 20, 25 and passim); αμπιλ (2 Kgdms 23:20; 1 Chr 11:22; Ezek 43:15, 16; 43:15). Note also the homophonous rendering of ταφον by οφεσις (Ezek 47:3).

203 See §5.2.2 below.
this corpus, and the rest are known outside Ezekiel. Of these eight unique transliterations, six are architectural terms (איל, αιλαμμω, αιλευ, θαιηλαθα, θειμ, θαελ), and the remaining two are properly homophones, not transliterations (Ἀραβία, ἀφεσις). When one considers that several of the architectural terms are related to each other, the proportion of transliterations decreases further still. Each of these unique transliterations deserves examination, as do other transliterations that σ Ezekiel 40-48 has in common with the rest of σ. Without acquaintance with such transliterations comprehension of the translator’s Übersetzungsweise is impossible. The transliterations will be introduced by textual evidence meant to suggest that these transliterations are not the result of the transmission of the Septuagint but go back to the original translation of Ezekiel.

2.4.2.1 αιλ (Ezekiel 40:48; 41:3).

Ezek 40:48 αιλ τοῦ αιλαμ B Aeth \(\text{αια (δια Q* το} \) αιλαμ Q*-407 αιλ 62; > ε'; αιλαμ του οικου 106; > αιλ του 967

Ezek 41:3 αιλ B O Q-62 46 49-90-198 Aeth \(\text{δια 233}; \text{αιλαμ 967}

Though this transliteration occurs only twice, it can be confidently ascribed to σ*. The unfamiliar αιλ was easily confused with δια in uncial script, especially in a genitive phrase, and was easily omitted or replaced with more familiar transliterations (αιλαμ), and so it suffered in the course of transmission. Аιл is a transliteration of the Hebrew הַיָּס III, “pillar of an archway.”\(^{204}\) In two instances in א Ezekiel 40-48, הַיָּס appears without suffixes but is not rendered by αιλ. 1) In 40:14, there is no obvious counterpart for א’s

\(^{204}\) HALOT, "יָס," 1:40. References to HALOT are to the two-volume study edition.
III in ø and the text may be corrupt.\textsuperscript{205} 2) In 40:16, אלי III is rendered by αἰλαμ, reflecting frequent confusion between אלי and אלת, based on the translator’s failure to distinguish waw and yodh.\textsuperscript{206} ø 3 Kgdms 6:21 translates אלי III by φιλιά.

2.4.2.2 αἰλαμ (40:6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 25, 40, 48, 49; 41:1, 15, 25, 26).

The frequency of the use of this transliteration allows it to be attributed to ø* without reservations. Outside of Ezekiel,\textsuperscript{207} αἰλαμ uniformly represents אלת, with the sense of “porch”.\textsuperscript{208} ø Ezek 8:16 agrees with the rest of the Septuagintal biblical corpus in its use of αἰλαμ to render אלת, while the translator of Ezekiel 32:24 uses the term as the transliteration of the inimical people אלי. Ezekiel 40-48 also knows of the equivalence of αἰλαμ with אלת.\textsuperscript{209} On the other hand, the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 appears to be unique in using the term αἰλαμ to render other architectural features,

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{206} It is also possible that a hypothetical reading of αλ in ø* was replaced by the more familiar transliteration αλαμ very early in the history of transmission. Though this tendency is noticeable in other transliterations unique to ø Ezekiel 40-48, as we will see below, such a suggestion must remain in the realm of speculation.

\textsuperscript{207} 3 Kgdms 6:3, 36 [1]; 7:3, 7, 8, 43, 44, 45; 2 Chr 3:4.

\textsuperscript{208} HALOT, 1:41.

\textsuperscript{209} Ezek 40:9 [bis], 15, 39, 40, 48 [bis], 41:15, 25, 26; 44:3; 46:2, 8.
\end{footnotesize}
Confusion between these similar words, especially in the plural of לֹּא III, is caused by the translator’s difficulty in distinguishing waw from yodh.

Nevertheless, the translator’s rendering is not entirely without value; nor does it necessarily reflect paraphrase on the translator’s part, as has been sometimes suggested. The appearance of αἶλαμ as the equivalent of the μא in Ezek 40:6 led Gese to remark that the “unverstandene terminus technicus μא=αἶλαμ ist unbestimmt genug, um zur Bezeichnung irgendeines architektonischen Zwischenstückes zu dienen.”211 This statement is predicated on the notion that the translator was working with a Vorlage identical to μא, which seems an inadmissible presumption. Gese’s judgment is further weakened by the correct translation of ησ in Ezek 43:8 by πρόθυρον twice. If the translator could recognize the term and correctly render it, it seems less problematic to assume that the term was not in his Vorlage than that he intervened inexplicably into the text.212 Another objection to Gese’s conclusion is the fact that renders ησ in 40:6 not with αἶλαμ but with βε, which is certainly not a multi-referential term. In any event, the difficulty of drawing any firm conclusions based on renderings in Ezek 40:6-10, a passage that has suffered massive textual confusion in transmission, should be kept in

210 40:10, 14, 16 (2°); 41:1 [bis], 3.

211 Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 131.

212 It seems difficult to conceive of any way in which the translator could have misread his source text in this instance, though such a possibility cannot be dismissed completely. It is also possible that the original translation was disturbed in the course of transmission.
In place of נְבָעַת, apparently an allusion to P’s tabernacle, ô reads τὸ εὐρός τοῦ αἴλαμ ἐνθεν, reflecting אלי III (“pillar”). Such instances highlight the fact that even in confusion, the translator preserves valuable information about the state of the text at his time, which was rather frequently not identical to א, as will become clear in chapter three.

2.4.2.3 αἴλαμῳ (40:22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38).

Like αἴλαμ, αἴλαμῳ was clearly present in א*, based on its frequency. Although the majority of the equivalents to this word in א are forms of הַאֵל / אֵל, in Ezekiel 40:37-38 ô twice uses αἴλαμῳ where א has הַאֵל III. In 40:37a, several commentators emend א to follow the reading of ô and other versions, reading הַאֵל in place of הַאֵל III. Further, in ô Ezek 40:38, seen as the beginning of a redactional section by several scholars, ô gives a much different reading than א and lacks the explanatory comment

213 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 342.


Finally, the translator repeatedly distinguishes the plural of ἄλλα / αλλα (αιλαμμω) from the plural of ἀλλα III (αλευν)\(^{218}\), and so αιλαμμω does not seem to exhibit the confusion between ἀλλα III and ἄλλα / αλλα shown by αιλαμ.

2.4.2.4 αιλεύ (40:9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37).

Again, in view of its frequency this transliteration was almost certainly present in δ*. In almost all its appearances, δ serves as the equivalent to the plural of ἀλλα III with possessive pronominal suffixes.\(^{219}\) In 40:34, it seems to represent ἀλλα III in the singular with a 3rd person masculine pronominal suffix (ἐπὶ τοῦ αιλευ), as implied by the article. As mentioned above, αιλευ represents the translator’s attempt to distinguish ἄλλα III from ἄλλα / αλλα.

2.4.2.5 ἀρηλ (43:15 [bis], 16)

The meaning of the Hebrew term (הַרְאָל or הָהָרָאלו [ו[מ]]) in these verses and its relationship to the ἀραλ of Isa 29:1, 2, 7 need not detain us here.\(^{220}\) The transliteration was certainly present in δ*, as shown by the manuscript witnesses, and is a technical name for a portion of the altar. Only in Ezek 43:15-16 does it represent this type of an

\(^{217}\) ἄλλα; ἄλλα; αιλαμμω αιλευν τα ἄλλα; αιλαμ. See §3.2.1 below.

\(^{218}\) 40:21, 24, 29, 33, 36.

\(^{219}\) 40:9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37.

\(^{220}\) See Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 426-27.
architectural feature, as elsewhere in δ it refers to proper nouns (Ezra 8:16) and serves as a designation for Jerusalem (Isa 29:1, 2, 7). Its use in 1 Chron 11:22 and 2 Sam 23:20 represents a famous *crux interpretum* that has been variously resolved. The different spellings in μ have not been preserved in δ, which is incapable of reproducing Semitic gutturals. Perhaps these variant spellings in μ Ezek 43:15-16 (‘םיאריא and רכדרה) are themselves attempts to preserve different folk etymologies for this architectural feature.

2.4.2.6 θαηλαθα (40:7).

Ezek 40:7 θαηλαθα B J θεηλαθα Q 407 239' εS, θεηλαθ C' 403' 106 544 Aeth (vid.); θεελαθ 46' 26 Hi; θεεηλαθ 130-223 410; θειλαμ 534; (vel θεε) αιλα 967 L'-V; θεελαμ 449; θεε A 62' Arab Armen; thei εW; θαιειμ 88 = μ; θαλαμ Syh; θαιειμ των παραστατων 198

The spelling θαηλαθα is witnessed only in Vaticanus and may not represent exactly the original spelling of δ*. Nevertheless, the fact that δ* included at least a very similar spelling at this point seems beyond dispute. Many witnesses provide a similar transliteration here, and the familiar tendency to substitute a more familiar transliteration for a less familiar one, or to correct the misreading of two words as one (e.g. θεε in A), strongly suggests the originality of θαηλαθα. If so, this transliteration probably


223 For a different explanation, see Konkel, *Architektonik des Heiligen*, 84.
represents the Hebrew נְוֵ֣נָה נְוֵ֣נָֽה and provides strong evidence that the Vorlage of \(\Theta\) Ezekiel 40:7 differed from \(\Psi\) at this point. If the scribe did not recognize that he was transliterating two words as one, he at least preserved his Vorlage faithfully.

2.4.2.7 \(\Theta\varepsilon\) (40:7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 21, 24, 29, 33, 36).

The frequency of use of \(\Theta\varepsilon\) and the occurrence of this transliteration in 3 Kgdms 14:28 allow us to conclude that it is original to \(\Theta^*\). The Hebrew נְוֵ֣נָה is used to designate a guard-room in 1 Kgs 14:28 and 2 Chr 12:11, but in Ezekiel’s temple vision it designates niches or alcoves.\(^{225}\) It appears to have much the same sense in the architectural descriptions in the scrolls from the Judean desert.\(^{226}\) One unique feature of the Greek transliteration \(\Theta\varepsilon\) is its ability to be either singular (40:12, 13), plural in the construct (40:10) or plural with pronominal suffixes (40:21, 24?, 29, 33). \(\Theta\) 2 Par. 12:11, in contrast to the other \(\Theta\) renderings of נְוֵ֣נָה, does not transliterate the term but renders it with ἀπάντησις.

2.4.2.8 \(\Theta\varepsilon\iota\iota\iota\) (40:12, 14, 16)

Ezek 40:12 \(\Theta\varepsilon\iota\iota\iota\) B \(\text{theein } \xi^W\); των θαυειμ 198; θαυειμ 62’; του θαυειμ 106; του θεε 967; το \(\Theta\varepsilon\iota\iota\iota\) A’ 407; των θεε 410; των ναυ(ε)ιμ (ναυιν 87-403’) C’\(^{764}\) 233-403’; των ναυειμ 130; theeri Hi

Ezek 40:14 \(\Theta\varepsilon\iota\iota\iota\) B \(\text{to } \thetaεεμ } \) Α Arab; \(\thetaει\) 544; θεε εν 26; το \(\thetaεε 410; \thetaεε 46; 87c-c1’239’; see C (87*); της αυλης 106 198; + της αυλης O-Q Hi.; seccundum thei \(\xi^W\); > 36; + και προς το ελαμ της αυλης 62’= \(\text{מ(טשנה ילע } \lambda^i\iota )\)

\(^{224}\) So Lust, “Lexicon of the Three,” 282.

\(^{225}\) HALOT, 2:1672.

\(^{226}\) 4Q365 3:5; 11Q19 26:6; 38:15 [tris]; 40:10.
The Greek manuscript tradition affords strong reason to suppose that the transliteration θε(ε)יμ goes back to Θ*. The evidence above shows a scribal tendency to change θειμ, a less common transliteration, to a more common one (θεε in 40:14) or to back-correct toward θμ by adding αυλή. In Θ Ezek 40:14, the use of θε(ε)יμ, which does not correspond to the reading in θμ, provides evidence for the massive textual confusion often detected in the verse.227 Despite this confusion in 40:14, the agreement of Vaticanus and Alexandrinus in the Greek manuscript tradition for this verse suggests that it accurately reflects θυ, and so constitutes evidence of the translator’s fidelity.

Representing the Hebrew plural יָדוֹת, θε(ε)יμ gives the expected masculine plural of יָד, apparently in the absolute state (as in θμ 40:16).228

2.4.2.9 θραελ (41:8).

The witness of the Greek manuscript tradition is consistent in representing a transliteration in 41:8, though of course the exact spelling is open to debate. This consistency speaks for the strong likelihood that θραελ is original to Θ*. The reading

227 Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 140-48 provides the basic solution upon which most modern commentators build, which sees 40:14 as composed of extracts from other verses and being of no great significance. See also Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 335; Cooke, Ezekiel, 433-34; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 532, 536.

228 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 334 uses this transliteration in Θ Ezek 40:12 to correct the unusual feminine plural in θμ Ezek 40:12 (יָדָות) to the masculine.
witnessed by מָזָּה is likely a metathesis of the correct reading witnessed by θ.  

The Hebrew equivalent for θραξλ is debated, since it seems to have represented a technical architectural term not otherwise preserved.  

It may be that the lamed of the next word was mistakenly seen as part of the term by the translator, who also failed to perceive that θαηλαθα really constituted two words.  

Gese thought this solution weak, since he deemed the interruption of the narrative through a verbal sentence improbable, and the translator’s use of the genitive made the misreading of the lamed unlikely.  

Rather than reconstructing מַרְאֹת, as would be expected from such a suggestion, Gese followed Cornill in postulating מַרְאֹת or מַרְאֹת יִהְיֶה.  

Zimmerli countered this reconstruction by instead proposing either מַרְאֹת יִהְיֶה or מַרְאֹת יִהְיֶה, which he considered “graphically more likely.”  

It is possible that this term represents a foreign loan-word, but its exact significance is unclear. Despite this inconclusiveness, θραξλ provides

---


Block, *Ezekiel 25-48*, 545 n. 31 retains מַרְאֹת, which he thinks provides a tolerable sense, as do Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann with Thilo Rudnig, *Der Prophet Ezechiel/Hesekiel Kapitel 20-48* (ATD 22.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 547.


evidence for the translator’s faithful rendition of his Vorlage as well as the superior nature of that Vorlage to $\aleph$ in the present instance.

In addition to marking technical architectural terminology, transliterations can provide helpful glimpses into the state of the Vorlage employed by the translator as well as into his Übersetzungsweise. In several instances, transliterations strongly suggest that $\aleph^V$ represents a textual tradition that diverges from $\aleph$ (especially in 40:6-10, 14), even occasionally representing an earlier text, as in the $\theta\rho\alpha\varepsilon\lambda$ of 41:8. On the other hand, there can be no illusions that such transliterations have not suffered during the history of transmission of the text. A brief glance at the above examples demonstrates the extent to which early manuscripts differ in their accounts of these transliterations. Coupled with the challenges faced by the translator, especially his difficulty in distinguishing yodh from waw, the pitfalls in the process of transmitting transliterations further obscure an already difficult architectural description. Despite these obstacles, transliterations represent the translator’s attempt at fidelity to his Vorlage and exemplify his determination to maintain the uniqueness of Ezekiel’s vision.

2.5 Conclusions

This chapter does not pretend to be the last word on the Übersetzungsweise of Ezekiel 40-48, but it has given a more complete picture than Tov’s qualification of $\aleph$ Ezekiel as a “relatively literal” translation. Three of the four characteristics of literal translation (etymological analysis, adherence to Hebrew word-order, and quantitative representation) strongly mark Ezek $\gamma'$. The fourth characteristic, the use of stereotyped
lexical equivalents, needs to be qualified as belonging more to the later history of revisions and recensions of the Bible into Greek. Although on occasion the translator is capable of using a relatively free Greek equivalent to a Hebrew phrase, either as a spontaneous free translation or in order to represent his source text in the clearest way possible, there is ample evidence that he generally reproduces the linguistic structures, grammar and syntax of his source text. Thus where differences between \( \text{MT} \) and \( \text{\sigma} \) lie outside the scope of this Übersetzungsweise, such differences ought to be attributed to his Vorlage, not his own intervention. The investigation so far has provided evidence in the specific case of Ezek \( \gamma' \) for Aeijmelaus’ general dictum that it is good practice “to start with the assumption that larger divergences from the MT mainly come from the Vorlage and only exceptionally and with imperative reasons to attribute them to the translator.”\(^{235}\)

In addition to the conclusions about the translator’s source text that will prove significant in the next chapter, the analysis so far has provided copious evidence for the literalistic nature of \( \text{\sigma} \) Ezek 40-48. This literalistic nature is best explained, I submit, as an unconscious choice on the part of the translator to reproduce many of the linguistic, syntactical and grammatical structures of his source text in his translation in order to highlight its authority (philological translation). While variations from this general rule have been adduced, they highlight the need for momentary clarity over any claim to divine authority (goal 1). After all, it is beside the point if a prophetic book strikes the acculturated reader as authoritative if it is incomprehensible.

\(^{235}\) “What Can We Know?” 89.
CHAPTER THREE:

THE Vorlage OF EZEKIEL 40-48:
HARMONIZATION AND MODERNIZATION

Evaluation of the translator’s Vorlage is intimately connected with the question of his manner of translation. Only through familiarity with the translator’s general practice, for example in his customary translations of individual words or his treatment of ambiguous sense or syntax, can the nature of his source text be assessed. However, the reverse is also true: the Vorlage provides the standard against which the translator’s Übersetzungsweise must be measured. Hence the two processes must always relate to each other dialectically, and their separation in terms of this study is more a heuristic organizational tool than a strictly discrete enterprise. No matter how interconnected the two considerations may be, though, familiarity with the translator’s source text is an indispensable prerequisite for understanding his contribution to Greek Ezekiel. In light of the previous chapter, attention now shifts to the other side of the coin: the matter of the translator’s Vorlage.

The primary concern in what follows is a preliminary description of the Vorlage of Ezekiel 40-48 with special attention to its unique features. Understanding the

\[^{236}\text{Troxel, } \text{LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation, 80.}\]
Vorlage of Ezekiel 40-48 gives us a baseline against which to gauge the contribution of the translator. In what follows, secondary readings in the translator’s source text will be the focus of attention, though of course the Vorlage preserves its share of early readings relative to as well. In this chapter, I focus on secondary pluses that are generally concerned with harmonizing problematic passages within the larger book of Ezekiel and authoritative writings as a whole. Moreover, several modernizing readings will be adduced, but they are far less common and mainly reflect the increased influence of apocalyptic eschatology and mysticism. Even these modernizing readings provide evidence for sustained reflection on Ezekiel as a whole. Harmonization, and to a lesser extent modernization, constitute the main methods for resolving problematic passages in the Vorlage of Ezekiel 40-48. This chapter builds on the results of the findings in the previous chapter, namely that the relatively literal Übersetzungsweise of the translator implies that, in the absence of compelling factors to the contrary, divergences from can be attributed to the translator’s Vorlage and not his own intervention.

3.1 Harmonistic Readings in the Vorlage

3.1.1 Readings Reflecting the Wider Context of Ezekiel

The first collection of harmonizing readings in concerns pluses that situate a certain event or command in its wider context within the larger vision of Ezekiel 40-48 or the book as a whole. Such contextualized readings are especially prominent in transitional sections of the vision, such as the vision of the returned glory of God (43:1-12), the introduction to the vision (40:1-4), and the vision of the re-fructified land (47:1-
12). They are also much more common in the Temple description (40:1-43:12), due perhaps to the difficulty of the architectural details.

3.1.1.1 Ἐφφασκας, υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου; (40:4; 43:7; 47:4)

σ Ezekiel 40:4
καὶ εἴπε πρὸς με ὁ ἄνήρ
Εφφασκας, υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου;
ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἴδε
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὦσὶ σου ἀκοῦεν
καὶ τάξον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου πάντα,
ὅσα ἐγὼ δεικνύω σοι.
dιότι ἑνεκα τοῦ δείξαι σοι εἰσελήλυθας ὃδε
καὶ δείξεις πάντα, ὅσα σὺ ὀρφας
tῷ οίκῳ Ἰσραήλ.

And the man spoke to me, “Have you seen, human? See with your eyes and hear with your ears and take to heart everything that I am showing you, because you have entered here in order to show you. And you will show everything you are seeing to the house of Israel.”

The most striking divergence between the two versions is the first reference to perception, which in σ ed is punctuated as a question: “Have you seen, son of man?” Nor is this phrase unique to the beginning of the vision; it recurs elsewhere in σ at Ezek 43:7

3.1.1.2 Notice that the translator resolves the chiasm of his source text here in favor of a parallel structure.

3.1.1.3 Presumably the translator read מ’s text here, but understood the verb as active with a directional he.
and 47:6, although present in 47:6 only in 47:6.\textsuperscript{239} In Ezek 47:6, the phrase could either be considered an exclamation, as Block suggests,\textsuperscript{240} or a question directed at the prophet’s perception of his visionary experience. The rendering in Ezek 47:6 (Ei ἐὁρακας, viē ἀνθρωπον;) could be considered ambiguous, since ει can introduce either a question (Ezek 14:3; 15:3 [2x], 5; 17:9, 15; 20:3a) or an oath formula (14:16; 16:48; 20:3b, 4, 30, 31). In the phrase Ei ἐὁρακας in 47:6, the ει could refer to a he interrogative or to an asseverative דא, and neither sense can be excluded.\textsuperscript{241} The absence of an explicit oath formula (e.g. λέγεις κύριος) makes it preferable to understand the phrase in Ezek 47:6 as a question. In Ezek 43:7, unlike the two other examples, the

\textsuperscript{239} מ Ezek 43:7 reads awkwardly (בכ אמש את-מקומם חמש את-מקומם כומת רולא אשתך-שמ בתוך, seemingly lacking a main verb. Several explanations have been offered: 1) Cooke, Ezekiel, 474, following GKC §117i, suggests that the particle תא here is depending on an implied verb, and thus the reading in 43:7 expands the thought that is implicit in מ. Thus תא is understood as indicating emphasis, and not as the object of a verb, as in Mishnaic Hebrew. Other scholars who follow this explanation include Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 34; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 408-09; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 570. 2) Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 243 suggested that the original reading was not תא but תאו. This is the tack taken by the Targum (דימ אserter מכסים שיר עד). 3) All in Ezekiel 20-48, 242 regards את-מקומ ב כומת רולא לולא הוא כומת עד-ברית-שאמרלא שך קדש as an anacoluthon resulting when the objects of ספים were brought forward in the sentence. This explanation is also held by Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 575 n. 12; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 73 and somewhat differently by Jahn, Ezechiel, 306. 4) Older scholars (Cornill, Ezechiel, 478; Bertholet with Galling, Hesekiel, 150) regarded the reading of תא as original, which had fallen out of מ inadvertently. However, מ’s reading explains the supplement in 47:6, and so it may judged to have been original.


phrase ἐόρακας, νῦν ἄνθρωπον is not used as an interrogative, but instead as a divine affirmation\textsuperscript{242} that the prophet has indeed perceived the vision correctly.

One significant feature of the distribution of ἐόρακας, νῦν ἄνθρωπον within \( \sigma \) Ezekiel 40-48 is its structural utility. While 40:4 serves to introduce the vision of the temple in chaps. 40-42, both remaining instances of the phrase occur in transitional sections: introducing the speech of the divine δόξα in 43:7 and the speech of the guide in the return to the re-fructified land (47:6). In Ezek 43:7, the reference to the prophet’s successful perception of the divine residence likewise alludes to the description of the temple in chaps. 40-42 while anticipating the regulations for the leaders (ἡγοομένοι; vv. 7-10) and for the house itself.\textsuperscript{243} Just as in 43:1-12, the transitional section in 47:1-12 recalls the previous temple description through the portrayal of the life-giving river emerging from under the porch of the temple. However, in 47:1-12 attention turns toward the land itself for the first time in Ezek 40-48.\textsuperscript{244} The fructification of the land through the river is the consequence of the divine presence within the temple and the correct operation of the cult.\textsuperscript{245}

In short, the distribution of the phrase (Εἰ) ἐόρακας, νῦν ἄνθρωπον serves to divide the vision up roughly along the three major independent sections commonly

\textsuperscript{242} The guide is purposefully located beside the prophet in order to clarify that the ἡγοομένοι/δόξα is speaking from the restored Temple. Konkel, \textit{Architektonik des Heiligen}, 77. For a discussion of the four divine or quasi-divine actors in Ezek 43:4-6 (the δόξα [vv. 4, 5b], God himself as speaker [v. 6a], the guiding man [v. 6b] and the πνεύμα [v. 5a]), see Pohlmann with Rudnig, \textit{Ezechiel 20-48}, 572-73.

\textsuperscript{243} Konkel, \textit{Architektonik des Heiligen}, 25.

\textsuperscript{244} Konkel, \textit{Architektonik des Heiligen}, 26.

\textsuperscript{245} Georg Fohrer with Kurt Galling, \textit{Ezechiel} (HAT 13; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1955), 244-45.

Further, the two rhetorical questions (40:4; 47:6), spoken by the guide, flank the divinely articulated assurance that the prophet has indeed perceived correctly (43:7). All three instances of the phrase in ᶦ Ezekiel 40-48 introduce revelatory speech that serves to unite the vision. These three occurrences of the phrase thus represent a secondary structuring of the text in ᶦ V in the interest of greater symmetry.

3.1.1.2 In Seven Steps (40:6)

Ezek 40:6a
καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πύλην
τὴν βλέπουσαν κατὰ ἀνατολάς
ἐν ἑπτά ἀναβαθμοῖς
And he entered the gate

246 Scholars debate whether Ezek 43:1-12 should be seen as the conclusion to Ezek 40:5-42:20 or as the prelude to the Temple Law that follows. Gese, in line with his thesis of the self-contained nature of chapters 40-42, assigned 43:1-9 to his “nasi-Schicht” and held that it was the center for all the material in chapters 43-48, which it served to introduce (Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 114; see also Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 406; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 249-50; H. van D. Parunak, “Transitional Techniques in the Bible,” JBL 102 [1983]: 542; Georg Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel [BZAW o.s. 72; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1952], 37). Talmon and Fishbane argue that the mountain and the wall, mentioned in the vision’s introduction in 40:1-5, are kept distinct in 42:20 (mentioning the wall) and 43:12 (mentioning the mountain). They argue that the prophet separated 42:20 and 43:12, originally contiguous verses, through the introduction of the ἡ βασιλεία–vision, which is not mentioned in the summary at all (Shemaryahu Talmon and Michael Fishbane, “The Structuring of Biblical Books: Studies in the Book of Ezekiel,” ASTI 10 [1975/76]:142-43). Other scholars emphasize that the second temple vision’s conceptual parallelism to chapters 8-11 requires the return of the ἡ βασιλεία to be original to the vision. In addition, they adduce ANE myths in which the construction of a sanctuary is completed by the god taking up residence in it (Tuell, The Law of the Temple, 37-42; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 576-77). Diane M. Sharon, “A Biblical Parallel to a Sumerian Temple Hymn? Ezekiel 40-48 and Gudea,” JANES 24 (1996): 99-109 argues that Ezekiel may have appropriated a Sumerian temple hymn in his vision. Kalinda Rose Stevenson, The Vision of Transformation: Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48 (SBLDS 154; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 138 acknowledges that her reconstruction of a text following the order of the Babylonian akītu festival differs in that there is no human king in 43:1-6 but a divine one.

247 It is also possible that the phrase was distributed at key points in the vision as an encouragement to the reader to persevere despite the difficulty of the vision.

248 Reading with Ṣ Q.
which faces eastward by seven steps. which faces eastward by seven steps. and he ascended its steps.

The number of stairs in 40:6 (ἐν ἑπτά ἀναβαθμοῖς) seems to be an assimilation to the seven steps outside the north gate (40:22) and the south gate (40:26). Alongside this harmonizing tendency, the translator’s variation in terminology is noteworthy: instead of the term κλιμακτήρ, as is employed in 40:22 and 26, in Ezek 40:6 he prefers the term ἀναβαθμός (as also in 40:49). Of course, this presents no difficulty at the level of ε; the Hebrew hyponym for both κλιμακτήρ and ἀναβαθμός is שלום. The fact that the translator of Ezekiel 40–48 is the only Septuagint translator to use the term κλιμακτήρ in ε underscores the peculiarity of this choice.

---

249 Notice the absence of any counterpart in ε to the verb ἔφυ in 40:6.

250 Block, Ezekiel 25–48, 517 n. 13; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 333; Cooke, Ezekiel, 129; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 129 allows that the reading of ε may be original, but it is more likely to be a harmonizing expansion.

251 For this reason and in view of the discussion to come, it makes more sense that the harmonization in the number of steps occurred in ε’s Vorlage, not through the translator’s intervention.

252 In classical Greek literature, κλιμακτήρ can be used in the sense of “rungs of a ladder” (Euripides, Hel. 1570; Hippocrates, Artic 73 uses the term four times in reference to the cross-bar of a ladder as a comparison for the cross-bar in a kind of splint used for bad joints). Hubler in fact translates this term as “rungs” in Ezek 40:22, 26 (J. Noel Hubler, “Iezekiel,” in NETS, 978). However, a fourth-century B.C.E. Athenian inscription more closely parallels the usage in ε Ezekiel by employing the term to describe steps. IG II² 244.80–81 makes reference to the vertical faces of the steps in this way: ΠΟΙΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΜΕΤΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΚΛΙΜΑΚΤΗΡΩΝ / ΧΕΙΛΑ ΚΑΙ ΟΡΘΩΝ. John Kirchner, ed., Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriors: Voluminis II et III Editio Minor, Pars Prima. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1924. Reprint, Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1974. Besides these spatial usages, astrological uses of the term to describe danger or a critical period could be cited. Vettius Valens, Antologiarum Libri, 3.8 uses the term several times to denote dangers portended by heavenly bodies. See also 5.2, 5.8, which use the term several times, and 9.4, which is titled περὶ κλιμακτηρίων. Wilhelm Kroll, ed., Vettii Valentis Anthologiarius Libri (Zürich/Dublin: Weidmann, 1973). However, none of the instances in which Greek sources use this term suggests any noticeable distinction between κλιμακτήρ and ἀναβαθμός.
3.1.1.3 The Eastward-Looking Gate (40:20-21)

20 And behold, there was a gate facing north in the outer courtyard. And he measured it, its length and width, 21 and the rooms, 22 three on this side and three on that side, and its pilasters and porticoes.

253 For the secondary nature of (θ=דַּעַת), see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 338.

254 The insertion of the waw here was made necessary when the וֹ=דַּעַת was added to θ. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 338.

255 Reading with מְרָא אַרְבָּא בְּשָׁלְשָׁה מֶפֶת אָמְלָי.

256 Reading with מְרָא אַרְבָּא בְּשָׁלְשָׁה מֶפֶת אָמְלָי.

257 These palms seem to have been introduced from the following verse: Cornill, Ezechiel, 442; Jahn, *Ezechiel*, 280; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 338.

258 Presumably an error for וי, since it is unclear why it would refer only to the last item in the series (Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 338; Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 221; Block, *Ezekiel 25-48*, 526 n. 59).
and palms.  
And these were in keeping with the measures of the gate that looks eastward:  
50 cubits was its length and its width was 25 cubits.  

In Ezek 40:21, the measurements of the outer eastern gate are recalled, but this gate is identified differently in $\sigma^V$ and $\nu$. $\nu$ refers to the “first gate” (השער הירושה), a unique phrase in Ezek 40-48, while $\sigma^V$ identifies it as τῆς πύλης τῆς βλεπούσης κατὰ ἀνατολάς (= $\sigma^V$ השער אשר פנוי דרכ הقديرמה). $\sigma^V$ reflects the use of this phrase to describe the eastern gate at Ezek 40:6; 42:15; 43:1, 4 (in 43:4 without the article on השער). $\sigma^V$ thus demonstrates greater contextual affinity than $\nu$, and in keeping with this contextual affinity $\sigma^V$ anticipates the palms of the following verse.

### 3.1.1.4 The Inner Hall and the Increased Adytum (41:1-4)

$\sigma$ Ezek 41:1-4

1 καὶ εἰσῆγαγέ με εἰς τὸν ναόν, ϖ διεμέτρησε τὸ αἰλαμ  
πηχὼν ἐξ τὸ πλάτος ἐνθεν  
2 καὶ πηχὼν ἐξ τὸ εὐρος τοῦ αἰλαμ ἐνθεν

$\nu$ Ezek 41:1-4

1 ויביא את-הואכל  
וימל את-האליים  
שפ-אמות-ראב-מכה  
שפ-אמות-ראב-מכה  
רחב האהלים

---

259 See the mention of the second gate (ἐπὶ τῆς πύλης τῆς δευτέρας) in $\sigma$ Ezek 40:38.

260 The translator read מַחֲאָלָה (porch, portico) which seems to represent a secondary contextualization of $\nu$’s original reading: Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 223.

261 Cooke, followed by other scholars, theorizes that $\sigma^V$ read רהב האהל where $\nu$ reads רהב האהל, and that the translator incorporated this gloss into his rendering of the preceding phrase. Cooke, Ezekiel, 452; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 23 n. 6; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 342; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 223.
(2) καὶ τὸ ἑώρος τοῦ πυλῶνος πηχῶν δέκα, καὶ ἐπωμίδες τοῦ πυλῶνος πηχῶν πέντε ἑνδέκαν καὶ πηχῶν πέντε ἑνδέκαν καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ μήκος αὐτοῦ πηχῶν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τὸ ἑώρος πηχῶν ἐκκοσία. 

καὶ τὸ θύρωμα πηχῶν ἕξ.
καὶ τὰς ἐπωμίδας τοῦ θυρώματος πηχῶν ἑπτά ἑνδέκαν καὶ πηχῶν ἑπτά ἑνδέκαν.
καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ μήκος τῶν θυρῶν πηχῶν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἑώρος πηχῶν ἐκκοσία καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ θύρα τῶν ἀγίων τῶν ἀγίων.

1 And he brought me into the temple whose porch he measured.
Six cubits was the width on one side
2 and six cubits was the width of the porch.

1 And he brought me into the temple and he measured the pilasters.
Six cubits was the width on one side
and six cubits was the width on the other side.

262 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 342 considers ר在校 adding as “a remarkably lame appendage” added by analogy with P’s מַעֲדו, as do Cooke, Ezekiel, 445; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 223; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 539 n. 8; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 539 n. 8.

263 For the awkward use of the consecutive perfect here, see Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 342 and Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 539 n. 9.

264 ὶ attests the correct reading (המת), which has fallen out of ר (Cooke, Ezekiel, 453; Alfred Bertholet and Kurt Galling, Hesekiel (HAT first series 13; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1936), 142; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 342; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 540 n. 10).

265 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 342 connects the reading in to its loss of the original מות, after the loss of which these words become meaningless. The reading with ᾲ is accepted by Bertholet and Galling, Hesekiel, 142; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 540 n. 11; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 546.

266 ή. See the discussion below.
on the other side.

(2) And the width of the gateway was ten cubits
and the sides of the gateway were five cubits
on this side
and five cubits on that side.
And he measured its length—40 cubits
and the width—20 cubits.
3 And he entered the inner courtyard
and he measured the gate’s pilaster—
two cubits
and the gateway—six cubits.
And the sides of the gateway were seven cubits
on this side
and seven cubits on that side.
4 And he measured the length
of the gates—40 cubits
and its width—20 cubits
facing the temple.
And he said, “This is the holy of holies.”

Two divergences are significant for the consideration of the layout of the larger temple complex: 1) the difference in the length of the adytum in v. 4, which is 20 cubits long in ר but 40 in ס; and 2) the surprising definition of the adytum as an inner courtyard (τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἐσωτέραν) in ס Ezek 41:3. After considering each of the divergences in turn, it will be necessary to determine whether they are related or independent.

Concerning 1), a process of contextual reasoning can be posited that, while simple, nevertheless yields theological dividends. In ר’s reading, the אָהָרָם פּוֹרָם seems to have suffered a metathesis through copying, so that it read

267 Thus the judgment of Cornill, Ezechiel, 452 that this variant represents “eine völlig unerklärliche, sinnlose Variante” is overstated.
Since this divergence makes little contextual sense, it is likely to have been an accidental rather than a deliberate change. The likelihood of a metathesis is supported by the identical metathesis in Ezek 42:3 // שֵׁקָר (שֵׁקָר). As this process left the measurement of the “gates” unspecified, a measurement had to be inferred. A redactor apparently concluded that the measurement of the adytum tallied with the measurement of the hall in front of it (41:2), thus comprising 40 cubits. In this fashion, the redactor doubled the size of the region devoted to the Deity.269 Read in conjunction with Ezek 43:7-9, a complaint against direct encroachment of secular leadership on divine space, this unwitting doubling of the sacred sphere underscored the priority of the sacred sphere and its claims over those of the secular realm. On the other hand, through this chain of events the square layout of the adytum was lost.270 Moreover, through the change in שְׁקָר, the adytum of Ezekiel’s temple no longer agrees with the measurements of the adytum in Solomon’s temple (20 x 20 x 20).  

268 For the translation of שְׁקָר as שְׁקָר, see שְׁקָר Ezek 46:12.  

269 Adrian Schenker, “Das Allerheiligste in Ezechiel’s Tempel War ein Hof: Die Tragweite der ursprünglichen Septuaginta in Ez 41,1-4.” in Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; BETL 192; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 363-64 provides a different solution. He interprets the שְׁקָר as referring to the space behind the gates, that is, the inner courtyard.  

20 cubits [1 Kgs 6:20; 2 Chr 3:8]; note that the height of the adytum is not mentioned in Ezek 41:3-4).

2) The inner courtyard mentioned in ו Ezek 41:3 can be distinguished from יִהְיָה εὐλήν יִהְיָה ἔσωτέραν in ו Ezek 40:34 by its different measurements (100 x 100 cubits for the latter [40:37] and 40 x 20 cubits for the former [41:3-4]). The oddity of this designation for the adytum of the temple in 41:3-4 is striking: why would the most sacred space in Ezekiel’s temple be a courtyard? Schenker argues that the differences between ו and ו in Ezek 41:1-4 stem from two different conceptions of the adytum. Schenker’s arguments concerning ו’s inner courtyard are persuasive, particularly in the context of the gloss in ו Ezek 41:bβ (радב התיאלי), which makes a comparable attempt to assimilate Ezekiel’s temple to more authoritative sanctuary models. Thus ו preserves one primary reading (concerning the inner courtyard) and one secondary reading (concerning the length of the gates). Though they belong to different redactional strata of ו, the end result of each divergence increases the particularity of Ezekiel’s

temple by giving the adytum different measurements from Solomon’s temple and by preserving its unique nature as a courtyard. Thus in each case $\phi$ seems to be oriented more toward underscoring the peculiar theology of Ezekiel than in assimilating his book to more well-known and authoritative models.

### 3.1.1.5 The Zadokite Priests (42:13)

And he said to me:

> “The arcades”\(^\text{273}\) to the north and the arcades to the south which are facing the intervals—these are the arcades of the holy place\(^\text{274}\) in which the priests, the sons of Zadok who approach the Lord, will eat the most holy offerings.”

---

\(^{272}\) The waw before לְשַׁבְיָה לֹא should be supplied following $\phi$ v: Cornill, Ezechiel, 474-75; Jahn, Ezechiel, 302; Bertholet, Hesekiel, 146; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 235; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 27 n. 2; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 396; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 563 n. 144; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 227; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 549; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 63.

\(^{273}\) For the translation of ἡξέδρα as “arcade” and the significance of this term, see §5.1.3 below.

\(^{274}\) An alternative translation: “of the Holy One.”
In 42:13, in the context of the discussion about the priestly arcades to the north of the temple area, $\sigma^V$ includes a plus that further specifies that this area is to be restricted to the Zadokite priests: οἱ νῦν Σαδδουκ (σ' חָרֹמ). This plus occurs in a context whose language evokes other instances in which Zadokite priestly prerogatives come to the fore, especially in its use of ἐγγυτέω (= הָרֹם; Ezek 43:19; 44:13; 45:4). An interesting window into the redaction-history of Ezekiel results through comparing this gloss in $\sigma$ to Ezek 40:46b. Both ṣ and $\sigma$ of this verse specify that the priests who keep the requirements of the altar are the Zadokites (דְּמוֹן נַעַרְיָד). For many years, redaction-critical scholars have identified Ezek 40:46b as a clarification made in order to highlight the preeminence of the Zadokites.\textsuperscript{275} If these redaction critics are correct, what can be seen in $\sigma$ Ezek 42:13 is simply the continuation of a redaction-critical trend toward further specifying distinctions implicit in Ezekiel’s vision.\textsuperscript{276}

3.1.1.6 Ezekiel 42:15-20

A large complex of divergences between ṣ and $\sigma^V$ in Ezek 42:15-20 requires explanation.

\textsuperscript{275} Gese’s model saw the Şadoqidenschicht as the last major component of Ezekiel 40-48 to be formed, sometime before Zerubbabel (Verfassungsentwurf, 122). Ezek 40:46b was a gloss intended to clarify the relationship between 40:45-46a and 44:6ff and to justify calling the priests in 40:45 חָרֹם (ibid. 22, 66-67). The observation that 40:46b was a gloss was made before Gese and continued after him: W. Rautenberg, “Zur Zukunftsthora des Hesekiel,” ZAW 33 (1913): 95 n. 1; D. Johannes Herrmann, Ezechiel übersetzt und erklärt (KAT 11; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1924), 268; Cooke, Ezechiel, 439-40; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 230; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 368-69; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 228; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 562; Konkel, Architektionik des Heiligen, 48.

\textsuperscript{276} That there is no analogous gloss in 45:4 is explained by the fact that the distinction between Zadokites and Levites has already been drawn with sharp lines in Ezek 44:6-31.
The term ὑπόδειγμα is characteristic of Greek Jewish compositions (2 Macc 6:28, 31; 4 Macc 17:23) and also occurs in Sirach 44:16.

Reading with Q. Ῥ reads ἀπὸ.

There is a long-standing tendency to delete קנים: “Das von G durchgängig nicht bezeugte, in 16-19 insgesamt viermal belegte קנים wird gemeinhin als spätere Hinzufügung identifiziert und entsprechend gestrichen” (Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 67). It is deleted by Jahn, Ezekiel, 302-03; Cooke, Ezekiel, 462; Fohrer with Galling, Ezekiel, 237; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 29 n. 2; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 536; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 402; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 227. Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 568 n. 161 retains קנים but understands it as an “instrument rather than a unit of measurement.”

Cornill, Ezekiel, 476 noted in 1886 that the likelihood that the original reading in συνετελέσθη in vv. 17a and 18a was בְּבָשָׁם, as in συνετελέσθη in v. 19a, was by his time “längst erkannt.” This is accepted by Jahn, Ezekiel, 302, Cooke, Ezekiel, 462; Fohrer with Galling, Ezekiel, 237; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 28-29 n. 2; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 402; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 536; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 227; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 568 n. 162; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 67.
καὶ διεμέτρησεν τὸ κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς θαλάσσης πεντακοσίους ἐν τῷ καλάμῳ τοῦ μέτρου· 19 καὶ ἐπέστρεψε πρὸς νότον καὶ διεμέτρησε κατέναντι τοῦ νότου πεντακοσίους ἐν τῷ καλάμῳ τοῦ μέτρου 20 τὰ τέσσαρα μέρη τοῦ αὐτοῦ καλάμου: καὶ διέταξεν αὐτὸν καὶ περιβόλον αὐτῷ κύκλῳ πεντακοσίων πρὸς ἀνατολάς καὶ πεντακοσίων πηχῶν εὔρος τοῦ διαστέλλειν ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ προτειχίσματος τοῦ ἐν διατάξει τοῦ οἴκου.

15 And the measuring of the house on the inside was completed.
and he led me out by way of the gate

281 If the reading סבב in vv. 17a and 18a is considered original (see n. 279), then this καὶ must also be considered original.

282 Ἐνδοῦκα τοῦ κατακράσιον τῶν γυμνών ἡ τοιοῦτος εἰσαγωγὴ ἀκολουθεῖ τα τέσσαρα μέρη, ἐν τῷ καλάμῳ τοῦ μέτρου. Εἰς τὸ κατακράσιον τῶν γυμνών ἡ τοιοῦτος εἰσαγωγὴ ἀκολουθεῖ τοὺς τέσσαρα μέρη τοῦ τοιοῦτος κατακράσιον πεντακοσίων, ἐν τῷ καλάμῳ τοῦ μέτρου· καὶ διεμέτρησεν αὐτὸν καὶ περιβόλον αὐτῷ κύκλῳ πεντακοσίων πρὸς ἀνατολάς καὶ πεντακοσίων πηχῶν εὔρος τοῦ διαστέλλειν ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ προτειχίσματος τοῦ ἐν διατάξει τοῦ οἴκου.

282 If the reading סבב in vv. 17a and 18a is considered original (see n. 279), then this καὶ must also be considered original.

283 If the reading סבב in vv. 17a and 18a is considered original (see n. 279), then this καὶ must also be considered original.

284 Notice that Ἐνδοῦκα apparently uses the older expression ἰερὸς, while Ἐνδοῦκα employs the later ἰερός... ὁ Θεοῦ... Of course, it is impossible to be certain that the translator is rendering his source text literalistically (see §2.1.1 above) but it seems more than likely. There is likely to have been an overlap in the period of time in which both expressions could be used with equal validity, and so it is impossible to infer the relative dating of each statement based solely on this criterion.
that faces east. And he measured the pattern of the house all around in its arrangement. 16 And he stood to the back of the gate that faces east and he measured:

500
by the measuring reed.
17 And he turned to the north and he measured the space in front of the north:
500 cubits
by the measuring reed.
18 And he turned to the west And he measured the space in front of the west:
500
by the measuring reed.
19 And he turned to the south and he measured opposite the south:
500
by the measuring reed.
20 The four were part of the same reed.
and he measured it And it had an enclosing wall around it 500 to the east and its length was 500 cubits to divide between the sanctuary and the trench which is in the arrangement of the house.

Of these differences, those pertinent for the present purposes (i.e. secondary in $\phi^V$) can be summarized as follows. 1) $\phi^V$ inserts three objects and one adverbial phrase where $m$ has

--

285 So NAB.

286 For justification of the translation “trench” for προσέχωμα, see below.
an absolute verbal form: a) τὸ ὑπόδειγμα τοῦ ὦικοῦ\(^{287}\) (v. 15); b) τὸ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ βορρᾶ (v. 17)\(^{288}\); c) τὸ κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς θαλάσσης (v. 18)\(^{289}\); and d) κατέναντι τοῦ νότου.\(^{290}\) 2) θ Ezek 42:15-20 contains two pluses: ἐν διατάξει (42:15b)\(^{291}\) and τοῦ ἐν διατάξει τοῦ ὦικοῦ (42:20b)\(^{292}\) that emphasize the arrangement of the temple. 3) θ adds the phrase καὶ ἔστη κατὰ νότου τῆς πύλης\(^{293}\) in v. 16. 4) The order of the gates described in m and θ differs. m lists the gates in the order east, north, south, and west, while θ reverses the last two gates.

1) The clarifications of three objects and one adverbial phrase in θ Ezek 42:15-20 each correspond to the pattern of διάμετρέω used with an architectural feature.\(^{294}\)

---

\(^{287}\) θ\(^{v}\)'s reading of this phrase is debatable, given that ὑπόδειγμα is used nowhere else in θ Ezekiel. This term may reflect ἡμιον (translated with ὑμίνωμα in Ezek 8:3; 10:8 and more periphrastically at 8:10) or ἡμιν (rendered with διατάξει at 43:11 and by a different translator with ὑμίνωμα at Ezek 28:12). See Cornill, Ezechiel, 476.

\(^{288}\) θ\(^{v}\): ἀλ. Μιν τοῦ τοιχού. Generally in Ezekiel 40-48, κατὰ πρόσωπον is the rendering of ἀλ. (ἀλ.). See Ezek 41:4, 12, 14, 15, 21, 25; 42:10 [bis], 13. It is the rendering of οἵμοιο in Ezek 42:11.

\(^{289}\) θ\(^{v}\): ἀλ. Μιν τοῦ τοιχού.

\(^{290}\) The corresponding phrase in θ\(^{v}\) is debatable, since κατέναντι is not associated with a clear hyponym in θ Ezekiel 40-48, as is often the case with prepositions (see §2.1.1 above). On occasion it seems to reflect the intervention of the translator where he senses a problem with the description in his Vorlage, as in 41:13.

\(^{291}\) θ\(^{v}\): διαταξι. Διατάξεις is the rendering of τοῖς ἑδραῖοι at Ezek 43:10, but could conceivably refer to another term (perhaps ἡμεῖς). See n. 287 above.

\(^{292}\) θ\(^{v}\): ἡμεῖς ἑδραῖοι. See nn. 287 and 291 above.

\(^{293}\) θ\(^{v}\): καὶ ἔστη κατὰ νότου. For the rendering of καὶ ἔστη κατὰ νότου, see θ Ezek 40:18, 40 [bis], 44 [bis]; 46:19. In θ Ezek 40:41, it renders λευκή, while in Ezek 42:16 above it renders ἀλήθιον.

\(^{294}\) At 40:35, the object of διαμετρέω is implied. At 41:13, where m supplies an object (ἀλ-τα), θ’s different conception of the sanctuary forces the use of a prepositional phrase instead (κατέναντι τοῦ
Only outside of the temple description in Ezek 40:5-42:20 does the use of ἀπέρατον for a simple measurement of distance appear.\textsuperscript{295} It seems that the secondary supplying of the object in Ezek 42:18bα and 19bα results from this recognition that measuring distance, not architectural features, is unusual within the temple vision. θ\textsuperscript{V} thus seeks to clarify which architectural features are in view. Moreover, the precision of the terminology, which specifies that the guide measures the space in front of (κατά πρόσωπον, κατέναντι) the southern and western walls but not the walls themselves, is noteworthy. As will become clear from the discussion of θ Ezek 41:6 (§4.1.1 below), one was not permitted to come into contact with the walls of the temple or to cut into them, as can be inferred from the parallel temple description in 1 Kings 6:6. By measuring the space in front of the walls and not the walls themselves, the guide properly observes the restrictions of the sanctuary. This also helps to make sense of the Greek translation of Ezek 42:20bβ, which seems to picture a defensive trench or open space between the enclosing wall and the area around the sanctuary, as will become clear.

The insertion of the phrase corresponding to τὸ ὑπόδειγμα τοῦ οἴκου in θ\textsuperscript{V} can be explained through a desire to concretize more closely the pronominal suffix on ἐμοί in θ\textsuperscript{V} Ezek 42:15bβ. As it stands in θ, this suffix apparently refers to the “gate facing east” (השער אשת מים ודרם המקדש), which seems to repeat measurements taken earlier. θ\textsuperscript{V} wishes

\textsuperscript{295} Ezek 45:3; 47:3, 4, 5.
to stress the arrangement of the complex as a whole, especially its outer components, not the inner sanctuary.

2) The pluses ἐν διατάξει (42:15β) and τὸ ἐν διατάξει τοῦ οἴκου (42:20β) need to be considered together, since both use the same term (διατάξεις) to stress the architectural plan of the house. If the hyponym of διατάξεις in these verses is in, as I have reconstructed, this provides an interesting parallel with the use of the same term in Ezek 43:10. Critics have commonly found Ezek 43:10-12 to represent a redactional seam in the present form of the prophet’s vision, and the same term is used in Ezek 43:10 in reference to the whole structure.\textsuperscript{296} If the proposed reconstruction holds, then ἡκτὴν would seem to be a common term in the later layers of the redaction of Ezekiel’s final vision. However, the longer plus in 42:20β reveals more than the potential presence of a common redactional term.

The normal methodology employed in this study would imply that this longer plus goes back to Ὠ, but its significance extends beyond this presumption. In Hebrew, the term לֹא could be subject to confusion between different pointings: לֹא (profane) and לֹא

\textsuperscript{296} For discussion of the secondary nature of Ezek 43:10-12 (or alternatively of v. 12 alone), see Johannes Herrmann, Ezekielstudien (Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1908), 52-53; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 39-43; Fohrer with Galling, Ezekiel, 237-38; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 418-20; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 555-56; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 250; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 80-82; Thilo Alexander Rudnig, Heilig und Profan: Redaktionkritische Studien zu Ez 40-48 (BZAW 287; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 308, 334. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 419-20 proposes that the term נבון in 43:12 refers to the holiness of the mountaintop, but this solution is too clever by half. The text is held as part of the original vision by Cooke, Ezekiel, 427; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 586-89.
(rampart).\textsuperscript{297} Προτέίχισμα, by contrast, is perfectly comprehensible as part of the translator’s portrait of the temple complex, which appeared already at 40:5. Thus it is highly likely that this gloss entered at the level of the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} rather than through the Greek translator, since it clarifies the Hebrew text but does not clarify the sense of the Greek. As a result, this longer plus supports the methodological presumption that the translator added little, if anything, by way of clarification to his source text.

If so, what is the significance of this gloss to the revisers of $\text{\O}^V$? This problem becomes more acute in view of $\text{\P}$ Ezek 44:23, where the priests are charged with instructing the people in the difference “between holy and profane” (בר נדות לחת), which the translator renders straightforwardly as ἀνὰ μέσον ἁγίου καὶ ἁββήλου. This demonstrates that the translator’s understanding of the term ἁρ in the sense of “profane” itself is not the problem.

The answer to the significance of the gloss resides in an appreciation of the larger context of Ezek 42:20b, namely Ezek 43:12. In spite of the substantive differences between $\text{\P}$ and $\text{\O}$ in their rendering of this verse, the significant portion for the present purposes is not contested. This verse states that all the borders of the mountain, in which the city is included (40:2), are most holy all around. Given that this level of sanctity conflicts with the non-sacred quality of the area outside of the temple in $\text{\P}$ Ezek 42:20, many redaction-critics see 43:12 as a late addition.\textsuperscript{298} While modern scholars sometimes

\textsuperscript{297} Compare \textsuperscript{3}’s reading: \textit{inter sanctuarium et vulgi locum} (“between the sanctuary and the public area was a place”).

\textsuperscript{298} See n. 296 above.
solve this dilemma redactionally, \( \Theta \) and its translator sought to solve it contextually: the enclosing wall (\( \pi ερίβολος \)) does not divide between holy and profane, as in \( \text{רֵאשׁ הָהָר} \), but between the sanctuary (\( \text{אָגִיה} \))\(^{299}\) and the outer trench (\( \text{פִּסִּים} \)).

\( \Theta \) Ezekiel 43:12

\( \text{אָגִיה} \) is a standard term in \( \Theta \) Ezekiel 40-48 for designating the sanctuary or holy areas (\( \text{דֵּרוּס} \): 41:21; 42:20; 44:13, 19; 45:6, 7 \( \text{בִּיס} \); 46:19; 48:10, 18\( \text{א} \). It occurs in the singular (\( \text{הָאָגִיָּן} \)) as well: 41:23; 42:24; 44:23, 27; 45:1 \( \text{בִּיס} \); 48:18\( \text{ב} \), 20, 21. \( \Theta \)'s \( \text{אָגִיה} \) corresponds to \( \text{רֵאשׁ הָהָר} \) in 44:8, 15, 16; 47:12; 48:10.

\( \text{רֵאשׁ הָהָר} \) Ezekiel 43:12

\( \text{רֵאשׁ הָהָר} \) translates as \( \text{רֵאשׁ הָהָר} \). Cooke, Ezekiel, 475; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 411. For a similar situation, see Ezek 16:22 and Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24 (trans. R. E. Clements; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 326.

And as for the diagram of the house on the mountain’s summit: all its borders all around are most holy. This is the Temple law. On the top of the mountain, its entire border all around is most holy. Behold, this is the Temple law.

---

299 \( \text{אָגִיה} \) is a standard term in \( \Theta \) Ezekiel 40-48 for designating the sanctuary or holy areas (\( \text{דֵּרוּס} \):

41:21; 42:20; 44:13, 19; 45:6, 7 \( \text{בִּיס} \); 46:19; 48:10, 18\( \text{א} \). It occurs in the singular (\( \text{הָאָגִיָּן} \)) as well: 41:23; 42:24; 44:23, 27; 45:1 \( \text{בִּיס} \); 48:18\( \text{ב} \), 20, 21. \( \Theta \)'s \( \text{אָגִיה} \) corresponds to \( \text{רֵאשׁ הָהָר} \) in 44:8, 15, 16; 47:12; 48:10.

300 The translator misread \( \text{תַּנּ} \) as \( \text{תַּנּ} \). Cornill, Ezechiel, 480; Cooke, Ezekiel, 475; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 411. For a similar situation, see Ezek 16:22 and Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24 (trans. R. E. Clements; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 326.

301 Apparently \( \Theta \) read \( \text{ירָם} \). Ezek 43:11-13 contains massive evidence of confusion related to the word \( \text{ירָם} \). Herrmann, Ezechiel, 262 proposed that in 43:11 the pair \( \text{נָהָר-בַּרְבֵּר} \) directly before \( \text{הָרָה} \) was a marginal gloss that had crept into the text. This marginal gloss wanted to change the meaningless \( \text{נָהָר-בַּרְבֵּר} \) into a more natural counterpart: \( \text{נָהָר-בַּרְבֵּר} \). This would also help to explain the later inexplicable repetition of \( \text{ירָם} \). This suggestion is followed by Cooke, Ezekiel, 474-75, who does not credit Herrmann with originating the idea. Tuell, Law of the Temple, 43 n. 64 holds that \( \text{ירָם} \) is the misplaced element, following Targum Jonathan, which does not read the first instance of \( \text{ירָם} \). rendering it as \( \text{נָהָר-בַּרְבֵּר} \) (“everything to which it is entitled,” as translated by Samson H. Levey, The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus and Notes; [ArBib 13; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1987], 117).

302 This final phrase is often seen as secondary (Cornill, Ezechiel, 480; Herrmann, Ezechiel, 263; Zimmerli, Ezechiel 2, 411; Allen, Ezechiel 20-48, 243). Other scholars defend it as original: Talmon and Fishbane, “The Structuring of Biblical Books,” 140-42; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 590; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 550.
Such a cultic sense for "היל"، the hyponym of προσείχισμα، can be illuminated by parallels in two Jewish works. In m. Mid. 2:3, "היל" refers to a 10-cubit space inside the outer partition (סורה) which was broken on the eastern side by steps upward to enter the Women’s Court (שער נשים). This use of "היל" reflects concern to divide the sanctuary from its surroundings, but the "היל" is not placed at the outermost border of the sanctuary as in Ezek 40:5 and 42:20. A closer parallel can be discovered in 11Q19 46:9-10, in which the space is envisioned as outside the temple complex proper, dividing it from its surroundings.

9 And you will make a trench around the temple, 100 cubits wide, which will be 10 dividing the holy sanctuary from the city, lest they enter suddenly into the midst 11 of my sanctuary and defile it. They will consecrate my temple and fear my temple 12 where I am dwelling in their midst.

---

303 See the helpful diagram in Philip Blackman, Mishnayot Volume 4: Order Kodashim (New York: Judaica Press, 1984), 568.


305 For a defense of the translation of "חיך" as “trench” or “fosse,” see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1:274-75.

306 Yadin translates "אש" in this clause as “because” rather than “where.” I have opted for the sense “where” based on the parallels in Num 5:3 and Ezek 43:7.
Both the Temple Scroll and m. Middot use חלל as an intervening space that separates holy areas from encroachment. The purpose of the trench, firm maintenance of cultic boundaries, is made explicit in the Temple Scroll: the trench exists “lest they enter suddenly into the midst of my sanctuary and defile it” (ויהוה). The hyperbolic measurement of the trench in the Temple Scroll (100 cubits) underscores the importance of this intervening space. In 8V Ezek 42:20, the same need is apparent and is resolved through an application of the identical term (חלל), originally used in a military context, to serve a cultic function.

3) What should be made of the plus καὶ ἔστη κατὰ νότου in v. 16? Like the additions already surveyed, this supplement clarifies that the guide is not directly touching the walls, but instead is standing some distance behind the east gate when he begins the process of measurement. One more piece of evidence establishes the importance of distance from the holy, even on the part of the guide.

4) The order in which מ lists the gates in Ezek 42:16-19 corresponds to the pattern of measurement in 40:6-26 (east, north, then south), which may be indebted to a conception of decreasing holiness.307 Rev 21:13 also witnesses this order. Other scholars prefer the way described in 8V, given that it provides a more natural path in which to walk

---

307 Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 68. This order is retained (without comment) by Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 570 n. 170, as well as Cooke, Ezekiel, 460; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 219 and Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 536.
around the complex.\textsuperscript{308} However, this more natural order implies that \(\phi^V\)'s reading is likely secondary.

In sum, \(\phi^V\) summarizes the temple complex in a way that elevates the need for separation from its holy structures to a greater degree even than \(\text{mr}\). The guide is not permitted to come into contact with the structure of the outer walls, and the distinction between the holy and profane in \(\text{mr}\) Ezek 42:20 is contextually transformed so as to deny the possibility of profane regions in light of Ezek 43:12.

3.1.1.7 And I Stood (43:6)

\begin{quote}
\(\phi\) Ezekiel 43:6

καὶ ἔστην.

καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου λαλοῦντος πρὸς με, καὶ ὁ ἀνήρ εἰστήκει ἐχόμενος μου.

\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\(\text{mr}\) Ezekiel 43:6

ואשמע מדבר אל המברח ואיש היה עומד על אלי.

And I stood and behold, a voice from the house was speaking to me and the man had stood beside me.

And I heard someone speaking to me from the house and the man was standing beside me.

\(\phi\) Ezekiel 43:6 contains a plus (καὶ ἔστην) indicating that Ezekiel stood before the address by the divine. This is explicable as a harmonistic expansion that refers to the divine instruction to the prophet to stand in the inaugural vision (2:1-2). Given the

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{308} Cornill, \textit{Ezechiel}, 476-77; Jahn, \textit{Ezechiel}, 302-03.

\textsuperscript{309} It is unclear whether the insertion of the term φωνὴ is an innovation of the translator or if it goes back to \(\phi^V\). See the similar renderings in \(\phi\) Ezek 2:1, 2, where an object of hearing is similarly supplied.

\textsuperscript{310} \(\text{mr}\) represents the more difficult and so the more original text: Fohrer with Galling, \textit{Ezechiel}, 243; Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel} 2, 408; Allen, \textit{Ezekiel} 20-48, 238; Block, \textit{Ezekiel} 25-48, 574. Despite the fact that Cornill, \textit{Ezechiel}, 478 describes \(\phi\) \(\phi\) as "echt hebraeisch und echt ezechielisch," this is no guarantee of authenticity, as we saw in §3.1.1.4 above. Rather it represents redactors who smooth out their received text with great fidelity to Ezekiel’s original vision.
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foundational nature of the inaugural vision for the subsequent ones (3:23; 8:4; 10:15, 20, 22), it is not surprising that the redactors of the Vorlage saw fit to include such a note here.

3.1.1.8 Conclusions

While the preceding examples do not exhaust the instances in which difficult portions of the prophet’s vision are explained through harmonizing exegesis in $\sigma^V$, they do illustrate its tendency to make Ezekiel’s final vision conform to his earlier ones, whether in the prophet’s characteristic posture in divine speech (καὶ ἔστην), or in its overall structure (Ἐρακας, νῦν ἄνθρωπον). Quantities are filled in based on analogous portrayals (ἐν ἑπτὰ ἀναβάθμοις), and distinctions to be made later in the Temple Law are prefigured (οἱ ἰερεῖς νῦν Σαδδουκ). Contextual exegesis also led to glosses to prevent the idea that the enclosing wall divided the holy from the profane on the holy mountain, in light of the statement in 43:12. Pluses also served to distance the guide from encroaching on the sacred sanctuary walls. On the other hand, $\sigma^V$ Ezek 42:16-19 provides an example in which the contextual logic of the earlier description in $\bar{\nu}$ Ezek 42:16-19 was missed. In this case, a reviser of $\sigma^V$ changed the more original enumeration of the gates according to the order of their sanctity in $\bar{\nu}$ (east, north, south and west) to an order easier to traverse, thus missing the correspondence to the pattern of measurement in 40:6-26. Nor are characteristic redactional touches always made, such as the specification of the perquisites of the Zadokites in $\bar{\nu}$ and $\sigma$ Ezek 40:46b and $\sigma$ Ezek 42:13 but not in either version of Ezek 45:4.
The preceding instances have suggested the significance of harmonization within \( \phi^V \) Ezek 40-48 as a method for resolving apparent difficulties in a cryptic earlier version of Ezekiel’s vision. Significant or repeated phrases taken from other contexts in Ezekiel’s vision provided these redactors with material for short additions that helped to explain difficult passages. Difficulties in the Temple Law, however, could be remedied by appeal to parallel material outside Ezekiel.

3.1.2 Pentateuchal Influence in \( \phi^V \) Ezekiel’s Temple Law

I have argued to this point that scribes invested a great deal of effort in harmonizing Ezekiel’s final vision to previous visions within the book of Ezekiel. When these scribes turned their attention to Ezekiel’s sketch of the laws of the new temple-state, they found nothing comparable in the rest of Ezekiel that might clarify ambiguities in this law code. However, a raft of pentateuchal legislation provided parallels to many of Ezekiel’s unique laws, and even contradicted them in not a few places. Interestingly, in only one instance, the prescription of the tithe in \( \phi \) Ezek 45:15, did later scribes try to harmonize Ezekiel’s rulings with the more normative prescriptions of the Pentateuch. Much more commonly, their goal was to solve perceived difficulties in Ezekiel’s law code through the use of small supplements, commonly of one word. In several cases, this supplementary wording drew on pentateuchal terminology, but always with an eye firmly on the meaning in Ezekiel, not on the more distant but more authoritative law-codes of the Torah.

The question of methodology is inevitable: what criteria should be used to identify the secondary readings in \( \phi^V \) that merit the designation *harmonizations* to the
Pentateuch? Studies of intertextuality and allusions that demonstrate many of the same concerns.\textsuperscript{311} Kowalski’s recent, thorough and persuasive examination of the influence of Ezekiel on Revelation sought to bring clarity to the question of intertextuality by distinguishing different levels of allusion.\textsuperscript{312} Regarding allusions on the lexical or thematic level, Kowalski accepts van Ruiten’s standard of two words shared between the two texts, except in the case of a \textit{hapax legomenon} in Rev that appears in Ezek and connected texts of the same genre. The context of the potential allusion must be borne in mind.\textsuperscript{313} Modifying these criteria for the present purposes, a minimum standard for

\begin{itemize}
\item Beate Kowalski, \textit{Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes} (SBB 52; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004), 61-64. She distinguishes allusions to linguistic and motif-levels, allusions to the stylistic level, allusions to the structural level, allusions to the contextual level, allusions to the level of communication, and combination of allusions or mixed allusions.
\end{itemize}
identifying harmonization would require at least two common words and similar context.

Where a degree of resonance between texts is suspected but the two texts do not share enough common vocabulary or context to speak of harmonization, it may nonetheless be proper to identify influence of one text upon another, keeping in mind the subjective nature of such an identification. With these minimal standards established, it remains to analyze these small supplements.

3.1.2.1 וְזֵכֶרְתַּה Ezek 45:15 and the Tithe

The pressing need for sacrificial animals is filled in Ezekiel’s vision by the קְנָה, who supplies them through a tax on his subjects. The amount of this tax differs in ו and ו. While ו requires a modest half-percent contribution, ו reflects the pentateuchal demand for a tithe (Lev 27:30-33; Deut 14:22-29) and so is usually deemed a correction toward such texts. Use of similar language and context corroborates this suggestion.

ו ו Ezek 45:15
και προβατον ו שֵׁה-אתח
ἀπὸ τῶν δέκα προβατων ו ו מֵה-זאתֵו מֵה-המאתים

314 Cornill, Ezekiel, 493-94 deems ו here a “Correctur nach dem pentateuchischen Zehntengebote.” See also Jahn, Ezekiel, 330; Cooke, Ezekiel, 507; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 474; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 568; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 240; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 145. Herrmann, Ezekiel, 283 holds out the possibility that ו’s reading is a corruption.

315 Similar language occurs in Lev 27:32 (ומז市场价格 בקר זואין) and Deut 14:23 (וּמֶזַּר הָעָרָבִים בְּכָרִים זֵאָנים). Use of two shared terms is evident in both, and the context discussing tithes likewise agrees. Cf. also Deut 12:6, 17; 2 Chron 31:6.

316 ו. The mem of〚mem〛 is translated as if from ו, but in reality probably constitutes part of the word. Where the translator expected a partitive as is common in the context of this verse, the supplementer of ו apparently was less concerned for context, using the technical term〚mem〛 instead. When describing rams or sheep, כ is used directly before ו elsewhere in Ezekiel and moreover is always reflected by the translator, who renders it with ו (43:23, 25). The phrase זֵכֶר בַּבָּקֶר is also usually
And a sheep from ten sheep will be a contribution from all the tribes of Israel.\(^{521}\)

\textit{It will serve as sacrifices}

rendered rather periphrastically for our translator by μόσχον ἐκ βοῶν (Ezek 43:19, 23, 25; 45:18). The use of ἄνω here is also apparently influenced by the context.

\(^{317}\) \(Θ\): תתרומת כל המשפחות (reconstructed in this way also by Cornill, Ezechiel, 494; Jahn, Ezechiel, 330). The term ἀφαίρεμα is only used one other time in Ezekiel, where it refers to the choice part of the first-fruits contributions to the priests, and has the hyponym ἀπὸ τῶν πατριῶν (44:30). Though this term appears only once in Ezekiel, ἀφαίρεμα is the most common rendering for τρῆμα in the Pentateuch as well (Exod 29:27, 28 [bis]; 35:5, 21, 24 [bis]; 36:3; Lev 7:4 [m 14], 22 [m 32], 24 [m 34]; 10:14, 15; Num 6:20; 15:19, 20 [bis], 21; 18:19, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29; 31:41, 52). Ἀραῖεμ ἂν renders תורופה (Exod 35:23 [m 22]; 39:7 [m 38:29]; Lev 8:26 [m 27]; 9:21), and דָּבָר (Exod 25:29), but there is no reason to suppose the uses of such terms in \(Θ\) Ezekiel. Much more commonly, תורופה is translated as ἀπαρχὴ in \(Θ\) Ezekiel (44:30; 45:1, 6, 7 [bis], 13, 16; 48:8, 9, 10, 12 [bis], 18 [bis], 20 [bis], 21 [bis]). The alternation between ἀπαρχὴ and ἀφαίρεμα in successive verses thus represents a distinction drawn by his translator and not by his source text.

\(^{318}\) The traditional reading of \(m\) here is יִשָּׁר, retained by Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 658 n. 55. Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 70 n. 1 following Grätz, suggests emendation to יִשָּׁמך which is taken up by BHS, Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 475; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 568; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 598.

\(^{319}\) The hyponym of the term πατριῶν in \(Ψ\) seems to have been יִשָּׁמך as commonly recognized (Cornill, Ezechiel, 494; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 475; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 247; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 658 n. 55). Such a rendering of יִשָּׁמך occurs in Jer 2:4; 3:14; 25:9; Ps 21 [m 22]:27; 95 [m 96]:7; 106 [m 107]:41.

\(^{320}\) \(Θ\) and \(Ψ\) read the second person, in keeping with the idea that the law is a divine address to Israel, while \(m\) uses the third person. Here \(Θ\) appears to be secondary, as it provides the easier contextual reading.

\(^{321}\) Following the suggestion in n. 313 above, we could render \(Ψ\): “As for sheep, a tithe of the flock will be the contribution for all the tribes of Israel.”

\(^{322}\) For the translation of the singular forms of sacrifices in \(m\) as plural, see Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 658 and Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 240.
and as burnt offerings
and as sacrifices of well-being
to atone for you
says the Lord.

and as burnt offerings
and as sacrifices of well-being
to atone for you—an oracle of the Lord God.

The recipient of the tithe in Ezekiel is the נֵזֶּה (although it is destined ultimately for the cult), unlike the Pentateuch, in which it is given to the priests and Levites. Cooke contends: “These ‘church dues’ in vv. 13-15 are to be distinguished from tithes for the support of the priests and, perhaps, of the Levites…they correspond rather to the half-shekel tax of P², Ex. 30:13-16.” This may be true for מִים, but ש is identifies the verse with the payment of the tithes in Jerusalem. With this correction, I would argue that the harmonizations of Ezekiel to pentateuchal norms are exhausted.

What should be made of the reading in מִים Ezek 45:15א (יִשְׂרְאֵל)? Unfortunately, it is impossible to agree with Cornill that this reading possesses “echt hebraeischem Colorit” and is thus original. If the reading in מי were original, it would be difficult to determine why it was changed to the enigmatic reading in מים. Rather, מי’s reading derives from its reading of the immediate context, and essentially repeats the information in the next verse (Ezek 45:16), adding the important qualification that this tax is to be paid from the clans (מִשְׂפָּחָה). The rarity of the term מִשְׂפָּחָה in Ezekiel (used only in Ezek 20:32) suggests it reflects the use of this term in P, especially in

323 Cooke, Ezekiel, 500.
324 Ezechiel, 494.
genealogies. Once again, $\phi^V$ provides a smoother text with the help of pentateuchal analogues.

If the text reflects the Pentateuch in its wording and context, it also may reflect modernizing concerns. It will be suggested below that in $\phi^V$ Ezek 40-48, the $\text{שׁוּם}$ takes on more priestly functions, and so by paying a tithe to the $\text{שׁוּם}$, priestly (i.e. Zadokite) control of the tithe might be assumed in the context of Palestine of the mid-Second Temple period. If one presumes that the $\text{שׁוּם}$ is a Zadokite, the regulation that the tithe is to be paid to the Zadokites, not the Levites, would directly contradict the priestly code and other early second temple texts. Later texts such as Jdt 11:13 and Jub 32:15, on the other hand, assign the tithes to the priests directly. This change in the recipient of the tithe is generally associated with Hasmonean practice, although this innovation probably antedated the Hasmoneans’ accession to the priesthood. The strongest support for this supposition is the clear statement in Jub 32:15 that the tithes go to the priests, without any justification. If this were a Hasmonean innovation, it seems unlikely that the author of

---

325 Exod 6:14, 15, 17, 19, 24, 25; 12:21; Lev 20:5; 25:10, 41, 45, 47, 49; Num 1:2, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42; 2:34; 3:15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 39; 4:2, 18, 22, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46; 11:10: 26:5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 57, 58; 27:1, 4, 11; 33:54; 36:1, 6, 8, 12.


327 Berndt Schaller, “Hekataios von Abdera über die Juden,” ZNW 54 (1963): 23-26 was the first to connect this change in the reception of the tithe to the question of the authenticity of the supposedly Hekataian fragments preserved in Jos, C. A. 1.187-204. He strongly argued for a Maccabean origin for the change in recipient of the tithe. Josephos, A. J. 20.181, 206; Vita 80 holds that the tithes belong exclusively to the priests, as do Philo, De Virt. 95 and Heb 7:5. Josephos also suggests that the tithes be shared between the priests and Levites (Vita 63; A. J. 4.68, 205). Philo also includes a statement assigning the tithes to the Levites (Spec. Leg. 1.156). See also b. Soṭa 47b-48a; Ket. 26a; y. Ma’at. 5. 56b.
Jubilees would have supported it so strongly. However, the tenuosity of the evidence at this point should be recognized. If anything, the equation of the אֶשֶׁר with the high priest in control of Palestine, which is hinted at sporadically in $\text{V}'s version of Ezekiel’s law code (see below), is even less clear. If one assumes that the אֶשֶׁר was a high priestly Zadokite ruler, however, as Zadokite readers of $\text{V}$ Ezek 40-48 presumably would have been predisposed to do, this requirement of Ezekiel’s law code would have provided firm support for increased Zadokite control over the finances of the increasingly important Second Temple. This assumption remains in the mind of a potential reader, however, and is nowhere clearly encoded in the text.

3.1.2.2 Ezekiel 44:13

In the midst of a scathing critique of the Levites for their past unfaithfulness (Ezek 44:6-14), the Deity imposes his penalties upon them as follows.

$\text{V}$ Ezek 44:13
καὶ οὐκ ἐγγιόσαι πρὸς με
tοῦ ἱερατεύειν μοι
οὐδὲ τοῦ προσάγειν πρὸς τὰ ἁγια vיוֹנ תּוּ לְגָנָה
οὐδὲ πρὸς τὰ ἁγια τῶν ἁγιῶν μου

$\text{V}$ Ezek 44:13
ולא נער אלה
לכוה יי
לגנות Aleppo
לא-הדרי הקדרים


329 Bezalel Bar-Kochva, Pseudo-Hecateus, on the Jews: Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 160. See also the discussion in GLAJJ, 1:41-42, which is more positive about the possibility of proving that the change preceded the Hasmoneans, but Stern’s evidence requires that Judith originated in the Persian period, a questionable hypothesis.

330 An example of the common use of יָלִוי for בֹּשׁ in $\text{V}$ Ezekiel.
And they will not approach me to serve me as priests either to approach the holy offerings of the children of Israel or to approach my most holy things. And they will bear their shame through the error in which they erred. and their abomination which they committed.

The major difference between the two versions is the plus υἱῶν τοῦ Ἰσράηλ in Ṣ. One could explain this supplementation by supposing that the Masoretic reading (כֵּסֶף) was interpreted as being in the construct state, instead of ending with a possessive suffix as in the MT. A scribe simply completed the phrase by supplying the nomen rectum. 333

But this completion is not as obvious as it might appear at first glance, since the terms קרֶשׁ and קרֶשׁ חֶרֶשׁ could refer either to a location in the temple or to gradations of offerings. How should the supplemenetor’s preference for a non-spatial understanding be explained?

---

331 הַלּוֹם is rendered in Ṣ by βάσανον (Ezek 16:52a, 54; 32:24, 30), ἀτιμία (Ezek 16:52b, 63; 36:7, 15; 39:26; 44:13), and ὀνειδισμός (Ezek 34:29; 36:6).

332 Ṣ 44:10 apparently read בֹּתָעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אָשֶׁר, a striking complement to וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אָשֶׁר is missing in Ṣ. Ezek 44:10. Cornill, Ezekiel, 486 suggested that Ṣ Ezek 44:13 was the source of the interpolation in וְיִשְׂרָאֵל.

333 An analogous case can be observed in Ṣ Ezek 45:8, where a plural noun ending with a first person suffix (נֶשֶׁת) was thought to be in the construct state and was supplied with a nomen rectum in Ṣ (ἀφηγούμενον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). It is also possible that originally יִשְׂרָאֵל was indicated through an abbreviation (נֶשֶׁת; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 467).
A pentateuchal analogue to Ezekiel’s law can be found in Num 5:9, which assigns all donations to the priest who offers them.

וֹלֵל-תּוֹרָה לְלָל-כָּדוּשׁ בֶּן-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר-כָּדוּשׁ לְחַג ה' לְיִשְׂרָאֵל.

Every gift from all the sacred donations of the Israelites which they will offer to a priest shall be his.

Both Num 5:9 and ❧ Ezek 44:13 share the phrase כָּדוּשׁ בֶּן-יִשְׂרָאֵל, thus meeting the standard for shared vocabulary. Num 5:9-10 further specifies the regulations providing for restitution of an offender who had misappropriated his fellow’s property and then denied it under oath (Num 5:5-8). Such a fellow commits “an act of betrayal” against the Lord (לֹא יִלְבָּשׁ בְּעַיִן יְהוָה; Num 5:6) by falsely invoking the divine name.334 Num 5:9-10 then specifies that such an individual may direct his penalty toward whichever priest he chose. Other passages (e.g. Lev 22:15)335 use identical terminology to refer to lay sacrifices in a global, comprehensive sense. This Pentateuchal phrase thus suggested itself to the suppler of ❧ Ezek 44:13, who added it to clarify the meaning here as referring to the offerings made by the lay Israelites. This avoids a potential spatial interpretation of כָּדוּשׁ.


335 Lev 22:15 prohibits the people from eating sacred food and assigns it only to the priests (Baruch A. Levine, Leviticus, [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: JPS, 1989], 150). This verse contains the same phrase as in Num 5:9 and Ezek 44:13 (כָּדוּשׁ בֶּן-יִשְׂרָאֵל).
But what sense would such a plus make in Ezek 44:13? It is likely that the editors drew the phrase קדשִׁי נֵסֶרֶת אֲמַלֵּי from Num 5:9, Lev 22:15, or other pentateuchal analogues to clarify that although the Levites are required “to slaughter the burnt offering and the sacrifices for the people” (המכה והשליח את-העולה ואת-הובת לוֹם; Ezek 44:11), they are not entitled to the proceeds thereof because they are prohibiting from offering them on the altar. Moreover, according to the Ezek 44:11, the Levites are explicitly commanded to enter the holy regions of the temple, and so it is unlikely that a spatial sense of קדשִׁי is conceivable in Ezek 44:13. Both near and far contexts (that is, the requirements of Ezekiel’s own vision and the phrasing from the Pentateuch) thus help to explain the editor’s supplementation based on the phrasing from verses such as Num 5:9 and Lev 22:15. This phrasing clarifies that despite the Levitical responsibility to slaughter sacrifices, they may not benefit from them. However, it must be noted that while the content of the plus may be borrowed from pentateuchal vocabulary, the context of Num 5:9 and Lev 22:15 is sufficiently distant from Ezek 44:13 that the pentateuchal terminology is employed solely in view of the needs of its new context. Thus here it is proper to speak of influence rather than harmonization, since the pentateuchal wording is applied beyond the specific instances envisioned in the Pentateuch (misappropriation followed by a false oath in Num 5:9; lay consumption of pure food in Lev 22:15). The supplementer applied pentateuchal terminology in Ezek 44:13 for exegetical purposes.

3.1.2.3 Ezek 44:24 and Capital Cases

φ Ezek 44:24
καὶ ἐπὶ κρίσιν αὐτῶν Ezek 44:24

 עליה-רבים
And concerning a capital case: they [the Zadokites] will stand to judge it.

They will decide my statutes justly and hold fast to my judgments.
And they will keep my teachings and my statutes at all my feasts and they will sanctify my Sabbaths.

Like Ezek 44:13, this charge to the Zadokites comes in the midst of a long divine speech excoriating the Levites for their unfaithfulness and granting the responsibility for capital cases to the Zadokites alone. There are two major divergences between א and ב of

336 Reading with א, on the basis of ב כ ק.

337 It is unclear at first whether ב corresponds to או or to או. Possible renderings in א Ezekiel is with (Ezek 5:6 [bis], 7 [bis]; 11:20; 18:9; 20:11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25). also renders in Ezek 5:10, 15; 11:9; 28:22, 26; 30:19. On the other hand, another common rendering of in א Ezekiel is with (Ezek 5:8; 7:27; 18:5, 8, 27; 22:29; 23:24 [bis]; 33:14, 16, 19; 34:16; 36:27; 45:9). renders Hebrew פ נ (Ezek 16:51, 52 [bis]) or פסנ (Ezek 21:13 [18]), unlike the term פסנ in א, which usually corresponds to פסנ (Ezek 7:27; 16:38; 20:4; 23:24, 45) or פסנ (Ezek 7:8; 11:10, 11; 18:30; 20:36; 21:30 [35]); 22:2; 23:36; 24:14; 33:20; 34:22; 35:11; 36:19; 38:22). Thus while it is possible that א corresponds to א פסנ, the general use of פסנ to render פסנ makes it more likely to correspond to או. Based on the parallel nature of the clauses and their normal translation-equivalents, we may provide a tentative reconstruction of א פסנ for או פסנ, as the general use of פסנ to render פסנ is more likely to correspond to או פסנ. This judgment is a question of potentiality rather than certitude.

338 Reading with ל, as witnessed by א כ.
While according to מ, all disputes come under the judgment of the Zadokite priests, מ limits their role to arbitrating capital cases. This limitation reflects the pentateuchal legislation found in Deut 17:8,\textsuperscript{339} according to which difficult cases of bloodshed (דם), lawsuits (נשא), and assaults (לחם) are to be presented to the levitical priests and the judge.\textsuperscript{340} Like the Deuteronomic legislation, Ezekiel’s mention of these cases comes in the context of the Zadokites’ mandate to teach the people (Ezek 44:23; Deut 17:11). 2 Chron 19:10 broadens the categories of Deuteronomy more widely than Ezekiel, mentioning bloodshed (דם) and other violations of the law as its main headings.\textsuperscript{341} Thus, 2 Chronicles broadens responsibility for judging difficult cases beyond those in Deuteronomy. 2 Chron 19:8-11 records Jehoshapat’s address to the Levites, tribal heads and priests concerning their administration of justice, corresponding to the secular judges of the fortified cities (2 Chron 19:5-7). Like מ Ezekiel 44:23 and Deuteronomy 17:11, 2 Chron 19:10 emphasizes the necessity of priestly instruction of those who come to them for arbitration. Comparison with these parallel texts highlights Ezekiel’s unique restriction of the judging capital cases to the Zadokites, not the Levites or secular functionaries. On the other hand, both 2 Chron 19:8-11 and מ Ezek 44:23 are

\textsuperscript{339} Cornill, \textit{Ezechiel}, 488. Both texts share the key terms דם and ריב.

\textsuperscript{340} For the sense of bloodshed, civil lawsuits and assaults as a summary for all aspects of criminal and civil law, see Jeffrey H. Tigay, \textit{The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy} (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 164, and the Jewish authorities cited there.

\textsuperscript{341} The pile-up of terms for legal and moral ordinances in 2 Chron 19:10 (זורו, מצות, חכמה) also mirrors the profusion of such terms in Ezek 44:24.
comparable in their development of the term דם from Deut 17:11 as a summary term for
significant cases.

While Deuteronomy seems to stand behind the clarification ריב דם in φV Ezek 44:23, the Targum defines the judgment under discussion exegetically without reference to Deuteronomy.342 Could such be the case in φV? The reconstructed reading of φV (ריב דם) does not appear in עב Deut 17:8, which instead speaks of a “juridical matter” (דבר למשתת). This might suggest that the editor of φV Ezek 44:23 is practicing exegesis without the influence of pentateuchal legislation.343 Yet two factors suggest that some degree of influence is likely: 1) the close proximity of adjudicating problematic capital cases to the requirement for priestly instruction in Deuteronomy, Chronicles and Ezekiel; 2) the similarity in vocabulary (the use of ריב and דם), even if the precise formulation does not agree with what is witnessed elsewhere. Because of the distinction in terminology (דבר לדם in Ezek and דם לדם in Deut), it is more proper to speak of the influence of Deuteronomy here rather than harmonization. As previously suggested, φV’s Temple Law combines influence from the Pentateuch with contextual exegesis. Influence from the Pentateuch is apparently not reflected from a desire to make Ezekiel’s law conform to the Pentateuch, but rather from a need to make sense of Ezekiel

342 כ Ezek 44:23 understands the judgment as putting the divine will into practice (בדאי רוחתי, ידיעות). φ does not offer an opinion of what this judgment consists (וכל לדם לדם למשתת למשתת); nor does φ (et cum controversia stabunt in iudiciis meis).

343 Cooke, Ezekiel, 492; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 113.
as it stands. As in the example of the tithe, however, the appointment of the Zadokites as judges of major cases increases their power at the expense of the Levites, who enjoy such a role in 2 Chron 19.

3.1.2.4 And His house (45:22a)

In ḫ Ezek 45:22, in the context of the stipulations for Passover, the leader is required to perform (ועשה/ποιέω) a purification offering. ṥ features a slight plus that will prove informative.

\[\text{Ezekiel 45:22} \quad \text{kai pòiôseî ὁ ἀφηγούμενος ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἶκου καὶ ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς γῆς μόσχον ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας.}\]

And the leader will offer on that day, on his own behalf and on behalf of his house, and on behalf of all the people of the land, a bull as a purification offering.

\[\text{Ezekiel 45:22} \quad \text{ועשו התשאא בימים התיה} \quad \text{בעד} \quad \text{בכד כל הספים ואתם פר ותאת}\]

And the prince will offer on that day, on his own behalf, and on behalf of all the people of the land, a bull as a purification offering.

In this verse, ṣ contains a plus (καὶ τοῦ οίκου; ṣ: ניבתא) indicating its concern to include the family of the leader explicitly. One potential pentateuchal passage to which ṣ Ezek 45:22 could be referring is ṣ Lev 9:7, which describes Aaron propitiating “for

\[\text{Ezekiel 25-48}, 661 \text{ translates; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 480 renders it with “present”}.\]

\[\text{As will be seen below, שעשה is a descriptive term in priestly literature for the entire act of sacrifice and so can be rendered “do” or “perform.” Without such a technical connotation, שעשה here is most naturally read as “provide” (as Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 661 translates; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 480 renders it with “present”).}\]
himself and his house." The fact that only two of the three elements (himself and his house) present in Ezek 45:22 are mentioned in Lev 9:7 makes it unlikely that this verse is the source of the assimilation. More likely is Lev 16:17, which has Aaron atoning “for himself and his house and for the whole assembly of the children of Israel” (וַעֲנוֹד וְעַד בֵּית וַתְּעֹד כָּל-כּוֹהָן יִשְׂרָאֵל). All three elements (the leader, his house and the people of the land) are present, though the terminology is considerably different with respect to the third element.

But does the context agree? Ezek 45:22 has Passover in mind, while Lev 16 is concerned with the great annual purgation of the central shrine. The recognition of the technical nature of the verb עשת in the context of sacrifice helps to explain the contextual connection. In the context of priestly legislation, עשת is not concerned with provision of the sacrifices as the NRSV translation of Ezek 45:17 and 22 would seem to indicate, but is a descriptive term for the entire rite of sacrifice. Once this fact is grasped, it is possible to evaluate the motivation for the plus in Ezek 45:20 correctly. The reviser sees a connection between Ezek 45:17, 22 and Lev 16:17 (possibly also Lev 9:7) because only

345 וע and ש differ on their reading of this verse. וע Lev 9:7 has Aaron make atonement “for yourself and the people” (וְעַד בֵּית וַתְּעֹד), while ש reads instead “for himself and his house” (περὶ σεαυτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου σου).

346 ש of this verse offers a slightly fuller reading of this last section (καὶ περὶ πάσης συναγωγῆς νείων Ἰσραήλ).

347 Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 266-67. Rashi, possibly influenced by the use of the verb עשת, was of the opinion that the נִשָּׂא mentioned in 45:17 was the high priest: אוֹמָר אֲנִי שָׁרָה שָׁיוֹ אֲנִי בֵּית נָדָר מָרָד וַל נִשָּׂא (Abraham J. Levy, *Rashi’s Commentary on Ezekiel 40-48 Edited on the Basis of Eleven Manuscripts* [Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1931], 100). See also his comments on 44:3.
in these four instances in cultic legislation is the descriptive term נַשִּׁיָּהוּ paired with the preposition בְּ. Moreover, the close connection implied in Ezek 45 between the purification of the sanctuary (vv. 18-20) and Ezekiel’s Passover (vv. 21-24) helps to mitigate the appearance of different contexts in Lev 16 and Ezek 45:17-22 to some extent.

If this explanation of the plus in ס וּ is accepted, it hints at a significant and somewhat startling turn of affairs. According to the present line of reasoning, the leader (נַשִּׁי) described in Ezek 45:17, 22 could be understood in ס וּ to be conducting sacrifice. Moreover, the use of נַשִּׁי and בְּ in Leviticus 9:7; 16:17 is reserved for Aaron, the chief priest, and so the assimilation in ס וּ Ezek 45:22 implies a close connection between Aaron and the leader. Given the unique fact that Ezekiel’s restoration envisions no chief priest, could the editor of ס וּ have identified the enigmatic נַשִּׁי as such a figure?

As suggested above, in ס וּ Ezek 45:15, 22, an interesting pattern of assimilation to the Pentateuch is in evidence. ס וּ Ezek 45:15 directs that a tithe of sheep be paid to the נַשִּׁי, while ס וּ Ezek 45:22 apparently portrays the נַשִּׁי as offering sacrifice on behalf of himself, his house and the people of the land. These two texts imply that the נַשִּׁי performs priestly functions, and ס וּ Ezek 45:22, with its allusion to Lev 16:17, implicitly
likens him to Aaron. How can this be explained? Given the generally *ad hoc* nature of scribal redaction, even if it can be proven that the high priest is the equivalent of the נשי in ו:Ezek 45:15, 22, such an equation may not hold throughout the rest of Ezekiel’s Temple Law. Still, the question is worth asking.

The best place to begin is with a consideration of the נשי’s role in 44:1-3. Here he is given the privilege to eat food in the divine presence (לפגי יהוה; v. 3) and to sit in the eastern gate, to which no one else had access. It is thus not surprising that Christian interpreters such as Theodoret, as well as Jewish exegetes such as Rashi, identified the נשי as the high priest and the closed eastern gate with the adytum. This concern

---

348 ה Ezek 45:22 also demonstrates the influence of Lev 16:7, since it describes the bull of the purification offering as a substitute for the leader (רמב) and the people:


349 As an example, we can note that the distinction between the Levites and Zadokites is present (though generally recognized as secondary) in both ו and ו ו:Ezek 40:46b (see §3.1.1.6 above). This distinction is added in ו ו:Ezek 42:13 but not in ו of that verse. Neither of the two versions makes the distinction in Ezek 45:4, a similar text where the distinction would be appropriate. (This lack of distinction in 45:4 may be due to the fact that the difference in role between the Zadokites and Levites is clarified in the preceding chap. 44. If this is true, the lack of such a gloss in ו:Ezek 42:13 still shows the incompleteness of the redaction.) This example shows that even highly significant glosses are often incompletely made throughout the entire vision.

350 In his fourteenth sermon on Ezekiel, Origen proceeded from the idea that the text described the high priest eating food in the holy of holies (Clausa est itaque ianua, ut nemo videat magnum sacerdotem panem in sanctis sanctorum comedentem. Text is from Marcel Borret, *Origène: Homélies sur Ézéchiel: Texte Latin, Introduction, Traduction et Notes* [SC 352; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989], 440). Theodoret likewise identified the figure in Ezek 44:1-3 as the high priest: “The high priest will offer the burnt offerings of the Sabbaths; for he calls him the leader” (τὸ δὲ ὀλοκληρωμα τῶν Σαββάτων ὁ ἀρχιερεύς προσοισία. Λύτων γὰρ καλεῖ ἄρηγογύμνον; PG 89:1278). See Wilhelm Neuss, *Das Buch Ezechiel in Theologie und Kunst bis zum Ende des XII Jahrhunderts* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1912), 58-59.

351 Rashi’s note on 45:17 clarifies that he sees the נשי as the high priest (see n. 344 above). At 44:3, he comments that the נשי may not eat with the rest of the priests in the rooms of the temple but must eat in the eastern gate (ואם דרכו [לישב] לאוכל ים שאר המנחות בלשון; Levy, *Rashi’s Commentary*, 93).
with the east gate reappears in 46:1-2, in which the gate is opened on the Sabbath, while the אֱלֹהִים is not himself an active participant in the sacrificial practice. Ezek 46:12 portrays him as opening the gate for himself and offering a freewill sacrifice, purification offering or offering of well-being using the technical descriptive verb פֶּסַח. וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם Ezek 46:13-14 portrays the אֱלֹהִים as further offering a purification offering in the morning along with its requisite cereal offering, in contrast to וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם of these verses, which gives this responsibility to the figure of Ezekiel, who is addressed in the second person in וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם Ezek 46:13-14.

<sup>352</sup> Here and in v. 14 the translator abbreviates the Hebrew בּוֹכָר-בּוֹכָר.
12 If the leader offers as a voluntary offering a burnt offering of well-being to the Lord, he will open for himself the gate that looks to the east and he will offer his burnt offerings and his offerings of well-being just as he does on the Sabbath days. And he will exit and shut the doors after he has gone out.

13 And a blameless year-old sheep he will offer as a burnt offering daily to the Lord; in the morning he will offer it.

14 And he will offer a cereal offering upon it in the morning a sixth of a measure and a third of a hin of oil to mix the fine wheat flour as a cereal offering to the Lord—a perpetual statute.

Φ’s reading is generally explained by arguing that it fails to recognize the beginning of a new subject with these verses. By entrusting these offerings to the καθήμενος, Φ portrays the καθήμενος as performing priestly activities. Later exegetes such as Theodoret

---

353 Cooke, Ezekiel, 512, Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 85 n. 2 and Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 669 n. 50 note that the מים is probably a marginal gloss that has been incorporated into the text. It seems to combine the formula תֶּלֶשׁ תֵּבָל (Exod 12:14, 17) with the formula ordinances of the Tamid.

354 For this sense of ὁμολογία, see GELS, “ὁμολογία,” 437.

355 Cornill, Ezekiel, 498 and Jahn, Ezekiel, 340-42 preserve Φ’s reading. Later scholars see the introduction of a new section and so maintain: Cooke, Ezekiel, 511; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 84; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 488; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 248; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 669 n. 47; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 164.
and Rashi apparently took such indications as evidence that the נֵזֶר was a high priest, thereby remedying the lack of a chief priest in Ezekiel’s vision. Origen apparently identified the נֵזֶר as a simple priest.\(^{356}\) The text of \(\textit{\$}\) seems to have moved in this direction as well by portraying the נֵזֶר as offering sacrifices at his own direction, though it is unclear whether he is envisioned as a regular Zadokite priest or as the high priest actually functioning at this period. Once again, however, the primary motivation seems to have been a smoother text, without the awkward change in addressee from \(\textit{\$}\) Ezek 46:12 (directed toward the נֵזֶר) and \(\textit{\$}\) Ezek 46:13-14 (addressed to Ezekiel the prophet). Here as elsewhere within Ezekiel’s law code, secondary changes in \(\textit{\$}\) appear to reflect more exegetical than modernizing concerns.

### 3.1.2.5 Ezekiel 45:18-20

\(\phi\) Ezek 45:18-20

18 Τάδε λέγει κύριος\(^{357}\)

'Ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ μνημείῳ\(^ {358}\)

μεῖξε τὸν μνῆμαν

λήμψει[θ]ε\(^ {359}\) μόσχον ἐκ βοῶν ἀμώμουν

\(\textit{\$}\) Ezek 45:18-20

יְנָהוֹ כְּפֶרֶן וִיתֶם

בראשית

בָּאָדֶה לַחַדש

טַחְקָה פַרְפַּר בַּכְרַת תִּמְתָּ

---

\(^{356}\) See nn. 350-351 above.

\(^{357}\) For the differences in \(\phi\) and \(\textit{\$}\) regarding the divine name, see chapter 1.

\(^{358}\) A further example of the relative fullness in dates in \(\phi\) compared to \(\textit{\$}\) (Gese, \textit{Verfassungsentwurf}, 8-9).

18 Thus says the Lord: in the first month on the first of the month you will take a spotless bull from the cattle to purify the sanctuary.

19 And the priest will take some of the blood of the propitiation and he will place it on the doorposts of the house and on the four corners of the propitiatory and on the altar and on the doorposts of the gate of the

360 A rare example of the translation of a finite verb with the Greek infinitive. See §2.2.1.2 above.

361 While points מִשְׁומִים as a singular noun, the versions (Δ ו ν) take it correctly as plural (Cooke, \( \text{Ezekiel} \), 507; Bertholet, \( \text{Hesekiel} \), 160; Fohrer with Galling, \( \text{Ezechiel} \), 253; Gese, \( \text{Verfassungsentwurf} \), 75 n. 3; Zimmerli, \( \text{Ezekiel 2, 480} \); Block, \( \text{Ezekiel 25-48, 660 n. 4} \)). Allen, \( \text{Ezekiel 20-48, 247} \) suggests מִשְׁומִים has been influenced by 46:2. Pohlmann with Rudnig, \( \text{Ezechiel 20-48, 603} \) accepts מִשְׁומִים’s reading but takes it as a collective singular.

362 An example of the common exchange of בְּּוָ and בְּ in \( \text{Ezekiel} \).

363 For the rationale for מִשְׁומִים’s translation here, see §4.2 below.

364 Occasionally the singular מִשְׁומִים is emended to a plural (Bertholet, \( \text{Hesekiel} \), 160; Fohrer with Galling, \( \text{Ezechiel} \), 253). Pohlmann with Rudnig, \( \text{Ezechiel 20-48, 603} \) again understand the term as a collective singular. Zimmerli, \( \text{Ezekiel 2, 480} \); Allen, \( \text{Ezekiel 20-48, 241} \); Block, \( \text{Ezekiel 25-48, 660 n. 6} \) retain מִשְׁומִים’s singular reading.
inner courtyard. inner courtyard. 20 And you will do thus on the seventh day in the month on the first of the month: you will take a portion from each one from anyone who sins inadvertently and from the fool and you will purify the house. Ezek 45:20a is a locus classicus in the history of scholarship on the Hebrew Bible. Wellhausen famously accepted the reading of ᶥ Ezek 45:20a as representing an original biannual purgation of the sanctuary in the course of his argument for the post-exilic date of P. Earlier scholars tended to follow Wellhausen in accepting the priority of ᶥ’s reading in Ezek 45:20a. Following Gese’s programmatic research on Ezekiel 40-48, however, scholars have begun to retain מ as representing the older reading. Gese argued that מ pictured the purgation as lasting seven days, with the rites from the first day of the first month repeated on the seventh day of that month. Konkel adds that the reading in ᶥ can be entirely derived from the text in מ: התנדנד was interpreted in the sense of “new moon” and so interpreted as referring to the first day of the month. The

365 Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel (Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1885; Reprint, Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 110.

366 Cornill, Ezechiel, 494; Jahn, Ezechiel, 334; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 254. Gustav Hölscher, Hesekiel: Der Dichter und das Buch: Eine literarkritische Untersuchung (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1924), 202 n. 2 charged מ with changing its text so as to agree with the date in Lev 16. Cooke, Ezekiel, 502 agrees with Hölscher (though he does not cite him).

367 Often those who argue for the priority of מ emend התנדנד to התנדנד: Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 77-78; followed by Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 480; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 569; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 247; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 661 n. 7; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 160-61. Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 161 notes that התנדנד can be used in place of התנדנד where the month was mentioned shortly before (Num 10:11; Ezra 10:9).

368 Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 161. For התנדנד in the sense of “new moon,” see the references in HALOT 1:294.
elliptical use of the ordinal adjective to designate the month without the accompanying noun שֶׁ֠מֶרֶךְ appears in Ezek 45:18, two verses earlier. When added to Gese’s observation that שֶׁ֠מֶרֶךְ tends to supplement incomplete information about the month in date formulae, the evidence is fairly clear that שֶׁ֠מֶרֶךְ is secondary, and the motivation for the change is an attempt at clarification. It is significant that the editor(s) responsible for such changes was prepared to introduce further variation from pentateuchal law into Ezekiel’s vision in an effort to clarify what he thought Ezekiel meant.

A second, equally fascinating, variant reading in Ezekiel 45:20aβ concerns the gifts made to purify the temple: λήμψη παρ’ ἐκάστου ἀπόμοιραν. Like the divergence in Ezekiel 45:20aa, it is a demonstrably secondary attempt to make sense of a cryptic earlier text, preserved in א. Zimmerli suggests that this editing “tries to provide an

---

369 Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 8-9 n. 1, citing Ezek 26:1; 32:7; 40:1. See the discussion of Ezekiel 40:1 above (§3.1.1.2).

370 The Vorlage for א’s reading is debated and uncertain. Cornill, Ezechiel, 494 reconstructs א as מַאֲשֶׂה לְךָ, apparently intending מַאֲשֶׂה to be understood as an infinitive construct, which is graphically likely (i.e. liable to be produced through misreading the consonantal text of א). However, it is difficult to evaluate Cornill’s reading without more information, since the term ἀπόμοιρα is used only here in the Greek Bible. מַאֲשֶׂה is not used in א Ezekiel, and so it is difficult to know how the translator would have handled it. One could object to Cornill’s reconstruction based on his assumption that the translator would render מַאֲשֶׂה in the future tense, as well as the fact that the translator renders the term in the second person singular. Jahn, Ezechiel, 334 postulates a somewhat different Vorlage for א (וֹאַהַ֥ הָאֲשֶׂה מַ֣מִּית מַ֣אֲשֶׂה לְךָ), given his thesis that לְךָ should be read instead as לְךָ. Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 661 n. 9 suggests מַאֲשֶׂה לְךָ instead of מַאֲשֶׂה לְךָ. My sense of the translator’s penchant for preserving word order suggests an alternative reconstruction of the Vorlage (אָֽלָהַ֥ הָאֲשֶׂה מַ֣מִּית מַ֣אֲשֶׂה לְךָ). The caveat of Emanuel Tov, that such a Vorlage may have existed nowhere in the translator’s mind, should not be forgotten (The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 88).

371 The sense of א has been much debated, as a glance at the commentaries will show. Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 663 understands it as extending “the possibility of atonement for all unwitting sin.” It is indeed interesting, as Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 266 and others have noted, that the adytum is not included in the places to be purged of impurity. This may hold an important clue for Ezekiel’s readers that the sins that brought about the first exile would not be capable of impinging on the second.
explanation for the duty of regular atonement for the sanctuary along the lines of what is said in Lev 4:13; Nu 15:22. "372 These texts detail the responsibility of the community in inadvertent sin, but neither is formulated in language particularly close to Ev. Ezek 45:20a. What is common to these texts and Ev is the conviction that the entire community, not just those who sin unintentionally or the unwise, must participate in the sacrifice. Once again, pentateuchal influence is secondary in Ev to the need to explain an unclear text, with the result that primary concern remains with clarifying Ezekiel’s meaning.

3.1.2.6 Two Spotless Goats (43:22)

In the instructions for the consecration of the altar that initiate Ezekiel’s Temple Law (Ezek 43:18-27), a fixed structure is prescribed. On the first day, the priests are to sacrifice a bull (vv. 19-21), and on subsequent days the sacrifices are identified as a goat followed by a bull and a ram (vv. 22-26a). The problem is the explicit command to sacrifice a goat daily for seven days, as well as a bull and a ram in v. 25. How can a goat (or a ram for that matter) be sacrificed for seven days if no goat is required on the first day? The problem is exacerbated by v. 27, which explicitly mentions that from the eighth day and afterwards regular sacrifices must resume. Zimmerli solves this problem by supposing that vv. 25-27 are later than vv. 19-24 and that these later verses “envisage the usage of the post-exilic community.” 373 It seems a safe assumption that such a

---

372 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 480.
373 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 435.
solution was not open to scribes in the Second Temple period, who had to resolve the tension differently.

Perhaps an attempt at a solution has appeared in † Ezek 43:22.

† Ezekiel 43:22
καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ
λήψουνται ἑρίφους δύο αἰγῶν ἀμώμους
ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας
καὶ ἐξιλάσονται τὸ θυσιαστήριον
καθότι ἐξιλάσαντο ἐν τῷ μόσχῳ

And on the second day
they will take two blameless kids from the goats
as a purification offering
and they will purify the altar
as they purified it with the bull.

† Ezekiel 43:22
בימיה
תקריב שעיר-נוי תמיים
ל يوسف
והשא את-המבה
казанה השאו בפר

And on the second day
you will offer a blameless male goat from the goats
as a purification offering
and you will purify the altar
as they purified it (= it was purified) ³/₄ with the bull.

The most obvious divergence between † and † in this verse is the number of kids required for purification of the altar: one in †, and two in †.³⁷⁵ Several suggestions for the origin of this difference have been put forward, almost all of which have seen † as assimilating in some way to the Pentateuch’s narrative of the institution of worship. Cornill offered Exod 29:38 as a source for the assimilation,³⁷⁶ but this is unlikely given that two lambs are in view in this verse, and not two goats. Cooke pointed instead to

---

³⁷⁴ The Semitic 3rd masculine plural can often function as a passive.
³⁷⁵ † mentions only a single goat, in keeping with its tendency to revise back toward a text comparable to proto-†.
³⁷⁶ Cornill, Ezekiel, 483.
Leviticus 8:2, 22,\textsuperscript{377} but this similarly fails in the fact that there two rams, and not two goats, are in view. More recently, Konkel proposed that it is not the narrative of institution of worship toward which \textit{טב} assimilates, but the stipulations for Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16.\textsuperscript{378} There Aaron is commanded to take “two kids of the goats” (\textit{נשל שניים}; Lev 16:5) along with a ram from the people of Israel, and to set the two goats before the entrance of the tent. After casting lots for the goats, Aaron is instructed to offer the goat upon whom the Lord’s lot fell as a purification offering. Leviticus 16 is the only passage outside of Ezekiel 43 in the Bible which mentions two goats, and so it is conceivable that this is the source of the mention of two goats in Ezekiel 43:22.

However, there are also significant differences between Leviticus 16 and the consecration of the altar in Ezek 43. The two goats mentioned in Ezek 43:22 are destined for sacrifice, while only one of those in Lev 16:5 is.\textsuperscript{379} Nothing like the scapegoat ritual is mentioned in Ezek 43; the purpose of the second-day sacrifices is explicitly to purify the altar (43:22). On the other hand, Ezekiel’s counterpart to Lev 16 is to be found in 45:18-20, where the sacrifice is a bull. Thus it appears that there is only a weak analogy between Lev 16 and the inauguration of the altar in Ezek 43. Even if this or any of the other mentioned pentateuchal analogies occurred to the supplanter of this passage in his effort to solve the dilemma posed by the text, they are clearly subordinated to his

\textsuperscript{377} Cooke, \textit{Ezekiel}, 476; Jahn, \textit{Ezechiel}, 313 offered Exod 29:1 as an analogue, but his suggestion fails for the same reason Cooke’s does.

\textsuperscript{378} Konkel, \textit{Architektonik des Heiligen}, 85.

\textsuperscript{379} Jacob Milgrom is adamant: “The he-goat for Azazel was not a sacrifice” (\textit{Leviticus 1-16}, 1018).
exegetical concerns. Despite the efforts of the redactor, the solution provided (the sacrifice of two goats on the second day) does not quite solve the problem posed by the text, and for this reason it is far from certain that the addition was intentional.

3.1.2.7 Summary and Conclusions

The main concern of the above examples was to demonstrate that secondary harmonizations toward the Pentateuch are not at all common in $\phi^V$ Ezekiel 40-48.\textsuperscript{380} The concern of the editors and copyists who transmitted the text that would form the basis of the Septuagint translation was apparently to clarify terse or enigmatic phrases in Ezekiel, in the process enhancing the unique character of Ezekiel’s vision. They seem to have relied on pentateuchal analogues to Ezekiel’s law only when it was necessary to clarify his train of thought, and when Ezekiel’s vision did not provide the necessary answers to their questions. The fact that scribes changed only one of Ezekiel’s laws that directly contradict the Pentateuch\textsuperscript{381} is testimony to the relatively conservative character of their intervention. Ultimately the nearer context of Ezekiel is far more significant than the more distant but more authoritative context of the Pentateuch.

\textsuperscript{380} The unique similarity to the Pentateuch in $\phi^V$ Ezek 45:5 ($\phi$ πόλεις τοῦ κατοικεῖν [=\phi\textsuperscript{V} $\theta$ πόλεις $\lambda$ in place of מִשְׂרָיִם לְשָׁם], which calls to mind P’s Levitical cities, is generally considered to be original and so does not fall under our discussion. See Cornill, Ezekiel, 492; Cooke, Ezekiel, 496; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 466; D. Barthélemy et. al., Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project Volume 5 (New York: United Bible Societies, 1980), 178-79; Allen, Ezekiel 25-48, 246; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 649 n. 12. Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 134-35 argues that מִשְׂרָיִם $\lambda$ represents a late anti-Levitical addition that wishes to assign them only 20 rooms in the area of the Temple but not a share in the land. Jahn, Ezekiel, 327-38 holds both מִשְׂרָיִם and $\phi$ as inauthentic.

\textsuperscript{381} The only law changed concerns the tithe (see §3.1.2.1 above). Other laws remain without change, for example Ezek 44:21, which contradicts Lev 21:7. Ezek 45:18 has no analogue in the Pentateuch, and Ezek 46:6 is at variance with Num 29:3-4.
Through the consistent use of small corrections, $\delta^V$ exhibits both harmonizing and modernizing tendencies. By far, the greatest purpose of these pluses was to explain Ezekiel’s meaning in terms of the near context, as well as that of the rest of the book. Only rarely did such pluses bring Ezekiel’s vision into agreement with the expected state of affairs in the Pentateuch or the reality of life on the ground in Palestine in the Second Temple period. With this recognition of occasional modernization in $\delta^V$ Ezekiel, then, it becomes necessary to consider other instances of the same phenomenon.

**3.2 Modernizing Readings in $\delta^V$**

The concern to this point has been the illustration of the tendency of scribes and copyists to understand elements of Ezekiel’s final vision in terms of their near and more distant contexts. While such contextualization seems to have been a primary influence in the creation of secondary readings in $\delta^V$, the impulse toward modernization is visible as well. While not as pronounced as harmonization, such modernizing readings reflect contemporary experience as well as emerging patterns of thought, such as mysticism and apocalyptic eschatology, and so contributed an important vector in the meaning of the text.
3.2.1 The Temple Drain (40:38-40)

The text of Ezekiel 40:38-40 differs not a little in \( \sigma \) and in \( \Pi \). At issue is the place beside the inner north gate where the sacrifices were washed (O).\(^{382}\)

\( \sigma \) Ezek 40:38-40
38 τὰ πασαρόφρια αὐτῆς\(^{383}\)
καὶ τὰ θυρώματα αὐτῆς
καὶ τὰ αἰλαμμῶν αὐτῆς
ἐπὶ τῆς πύλης τῆς δευτέρας\(^{385}\)
ἐκρύσεις

\( \Pi \) Ezek 40:38-40
38 וְלֹעֵבָה
פַּתַּהוּ
בַּאֲלִימִים
הֵשֵׁעַ

\( \text{הֵשֵׁעַ} \) 39 וַֽיֲדֹ֥יוּ הָאָֽתָם הָעָֽלָה

\(^{382}\) The letter in parentheses refers to the designation given this architectural element in the diagrams (see Appendix A).

\(^{383}\) This suffix refers to the inner northern gate in 40:35-37. The addition of the possessive pronoun to all the elements of the gate probably represents a grammatical leveling on the part of the translator, as can be seen by the addition of the Greek possessive pronoun (αὐτῆς) to a transliteration containing a Hebrew possessive suffix (αἰλαμμῶν). The rendering of all these elements as plural also seems to indicate grammatical leveling.

\(^{384}\) Many scholars emend בַּאֲלִימִים to בַּאֲלָלוֹת in line with the reading in \( \sigma \) (Cornill, Ezekiel, 444; Herrmann, Ezekiel, 257; Cooke, Ezekiel, 444; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 154; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 363; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 533; Fohrer with Galling, Ezekiel, 227-28; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 222; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 530 n. 82; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 42).

\(^{385}\) \( \sigma \)'s translator presumably read בַּאֲלָלָת (Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 363), a secondary explanatory comment. See \( \Pi \) Ezek 40:21 and §3.1.1.4 above.

\(^{386}\) The plural בַּאֲלָלָת in \( \Pi \) is difficult to understand grammatically. Many scholars emend to the singular (Cornill, Ezekiel, 444; Cooke, Ezekiel, 444; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 154; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 363; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 533; Fohrer with Galling, Ezekiel, 228; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 222; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 42).

\(^{387}\) This statement in \( \Pi \) is related to the bronze basins of the Solomonic temple in 2 Chr 4:6 (לְדַנְעֵה). See below.

\(^{388}\) Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 154 describes \( \sigma \) as abbreviating the text, although he does not describe the translator’s motivation in his abbreviation (quoted approvingly in Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 42). Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 530 n. 83 plausibly suggests parablepsis. The presence of eight total tables in both \( \Pi \) and \( \sigma \) Ezek 40:41 suggests an accidental rather than deliberate omission.
38 Its [the gate’s] chambers and its entrances and its porticoes are an outlet

39 so that they may slaughter in it (the

39 ὅπως αφάζωσιν ἐν αὐτῇ

38 A chamber and its entrance and its porticoes were among the pilasters of the gate. There they wash the burnt offering.

39 And in the vestibule of the gate there are two tables on this side and two tables on that side upon which to slaughter

389 In the same way as he inserted the pronoun αὐτῆς in 40:38, the translator renders ἐν αὐτῇ here to clarify that the sacrifice is to take place within the inner northern gate.

390 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 367 suggests that the translator of ἔλθεν deliberately omitted the reference to the ἔδρα in 40:39 on the basis of 40:42, which mentions four tables specifically for the ἔδρα. According to the ἔλθεν translator, then, the four tables mentioned in v. 39 are for the purification and reparation offerings, while the four tables in v. 42 are for the burnt offering. Zimmerli, following Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 158, instead understands ἔδρα in 40:42 as a comprehensive, summary term for all sacrifices instead of the designation for a single sacrifice, making the translator’s omission unnecessary.

391 See Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 530 n. 85 and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 363 for the explanation of ἔδρα as a participle and not as a noun.

392 The ἔλθεν translator apparently read θέμνειν instead of θάρειν.

393 The significance of the secondary phrase twice πρὸς / κατὰ ἀνατολάς in ἔλθεν Ezek 40:40 is unclear, given the confused treatment of the tables in ἔλθεν (Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 363). The addition of this phrase occurs elsewhere at Ezek 42:1, 20. The addition at 42:1, where the translator clarifies the older reading δύο ἔδρα by translating κατὰ ἀνατολάς, is significant because it demonstrates the translator’s propensity toward treating the east as the primary or most significant direction.
the burnt offering and the purification offering and the reparation offering. and the reparation offering.

40 And behind the flow of the burnt offerings

and of the gate that looks northward toward the entrance of the northern gate were two tables.

To the other side of the gate’s portico were two tables.

The many divergences between מ and ס in Ezek 40:38-40 are not the concern of the present investigation. Rather, two elements are especially important: the ἐκφύσις ("efflux, outflow") mentioned in 40:38 and the ρόαξ ("stream, drain") of 40:40.

394 The more common term ἐκφύσις at its simplest indicates a flow of water emanating from one body of water and moving into another (e.g. Aristotle, On Colors 796a1.12). It can be used of the going out of the tide (Strabo, Geography 1.3.4), the discharge of rivers and other bodies of water into the sea or lakes (Strabo, Geography 1.3.6 bis, 1.3.13, 8.8.4; Aristotle, Meteorologica 351 a1.5), or the breaking through of underground waters or springs to the surface (Strabo, Geography 3.5.7) or over their banks (Strabo, Geography 8.6.21). These uses in classical literature suggest that for the translator of Ezek 40:38, the sense of ἐκφύσις may have included a harnessing of some sort of natural flow of water, perhaps the Gihon spring.

395 ῥόαξ is used only a handful of times in extant Greek literature, and so its meaning is debatable (in addition to the citations below, see the Scholia in Platonem Dialogue R 372b line 3 [quod non vidi]). Probably it is to be related to the verb ρέω / ρέομαι, which gives the sense of flowing, running or streaming (LSJ, 1568). This grammatical relationship is supported by a fragment from Philoxenus, in which the grammarian relates the noun ρόαξ to the terms ρόος and ρώας. Fragment 304: τρβακος· τρβη· τρβαξ παρώνυμον, καὶ ἡ γενικὴ εὐθεία γίνεται πάλακες, ὡς φύλαξ φύλακος καὶ ὁ φύλακος· κόχλος κόχλαξ, ἱερὸς ἱεράς, ρόος ρόαξ, καὶ μεταθέσει τὸν ὁ εἰς τὸ τρόπον τῷ Περὶ τῆς ἱάδος διαλέκτου. Text is cited from Christos Theodoridis, Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976), 231. This fragment is preserved by Orion of Thebes in his Etymologicom. See the edition of F. G. Sturzius et al., eds., Orion Thebanus, Etymologicom (New York/ Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1973), 154. Like these two related terms then, ρόαξ seems best rendered as “stream” or “drain” (For ῥόος, see Homer, Iliad, 11.726, 16.151, 21.263, 219, 12.33, 21.258, 303, 369; Odyssey 5.327, 449, 461; Herodotus 2.96; Plato, Republic 492c; Hippocrates, On Women 121, 176; Aristotle, Animal History 521a. For ρόαξ, see Thucydides 4.96; 3.116; Plato, Phaedo, 111e 2; Strabo, Geography 6.2.3; Aristotle, Mirabilia 833a; Diodorus Siculus 14.59).
Both of these elements must be considered together. As it happens, the concern with washing away the blood of the sacrifices is comparable to descriptions of the Second Temple in which such facilities are mentioned.

The presumed hyponym of †ἐξώπονας in Ṣ V Ezek 40:38 is uncertain, since it corresponds to the phrase שֶׁנֶּאֶרֶד הָאָתָן הָעֵצָלָה in 396. The term ῥήδη, used only here in all of Ezekiel, is a relatively late one that in Mishnaic Hebrew replaces רְהִית as a technical term for cultic washing. This increases the likelihood this clarification in 396 is relatively late. A parallel in 2 Chr 4:6 describes ten lavers for washing, five on the south side and five on the north, in which utensils for the burnt offering were to be rinsed (לָרוּזוּת בַּמְּחָמָא מְעָשָּׂא) 397. However, the direction of influence between 396 Ezek 40:38 and 2 Chr 4:6 is debatable. It seems likely that all extant versions (396 Ṣ ὅ) represent parallel clarifications of an original text whose significance was no longer clear. For Ṣ, the result of the confusion of the postulated earlier text was the incorporation of an outlet for

396 As far as I am aware, Cornill, Ezechiel, 447 was the first to understand these pluses in Ṣ together.


398 The term ῥήδη appears in 2 Chr 4:6; Isa 4:4 and Jer 51:34, as well as Ezek 40:38. Compare Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 366-67 and Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 154. Gese argues for the dependence of 2 Chr on 396 Ezek 40:38 at this point; Zimmerli is non-committal.

399 ἄ avoids the idea of washing in its translation (τὸν ματθησμὸν ἀν ἑλαθόν), speaking only of preparing the sacrifice, as does ἀ (ἔθαμ, ἀθάμ, ἀθαμμα, ἀθαμμα), which speaks of placing. It is possible, as Cornill, Ezechiel, 446 thinks, that neither ἀ nor ἄ read the present text of 396 as it now stands. 396 follows ἄ (ibi lavabunt holocaustum).
the sacrificial blood in $\sigma^V$, in line with descriptions of the Second Temple. Field identified the hyponym of $\epsilon\kappa\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ in $\sigma^V$ as a misunderstood נחלות ($\text{from נחלות D, emisit}$) that attracted the addition of $\rho\omicron\alpha\varsigma$ in v. 38.\textsuperscript{400} Given the paucity of evidence for this term, no definite conclusions can be drawn.\textsuperscript{401}

By contrast with $\epsilon\kappa\rho\upsilon\varsigma$, the equivalent for $\rho\omicron\alpha\varsigma$ in $\mid$ Ezek 40:40 is certain: מזרחי. This is the only occurrence of the form מזרחי in $\mid$, but the translator consistently recognized מזרחי in his source text.\textsuperscript{402} According to Cornill,\textsuperscript{403} Ewald suggested that the translator read מזרחי in $\sigma^V$, either correctly or incorrectly, which would correspond to the sense of rushing (ῥέωματι) implicit in $\rho\omicron\alpha\varsigma$. Yet מזרחי more commonly refers to the path for a race, not a conduit for liquids to flow.\textsuperscript{404} Whatever term he supplied, it is clear that here the supplementer of $\sigma^V$ Ezekiel 40:40 highlighted the disposal of sacrificial effluence, possibly motivated by the contemporary needs of the sacrificial cult for irrigation. Moreover, this explication of the source text was motivated either by personal acquaintance with the Second Temple itself or with texts describing it.

\textsuperscript{400} Cited in Cornill, Ezechiel, 446-47.

\textsuperscript{401} The noun $\epsilon\kappa\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ appears only in Ezek 40:38. The verbal form $\epsilon\kappa\rho\varepsilon\omega$ has the hyponym נחלות in Deut 28:40 and נבל in Isa 64:5. 1 Macc 9:6 uses it in the sense of “slip away.”

\textsuperscript{402} He translated it with ἐξοθεῖν (40:5; 43:21; 46:2) and ἐξω (40:19).

\textsuperscript{403} Ezechiel, 447.

\textsuperscript{404} 2 Sam 18:27; Jer 8:6; 23:10. See HALOT, "מרצתו,” 1:634.
Three sources mention the washing of blood from the sacrifices of the altar of the Second Temple. M. *Mid.* 3:2 mentions two holes at the south-western corner of the altar that enabled the blood to mingle in the water channel and then to exit into the Wadi Kidron. A more expansive mention of the water supply of the Temple occurs in the Letter of Aristeas §88-91.405

§88 The whole foundation (ἐξαρατός) was decked with (precious) stones and had slopes leading to the appropriate places for carrying the water which is (needed) for the cleansing of the blood from the sacrifices. (Many thousands of animals are brought there in the festival days.) §89 There is an inexhaustible supply of water, because of a plentiful spring arising naturally from within, and there are furthermore indescribably wonderful underground reservoirs (ὑποδοχείων), which within a radius of five stades from the foundation of the Temple revealed innumerable channels (σύργαγας) for each of them, the streams (ῥέωματων) joining together on each side. §90 All these were covered with lead down to the foundation of the wall; on top of them a thick layer of pitch, all done very effectively. There were many mouths at the base, which were completely invisible except for those responsible for the ministry, so that the large amounts of blood which collected from the sacrifices were all cleansed by the downward pressure and momentum. §91 Being personally convinced, I will describe the building plan of the reservoirs just as I understood it. They conducted me more than four stades outside the city, and told me to bend down at a certain spot and listen to the noise at the meeting of the waters. The result was that the size of the conduits (ἀγγείων) became clear to me, as has been demonstrated.

---


406 Here I have changed Shutt’s rendering of ὡς ἄν from “just as if there were” to “because of,” following the translation of André Pelletier, *Lettre d’Aristée à Philocrate: Introduction, Texte Critique Traduction et Notes* (SC 89; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1962), 147 (à cause). My motivation for the change is the presence of the Gihon spring, which conflicts with the use of a contrary-to-fact condition. Compare Moses Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (JAL; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951; Reprint New York: Ktav, 1973), 135, who also gives this clause a causal sense.
The Letter of Aristeas describes two sources of water which serve to clean the blood from the sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple: a plentiful spring (the Gihon), and water brought by a network of streams running into underground reservoirs. Much more than in m. Mid. 3:2, the Letter of Aristeas is at pains to emphasize the architectural beauty and magnitude of the mechanisms to eliminate the sacrificial effluence. It represents the most detailed description of the water supply of the Temple area of many accounts from both Jewish and Roman historians, and serves clear apologetic purposes.

The final source is 11Q19 (11QTemple) 32:12-15.

```
12 ...as they go to serve in the sanctuary. [And] you will make a conduit (?) all around for the laver beside its house. And the conduit
13 runs [from the house of] the laver to the hole that descends [and spreads] out into the center of the earth into which
14 the water will be poured and will go into it [i.e. the land] and will be lost in the midst of the land. And no person will
15 be touching it [i.e. the water], since some of the blood of the burnt offering is mixed with it.
```

While the motivation in the Letter of Aristeas for mentioning the draining of the sacrificial effluence seems to be the need to highlight the impressiveness of the

---


408 The text is that of Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2:139. The translation is my own.
architecture, the description in 11QTemple³ is more concerned lest the pure waters of the
effluence come into contact with a less holy individual.

The reminiscences of these three Jewish sources suggest that the inclusion of an
outlet for the sacrificial waste in 6 Ezek 40:38, 40 may have been influenced by the
realia of the Second Temple or by a source describing them. Yet even here such
modernizing additions do not seem to have been added for their own sake as much as for
clarification of an otherwise vague text, so that the exegetical and contextual motivations
behind other pluses in 6¹ yalp that have been suggested so far seem to be in play here as well.

3.2.2 The Influence of Mysticism and Apocalyptic Eschatology

3.2.2.1 Like Gleaming Bronze (40:3)

.Offset<sup>409</sup> 6 Ezek 40:3
καὶ εἰσῆγαγέ με ἐκεῖ,
καὶ ἴδοὺ ἀνήρ,
καὶ ἢ ὄρασις αὐτοῦ
Ἑν ὑσεὶ ὄρασις χαλκοῦ στίλβοντος,
καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἢν σπαρτίων
οἰκοδόμων
καὶ κάλαμος μέτρου,
καὶ αὐτὸς εἶστήκει ἐπὶ τῆς πύλης.

 OFFSET<sup>410</sup> 6 Ezek 40:3
וַיִּבְרָא אָוִית שְׁמָה
וָהָנָה-אָישֶׁה
מֵרָאוּת
כָּכְרָאָה נְשׁוֹת
וֹפָטִיל-פְּשָׁתִים בִּדְו
תקְּנָה עָמְרָה
וָוָה עָמְרָה בְּשֵׁעֶר

And he brought me in there
and behold a man!
And his appearance
was like the appearance of gleaming

---

<sup>409</sup> Offset 6 Ezek 40:3 include the connective waw, which is more normal (Cooke, Ezekiel, 441).

<sup>410</sup> While the Masoretic tradition interpreted אָוִית as a participle, the translator took it as a perfect
whose action was completed before that of the main sequence (Walke and O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew
Syntax, §30.5.2 [pp. 490-91] and GKC §106f [pp. 310-11]), thus rendering it as a pluperfect.
bronze.
And in his hand were a builder’s cord and a measuring reed.
And he had stood by the gate.

One minor example of the influence of apocalyptic eschatology on Ezekiel 40-48 can be found in Ezek 40:3. Where describes the guide’s face as resembling bronze (تان), describes it instead as “gleaming bronze” (חָלָק וְסִיִּיבָנָת = תַּנָּתִּי),. Although this same phrase is used of the feet of the יְהֹוָה in Ezek 1:7, it shares more with the guiding figure in Dan 10:6, who has arms and legs of gleaming bronze. Dan 10:6 provides the identical translation (חָלָק וְסִיִּיבָנָת) to that of Ezek 40:3. This may represent a gloss added during the course of transmission of the Greek manuscripts of Ezekiel, under the influence of the parallel in Daniel 10, but it is impossible to be certain.

3.2.2.2 The Return of the Glory (42:2-3)

A second, and much more striking, example of the increased influence of apocalyptic eschatology on Ezek 40-48 is the expanded description of the chariot in Ezek 43:2-3.

Ezek 43:2-3

511 The conjecture of Jahn, Ezechiel, 274, who sees וְסִיִּיבָנָת here as , is unsupported.
512 Ezek 1:7 shows signs of strong editing, according to Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 83.
513 The reading of וְסִיִּיבָנָת is an assimilation to the normal designation of the east gate as in Ezek 40:6; 42:15; 43:1, 4 (in 43:4 without the article on the east gate). See §3.1.1.4 above.
Cf. Ezek 1:24 and the discussion below. In Ezek 4:2, the only other occurrence of מַעֲנֵה in Ezekiel, it is likewise translated with פָּרֵמֶבֹלָה. מ might also have the heavenly camp in view (אֱלֹהֶים שלמה).

חַלְיָה, as advocated by Cornill, Ezechiel, 478; Zimmerli, Ezechiel 2, 407 and Jahn, Ezechiel, 305. Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 214, 229 n. 39 prefers מַעֲנֵה, adducing Asclepiodotus, Tact. 10, 17.18 as a parallel. דָּיָּם מַעֲנֵה is only used elsewhere in מ at Ezek 21:19, where its hyponym is שַׁמָּה. שַׁמָּה seems a more likely choice than מַעֲנֵה given the context.

הָאָוִים והָאָרָה נֶנְנָה. Where extant in מ Ezechiel, מ is always rendered by פָּרֵמֶבֹלָה (Ezek 1:4a, 13, 27, 28; 10:4). Cf. also Ezek 1:4b, where this term is not extant in מ but was probably in מ.

Zimmerli, Ezechiel 2, 407-08 considers the beginning of מ Ezek 43:3 to be “overloaded” and suggests that this state originated from a dittography of מ מ. The versions suggest different ways to eliminate the superfluous terms: מ reads מַעֲנֵה הזָּה בָּא, מ reads מַעֲנֵה הַיוֹדָה, and מ reads מַעֲנֵה et vidi visionem. See Cornill, Ezechiel, 574; BHS, Allen, Ezechiel 20-48, 242. Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 72 and Block, Ezechiel 25-48, 574 n. 4 want to understand מ on its own terms without deleting any terms. Cooke, Ezechiel, 474 points out that wherever מ (plural) is used and מ seems to be redundant, the text is uncertain (cf. מ Ezek 8:2; 10:1; 41:21).

The first person is read by מ מ מ; מ reads instead quando venit, and the third person is read also by the Syro-Hexapla and Theodotion. מ maintains the first person but changes the verb, reading instead “when I prophesied” (בַּאָה בָּאָה), thus ameliorating the sense. Zimmerli, Ezechiel 2, 408 maintains that the first person reading is “scarcely original.” On the other hand, if the reading is retained it has been proposed that in the word מ the final יְוָדָה could be an abbreviation of the tetragrammaton (Fohrer with Gallig, Ezechiel, 241). However, Cooke, Ezechiel, 474 is correct in noting that if this is to be accepted, the versions who might be expected to have understood it give no hint of such an abbreviation. In light of the confusion between מ and יְוָדָה in many Hebrew scripts, it is easy to see how either of the variants could have caused the other. All in all, the more difficult reading (with the first person) is probably original.

The translator seems to have read מ, but whether this was a mistaken reading or was actually in his source text is impossible to know. The suggestion of Jahn, Ezechiel, 304 that the translator read מ is unlikely, since he recognized this term in Ezek 21:36 (rendered as בַּאָה בָּאָה).
2 And behold the glory of the God of Israel was coming along the way of the gate that faces east. And the sound of the camp was like the sound of many doublers and the land shone like a light from the glory all around.

3 And the vision, which I saw was in keeping with the vision, which I saw when I entered to anoint the city. And the vision of the chariot, which I saw was in keeping with the vision, which I saw by the Chobar River. And I fell on my face.

Several scholars think that φ Ezek 43:2-3 reflects the incorporation of μ Ezek 1:24 to some extent, and so consideration of this text is likewise essential.

420 V. It is most unlikely that Cornill, Ezechiel, 478 is correct in designating the mention of the chariot as "gewiss ursprünglich," even if the term was studiously avoided in Ezek 1.

421 The use of the historical present (πίπτω) for the Hebrew phrase אָלָל עַל-פֶּן is characteristic of the translator of Ezekiel α’ (Ezek 1:28; 3:23; 9:8; 11:13; 44:4). This phrase does not occur in Ezekiel β’ (chaps. 27 [25]-39).

422 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 407; Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 208-17; Cooke, Ezekiel, 463.
And I kept hearing the sound of their wings as they went,
like the sound of much water.

\( (\text{as they went}) \)

And when they stood
their wings would cease.

In Ezekiel 1:24, בֵּין־הַשָּׁמָ֖יִם does not preserve the more original text without all the pluses present in מֵהַשָּׁמָ֖יִם.

Even a cursory glance shows that these pluses in בֵּין־הַשָּׁמָ֖יִם Ezek 43:2-3 and מֵהַשָּׁמָ֖יִם Ezek 1:24 have much in common, given that they elaborate the aural impression made by the celestial retinue and share mention of the angelic camp (מַהֲנֶת). This raises two interesting questions: why do בֵּין־הַשָּׁמָ֖יִם Ezek 43:2-3 and מֵהַשָּׁמָ֖יִם Ezek 1:24 insert this related material into

\[ \text{And I kept hearing the sound of their wings} \]
\[ \text{as they went,} \]
\[ \text{like the sound of much water,} \]
\[ \text{like the sound of the Almighty,} \]
\[ \text{as they went;} \]
\[ \text{the sound of a rainstorm} \]
\[ \text{like the sound of a camp.} \]

\[ \text{When they stood} \]
\[ \text{their wings would go slack.} \]


424 Compare מַהֲנֶת, which places Ezek 1:24 in more of a liturgical context: כָּכֹל מִמֶּשׁ רַבִּים כָּכֹל מִמֶּשׁ רַבִּים מַהֲנֶת כָּכֹל מִמֶּשׁ רַבִּים כָּכֹל מִמֶּשׁ רַבִּים כָּכֹל מִמֶּשׁ רַבִּים כָּכֹל מִמֶּשׁ רַבִּים. 160
different places in Ezekiel’s vision? Why are some elements common to the two additions while others vary?

Almost all commentators have noticed that many of the secondary glosses present in Ṣ Ezek 43:2-3 and Ṫ Ezek 1:24 derive from elsewhere in Ezekiel. The first of these is מני ורבים, which occurs in Ṭ Ezek 43:2 as well. This phrase is frequent elsewhere in Ezekiel especially in the oracles against the nations, where in certain passages it takes on mythological overtones. The comparison to many waters is taken up in later apocalypses. In Revelation, the comparison is probably taken over from Ezekiel: the Son of Man is compared to ὁ δάκτων πολλῶν (1:15), as is a nameless voice from heaven (14:2) and the sound of the great crowd (19:6). By way of contrast, the scrolls from the Judean desert reflect a predominantly negative connotation to this term. Similarly, the comparison בקולה וישי in Ṭ Ezek 1:24 derives from Ezek 10:5, where it also describes the sound of the wings of the beings (in chap. 10 defined as cherubim).

However, appeal to contextual reasoning does not solve all the problems of the relationship between Ṭ Ezek 1:24 and Ṣ Ezek 43:2-3, in particular that of the camp (מחנה) shared by both additions but not mentioned elsewhere in Ezekiel. Nor does it

---

425 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 88, 130; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 51 and Fohrer with Gallimg, Ezekiel, 13 identify vv. 23-25 as secondary glosses.

426 Ezek 17:5, 8; 19:10; 26:19; 27:26; 31:5, 7; 31:15; 32:13; 47:9.


428 1QH a 10:16, 27; see also the water imagery in 1QH a 11:14-16; 16:4-25. A positive use of the phrase in a theophanic context is visible in 11Q5 (11QPsalms a) 26:10.
explain some of the unique elements of Ezek 43:2-3, including the “doublers,” the light (נער), and the chariot (מרכבות). The fact that only one element is held in common between Ezek 1:24 and the pluses in Ezek 43:2-3, while three are not, suggests that Ezek 43:2-3 is not simply copying Ezek 1:24. An alternative explanation can be developed by considering 4Q405 (4QShirShabb) 20ii, 21–22:6-14.429

[4QShirShabb 20ii, 21–22:6-14]

6 vac]  For the leader. A song of the offering of the twelfth Sabbath [on the twenty-first of the third month. Praise the God of]

7 [extra]ordinary years] and exalt him in keeping with the Glory in the tabernacle of the God of knowledge.430 The [cher]ubim fall before him and bless as they are exalted. The sound of divine silence

---


430 An alternative sentence break is possible: “…before the Glory. In the tabernacle…”
[is heard], and an abundance of shouts as they raise their wings—the sound of
divine silence. They bless the image of the chariot-throne above the cherubim’s
firmament.

They sing the majesty of the shining firmament below the seat of his [glory], and
as they go the ophanim\(^{431}\) return. The holy angels go forth from within
his glorious [wheel]work. His most holy spirits have the appearance of fire all
around, fiery streams like electrum (וּם הַשָּׂמַר). And there is the appearance
of brightness in glorious weaving, extraordinarily tinted, purely blended. The
spirits of the living gods walk about continually with the glory of the wondrous
chariots. There is a small sound of blessing in the multitude of their going and
they praise the Holy One as they return on their ways. As they are exalted, they
rise in extraordinary fashion and as they dwell

[t]heir [they stand still]. The rejoicing shout falls silent, and there is a quietness of divine
blessing in all the camps of the gods, and the sound of praises

This extraordinary song of praise shows prolonged and careful reflection on the
message of Ezekiel, especially his visions in chapters 1, 10 and 43. It appropriates many
of the terms and concepts unique to Ezekiel’s prophecy. Features shared between Ezekiel
and 4Q405 (4QShirShabbf) 20ii, 21-22:6-14 include the cherubim, their wings, the
chariot-throne, which is informed by an exegetical tradition, as will become clear.

4QShirShabbf 20ii, 21–22:6-14 is also relevant because it includes three of the
lexical features previously isolated in 4\(^{V}\) Ezek 43:2-3. It also includes thematic parallels
to the fourth element, that of angelic praise of the Deity. These agreements suggest that
4\(^{V}\) Ezek 43:2-3 is best understood not as a reworking of מ Ezek 1:24 but as preserving

\(^{431}\) A special class of angels at Qumran and elsewhere (1 Enoch 61:10; 71:7; 2 Enoch 20:1). See
Saul Olyan, A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism
(TSAJ 36; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1993), 34-41; David J. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot: Early
Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision (TSAJ 16; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1988), 52; Christopher
developing merkabah traditions such as can be found in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.

As just mentioned, 4QShir ShabbåÊ20ii, 21-22:6-14 contains three of the same terms that were reconstructed in ⁶ Ezek 43:2-3 (מְרוֹבֶת, מִנָּה, and מַחְנֶה), and includes thematic parallels to the fourth (praise of the Creator). First it can be noted that the description of the angelic camp (מַחְנֶה) in lines 13-14, in which each angel has his assigned station (מַעֲמֵד). The notion of the camp, consisting of the children of Israel, is particularly significant in the wilderness narratives: it must be ritually pure because of the presence of the deity (Num 5:1-4; 31:19; Deut 23:14). Sectarian texts from Qumran apply this idea of the divine presence in the camp to the expected holy war in the eschatological future (e.g. 1QM 8:1-10). Likewise the author of the Apocalypse pictured the “camp of the saints” (τῆν παρεμβολήν τῶν ἀγίων) which would be vindicated by God in the eschatological future (Rev 20:9). These texts and others represent the pure armies of human Israel arrayed for eschatological battle.

On the other hand, παρεμβολή is used elsewhere to indicate God’s angelic army. The term has a significant role to play in two theophanies in the Septuagint (Gen 32:2-3, Joel 2:11), in both of which God leads his angelic host. In the more interesting of these,

---

432 For an early discussion of the idea of the war-camp at Qumran and its relation to the NT, see F. C. Fensham, “‘Camp’ in the New Testament and Millḥamah,” RdQ 4 (1964): 557-62. In some respects, the sectarians tightened and more closely defined the purity laws concerning the camp known from the Hebrew Bible, as in the prohibition of excretion within 2000 cubits of the camp (1QM VII, 7).

Gen 32:2-3 [m 32:1-2] notes that Jacob, “when he lifted up his eyes, saw the camp [παρεμβολήν] of God set up,” a phrase missing in m of the verse. In the context it is clear that this camp consists of angels. By way of contrast, texts that share an apocalyptic worldview emphasize the term’s martial ties in depicting God’s angelic army.

1 Enoch mentions God’s war-camp, with the help of which he executes judgment against the Watchers (1:3b-4, Greek): “My great Holy One will come from his dwelling, and the Eternal God will tread upon the land, upon Mount Sinai, and will manifest himself from his camp [ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς αὐτοῦ] and will appear in his great might from the highest heaven.”

The mentioned in both m Ezek 1:24 and θV Ezek 43:2-3 thus reflect this element of the emerging mystical tradition of apocalyptic eschatology.

However, this is where the commonalities between the pluses in m Ezek 1:24 and θV Ezek 43:2-3 cease. A second element of the pastiche of pluses in θV Ezek 43:2-3, the light (בנה) which the land reflects in θ Ezek 43:2, appears in 4QShirShabbf 20ii, 21–22:11-12 in the context of a description of the fantastic appearance of the most holy beings. 4Q286 (4QBerα) 1a, ii, b:2-3 similarly mentions “flames of brightness” (שיבנים

---

434 Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, 58 concurs that Gen 32 is in view in the addition in θV Ezek 43:2.


436 Καὶ ἔξελεύσεται ὁ ἅγιος μοῦ ὁ μέγας ἐκ τῆς κατοικίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰώνος ἐπὶ γῆν πατήσει ἐπὶ τὸ Σεινα δρός καὶ φανερωσεῖ ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ φανεραίη ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν. The text cited is that of M. Black and Albert-Marie Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece and Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae Supersunt Graeca una cum Historicorum et Auctorum Judaicorum Hellenistarum Fragmentis* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 19. Note what while in the Greek version, ὁ ἅγιος μοῦ ὁ μέγας may be a quasi-divine intermediary, in the Ethiopic of this text it has been identified as God himself.
combines in terms very similar to Ezek 43:2-3, though in context it seems to be describing Ezekiel’s first vision.\footnote{Devorah Dimant, \textit{Qumran Cave 4 XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts} (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 42-43. The translation is my own.}

Such texts are informed by the use of נגヘ in Ezekiel. In Ezek 1:4, נגヘ describes the brightness around the great cloud, and the translator likewise renders מجمالו in Ezek 1:4b. However, the vision in chap. 10 provides the closest parallel to $^\phi$V Ezek 43:2’s use of נגヘ, since there it describes the brightness of the Lord’s glory that filled the Temple (10:4).

The third element is the description of the chariot (מרכבת).\footnote{B. Nitzan, “4QBerakhot,” in \textit{Qumran Cave 4 VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1} (DJD 11; ed. James VanderKam and Monica Brady; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 12-13.} As Halperin notes, along with Sir 49:8, $^\phi$V Ezek 43:3 is one of the earliest texts to mention the divine chariot.\footnote{Halperin, \textit{Faces of the Chariot, 57.}} $^\phi$V Ezek 43:3 mentions only one chariot (as does 4QShirShabb$^f$ 20ii, 21–22:8),

\begin{verbatim}
5 The vision which Ezekiel saw
6 The brightness of the chariot. And the four living beings[

\end{verbatim}
while 4QShirShabb\(^f\) 20ii, 21–22:11 seems to know of many. In 4Q403 (4QShirShabb\(^d\)) 1ii:15, the chariots are envisioned praising God in the inner sanctum of the heavenly temple.\(^{441}\) The *Wirkungsgeschichte* of this concept in Judaism is extensive, as is evident in a much later Jewish text that describes each of the seven heavens as possessing its own chariot.\(^{442}\) The brightness in *V* Ezek 43:2-3 thus participates in a long exegetical tradition whose path is traceable from *V* Ezek 1:24 through the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice into the hekhaloth texts and later.\(^{443}\)

Finally, while the verb reconstructed in *V* Ezek 43:2, שָנָה, does not appear in 4Q405 20ii, 21-22:6-14, there is a discernible emphasis on the praise offered by the heavenly beings in both texts. The praise of God is expressed particularly through the stem בְּרֵד, which occurs several times in the above passage and 49 times in 4QShirShabb as a whole (though this includes overlapping instances).\(^{444}\) This element of praise, characteristic of the heavenly liturgy, became increasingly associated with the merkabah tradition.\(^{445}\) *V* Ezek 1:24 and 43:2 likewise call attention to the praise of God by his

\(^{441}\) See also 11Q17 (11QShirShab\(^b\)) 7:5; 10:7, which have similar conceptions of the plural מְרָכָבָה in the adytum of the heavenly temple.


\(^{443}\) Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 209 helpfully speaks of a “long exegetical tradition of **merkābhā** interpretation.”

\(^{444}\) 4QShirShabb\(^a\) 3ii+5:5; 4QShirShabb\(^b\) 13:3; 38:1; 4QShirShabb\(^d\) 1i -1-29:16 [bis], 17 [bis], 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27 [tris], 28 [bis], 29 [bis], 3ii:15; 4QShirShabb\(^c\) 2:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11; 4QShirShabb\(^f\) 3a ii, b:2, 5 [bis], 6, 7, 17; 13 a, b:3 [bis], 5, 6; 15ii, 16:5; 19 a-d:7; 20ii, 21-22:7, 8, 23i:9; 23ii:12; 29:1.

\(^{445}\) This is especially emphasized by Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot.*
celestial retinue, suggesting that it understood such texts in the context of the angelic liturgy. Yet if this is the object of the expression in ḫ Ezek 43:2 (ὡς φωνῇ διπλασιαζόντων πολλῶν), its manner of expression is peculiar. Halperin suggests that the source for the odd term “doublers” in ḫ Ezek 43:2 is Ps 68:18, which reads in Ṣ and ḫ as follows.447

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ps 67:18</th>
<th>Ps 68:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον,</td>
<td>Ῥχβ ἄλλων ῥβάτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χιλιάδες εὐθηνοῦντων.</td>
<td>ἀλτίς χνίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ κύριος ἐν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>ἄδων βομ ξύν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν Σινα ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ.</td>
<td>στίς βασιλὲς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

God’s chariots are ten thousand fold thousands of thriving ones.449 The Lord is among them in Sinai, in the holy place.

God’s chariots are twice ten thousand thousands upon thousands. The Lord is among those who are from Sinai in the holy place.450

The association between ḫ Ps 67 [mäßig] 68:18 and Ezek 43:2-3 does not work if the Septuagint translator is borrowing from the Greek translation of Psalms, since the terms are different (εὐθηνέω in Ps 67 [mäßig] 68:18 and διπλασιαζόω in Ezek 43:2). Therefore, the association must either be made by the translator of Ezekiel while he is reflecting on the

---

446 Ezek 1:24: τόκλ μεβρίτι שְׁמִי בְּמַמֵּחַ/register κָּל מָלַולים כִּי מִרְצָיו. See Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, for a consideration of the rabbinic attitudes toward such traditions.


448 Frequently this text is emended to read אדונ ב[ך] מָסִי, as in Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary* (trans. H. C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 46. See also the translations of NIV, NRSV, NAB and NJV, which follow this emendation. The versions provide no support for such a reading.

449 ḫ thus presumably read the word as שְׁנֵי (at ease). The translation of εὐθηνοῦντων is based on GELS, “εὐθηνέω,” 249.

Hebrew text of the psalm, or it must have been made already in $\sigma^V$. Following the usual methodology in this chapter, this change can be reasonably attributed to $\sigma^V$, since in keeping with his Übersetzungsweise the translator is unlikely to have added it on his own.

As a result, I propose that $\sigma^V$ of Ezek 43:2b$\beta$ read כִּכְלַוֶּנֶּס רֶבֶם, and that the participle reflects the Hebrew text of $\sigma^V$ Ps 68 [68]:18. $^{451}$ There, the unique term שְׁאה is generally derived from the root שנָה, "repeat." $^{452}$ In $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2b$\beta$, it is likely that διπλασιάζοντον also reflects the root שנָה, although there is no direct evidence for this. $^{453}$ Διπλασιάζω, a verb which, like שנָה, means "to double" in the Septuagint, $^{454}$ depicts the angels as "doubling" or "repeating" the praises of God. $^{455}$ Moreover, the mention of the chariot provides a further connection between Ps 68 [68]:18 and $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2. Thus it appears likely that the translator of this phrase is merely rendering his Vorlage accurately, and that a suppler of the Vorlage is drawing an element derived from the Hebrew text of $\sigma^V$ Ps 67 [68]:18 into $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2. In light of the rest of the

$^{451}$ See n. 416 above.

$^{452}$ Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 2, 160 n. h; BDB, "שְׁנָה," 1041. For a comprehensive treatment, see HALOT, "שְׁנָה," 2:1596-97.

$^{453}$ See n. 416 above.

$^{454}$ Ezek 21:14; see also the uses of the related adjective διπλάσιος in Sir 12:5; 26:1.

$^{455}$ See Rashi’s interpretation of Ps 68:18: “[The purpose of v. 18 is] to make mention of the endearment [in which God holds] His people, [which endearment is exemplified by the fact that] even when GOD’S CHARIOT was revealed there were TWO MYRIADS of thousands of persons at ease [ša ʾãnנîm] [i.e., šênûnîm ‘whetted beings’ [which means] sharp angels.” Rashi thus understands שְׁנָה as שְׁנָה, just as the $\sigma$ translator does. The translation is from Mayer I. Gruber, Rashi’s Commentary on Psalms (Brill Reference Library of Judaism 18; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 449.
pluses in \( \text{V} \) Ezek 43:2-3, it is likely that this element of \( \text{V} \) Ps 67 [\( \text{m} \) 68] had already become part of a larger mystical tradition. Relating this agreement in terminology to the level of the Vorlage and not to the translator solves the problem encountered by both Halperin and Lust, who both struggle to explain why the translator would act as he did if he read the text in \( \text{m} \) Ezek 43:2-3 and tried to expand it based on the plus in \( \text{m} \) Ezek 1:24.\(^{456}\) I propose instead that both \( \text{m} \) Ezek 1:24 and \( \text{V} \) Ezek 43:2-3 reflect a mystical tradition based in large part on Ezekiel but incorporating other mystical texts such as Ps 67 [\( \text{m} \) 68]. This would explain why \( \text{m} \) Ezek 1:24 and \( \text{V} \) Ezek 43:2-3 have one element in common (the מַהֲרָה) as well as why they differ, since \( \text{V} \) Ezek 43:2-3 may reflect a later and more developed form of the tradition. In any event, \( \text{V} \) Ezek 43:2-3 is noteworthy for its very early linkage of the Sinai and merkabah traditions.

The above reflections allow us to observe the influence of mystical traditions, which are themselves shaped by exegetical and visionary reflection on Ezekiel’s visions, on the text of Ezekiel itself. While \( \text{m} \) Ezek 1:24 inserts its mystical reflection into the prophet’s definitive inaugural vision, \( \text{V} \) Ezek 43:2-3 opts instead for the vision of the restoration, which these verses take great pains to relate to Ezekiel 1. The vision of God is thus part of the idealized restoration in \( \text{V} \), perhaps reflecting its concern for its

\(^{456}\) Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, 55-59 argued that the translation of Ezekiel 40-48 was much later than that of the rest of the book and so could not incorporate the plus in \( \text{m} \) Ezek 1:24. As a result, he argues, this plus was incorporated into \( \text{V} \) 43:2 instead. The idea that certain portions of Ezekiel were translated earlier than the rest depends on the work of Baudissin, which has been rendered obsolete by the discovery of \( \text{m} \)\(^{967}\) (Lust, “Exegesis of LXX Ezekiel,” 215). Lust’s theory, that the translator read מַהֲרָה in place of \( \text{m} \)’s reading מַרְבֶּה, minimizes the disparity between \( \text{V} \) and \( \text{m} \) of these verses. It is, however, less likely in my estimation that מַרְבֶּה רָבָה C would be rendered with a verb more precisely concerning “doubling,” and so I prefer מַהֲרָה.
continued or future accessibility. In both texts there is an impulse toward exegetical supplementation; that is, that details assumed to have been common to all of Ezekiel’s visions are filled in where appropriate from comparable contexts. Both supplements, however, are different enough that one cannot be derived from the other. It is less problematic to view ㎪ Ezek 1:24 and ṢV Ezek 43:2-3 as participating in a common exegetical and mystical tradition, as witnessed by 4QShirShabb ㎪ 20ii, 21–22:6-14 and other texts recovered from the Judean desert.⁴⁵⁷ Each of the additional terms in ṢV Ezek 43:2-3 is added not because it clarifies some exegetical difficulty but because it represents a significant element of the larger esoteric tradition.⁴⁵⁸ ṢV Ezek 43:2-3 thus constitutes what Teeter calls a “pastiche” of esoterically-oriented exegetical expansions.⁴⁵⁹

4QShirShabb helps us to ask how ṢV Ezek 43:2-3 and ㎪ Ezek 1:24 relate to portrayals of the angelic liturgy during this period. ㎪ Ezek 1:24 does not mention any laudatory activity by the beings, instead seeking to explain the sound of their wings. Precisely in the thematic parallels between 4QShirShabb ㎪ 20ii, 21–22:6-14 and ṢV Ezek 43:2-3 (repeating God’s praises) is the shared concern for divine worship of the Creator

---

⁴⁵⁷ E.g. 4Q385 (4QpsEzek) 6:5-6; 4Q286 (4QBer) 1a, ii, b:2. A fascinating exegetical tradition also relates the raising of the dead bones Ezek 37 with Israel’s praising their Creator: 4Q385 (4QpsEzek) 3:2-3 and 4Q386 (4QpsEzek) 2a:9-10, though this is less explicitly hymnic. For the significance of Ezekiel at Qumran in general, see Devorah Dimant, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran,” in Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity (ed. Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu Strousma; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 31-51.

⁴⁵⁸ For example, Lust’s explanation for the addition of ὧς φάγγος as an attempt to harmonize the description of the glory as the external form of the divine appearance in v. 3a with the light emanating from it in v. 3b is unnecessary (“Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 215). While these additions are not made for the sake of clarifying exegetical difficulties, they are nonetheless derived from exegesis.

manifested. It is thus likely that the unique readings in $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2-3 derive from a stream of exegetical and mystical traditions associated with the merkabah and angelic liturgy, and not directly from m Ezek 1:24. The lone commonality between m Ezek 1:24 and $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2-3, the angelic camp, is readily explained by such common tradition. The more significant differences are understandable if m Ezek 1:24 stands near the head of such a stream of exegetical reflection, while $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2-3 is much closer to the time of the composition of 4QShirShabb f 20ii, 21–22:6-14, resulting in tighter correspondences. Such a proposal would explain the more explicitly liturgical and hymnic nature of $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2-3 and 4QShirShabb f 20ii, 21–22:6-14 compared with the more narrowly exegetical interest of m Ezek 1:24 in the sound of the beings’ wings.

3.3 Conclusion

The previous, and rather protracted, inquiry has established that the Vorlage of Ezekiel 40-48 contains a considerable number of secondary, harmonizing additions, especially in transitional sections of the vision (40:1-4; 42:15-20; 43:1-12; 47:1-12). In many cases, these harmonizations are merely attempts to make the sense of the larger vision more explicit or to conform Ezekiel’s final vision to earlier ones. Most of the harmonizations take the form of simple transfer of wording from related texts within Ezekiel 40-48 or the larger book, although $\sigma^V$ Ezek 43:2-3 takes a more complicated form
of expansion via pastiche.\textsuperscript{460} This pastiche appears to have been added in $\mathfrak{V}$ from a living stream of exegetical tradition.

Harmonization in $\mathfrak{V}$ Ezek 40-48 is not exclusively concerned with making the book of Ezekiel agree with itself. Harmonizations with the Pentateuch are occasionally in evidence, as in $\mathfrak{V}$ Ezek 45:15 (concerning the tithe) and perhaps in $\mathfrak{V}$ Ezek 45:22a (the Passover purification offering) that suggest that the editors may have envisioned the נוש in Ezekiel’s law-code as performing priestly tasks. These harmonizations are not as extensive as one might suppose, in view of the fact that the vast majority of Ezekiel’s laws that directly contradict the Pentateuch were left unchanged.

Perhaps more interesting than the harmonizations are the less frequent instances of modernization. For example, the clarification of how the sacrificial effluence was disposed of recalls two second-century B.C.E. texts (the Letter of Aristeas and the Temple Scroll), concerned in part with the same subject. Here, however, the inclusion of new information seems to have been motivated more by the perception of an exegetical difficulty in the text than simply by an impulse toward modernization.

The same, purely exegetical, motivation does not seem to be operative in $\mathfrak{V}$ Ezek 43:2-3, which supplements the vision of the return of the Deity based on a stream of esoteric tradition. I have argued that $\mathfrak{V}$ Ezek 43:2-3 provides evidence of an ongoing esoteric tradition concerning the merkabah, and that this passage provides a link in the chain of this tradition from the plus in מ Ezek 1:24 to the fuller descriptions in the Songs.

\textsuperscript{460} Again, this terminology is indebted to Teeter, “Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law.”
of the Sabbath Sacrifice. If this argument is accepted, it points to a date of the third to second century B.C.E. for the time that \( \phi^V \) Ezek 40-48 entered something like the form from which it was translated. It also suggests that this redactional activity (at least that concerned with the chariot) took place in Palestine, given that I am not aware of any evidence that such mystical traditions were being cultivated elsewhere. This corresponds well to evidence presented in chapter 1 that Ezekiel as a whole was still undergoing significant redaction during the second century B.C.E. Now this statement may be qualified by emphasizing the exegetical basis for much of this redactional activity. The rise of apocalyptic eschatology no doubt catalyzed the re-emergence of Ezekiel’s visions during this period, impelling scribes to pore over his cryptic book. To a great extent, these exegetical considerations (i.e. harmonizations and modernizations) in \( \phi^V \) seem to have focused disproportionately on Ezekiel’s vision of the renewed temple, given that \( \phi^V \) Ezek 1-39 is generally shorter and earlier than \( \pi \). If these scribes sought clarity in their consideration of Ezekiel 40-48, however, they have diminished none of the numinous power of the prophet’s words; rather, they show themselves to be deeply under their sway.

Four conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the harmonizing and modernizing pluses in \( \phi^V \) Ezek 40-48.

1) Such pluses cluster in the transitional sections of the vision (40:1-4; 42:15-20; 43:1-12; 47:1-12), but are encountered elsewhere.

2) The purpose of the vast majority of the supplements is exegetical in nature, and these pluses draw primarily on the book of Ezekiel to resolve difficulties. Even where texts outside Ezekiel are adduced, these are used not to resolve conflicts
between Ezekiel and other texts, but to explain the text on its own terms (with the exception of Ezek 45:20). This concern with explaining Ezekiel on its own terms provides an interesting contrast with Stromberg’s identification of a canonical orientation for several pluses in Ezekiel.

3) Secondary pluses are sensitive to the modes of expression common in the book of Ezekiel, and so the use of “authentic” or “typical” phrases or motifs from Ezekiel should only be used with great caution as a criterion of authenticity.

4) Ezek 44:24 increases the power of the Zadokites by assigning them the exclusive right to serve as judges in capital cases. In addition, numerous hints imply that the editor(s) of these chapters envisioned Ezekiel’s אַשְׁרֶה acting in a priestly role by offering sacrifices. Such observations raise the possibility that the Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40-48 may reflect the experience of mid-Second Temple Judea to a greater extent than the Masoretic version of these chapters, even if sporadically, suggesting it was a significant source of authority and legitimation in important quarters.

---

461 For the growth of מ Ezek compared to ב based on harmonization to texts within and outside Ezekiel, see Stromberg, “Inner-Scriptural Scribal Expansion.”
CHAPTER FOUR:
NEAR AND FAR CONTEXTS IN THE RENDERING OF 6 EZEKIEL 40-48

As has been suggested implicitly throughout this study, the supplementer(s) of the source text from which the translator of 6 Ezekiel 40-48 was working cannot be assumed to have had the same goals as the translator of these chapters. Earlier, the translator’s primary goal was identified as the accurate and comprehensible representation of his source text in his translation. Inevitably in any translation, and frequently in 6 Ezek 40-48, problematic issues constrained the translator to exercise his best judgment as to the meaning of his Vorlage. When faced with such issues, the translator sometimes made use of the larger context of the book of Ezekiel itself to clarify problematic lexical issues, among the other avenues available to him. Yet he did not approach the rendering of his text completely de novo, but could refer to previous examples of the translation of sacred Hebrew texts, principally the Greek Pentateuch. The goal of the present chapter is to examine two major categories of contextual influence on the translator’s rendering of technical terms. The first category includes instances in which the translator allows a larger theme (specifically, cultic purity) to influence his rendering of technical terms, while the second explores his appropriation of pentateuchal sacrificial terminology and
the degree to which he adapts this terminology in ways appropriate for its context in Ezekiel.

4.1 The Translator and Cultic Purity

As already intimated, the large number of difficulties that Ezek 40-48 presented the translator should not be underestimated. On the other hand, Ezek 40-48 exhibits a clear concern with establishing and maintaining clear cultic boundaries, with the result that this constitutes an important (perhaps the most important) theme of Ezekiel’s final vision. One unique characteristic of the translator of these chapters is that he used the theme of cultic purity to guide his lexical selection, especially with respect to three terms (διάστημα, διορίζον, and ἀπολοίπον). In some cases, his use of these terms corresponded to technical architectural terms that he may not have understood (e.g. διάστημα rendering בְּבֵית in Ezek 41:6b). In other cases, the translator employed these terms even though his Hebrew source text was presumably comprehensible (e.g. διάστημα rendering מִסְדָּה בְּבֵית in Ezek 41:8). The employment of these three terms in both situations suggests that the translator intentionally selected lexemes that emphasized the significance of this theme.

4.1.1 The Interval (Διάστημα)

One of the most characteristic terms of the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 is διάστημα, which indicates an interval. Διάστημα is commonly used to render at least
seven hyponyms, and so constitutes one of the translator’s favorite go-to terms.\textsuperscript{462} The extensive use of this term has led to scorn for the translator’s competence,\textsuperscript{463} but it corresponds to a clear pattern of employment of this technique for difficult or poorly understood terms.\textsuperscript{464} For the present purposes, the more pressing question becomes why the translator chose to employ διάστημα when he could easily have resorted to transliteration or some other means to derive some meaning from the text. In perusing the contexts in which he employed this term, it becomes clear that for the most part, the translator employs διάστημα in contexts that have to do with maintaining cultic purity. The most obvious place to demonstrate this concern is the first passage in which it occurs, Ezek 41:6-8, where διάστημα is used three times. Ezek 41:6b affords a convenient place to begin.

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ezekiel 41:6b}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{καὶ διάστημα ἐν τῷ τοίχῳ τοῦ οἴκου}
\item \textit{ἐν τοῖς πλευροῖς κύκλῳ}
\item \textit{τοῦ εἰσιν τοῖς ἐπιλαμβανομένοις δρᾶν,}
\item \textit{ὅπως τὸ παράπαν μὴ ἀπτωνται τῶν τοίχων τοῦ οἴκου}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

And there was an \textbf{interval} in the wall of the sanctum (house) in the sides all around

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ezekiel 41:6b}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{ובאות בית שישל}
\item \textit{לעלית סבים סכיב}
\item \textit{לחנות אחותים}
\item \textit{לא יהי אחותים בקריה בית}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

And there were \textbf{ledges} in the wall of the sanctum

\end{multicols}

\textsuperscript{462} Ezekiel 41:6; 41:8a; 41:8b; 42:5a; 42:12; 42:13; (45:2; 48:15, 17). It is uncertain to what the term refers in 42:5b.


\textsuperscript{464} See the similar approach to lexical translation represented by terms such as those in Appendix C.
so that they should be for those who grasped them to see lest they should in any way touch the wall of the sanctuary (house).

for the side-rooms all around to serve as supports, lest there should be supports in the wall of the sanctuary.465

Commentators have long noticed the similarity of this passage to the description of Solomon’s temple in 1 Kgs 6:6, which mentions “offsets” (NRSV; Heb. מַמְרָעִית) in the walls of the temple supporting the floors, so that no incisions into the temple walls were necessary.466 Many scholars explain the puzzling בָּאָשָׁה in Ezek 41:6 by analogy to these offsets in 1 Kgs 6:6.467 As in Ṣ Ezek 41:6b, the translator of 1 Kgs 6:6 rendered these structures with διαστήμα. This may suggest that the translator also rendered 1 Kgs, or that he was familiar with it and consulted it here for assistance, assuming that it was already translated.468 If so, it would make sense that he would appeal to the term in doubtful situations.

465 My translation of מַמְרָעִית is based on Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 548.

466 Cornill, Ezechiel, 456 mentioned in 1886 that the relationship of בָּאָשָׁה in Ezek 41:6 to בָּאָשָׁה in 1 Kgs 6:6 “ist längst erkannt.”

467 Cooke, Ezekiel, 447; Herrmann, Ezechiel, 269; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 231; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 164; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 370; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 223, 232; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 549. Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 55 n. 136 suggests that Ezek 41:6 may have been patterned after Solomon’s temple and not necessarily the temple description in 1 Kgs.

468 Evidence that the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 knew 3 Kgdms is equivocal. Any terms the two accounts have in common may be put down to the common subject matter or similar trends in translation. See Appendix C.
Once the translator introduces the term διάστημα, he preserves it throughout the rest of the immediate context, flattening other terms in the interest of preserving the interval.\textsuperscript{469} So two further uses of διάστημα come quickly in Ezek 41:8.

\textsuperscript{469} That the translator preserves the transliteration θραξιλ mandates that this flattening effect is not absolute. One could also understand the translation of άδει το διαστήματος as ἑκ διαστήματος in 3 Kgdms 7:46 (=7:9 \textit{m}) as a small example of the same technique, that of using an already introduced term to explain an unknown one. For further instances of this “flattening” phenomenon, see §5.1.4 (περίπατος) and §5.1.5 (αἴθριον) below.

And the thrael of the house was high all around. The interval of the sides was equal to the reed—an interval of six cubits.

\textsuperscript{470} For discussion of the debated significance of the θραξιλ, see §2.4.2.9 above.

\textsuperscript{471} The normal rendering of στώρις καταβά in \textit{m} Ezekiel 40-48 is with a single term: κύκλων: 40:5, 14, 16, 17, 29, 33, 36, 43; 41:6, 7, 8, 10, 16 (in the second instance), 17; 42:20 or κυκλόθεν (40:16, 25; 41:5 [=\textit{m}] στώρις κάτω κάτω καταβά, 11, 12, 19; 42:15). Three instances exist in which a single καταβά is rendered with κύκλων: 41:16 (the first instance in the verse); 43:20; 46:23 [\textit{m}]. In two instances, κυκλόθεν does not correspond to any hyponym in \textit{m} (43:2, 12), and it corresponds to only one καταβά in 43:13, 17 bis; 45:1, 2 [\textit{m}].

\textsuperscript{472} The \textit{g} translator assimilates his Vorlage, which was probably identical to \textit{m} at this point, to the more usual phrase τάπητι ἄρη, which it translates the same way (ισόν τῷ καλάμῳ) in 40:5, 6, 7 [\textit{g}], 8 [\textit{m}]. The phrase in \textit{g} Ezek 40-48 provides a fine example of the way in which a generally literal translator can employ a more dynamic rendering (see §2.3.2 above).

\textsuperscript{473} Translation of \textit{m} Ezek 41:8 is based on Block, \textit{Ezekiel 25-48}, 545.
Like the walls of the οἶκος described in 41:5-6, the θυραὶ in 41:8 is portrayed as possessing an interval (διάστημα) of six cubits between the sides of the middle and upper stories of the temple building. It is doubtful whether the translator had a clear mental picture of all of the details he was rendering, but one fact is clear. θ Ezek 41:6-8 illustrates the translator’s conviction, based perhaps on the Hebrew text of 1 Kgs 6:6, that the interval was part and parcel of the layout of holy structures. He illustrates this conviction with his employment of the term throughout the rest of his translation of Ezekiel 40-48. For example, there is an interval (διάστημα) of fifty cubits around the sanctuary as a whole (45:2), and there is a space in front of the northern and southern rooms assigned to the priests opposite the οἶκος (42:13). The upper peristyles and stoas of the ἔξοδοι nearest the open space behind the partition (Y) also possess intervals between them (42:5).474 In addition to the use of διάστημα in cultic contexts, intervals were also a part of structures not exclusively intended for Zadokites, such as the city (45:2; 48:15, 17).475

474 The use of the letters in parentheses refers to the architectural elements of the Temple designated in Appendix A.

475 In Ezek 45:2; 48:15, 17, מָרַשׁ represents open space: either around the sanctuary (45:2; 50 cubits) or around the city for dwelling and pasturage (48:15, 17; 5000 by 25,000 cubits). This is not surprising for literature influenced by priestly concerns, for which מָרַשׁ can indicate a sacred space, as for example in the Levitical cities: Num 35:2, 3, 4; Josh 14:4; 21:2, 3, 8; 1 Chr 6:40; 13:2 (DCH, “מָרַשׁ,” 5:138). מָרַשׁ can often simply mean “pasture land,” reflecting the common use of such open land (1 Chr 5:16; 13:2; Lev 25:34). Yet it is significant that nowhere else in θ does διάστημα serve as a translation of מָרַשׁ. This translation could be partially explained by the root מָרַשׁ, which has to do with the idea of separation or expulsion. The root מָרַשׁ occurs five times in the legal contexts: Ezek 44:22; Lev 21:7, 14; 22:13; Num 30:10 [9 Eng.], in all of which it is translated by ἐκβάλλω, to describe a divorced woman. The idea of banishment or driving out is apparent in Gen 3:24; 21:10; 4:14; Jdg 9:41; Ps 34:1; 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 26:19; 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms) 2:27. In Ezek 31:11, where מָרַשׁ has a form of מָרַשׁ, θ renders καὶ ἐποίησε τὴν
4.1.2 The Partition (τὸ διορίζων)

A second example of the translator’s introduction of the notion of holiness inherent in Ezekiel’s temple description into the temple architecture itself is his curious rendering of the term בֵּית as “the partition” (τὸ διορίζων). This unusual translation seems to be due to the translator’s derivation of בֵּית from a root related to the preposition ב, hence implying separation and division.\(^{476}\) As a neologism of the exilic period and later, בֵּית may have been unfamiliar to the translator.\(^{477}\) If the term was unfamiliar, its architectural significance was equally so. In ה, the בֵּית is a mysterious structure, whose placement in the far west is described with great detail, but whose purpose is not elaborated. The external measurements of the building, 100 by 80 cubits, are greater than those of the temple structure itself. Perhaps this great use of space represents a reaction against the encroachments of the pre-exilic monarchy.\(^{478}\)

\(^{476}\) Proposed by Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 373 n. 12a. See Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 454, who suggests that in 41:12, ה’s reading בֵּית should be emended to בֵּית based on ו and the appearance of the form in the next verse.

\(^{477}\) בֵּית appears only in Ezekiel 40-48 in ה: 40:5; 41:12, 15; 42:1, 5, 10. For discussions of בֵּית as a neologism, see Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem* (CahRB 20; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982), 132-35; and Max Wagner, *Die Lexikalischen und Grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* (BZAW 96; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966), 36 §44.

\(^{478}\) Suggested by Block, *Ezekiel 25-48*, 553.
With the exception of one instance, all occurrences of לְבָן in מ correspond to “the partition” (τὸ διορίζον) in Ἐ, the vast majority of uses of διορίζω in Ἐ Ezek 40-48. Like the parallel uses of διορίζω in Ἐ Exod 26:33 and Lev 20:24, the cultic significance of this partition is patent, since it is located in the holiest region of the temple. Its exact layout does not seem to correspond to the לְבָן mentioned in מ, although it is difficult to determine how far the translator was able to penetrate the obscure details of the text. In any case, the following scenario seems to have resulted. According to Ἐ Ezek 41:4, the adytum measured forty cubits in length, as opposed to the twenty cubits of מ, and so the temple is twenty cubits longer in Ἐ than it is in מ (§3.1.1.5 above). This increase of twenty cubits would have cut into the twenty cubits of space that surrounded the temple on each side (Ezek 41:10), so that the partition would have butted up against the wall of the temple itself. Considering the polemic against the royal proximity to the sanctuary in 43:7-8 and the need for intervals in the wall of the sanctuary itself (41:6-8), it is most unlikely that any structure would be allowed to come in contact with the holiest building of Ezekiel’s vision (cf. 1 Kgs 6:6). If the partition is allowed to function as a simple wall, as is implied in Ἐ Ezek 41:12 (τὸ τοίχον τὸ διορίζοντος), this twenty

---

479 Ezek 40:5, in which the term לְבָן is used loosely to describe the outer wall, is translated with προτεῖχισμα. See §5.1.2 below.

480 Ezek 41:12, 13, 15; 42:1, 10; 47:18.

481 Besides the descriptions of such a dividing wall, the only other appearance of διορίζω is found in 47:18, where it translates a C participle of מְזָרֵא mistakenly pointed in מ as a noun. מ reads מְזָרֵא מְזָרֵא in 47:18, 20, but Ἐ read the term as a C participle (מְזָרֵא). In 47:20, Ἐ translates the term using the simple verb ὁρίζω, varying it from the compound form used two verses earlier.
cubit’s worth of space can be preserved in the fashion presented in the temple diagram. Moreover, the width of the partition, established as five cubits in 41:12, fits exactly into the measurements required. That this reconstruction is uncertain need not be belabored.

It is unclear what the partition was intended to screen off. As reconstructed in the diagrams (Appendix A), the intent of this partition is to shield the adytum from view. Whether the obscure details have been reconstructed correctly in the diagrams or not, the translator’s intention to incorporate Ezekiel’s stress on holiness into his architectural descriptions is illustrated through his introduction of this feature. What could fit Ezekiel’s strenuous emphasis on separation better than a partition?

4.1.3 Intervening space (τὸ ἀπολόιπον)

A third noteworthy feature of the translator’s rendering of Ezekiel’s second temple description is his conflation of two distinct elements in the: the “free space” (מָנוֹחַ) and the “court” (מַרְחֶק) portrays these two features as serving different

---

482 The wall (5 cubits) plus the intervening space (20 cubits) flanks the temple itself, whose width is 50 cubits. All together, the temple, intervening space and wall add up to 100 cubits, which equals the 100 cubits ascribed to the inner court (40:47).

483 ἀπολοίπος corresponds to this hyponym in Ezek 41:9, 11 [bis]. For the meaning of this term, see DCH, “Ἐπολοίπος” 5:640 2a-b and HALOT, “embros” 1:601; Karl Elliger, “Der Grossen Tempelsakristeien im Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (42, 1ff),” in Geschichte und Altes Testament (BHT 16; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1953), 82; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 231.

484 מַרְחֶק corresponds to מָנוֹחַ in Ezek 41:12, 13, 14, 15a; 42:1, 10. For its significance, see DCH, “מרחך” 2:341-42 and HALOT, “מרחך” 1:187 as well as Elliger, “Tempelsakristeien,” 82 and Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 231.
purposes, both of which emphasize the holiness of the temple itself. The court is located to the west of the temple building and serves to separate it from the building at the extreme west of the layout. The free space serves to separate the temple from the barrier running parallel to the outer court. Both structures, though distinct, are alike in their function of separating the temple from potential defilement. In, these two separate features are collapsed into one term (ἀπολοίπος), which like its analogues in serves to emphasize the protective area around the temple. Probably this conflation was motivated by the fact that both the court and the free space measure 20 cubits.

In sum, the translator’s decision to use lexemes referring to separation and distance, including ἀπολοίπος, τὸ διορίζειν, and διάστημα, indicates his conviction of the importance of cultic purity.

4.2 Sacrificial Terminology in Ezekiel 40-48

In what follows, it will be demonstrated that the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 took his cue from the cultic vocabulary of the Pentateuch, but did not reproduce its terminology slavishly. Where misunderstanding was possible, the translator freely diverged from the wording of the Greek Torah. First it will be necessary to examine

---

485 This distinction is shown by the diagrams in the commentaries. The most reliable and comprehensive diagram of Ezekiel’s temple in in my judgment is that provided by Hans Ferdinand Fuhs, Ezechiel II 25-48 (NEchtB; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1988), 267-68. It is reproduced in Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 631. Compare this to the opposite approach of Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 366, who provides quite a bare-bones sketch.

486 This term probably represents a neologism coined by the translator. As far as I am aware, it appears in Greek literature only in Ezek 40-48 and in Theodoret’s commentary on Ezekiel (PG 89:140a).
major terms for sacrificial offerings (המשלת, עלה, מנחה, and שולחן) and then proceed to select minor terms that clearly illustrate Ezekiel’s dependence on the Greek Pentateuch, as well as the transformation of many of its usages in ways appropriate for Ezekiel’s law code. Finally, instances (e.g. אש) where the dependence is less clear will be adduced.

As a sacrificial term, the Hebrew מנחה is used in two situations: as an adjunctive offering to other sacrifices of animals and as a discrete offering. In the latter case, it often functioned as a substitute for the more costly animal offerings for the less well-to-do. This fact may have been one motivation behind the general decision of the pentateuchal translators to render מנחה with θυσία, despite their choice of the same rendering for נפח. In the few instances where they could be confused (Lev 5:13; Num 18:9; Lev 23:37), the translators opted for different equivalents.

As in the Pentateuch, the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 commonly uses θυσία to render מנחה. Somewhat disconcertingly, in the midst of a passage, he switches to the transliteration μαναα (45:24-25), which he employs throughout the rest of the instances

488 Lev. Rab. 8:4; m. Menah. 13:11; b. Menah. 110a, 104b; Philo, Spec. Leg. 1.271.
489 Gen 31:54; 46:1; Exod 12:27; 18:12; 24:5; 34:15; Lev 3:1, 3, 6, 9; 4:10, 26, 31, 35; 7:1 [m 11], 2 [m 12], 3 [m 13], 5 [m 15], 6 [m 16], 7 [m 17], 10 [m 20], 19 [m 29; bis], 22 [m 32], 24 [m 34], 27 [m 37]; 8:18; 10:14; 17:5 [bis], 7, 8; 19:5; 22:21, 29; 23:19, 37; Num 6:17, 18; 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 88; 10:10; 15:3, 5, 8; 25:2; Deut 12:27; 18:3; 32:38; 33:19.
491 42:13; 44:29; 45:15, 17 [bis], 24; 46:5b.
in which מנן occurs, with one exception.\textsuperscript{492} Daniel’s explanation for this fact attributes too much ingenuity to the translator by supposing that he uses ٹوسیا only when he is referring to cereal offerings containing both flour and oil.\textsuperscript{493} This does not explain the translation of 45:24a as ٹوسیا, which she argues must be caused by the reference to the offering as a whole. Similarly, Daniel is required to emend the text of Vaticanus in 46:5 to make her theory work, as this verse contains ٹوسیا where the oil would presumably not be included. It seems simpler to see this as normal translational variation, which is characteristic of the translator of ٹ Ezekiel, as has been demonstrated. The use of ماناء in the translation of other Septuagint books could indicate that the transliteration was used to eliminate the confusion between the two referents of ٹوسیا (مٍ and ماناء).\textsuperscript{494} There seems to be little evidence to determine what occasioned the translator’s sudden switch in his rendering of منانه.

The translator’s rendering of the holocaust sacrifice likewise conforms to pentateuchal analogues. Occasionally, especially when it refers to the altar of burnt offering in the tabernacle or has some other comprehensive nuance, it can be translated with کَارَنَμا in Exodus (40:6, 10, 29), as is ہش.\textsuperscript{495} کَارَنَمَا reappears in Lev 1, but

\textsuperscript{492} 45:25; 46:5a, 7, 11, 14 [bis], 15, 20. The exception occurs at 46:5b, where he again employs ٹوسیا.

\textsuperscript{493} Daniel, \textit{Vocabulaire du Culte}, 215-16.

\textsuperscript{494} ماناء is used in 4 Kgdm 8:8, 9; 17:3, 4; 20:12; 2 Par. 7:7; Neh 13:5, 9; Dan Th 2:46.

\textsuperscript{495} Daniel, \textit{Vocabulaire du Culte}, 241-42.
without the comprehensive nuance, and is used more or less as the synonym for the more
common ὀλοκαύτωμα. The ὀλοκαύτωμα and ὀλοκαύτωσις are by far the preferred terms
for the burnt offering in Numbers and Deuteronomy. The rendering of ἔλλειψις as
sterolma in Ezekiel 40-48 is drawn from a common rendering in the Greek
Pentateuch and the rest of the Greek Bible. The probative quality of this
correspondence is increased because ὀλοκαύτωσις and ὀλοκαύτωμα represent
neologisms introduced for the first time in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch.

If the rendering of the Hebrew ἔλλειψις follows the pentateuchal lexicon exactly, the
rendering of the sterlama offering shows that though the translator was not bound by the
exact formulae of the Pentateuch, he still makes use of it. The exact meaning of sterlama
has been the subject of widespread debate, but the Greek rendering τὸ σωτηρίουν carries
more or less the idea of health or well-being. Daniel traces the use of τὸ σωτηρίουν as

---

496 ἐρῶμα is used at Lev 1:4, 9, 13, 14, 17; in the same chapter, ὀλοκαύτωμα is used in vv. 3, 6,
and 10.

497 ὀλοκαύτωμα translates ἔλλειψις at Num 6:11, 14, 16; 7:15, 21, 27, 33, 39, 45, 51, 57, 63, 69, 75,
81, 87; 8:12; 10:10; 15:3, 6, 8, 24; 23:6; 28:6, 10, 11, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30 [31]; 29:2, 6 [bis], 8, 13, 36, 39;

498 Ezek 40:40, 42; 43:18, 24, 27; 44:11, 15, 17, 23, 25; 46:2, 4, 12, 13, 15. For uses in the rest of
the Greek Bible, see Hatch and Redpath.

499 Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 249-54.

s’affaiblit lorsqu’il est substantive au neuter, ainsi qu’il l’est ici. Tο σωτηρίουν en effect signifie en grec, non
pas ‘ce qui donne le salut’, ‘ce qui est salutaire’, mais ‘le salut’ lui-même; autrement dit, c’est un veritable
synonyme du nom feminine ἡ σωτηρία” (Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 275).
the translation of שְלֵיתָם to pagan cultic practices beginning with Xenophon but current in the third century B.C.E.; such practices commemorate the saving act of a particular deity toward a certain locality.501 In Ezek, the unique rendering τὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου (Ezek 43:27; 45:17; 46:2, 12b) is more common than the simple σωτηρίου (Ezek 45:15; 46:12a). Though the rendering τὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου is unparalleled elsewhere in the Greek Bible, the combination of this unique reading and the simple σωτηρίου in the same context (Ezek 46:12) shows there cannot be any great difference in meaning.502 The substantivized neuter article can be explained as referring to the circumstances surrounding the offering, which preserves the idea of σωτηρίου as well-being. In fact, one passage suggests that σωτηρίου (in the genitive) has become something of a terminus technicus for the translator. In 6 Ezek 45:15, he renders לְשֵׁיתָם with καὶ εἰς σωτηρίου.503 The solecism of the genitive case following the preposition εἰς is explicable only if the translator viewed the genitive σωτηρίου as being a fixed expression.504 Further, if this is the case, he can only have derived this fixed expression from the Pentateuch, once again demonstrating his dependence on it.

The rendering of the purification offering (חְטאת) in the Greek Pentateuch often refers to the sin that necessitates the sacrifice using the preposition περί or the simple

501 Vocabulaire du Culte, 278-79.

502 Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 282 suggests the translator was willing to render שְלֵיתָם (without an article) with the simple σωτηρίου, but preferred his original construction for definite constructions.

503 For the full text, see §3.1.2.1 above.

504 Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 282-83.
genitive.\footnote{Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 301-02. Περί: Exod 32:20; Lev 4:3 bis, 14, 28; 4:35. Genitive: Lev 4:8, 20.} In other cases (e.g. Lev 5:6, 7, 8, 9), περί (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας occurs as a clear designation for the offering itself. Where the sacrificial animal itself was in view, this fact could be expressed by a neuter article before the prepositional phrase (τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας), whose antecedent can be construed as an implied δῶρον, ζώον, or ἱερεῖον.\footnote{Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 302.}

Like the Greek Pentateuch, the translator of Ezekiel sometimes renders the purification offering (ἁμαρτία) with the preposition περί, but more commonly uses ὑπέρ.\footnote{Ὑπέρ: 40:39; 43:22, 25; 44:29; 45:17, 22, 23, 25; 46:20; cf. 1 Esdras 7:8. Περί: 42:13; 43:19, 21.} As will become clear, the translator varies also in his use of περί and ὑπέρ for the reparation offering as well, so this variation is not especially significant. When the sacrificial animal is in view, the neuter article precedes the prepositional phrase.\footnote{Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; 45:17, 25; 46:20.} In two instances, however, the translator renders the purification offering with a term other than ἁμαρτία.

The first such instance occurs at Ezek 44:27, where the Hebrew הָנֵא הַכְּרִישׁ is expressed through ἵλάμος.

\begin{verbatim}
6 Εzek 44:27 καὶ ἦν ἡμέρα εἰσπορεύονται εἰς τὴν ἁυλὴν τῆν ἐσωτέραν
509 ἤν οἷον καλέσατο ἄνωθεν τὴν εἰρήνην
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{The prepositional phrase ἤν οἷον καλέσατο is generally deleted with ὅ: Cornill, Ezechiel, 488; Jahn, Ezechiel, 322; Bertholet, Hesekiel, 157; Fohrer with Gallings, Ezechiel, 249; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 451. It is retained as emphatic by Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 246 and Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 638 n. 127.}
And on whatever day they enter
the inner courtyard
to serve in the holy place,
they will bring an expiation, says the Lord.

The context of the prescription has to do with the corpse-impurity of the priests, also dealt with in Lev 21:1-4. However, Ezek 44:27 seems to be describing regulations for priests to purify themselves from corpse-impurity that exceed those mentioned in the Pentateuch. Num 19:11-12 knows of a seven-day period applicable to all Israelites. Ezek 44:27 seems to be prescribing an additional seven-day period of impurity that applies to priests. While in בָּשָׁם, Ezek 44:27 is most naturally read in light of the preceding concern with corpse-impurity (vv. 25-26), the translator modulates into the plural in v. 27, but not by analogy with v. 25. He interprets כְּרָב as a 3cp perfect form, not an infinitive construct, as the Masoretic tradition understood it. This grammatical decision presumably caused him to render כְּרָב at the end of the verse as a plural as well. In this way, the translator broke the connection of Ezek 44:27 with its preceding context. “Il pensait donc que ce second versait concernait une tout autre chose: l’offrande prescrite aux prêtres quand ils entraient en function.” Of what might this “function” consist? The translation of כְּרָב as ēlāsmōn recalls the use of this term in the Pentateuch as the hyponym of ēlāmōn.

---

510 Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 124; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 461.
511 Pace Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 461.
512 Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 319.
Based on this usage, it is possible that the translator was thinking of the biannual purification of the sanctuary to be depicted in ἕζειλασμός. Ezek 44:27 mentions the “inner court,” where the altar was located, which may have led the translator to make the connection with ἕζειλασμός. Ezek 45:18 describes the purpose of the purification offering as precisely this: ἔξωπα ἡμέρας ἤτοι ἔξωπα ἡμέρας. So if the translator renders the ἡμέρας in the following verse as an ἕξωπα, it seems he wants to draw attention to the word play between ἕξωπα in v. 18 and ἡμέρας in the next verse, which he accomplishes by using the same Greek root (ἔξωπα and ἕξωπα). Like the term ἱλάσμος, ἕξωπα is also used to describe the Day of Atonement in the Greek Pentateuch (Lev 23:27-28), corroborating the previous suggestion relating ἔζειλασμός to the biannual purification in Ezek 45.

Along with this major sacrificial terminology, there are a host of minor sacral terms that likewise show the translator’s dependence on the Greek Pentateuch. As is frequently the case in the rest of the Septuagint, ἕζειλασμός in Ezek 46:12 renders the Hebrew ניבָה.

---

513 Lev 25:9; Num 5:8. See also 2 Macc 3:33, where the term is used in the context of Heliodoros’ illegitimate entry into the temple. In Dan 9:9 and Psa 130:4, the term translates סליחה, “forgiveness.”

514 For the text, see §3.1.2.5 above.
with ὀμολογία. 515 Similarly, in Ἐζχ 44:31 θυσιαστήριον expresses ἱερασμός, as is always the case throughout the Greek Bible. 516 In the latter instances, θυσιαστήριον is paired with θηριάλωτος (= תִּרְפָּה), which is also uniformly translated throughout the Greek Bible. 517

The Greek Pentateuch also apparently introduces the term θυσιαστήριον for the first time, using it to represent authentic Jewish worship, in contrast to pagan altars, which it designates as βωμοί. 518 Ἐζχ 40-48 adopts the pentateuchal term θυσιαστήριον for the Jewish altar, but the wider book applies it equally to pagan altars. 519 Several transliterations common in the Pentateuch appear in Ἐζχ 40-48 as well, such as ἴν 520 and οἰωνί, but this is not sufficient proof of dependence. 521

The foregoing instances strongly suggest that Ἐζχ 40-48 participates in a translational tradition regarding sacrificial terminology, which was begun in the Greek Pentateuch. This employment of the Pentateuch as a sort of lexicon should not be

515 The same translation is made in Deut 12:6, 17; 1 Esdras 9:8; Amos 4:5. ὀμολογία renders ἱερασμός in Lev 22:18; Jer 51 [tr 45]:25.

516 Lev 5:2 [tris]; 7:14; 11:8, 11, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 [bis]; 17:15; 22:8; Deut 14:8, 21; 3 Kgdms 13:25 [bis]; 4 Kgdms 9:37; Ps 78 [tr 79]:2; Isa 5:25; Jer 16:18; 41 [tr 34]:20; 43 [tr 36]:30; Ἐζχ 4:14.


518 See Philo, Spec. Leg. 1:290, who apparently regards θυσιαστήριον as a specifically Jewish word that must be explained (Daniel, Vocabulaire du Culte, 26-32).

519 It is used in Ἐζχ 40-48 at 40:46, 47; 41:22; 43:13 [bis], 18, 20, 22, 26, 27; 45:19; 47:1. θυσιαστήριον designates pagan altars at Ἐζχ 6:4, 5, 13.

520 Ἐζχ 4:11; 45:24; 46:5, 7, 11, 14. ἴν is used in the Pentateuch at Exod 29:40 [bis]; 30:24; Lev 23:13; Num 15:4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10; 28:5, 7, 14 [tris].

521 Ἐζχ 45:13b; note the more common rendering of ἱερασμός as μέτρον in 45:13a. οἰωνί appears in the Greek Bible at Lev 5:11; 6:13; Num 5:15; 15:4; 28:5; Jdg A and B 6:19; Rut 2:17; 1 Κgdms 1:24; 25:18.
understood in a mechanical fashion, as if the individual translators of the rest of the Greek Bible were deprived of their own judgment in deciding on lexical equivalents. Though occasionally the translator even employs pentateuchal terminology without exception (e.g. ὀλοκαύτωμα), far more frequently he varies the sacrificial terminology to suit his own understanding. Most often, the translator can be said to begin from or allude to pentateuchal terminology while freely varying terms based on his understanding of individual passages. This characteristic of the translator corresponds to his general Übersetzungsweise as we defined it above, in which lexical variation is a fundamental characteristic of the translator’s approach.

One noteworthy exception to the translator’s tendency to use terminology from the Greek Pentateuch can be found in his rendering of the reparation offering (Pesah). While the pentateuchal translators frequently render the reparation offering as πλημμέλεια, this rendering is never found in Ezek 40-48. Rather, the translator renders the term with περὶ ἀγνοίας or ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας. Daniel explains this difference by supposing that the translator found the pentateuchal equivalent inadequate in this instance: “On est donc amené à conclure que ce recours à ἀγνοία est uniquement une question de vocabulaire, l’autour de la Version d’EZéchiel ne se contenant pas toujours des mots que lui fournissait la Version du Pentateuque.” According to Daniel, the term

---

522 Πλημμέλεια occurs in the Pentateuch at Lev 5:15, 16, 18, 19; 6:5 [ר 5:25], 17 [ר 6:10], 31 [ר 7:1], 32 [ר 7:2], 35 [ר 7:5], 37 [ר 7:7]; 7:27 [ר 7:37]; 14:12, 13, 14, 17, 24, 25 [ב], 28; 19:21 [ב], 22; 22:16; Num 5:7; 6:12; 18:9.


πλημμέλεια had come to refer to criminal or sacrilegious conduct, not just inadvertent action, in the translation of the other books of the Septuagint. As this did not fit with the idea described by פש, the translator settled on the use of περί / ὑπέρ ἁγνοίας.

As it turns out, this translation may be motivated by the Greek Pentateuch as well. In Gen 26:10, Abimelech complains to Abraham that by passing off Sarah as his sister, he could have caused one of the people to sleep with his wife and thereby he would bring an inadvertent sin upon them (הคมאת עלונ אשם). Daniel argues that the sense of ἁγνοία in this context is not one of ignorance but of a wrong committed against a neighbor, adducing as her evidence the Greek translation of Sirach 28:7, more or less contemporaneous with that of Ἑzekiel, which counsels the wise person to “overlook faults” (πάριδε ἁγνοίαν). It may also be that two instances in Leviticus (5:18 and 22:14) where שננה is rendered with ἁγνοία (hence more with the idea of inadvertent sin) may have influenced the translator. Whatever his motivation, even if the translator of Ἑ Ezek 40-48 did not follow the regular Septuagintal rendering of the Greek Pentateuch, he still seems to have found inspiration in its pages for an alternative rendering.

In addition to this major divergence, there are numerous minor examples of divergence from standard priestly terminology. For example, the translator uses πέμμα (“cakes”) to render several instances of רתים, whereas the Pentateuch uses the


transliteration οὐφι. The translator also uses οὐφι at Ezek 45:13b, demonstrating he is aware of it. More commonly, he uses μέτρον and πέμμα. Where the translator understands רעפ to indicate a specific measure of dry ingredients he renders the term with μέτρον, and where he understands it to be presented in baked form he uses the term πέμμα, which is otherwise not connected with the Jewish cult in the Greek Bible.

A few other variations can be explained as simple variation of vocabulary without deep significance. Thus πρωτογένημα renders בקורים in P, but in Ezek 44:30; 48:14 it renders ראשית. Probably the translator wanted to express the Hebrew root as closely as possible, and so reserved the root πρωτο- for the term more easily understood as “first” (ראשית). Another exchange is more significant for what it tells us about the translator’s thought patterns. While the Pentateuch uses ἱλαστήριον to translate נזרה, for the translator it is the equivalent of נזרה. This may indicate that the translator was aware of the fact that there was no ark of the covenant in Ezekiel’s temple, but still wanted to preserve the idea of propitiation inherent in the term, and so applied it to a part of the

---

527 For the use of οὐφι in the Greek Bible, see n. 529 above. The translator uses πέμμα in Ezek 45:24 [tris]; 46:5 [bis], 7 [tris], and 11 [tris].

528 In Hosea 3:1, the only other use of πέμμα in Θ, it translates אספיה, a raisin-cake apparently connected with idolatrous rites.

529 Πρωτογένημα renders בקורים in Exod 23:16, 19; 34:26 [with בקרין]; Lev 2:14 bis; 23:17, 19, 20; Num 18:13; also 4 Kgds 4:42; Neh 10:35 [36].

530 The translation of מזרת with ἱλαστήριον occurs at Exod 25:17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; Lev 16:2, 13, 14. ἱλαστήριον renders נזרה at Ezek 43:14 [tris], 17, 20.
altar with which he was unfamiliar (the ledge or נַחַל). If so, the translator’s motivation would be not to contradict but to preserve an important pentateuchal term. As a whole, then the translator seems to have made use of the sacrificial terminology of the Greek Pentateuch to a great extent, confirming his indebtedness to the Alexandrian translational tradition. On the other hand, the translator does not reproduce such terminology mechanically, but adapts in order to articulate its contextual significance as clearly as possible.

531 The internal evidence of the translation of various books is so far the strongest evidence for such a tradition of which I am aware. Because of the lack of evidence, I find it inadvisable to speak of a “school” setting for the use of the Greek translations. On this point, see Troxel, *LXX Isaiah*, 69-70.
CHAPTER FIVE:
THE TRANSLATOR AND HIS TARGET READERSHIP

This and the following chapter address the degree to which the translator tailored his translation to the circumstances of his intended readership. In this chapter, I will adduce evidence for two major ways in which the translator updated his source text in order to highlight its persuasiveness: his incorporation of Hellenistic architectural terminology in his temple description, and his assumption that economic and religious benefits enjoyed by Jews should be mediated outward. Both of these larger trends seek to recontextualize the translator’s source text in his Hellenistic milieu, but are subordinated to his larger translational goals. In Chapter Six, examination of evidence for leadership will suggest that such updating of the source text does not include actualizing exegesis of the kind often presupposed by scholars such as Arie van der Kooij.

5.1 The Translator and Hellenistic Temples

In both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text, Ezekiel’s temple functions as an integrated architectural symbol of the presence of the Deity with his people. This presence is guaranteed through the proper operation of the cult by the appropriate
ministers. By this I mean that Ezekiel’s temple constitutes a system of symbols whose meaning exists in the relationship of these symbols both to one another and to the larger reality in which they participate. It is crucial to the functioning of such an integrated set of symbols, therefore, that the reader engages them on both levels; that is, in their relationship with each other and their connections to the larger cultural matrix.

Much of the architecture of Ezekiel’s temple highlights distance and separation from the dangerous power of the Deity. The imposing gates, which measure half as long as the inner court, emphasize the strong separation necessary between the sacred and profane realms. So, too the sequence of staircases with increasingly numerous steps serves as a concrete representation of controlled access to the sacred. The main emphasis of Ezekiel’s new and improved temple is clear: “to separate the holy from the profane” (וַיְקַלָּה בְּהַר הַכְּבָּרָה, Ezek 42:20). The external motivation for Ezekiel’s vision is also supplied in the prophet’s polemic against the מַעֲרֶךְ מַלְכוּת in Ezek 43:7-9, which was separated from the temple only by a wall, and so did not properly respect the sacredness of the temple complex.

With the advent of Hellenistic culture and the need for the rendering of the Hebrew source-text into Greek, the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 was confronted with a problem: many aspects of the rich tapestry of symbols that constituted Ezekiel’s temple

---

532 I define the term “symbol” as a verbal or concrete expression that points beyond itself to a deeper reality with which it cannot be completely identified. For a differentiation of the term symbol from sign, see Lauderville, Spirit and Reason, 6-9.

had in the meantime become obsolete. Lauderville notes: “Integral to the authentic functioning of a symbol is its interpretation. If that symbol does not resonate with the interpreter and call that person to self-expression, then the symbol has become broken.” My purpose in this section is to examine how the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 incorporated Hellenistic architectural elements within his rendering of Ezekiel’s temple, and what resonances these terms carried among the Hellenistically-acculturated audience of his day. I will argue that the depiction of the idealized temple in the Septuagint of Ezekiel motivated its readers in part through its power to stimulate their imagination. As a result, by updating the aesthetic appeal of Ezekiel’s restoration as he did, the translator was able to stimulate his readers’ positive perceptions of Judaism. The translator’s incorporation of Hellenistic architecture in his rendering of Ezekiel’s temple therefore serves as one mechanism to re-idealize the symbolic world of Ezekiel’s temple and thus to preserve its suasive force. In the received Hebrew text, Ezekiel’s vision begins with the temple, proceeds to the Zadokite priests and their law, and only then enlarges its view outward toward the redistribution of the promised land. Likewise in the Septuagint, the vision of idealized Jewish identity is rooted in the cult and is most concretely visible in the temple architecture (Ezek 40:4; 43:10-12). The Greek version of these chapters, in contrast to the Masoretic Text, also asks how such a vision of Jewish identity addresses the question of the relationship of such religiously defined Jews to their Hellenistic environment, in the process addressing questions of Jewish identity beyond the confines of their own land.

5.1.1 Στοά / Περίστυλον (40:17-18; 42:3-5)

As is well known, in sacred Greek architecture, the term στοά is used to describe a long, often rectangular, colonnade enclosed by a roof. Frequently, this rectangular colonnade served as an entrance to the temple, and so the term is often rendered as “portico” or “porch.” A στοά could consist of multiple stories, as in the Stoa of Attalos in the Athenian agora.535 Josephus repeatedly describes the porticoes of the Second Temple536 and depicts Solomon’s temple as possessing them as well.537 According to Philo, the Jerusalem temple had four double stoas (Spec. Leg. 1.71). 3 Kgdms 6:33 likewise places stoas with four rows (στοάι τετραπλῶς) at the entrance to the ναόν in Solomon’s temple.538 A missive from Antiochus III to Ptolemy apparently regards a στοά as a necessary component of any temple, and commands Ptolemy to construct the temple using the materials provided (A.J. 12.141). Likewise, John 10:23 depicts Jesus as

---


536 Josephus’ main description of the στοάί of the Second Temple occurs in B.J. 5.190-92. He portrays Herod as surrounding the Second Temple with enormous stoas (περιελάμβανε δὲ καὶ στοάις μεγίσταις τὸν ναόν, A.J. 15.396), which took him approximately eight years to build (A.J. 15.420). The eastern side of the Temple was furnished with a double stoa (A.J. 15.411), which Josephus noted many past kings had adorned (A.J. 15.401).

537 Josephus attributed the eastern-most stoa of the Second Temple to King Solomon and described it as measuring 400 cubits in length (A.J. 20.221; B.J. 5.185). He also portrays Solomon as constructing great porticoes in the first temple with wide gates surrounding the outer court (A.J. 8.96-98).

538 The MT is defective at precisely this point, reading מָשָׁאָה רְבֻעִית. Some exegetes restore the MT to read מָשָׁאָה רְבֻעִית מַעַת בְּרוּשִׁית in agreement with the LXX (στοάι τετραπλῶς). Others delete מָשָׁאָה and view מַעַת בְּרוּשִׁית as analogous to מַעַת בְּרֹשִׁית in 6:31, thus representing four-sided doors. See Martin J. Mulder, *1 Kings 1-11* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 277 for further bibliography.
walking in Solomon’s portico (엥 רְחֵ֫ם נְבֵ֑עַ סְגוֹן וְסָלֹֽמֶנֶֽס), and this feature of the Second Temple is mentioned by other NT sources as well.\footnote{Acts 3:11; 5:12.}

Hebrew accounts likewise reflect the influence of the Greek stoa, due no doubt to the architecture of the Second Temple. The Temple Scroll mentions a פֹּרָר nine times, perhaps referring to porches or porticoes in the inner and outer courts.\footnote{\textit{Peshitta} appears at 11Q19 5:3; 35:9-10; 37:6, 9; 42:4, 8-9 [\textit{tris}] nine times \textit{in toto}. For a discussion of the significance of the term in the Temple Scroll, see Yadin, \textit{The Temple Scroll}, 1:237-39.} Targum Pseudo-Jonathan renders the Hebrew אֲסַטְטוֹנָה with the term עֵמֶ֔ד, which can refer to a pillar or a colonnade (2 Kgs 11:14; 23:3; 2 Chr 34:31). This appears to conflate Solomon’s temple with the Second Temple, which had such a colonnade.\footnote{Carol A. Dray, \textit{Translation and Interpretation in the Targum to the Books of Kings} (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 5; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 27.} Outside the Targum, the related term אֲסַטְטוֹנָה seems to refer to a colonnade (b. \textit{Šab.} 6a, 6b; \textit{Pes.} 13b), although the term may not be a Greek loanword but a Persian one.\footnote{Dray, \textit{Translation and Interpretation}, 27 cites A. Tal, \textit{The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects} (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1975), 186 [Hebrew] in support of the derivation of אֲסַטְטוֹנָה from Old/ Middle Persian \textit{sutūn}, “column/pillar.”}

In 6 Ezekiel 40-48, the term סְגוֹף is used opposite the Hebrew הַיָּבָ֖ה (40:18), הַנִּחֲוָ֖ה (42:3) and בֵּית (42:5). These descriptions of the סְגוֹף constitute part of the depictions of both the outer court (40:17-18) and the priestly arcades (42:1-14), and they run as follows.
The stoas were behind the gates, corresponding to the length of the gates. This was the lower colonnade.

The pavement was beside the gates, corresponding to the length of the gates. This was the lower pavement.

543 Διαγεγραμμέναι here seems to be the translator's insertion, or his guess at whatever corresponded in his Vorlage to the מִשְׂמֶר הַבָּרֹא (40:18) in the MT. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 392 confesses ignorance of the motivation for the LXX translation διαγεγραμμέναι. Over a hundred years ago, Peters argued that the translator recognized MT’s reading מִשְׂמֶר (= "gates") as a mistake for מִשְׂמֶר ("the twenty") and then marked it as a gloss (διαγεγραμμέναι = "erased") [John P. Peters, “Critical Notes,” JBL 12 (1893): 47-48]. Peters appealed to the practice of Babylonian scribes in writing ΗΩ (broken) when their source text was destroyed or illegible. The fact that elsewhere in LXX Ezekiel or the rest of the Septuagint no similar note can be found, as well as the fact that מִשְׂמֶר means something “engraved” or “written” elsewhere in LXX Ezekiel (4:1; 8:10; 43:11) makes this solution unlikely.

544 The phrase מִשְׂמֶר in LXX Ezekiel 40-48 occurs opposite two hyponyms: מִשְׂמֶר (42:7; 45:6) and מִשְׂמֶר (46:12; 48:11). At 40:23, it is unclear what its Hebrew hyponym could be, and it is possible it represents the translator’s addition. In 42:3, it is likely the translator read מִשְׂמֶר, although a determination of his precise Vorlage is impossible.
The arcades were decorated in the same manner as the gates of the inner court and in the same manner as the peristyles of the exterior courtyard. Triple stoas were arranged in rows, facing each other. And opposite the arcades was a walkway of 10 cubits’ breadth by 100 cubits in length and its doorways were northward. And the upper walkways were similar, because the colonnade projected from it, from the lower colonnade and the interval. In this way were the colonnade and interval, and in this way was the stoa.

3 The arcades were decorated in the same manner as the gates of the inner court and in the same manner as the peristyles of the exterior courtyard. Triple stoas were arranged in rows, facing each other. And opposite the arcades was a walkway of 10 cubits’ breadth by 100 cubits in length and its doorways were northward. And the upper walkways were similar, because the colonnade projected from it, from the lower colonnade and the interval. In this way were the colonnade and interval, and in this way was the stoa.

3 Opposite the twenty cubit space belonging to the inner court and opposite the pavement belonging to the exterior courtyard, were galleries facing galleries in three stories. In front of the chambers was a walkway of 10 cubits’ breadth; on the inside was a one-cubit way (?), and their doorways were northward. The upper chambers were shortened for the galleries took away more from them than from the lower and middle levels of the structure.

The first hyponym, רעמה, which is translated with περίστυλον in 40:17; 18b and with στοά in 40:18a, highlights the translator’s lexical freedom. Yadin suggested that the translator understood the term רעמה to comprise both a περίστυλον, a colonnade running

545 Ezek 42:5 includes a summary statement not witnessed in ע. Due to the translator’s variability in rendering διάστημα and στοά, it is impossible to retrovert the Greek translation to its original Hebrew.

546 That the ἐξέδρα of 42:1 are in view is shown by the feminine plural form of the participle, which does not agree with the neuter τὰ περίστυλα of 42:3 or τὸ διορίζον of 42:1.

547 The translation of ע here follows Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 561.
the length of the side, and a στοά, a portico immediately behind each of the three outer gates.\textsuperscript{548}

The fact that both στοά and περίστυλον likewise occur in close proximity in Ezek 42:3-5, the only other passage in which רצפת appears in Ezek 40-48, supports Yadin’s hypothesis. In the latter passage, the translator describes three rows of stoas laid out next to one another. Once again, the translator exhibits a conscious lexical differentiation in his rendering of אָרְחָּה with both στοά and περίστυλον. In lieu of transliterating this presumably unknown term,\textsuperscript{549} as he frequently does with other terms throughout the temple description,\textsuperscript{550} he chooses instead to translate it \textit{ad sensum}.\textsuperscript{551} The reappearance of the Hebrew רצפת in Ezek 42:3 occasioned the re-employment of both Hellenistic features associated with this architectural element in Ezek 40:17-18 (στοά and περίστυλον). It is likely that the translator also took his cue from the implication of the phrase רצפת התחתון (“the lower pavement”) in Ezek 40:18 that there must be an upper רצפת –complete with stoa and peristyle—as well, even though this structure is not mentioned. If so, the translator apparently regarded Ezek 42:3-5 as the depiction of this upper רצפת. Even if

\textsuperscript{548} \textit{Temple Scroll}, 1:263.

\textsuperscript{549} For consideration of the meaning of the Hebrew אָרְחָּה, see the commentaries: Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel} 2, 382; Elliger, “Tempelsakristeien,” 85; Block, \textit{Ezekiel} 25-48, 558. Pohlmann with Rudnig, \textit{Ezechiel 20-48}, 547 translates this term with \textit{Absätze}.

\textsuperscript{550} For transliterations in \textit{Ezekiel}, see Lust, “A Lexicon of the Three” and §2.3.2 above.

\textsuperscript{551} He renders אָרְחָּה with four terms in his translation, each of which seems to indicate a sense derived from its immediate context (see Appendix C). It is expressed with ἀπόλοιπον in 41:15b and ὑπόφανσις in 41:16, in addition to the renderings with στοά and περίστυλον in Ezek 42:3, 5.
this explanation is not accepted, in these passages, it is incontrovertible that the translator introduces two indispensable components of a Hellenistic temple, the stoa and its peristyle, into Ezekiel’s temple.

5.1.2 Περίβολος / Προτείχισμα (40:5; 42:20)

In Greek architecture, the term περίβολος can refer either to a wall that encloses the outer court of a sanctuary⁵⁵² or to the temenos thus enclosed.⁵⁵³ The term is well-attested in Greek Jewish sources when applied to the Jerusalem Temple. Philo, for example, discusses the temple’s περίβολος as an enclosing wall, consisting of great size and breadth and enclosing four porticoes (στοαίς) of lavish appearance (Spec. Leg. 1.71). Josephus, A. J. 13.181 pictures Jonathan as urging the people to set up the enclosing wall (περίβολος) around the temple that had been torn down. Aristeas §84 mentions three enclosing walls of the Temple, over seventy cubits in size. (Pseudo-?) Hekataios reports that the sanctuary is located nearly in the middle of the city and contains a περίβολος that encloses an area of about five plethra by 100 cubits (apud Jos. C. A. 1.198).⁵⁵⁴

Προτείχισμα, on the other hand, is not generally associated with sacred architecture in Greek sources. Frequently in Jewish sources it describes an outside support to existing defensive structures, especially fortifications.⁵⁵⁵ For example,

---


⁵⁵³ 1 Macc 14:48; 2 Macc 6:4; 4 Macc. 4:11; Sir 50:2; Josephus B. J. 5.186; A. J. 15.380, 417, 400.

⁵⁵⁴ The authenticity of the fragments attributed to Hekataios in Josephos’ Contra Apionem has been the subject of fierce debate. For a recent view, see Bar-Kochva, Pseudo-Hecataeus, 54-181.

⁵⁵⁵ 2 Par. 32:5, 2 Kgdms 20:15; Jer 52:7; Lam 2:8; Philo, Post. 50.
Josephus, *B.J.* 1.42 describes an elephant of Antiochus’ army adorned with gold-covered protective gear (προτείχισμα). In addition to these Jewish Greek sources, the mostly defensive significance of προτείχισμα is evident from native Greek sources.\(^{556}\)

These two terms, περίβολος and προτείχισμα, appear together twice, in Φ Ezekiel 40:5 and 42:20. The letters in parentheses refer to the architectural elements identified in the diagrams in Appendix A.

\begin{itemize}
\item Φ Ezekiel 40:5
\begin{quote}
Καὶ ἰδοὺ περίβολος ἐξωθεν τοῦ ὦκου κύκλῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κάλαμος, τὸ μέτρον πηχῶν ἐξ ἐν πηχίει καὶ παλαιστής, καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ προτείχισμα, πλάτος ἵσον τῷ καλάμῳ καὶ τὸ ὤψος αὐτοῦ ἵσον τῷ καλάμῳ.
\end{quote}
\end{itemize}

Now behold there was an enclosing wall (R) outside the house, all around.
And in the man’s hand was a reed whose measure was six cubits (by the cubit and a span measure).
And he measured the outwork (c):
its width was equal to the reed
and its height was equal to the reed.

\begin{itemize}
\item Φ Ezekiel 42:20
\begin{quote}
tὰ τέσσαρα μέρη τοῦ αὐτοῦ καλάμου, καὶ διέταξεν αὐτὸν καὶ περίβολον αὐτῷ κύκλῳ πεντακοσίων πρὸς ἀνατολάς.
\end{quote}
\end{itemize}

Now behold, there was a wall outside the house, all around.
And in the man’s hand was a reed; whose measure was six cubits (by the cubit and a span measure).
And he measured the width of the structure:
one reed
and the height was one reed.

\(^{556}\) Thucydides 4.90.4; 6.100.2; 6.102.2; 7.43.6; Plutarch, *Aem.* 13.4; Diodoros Siculus 15.72.1; 18:34.1; 20.23.1; 20.23.2. An apparently offensive nuance of προτείχισμα as referring to a siege-wall is present in Plutarch, *Dion* 44.5.

\(^{557}\) For differences between Μ and Φ Ezekiel 42:20, see §3.1.1.7 above.
20 The four were part of the same reed. And he measured it. And it had an enclosing wall (R) around it 500 to the east and its length was 500 cubits and its width was 500 to divide between the sanctuary and the outwork (c) which is in the arrangement of the house.

As demonstrated above (§3.1.1.6), προτείχισμα renders יוּלָה in 转型发展 Ezek 42:20, where instead points the word as הָלַח (profane), for contextual reasons. On the other hand, περίβολος corresponds to חומת in both texts. The two terms together form an inclusio, made more noticeable in Ο Ezek 40:5 and 42:20 through the repetition of προτείχισμα, which brackets the description of the temple in 转型发展 Ezekiel 40:5-42:20. The deliberateness of this inclusio is beyond question, since in 40:5 the translator parts with his usual translation of בַּנִּי by τὸ διορίζον (‘the partition’) in order to sustain it. The

558 It is likely that the last phrase of 42:20 was a marginal note or explanatory gloss in the Hebrew that has been drawn into the translator’s Vorlage. In the context of 转型发展 Ezekiel, προτείχισμα is perfectly comprehensible as constituting part of the Temple architecture, while the term יוּלָה in Hebrew could be subject to confusion between הָלַח (profane) and בַּר (rampart), as discussed in §3.1.1.6 above. Compare Ο’s reading: inter sanctuarium et vulgi locum (“between the sanctuary and the public area was a place”).

559 So NAB.

560 For justification of the translation “trench” for προτείχισμα, see below.

561 לָשׁוֹן’s reading in 40:5 must be taken in the looser sense of “structure.” See Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 348-49; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 516 n. 5 for discussion of the term בַּנִּי in ל. Zimmerli and other form- and
translator seems already to have been aware of Ezek 42:20, with its identification of the 
 lặng (=προτείχισμα, outwork) as an architectural feature, and to have used this knowledge
to interpret the less specific ס建设用地 in 40:5. Thus, the translator’s understanding of 
שם is rooted in ו. 562

It is difficult at first glance to determine what relationship the translator
envisioned between the enclosing wall (περίβολος) and the outwork (προτείχισμα). In
his recent translation of ו Ezek 42:20, Hubler seems to differentiate the terms, rendering
περίβολος with “enclosing wall” and προτείχισμα with “outer wall.” 563 The defensive
nuance of προτείχισμα, which is apparent elsewhere in ו, 564 supports Hubler’s
translation. This protective function, similar to that of the outsized eastern gates, 565 is not
intended to withstand attack from enemy forces but instead to protect the sanctuary from
illegitimate encroachment. While such a defensive nuance is foreign to Greek temples in
general, its association with περίβολος may have rendered it a bit more acceptable to

562 See §3.1.6 above.
564 2 Kgdms 20:15; 3 Kgdms 20:23 (=מ 1 Kgs 21:23); 2 Par 32:5; Jer 52:7; Lam 2:8.
565 The outsized gates, whose length is half of the length of the inner court, represent the idea of
controlled access to the divine. Greenberg, “Ezekiel’s Program of Restoration,” 225; see also Tuell, Law of
the Temple, 59-61. Zimmerli postulates that guards must have been stationed in the niches of the gates in
order to restrict access: Walther Zimmerli, “Ezechieltempel und Salomostadt,” in Hebräische
406-07.
culturally sensitive Greek Jews. The defensive nuance of προτείχισμα underlines the translator’s commitment to cultic purity, as identified above.

5.1.3 έξεδρα (40:44-46; 41:10; 42:1-14; 44:19; 46:19-23)

A third term that provides evidence of the translator’s use of Hellenistic architecture is έξεδρα, which does not appear in ε outside Ezekiel 40-48. It can refer to a bench, but can also designate a hall or arcade with seats, such as at athletic contests. Commonly, the έξεδρα is a room with seats used for philosophical or other kinds of discussion. Vitruvius depicted a structure in this way: “In the three colonnades construct roomy recesses (exedras) with seats in them, where philosophers, rhetoricians and all others who delight in learning may sit and converse” (De Architectura 5.11.2). Similarly, έξεδρα can indicate a place for political deliberation. Cicero uses the term exhedra to describe an alcove for individual use. In line with classical usage, Josephus mentions a “magnificent hall” (έξεδρα διαπρεπής) in which Solomon used to render judgment to his subjects (A. J. 8.134). Herod’s temple also had έξεδρα in its inner forecourts (B. J. 5.201-06). The Greek έξεδρα also made its

566 Menander, Women Drinking Hemlock, 10.
567 Euripides, Orestes, 1450.
568 Dio Chrysostom, 28.2.
570 Plutarch, Brutus, 14.2, 17.1
571 De Orat. 3.5.17; De Finibus 5.2.4.
way into rabbinic parlance.\textsuperscript{572} In view of the uses of ἐξεδρα in Greek literature surveyed, the possibility that the translator chose the term for its connections to philosophy, rhetoric and learning may be raised.

In δ Ezekiel 40–48, ἐξεδρα is used for the most part as one of the renderings of the Hebrew לしまう in δ,\textsuperscript{573} but it also is the equivalent of the term σωρ in δ Ezek 46:23, where it occurs twice. Nor is לしまう always rendered by ἐξεδρα.\textsuperscript{574} Thus the לしまう in the outer courtyard, accessible to the Levites and lay Israelites, are not ἐξεδρα but παστοφορία.\textsuperscript{575} Other renderings of לしまう indicate a difference in Vorlage (45:5)\textsuperscript{576} or introduce another Greek architectural feature, the walkway (περίπατος) in 42:4.

Two different kinds of structures called ἐξεδρα are differentiated by the width of their walkways. The five or 15 structures with dimensions of 50 x 20 cubits mentioned in

---

\textsuperscript{572} In δ Mid. 1:5, a northern gate of the Temple, called the “Gate of Light,” has a chamber (אָספָרָם) with an upper room on top of it, so that the priests could keep watch above and the Levites could below. In this passage, the Mishnah thus associates the ἐξεδρα with the Levites. This אָספָרָם had an entrance to the rampart (לְחֵרָה) previously discussed (see also δ Tam. 1:3). Outside the temple description, the term refers to a chamber (Tg. Pss. 104:3; Tg. Ps.-J Judg 3:23), describes the portico of a school-house (b. B. Bat. 11b), and appears in a cosmological comparison (b. B. Bat. 25a-b).

\textsuperscript{573} Ezek 40:44, 45, 46; 41:10; 42:1 (δ adds the descriptor πάντε here), 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 [3x]; 44:19; 46:19.

\textsuperscript{574} In δ is rendered by a variety of terms in δ in addition to ἐξεδρα: περίπατος (42:5), τοῦ κατοικεῖν (45:5, reading לָשֵׁנָה), and παστοφορία (40:17 [2x], 38). In δ Ezek 45:5, the presumed Vorlage is לָשֵׁנָה; see Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 466.

\textsuperscript{575} This translation of לָשֵׁנָה with παστοφορία recalls the identical translation in 1 and 2 Par, which associate these rooms with the Levites. See especially 1 Par 9:26; 23:28, which assign the παστοφορία to the Levites; cf. also 1 Par 28:12; 2 Par 31:11. The παστοφορία are assigned to the priests in 1 Macc 4:38, 57.

\textsuperscript{576} Ezek 45:5, where δ’s rendering presumes לָשֵׁנָה as its Vorlage.
42:1-14 are intended for the consumption and storage of the most sacred offerings, and are marked by a 10-cubit walkway (Y). A second set of ἐξεδραί is mentioned in 41:10-11 and is distinguished from the former set of ἐξεδραί by its five-cubit light-opening (a). The intention of this last set of ἐξεδραί is not mentioned in the text, but it could have served scholastic, philosophical or scribal purposes, as suggested by its Greek name. Though direct proof is lacking, the designation of both sets of these halls or arcades as ἐξεδραί associates the Zadokites with the Jewish intelligentsia.

5.1.4 Περίπατος (42:4, 5, 10, 11, 12)

In 6 Ezekiel 40-48, the περίπατος (walkway; d) appears only in the account of the arcades toward the north of the northern barrier and the empty space (42:1-14). It provides a clear example of the translator’s lexical freedom, as it corresponds to three different hyponyms in the MT.\(^{577}\) Besides these three uses, it appears in 42:10 as well, where its hyponym is uncertain. The first Hebrew term in the MT to which it corresponds, מַחְלָה (42:4), provides a very close counterpart to περίπατος in the LXX. Once the translator introduces his walkway, he maintains it through the entire section, even at the risk of identifying it with an architectural feature that would not ordinarily be associated with such a walkway (for example, לְשׁוֹנָה in 42:5).\(^{578}\)

\(^{577}\) In 42:4, περίπατος corresponds to מַחְלָה; in 42:5, it renders לְשׁוֹנָה; in 42:11-12, its Hebrew analogue is לְשׁוֹנָה.

\(^{578}\) This technique is also used with the atrium (αἰθρίον) and the interval (διάστημα) in LXX Ezekiel 40-48. See §4.1.1. above and §5.1.5 below.
As in Ezekiel 40-48, the most basic sense of περίπατος in Greek is that of a walkway. The public walkways were a favorite of philosophers, who used them to discourse and to discuss the problems of their field, although non-philosophers could certainly walk and talk as well. In the course of time, περίπατος increasingly served to indicate a kind of philosopher, the Peripatetic. The use of ἐξέδρα and περίπατος together can be illuminated by comparing the depiction of Ezekiel’s temple to the Mouseion at Alexandria, as described by Strabo.

The Mouseion is also part of the royal estates. It has a walkway, an arcade, and a great house, in which is located the mess-hall of the members of the Mouseion, learned men. In this company there exists both a common fund and a priest who is over the Mouseion, formerly appointed by the kings but now by Caesar.

It is striking that the translator uses the same two architectural features Strabo noted in the Mouseion to describe Ezekiel’s Temple (ἐξέδρα and περίπατος). I am not arguing that the translator of Ezek 40-48 can be proven to refer to the Alexandrian Mouseion in his translation, especially given that Strabo’s description of the structure

---


580 Polybius, 29.1.1.1; Josephus, *A. J.* 15.337.


582 The text is from *Geo.* 17.1.8 (C794), as given in Horace Leonard Jones, *The Geography of Strabo* (8 vols; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932; Reprint, 1959), 8:34.

583 *LSJ*, “συνόστιον,” 1734 provides an alternative sense of the term as “common-room.” Since the passage describes common funds, it is more likely to refer to provision of meals.
probably post-dates the translation of Greek Ezekiel. What is significant, I believe, is the association of these two terms with philosophy and learning. Their use in Ezek 40-48 suggests that like the Alexandrian Museion, renowned for its scholarship, Ezekiel’s temple is populated by Zadokite priests, who are in actuality learned men (φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν). In the Septuagint, as in the received Hebrew text, Ezekiel’s temple description is in part an architectural commentary on the Zadokite priests, who like the temple serve as idealized symbols of Jewish identity. Unlike the received Hebrew text, however, the Septuagint translator could be seen as associating the idealized Temple with Greek philosophy and learning. These associations are precisely what would be expected given the classification of LXX Ezekiel 40-48 as an operative translation, in which connotations and associations of given terms serve the art of persuasion (see §1.3.1 above). So while on one level the translator is merely making use of common elements of Greek architecture, on a deeper level, the associations and connotations of these architectural elements create additional meaning that cannot be summarily excluded.

In support of this association of ἔξοδα and περίπατος with philosophy and learning is the association of Jewish worship with the highest ideals of Greek philosophy, which had become commonplace by the second century B.C.E. and can only be treated

---

584 Strabo was born ca. 64 B.C.E. and lived past the turn of the era. For Strabo’s life and his reception in antiquity, see Daniela Dueck, Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome (London/ New York: Routledge, 2000); Aubrey Diller, The Textual Tradition of Strabo’s Geography (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1975), 3-24; and Georg Wissowa, Wilhem Kroll and Karl Mittelhaus, Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft 2. Reihe (18 vols.; Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1931), 7:76-155. The time of the translation of LXX Ezekiel is disputed, but probably belongs most easily in the second century B.C.E.
briefly here.\textsuperscript{585} In his Αἰγυπτιακά,\textsuperscript{586} Hekataios of Abdera famously connected the aniconism of Jewish liturgy with the idea that Jews were philosophers.\textsuperscript{587}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{δάγαλμα δὲ θεῶν τὸ σύνολον οὐ κατεσκέυασε διὰ τὸ μὴ νομίζειν ἀνθρωπόμορφον εἶναι τὸν θέον, ἀλλὰ τὸν περιέχοντα τὴν γῆν οὐρανὸν μόνον εἶναι θεῶν καὶ τῶν ὀλων κύριον.}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

But [Moses] did not construct any images of the gods at all for them, since he did not consider God to be shaped like a human, but that heaven, which surrounds the earth, is alone God, and is lord of the universe.

Hekataios’ description is indebted to a long line of Greek natural philosophers who stressed that true worship must be aniconic and was so appropriately directed towards the heavens, whose regular movements functioned as proof of the divine.\textsuperscript{588} If

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{585} A sensitive and informative, though a bit outdated, treatment of this issue can be found in Yehoshua Gutman, \textit{הספות יהדות-הלניסטים: יהדות החללתנים בעיון חקר וحضות} (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1958-63). See also Martin Hengel, \textit{Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2.Jhs. v. Chr.} (WUNT 10; Mohr [Siebeck], 1969), 464-86.
\item\textsuperscript{586} The precise name of Hekataios’ work has not been preserved. Modern reconstructions of the precise title have differed. Some scholars have advocated Αἰγυπτιακά: Curt Wachsmuth, \textit{Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte} (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1895), 330; Karl Trüdinger, \textit{Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie} (Basel: E. Birkhäuser, 1918), 50; Anne Burton,\textit{ Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary} (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 5. Others have advocated Περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων: Jacoby, \textit{FGH} 3a 264 (p. 12); idem, \textit{FGH} 3a (Kommentar), 75-87; O. Murray, “Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship,” \textit{Journal of Egyptian Archaeology} 56 (1970): 142, 150; P. M. Fraser, \textit{Ptolemaic Alexandria} (3 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 1:496. Both titles are based on analogous ethnographical works, and no final judgment seems possible given the present state of the evidence.
\item\textsuperscript{587} Didoros of Sicily (ca. 60-30 B.C.E.) abbreviated and paraphrased an account by Hekataios of Abdera from ca. 300 B.C.E. and incorporated it into his \textit{Historical Library}. Diodoros’ work survives in a quotation by Photius, the Byzantine historian of the 9th century C.E. The text is quoted from \textit{FGH} 264 F6 (Diodoros 40.3.4).
\item\textsuperscript{588} Xenophanes (ca. 545 B.C.E.) had already expressed the idea that only one God existed, who could not be expressed in human form, and he further equated this divine entity with the heavens, which include everything. Natural philosophers, such as Anaximander (ca. 610-540 B.C.E.), had previously identified the encompassing heavens with Deity. Democritos (b. ca. 460-57 B.C.E.) postulated two causes for human religion: fear, and respect for natural phenomena; in respect to the second cause, the heavens seemed especially potent. The movement of the cosmos figured as a proof of the divine in Plato’s and Aristotle’s works. Given the widespread distribution of this concept in Greek philosophy, it is no wonder
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Hekataios associated Jewish worship with the philosophical bent of the Jewish race, he portrayed the Jewish priests as being exceptionally gifted in this regard.  

Selecting the most educated and especially capable to lead the entire nation, [Moses] designated them priests. He commanded that their way of life should concern the temple and the divine honors and sacrifices. He designated these men judges of major cases, and turned over the preservation of the laws and customs to them.

Because of the barring of images, Hekataios explained Jewish worship in terms of the development of Greek philosophy, which had arrived at similar conclusions on other grounds. It is a small step from such an explanation to portraying those who superintend such worship as being exceptionally talented and capable. In view of the fact that similar priestly leadership is accorded to the utopian state of the Panchaeans (Diodoros 5.45.4), where the priests likewise are judges of capital cases and the final arbiters in public matters (cf. the plus in $^\dagger$ Ezek 44:24), it is likely that the translator


---

589 *FGH* 264 F6 (*apud* Diodoros 40.3.4-5).

590 For the relation of “ethical monotheism” to the other patterns of universalism present in late Second Temple Judaism, see Terence L. Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007), 493-98.
chose his terms at least in part for their connection with learning and philosophy. The prominence of priestly leadership in Ezekiel’s vision may coincide with a common trend in early Hellenistic utopias, which would serve to underscore this connection.  

5.1.5 The αἰθριον (40:14, 15 [bis], 19 [bis]; 47:1)

One final feature of the translator’s updating of his source text is his use of the term αἰθριον, which is a Hellenistic adaptation of the Roman atrium. It describes an open-air courtyard, and sometimes can be used as a synonym for αὐλή. The most significant use of the term in Greek Jewish texts discussing sanctuaries occurs in Flavius Josephus’ discussion of the tabernacle in the third book of his Jewish Antiquities. The tabernacle possesses a courtyard (αἰθριον) of 50 cubits in width and 100 cubits in length (A. J. 3.108, 114), in which Moses sacrifices a kid, a bull and a ram to dedicate the structure (§204). At the turn of the last century, Weill thought that the use of αἰθριον in Josephus’ description in place of the more usual αὐλή to designate the tabernacle’s

591 Gutman, הפסח מوحد-десят, 1:64.
593 LSJ, 37.
595 See the discussion of Louis H. Feldman, Judean Antiquities 1-4: Translation and Commentary (vol. 1 of Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary; ed. Steve Mason; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 259 n. 245. It may be that Θ Ezekiel influenced Josephus in his presentation of the tabernacle in A. J. Book III. Robertson, “Ancient Israelite Tabernacle,” 62 suggests that the precedent of Θ Ezekiel and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Isaiah may have influenced Josephus to reserve αἰθριον as a special term referring to the court of the tabernacle.
courtyard was intended to impart a more contemporary touch, and the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 may have been similarly motivated.

The first verses in which αἰθριον appears in ὦ Ezekiel 40-48 are Ezek 40:14-15.

14 And the atrium of the portico of the gate was sixty cubits. **There were** twenty recesses of the gate all around. 15 And from the atrium of the gate from the outside to the atrium of the porch on the inside was fifty cubits.

According to Gese, whose reconstruction has been followed by many modern scholars, the term αἰθριον is a misunderstanding of various iterations of the prepositional

---


597 Emended from the text in ἀναλόγω, which is difficult in this context. This emendation is followed by Block, *Ezekiel 25-48*, 518 n. 24. See Gese, *Verfassungsentwurf*, 146-47, who argued that v. 14 is entirely corrupt. For an alternative view as to how the problems in Ezek 40:14 arose, see Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 220.

598 See Block, *Ezekiel 25-48*, 518, for the comparison of ייעש to ייעש.
phrase נָעֲרָם, which appears opposite אֵיתִרֵין four times in Ezek 40:15 and 40:19.599

Gese fails to explain why the translator who uses אֵיתִרֵין as the rendering of מָסָא in Ezek 47:1 would use it to render a prepositional phrase here. He also fails to explain why the translator expressed this prepositional phrase more comprehensibly elsewhere.600 If it is allowed that the translator of Ezekiel 40-48 also worked on at least the first third of the book,601 it becomes more likely that the translator’s employment of this architectural feature was not mistaken or random. Two examples, Ezek 9:3 and 10:4, can be cited in which the same rendering of מָסָא with אֵיתִרֵין occurs, and in both of these verses the threshold of the temple is a transitional stage in the departure of the δόξα from the temple. The translator apparently saw the אֵיתִרֵין as an essential component of the envisioned temple, as shown by the translations in Ezek 9:3; 10:4 and 47:1. Based on this knowledge, he seems to have inserted the אֵיתִרֵין, which he saw as representing the threshold (מָסָא), into contexts where it seemed appropriate, especially contexts having to do with measurement from the outermost portion of the east gate (40:15, 19). Whatever his motivation in using this term, אֵיתִרֵין itself provides a clear example of his determination to express Ezekiel’s vision in contemporary language comprehensible to

599 Verfassungsentwurf, 144. He writes: “...den Sinn von נָעֲרָם nicht verstanden hat, wenn er für einen präpositionalen Ausdruck einen architektonischen terminus technicus setzt.” He does not raise the possibility, as I have been doing, of an intentional change in the sense on the part of the translator. He is followed in his treatment of the problems in 40:14 by Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 36, Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 220 and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 335.

600 The translator uses the following phrases to render נָעֲרָם: κατὰ πρόσωπον (41:15); ἀντιπρόσωπον (42:8); and ἔπι (48:15, 21).

601 See above, chap. 1.
his readers and listeners. In addition to exemplifying this determination, the insertion of the atrium into Ezekiel 40 creates a greater coherence in the Greek version of Ezekiel 40-48 than exists in תֵּרְסִי, which uses different terms for the threshold in 40:6-16 (סֵפָר) and 47:1 (מַסְף).

5.1.6 Summary and Conclusions

The Greek architectural terms adduced in this study re-idealize Ezekiel’s temple in Hellenistic terms, thus providing an implicit commentary on the nature of the worship that occurs there as well as the nature of the worshippers. In its Greek translation, Ezekiel’s vision of the restored temple combines features of Hellenistic architecture with Ezekiel’s preventive measures intended to safeguard and mediate the dangerous power of the divine. It is no accident that these Hellenistic architectural terms are distributed more or less evenly throughout the temple, moving from the outer wall (περίβολος; ἢ Ezek 40:5; 42:20) to the inner arcades accessible only to the priests (ἐξεδραί). This distribution suggests that the incorporation of Hellenistic architectural features was not random, but purposeful. This recalls what Wolfgang Kraus concluded from a recent foray into Ezekiel 40-48.602

These examples show that translation and interpretation cannot be separated, but are rather mingled in the LXX. And these examples bring me to the conclusion that the LXX is in the first instance a translation, but it is more. The

translators wanted to mediate between the tradition and the contemporary situation. This includes modifications and updates.

If the Greek translation of the description of Ezekiel’s temple suggests that more is at stake than the question of the relationship of contemporary Jews to their Hellenistic environment, at the least it suggests this concern is not without influence. Incorporation of some of the elements of Greek architecture enabled Hellenistically-acculturated readers to envision Ezekiel’s temple in terms of contemporary tastes. The incorporation of such cultural components helps to eliminate some of the foreignness of Ezekiel’s temple layout, which no doubt posed a considerable barrier to the persuasiveness of Ezekiel’s vision in Greek. Unconsciously or consciously, the translator chose terms whose association with Hellenistic tastes is undeniable.

5.2 The Translator, Gentiles and Inclusion

At first glance, the translation of Ezekiel 40-48 might seem an odd choice if the goal is to define Judaism positively in a Hellenistic milieu. Ezek 44:7-9 speaks contemptuously of the “foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and in flesh” (בְּנֵי נַחַר צְרִיךְ וְלֵי, וּמַעֲרִיל בֵּית), who may not officiate in Ezekiel’s temple. Though the precise identity of these would-be priestly officials has been the subject of competing identifications, Ezekiel’s speech in this passage hardly seems to provide an auspicious beginning for
rapprochement with the non-Jewish world. Konkel characterizes his second 

_Fortschreibung_, which includes this passage, as follows.

Das Charakteristikum dieser Fortschreibung besteht in der Ausweisung des unbeschnittenen Fremden aus dem Temenos und der Einsetzung der Zadokiden als einziger Priesterklasse. Das alleinige Anrecht der Zadokiden auf das Priesteramt wird von ihr consequent zu Beginn und Schluß der Tempelvision nachgetragen (40,46b; 48:11f).

When it is recalled that the Septuagint Vorlage further underlines the prerogatives of the Zadokites (§3.1.2.3 above), this apparent difficulty only increases. One must acknowledge that the Hebrew text of Ezek 40-48 is not on the whole solicitous of non-Jews, in the few instances in which they are considered.

Yet it should also be borne in mind that Ezekiel’s description arises from a polemic against those perceived as genealogically unfit sacral ministers and so is not intended to make general pronouncements about foreigners. Moreover, the Septuagint version of these chapters contains two intriguing hints that Ezekiel’s concern with the reconfiguring of Jewish identity was not allowed to obscure completely a concern for inclusion.

---

603 Possibilities suggested include the Gibeonites (Josh 9:7), the people of Baal of Peor (Num 25), the Netinim (Ezra 2:43-58), and the Carians (2 Kgs 11:4-8). See Levenson, _Program of Restoration_, 134-48; Block, _Ezekiel 25-48_, 622-23; Iain M. Duguid, _Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel_ (VTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 76-77; Allen, _Ezekiel 20-48_, 260-61.

And you will apportion this land for them, for the tribes of Israel.

And they will be for you as natives among the tribes of Israel.
children of Israel. With you they will eat in their inheritance

in the midst of the tribes of Israel.
23 And they will be among the tribe of proselytes,
among the proselytes who are with them. There you will allot them an inheritance, says the Lord.

the children of Israel. With you they will be allotted their inheritance

in the midst of the tribes of Israel. 23 And the resident alien will be in whichever tribe in which he sojourns. There you will allot him his inheritance—an oracle of the Lord God.

This passage belies the first impression of Ezekiel as a prophet concerned only for the privileges of the upper stratum of society. Here Ezekiel provides for the re-integration of the resident alien back into the reconstituted Israel, following the long-standing tradition for the ṣâ within Israelite law. All tribes, presumably even those who have been compromised through their intermarriage to the Assyrian settlers, are likewise to be re-established.

The Septuagint transcends even this relatively generous vision. Depending on his Vorlage, the translator mentions a “tribe of proselytes” (ἐν φυλή προσηλυτῶν) above and beyond the ancient ethnic allegiances. Προσηλυτος is a common designation for the

---

609 I have in mind here the isolation of the “golaorientierte Redaktion” envisioned by Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, Ezechielstudien: Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und zur Frage nach den ältesten Texten (BZAW 202; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), as well as in Pohlmann’s commentaries on Ezekiel in the ATD series. For a redactional approach to Ezek 40-48 in line with Pohlmann’s thesis, see Rudnig, Heilig und Profan. Certainly Pohlmann and others who identify such a redactional stratum would hasten to add that this textual layer is merely one of several evident in the book, and so should not be identified exclusively with its message.


611 The reason I am discussing this plus in ṢV in the context of the translator and not of the Vorlage is that this plus and the translator’s rendering of Ezek 47:13 need to be understood together for their import to be comprehensible.
resident alien in the Septuagint, and so no great innovation can be assigned to the translator’s use of the term.\textsuperscript{612} The mention of an entire tribe devoted to proselytes certainly raises some profound questions, especially given the neat outline of Ezekiel’s land division, in which the twelve ancestral tribes are given more or less equal portions. It is unlikely, as Jahn and Cornill think, that such a designation of a quasi-tribal entity devoted to proselytes was intended to contain and exclude them from the rest of Israel, as this goes against the entire sense of the context.\textsuperscript{613} The statement in v. 22 that the proselytes “will be as natives to you” is translated as literally as could be wished in the Septuagint, and puts the proselytes on equal footing with the natives. Rather, it is likely that by elevating the proselytes to a quasi-tribal entity, the translator seeks to recognize them as a component of the reconstituted Israel in their own right, albeit without giving up the ancient structure of 12 tribes. Like the natives, the proselytes are concretely incorporated within the land of Israel.

This observation is confirmed by the translator’s rendering of Ezek 47:13.

\begin{align*}
\text{Ezek 47:13} & \quad \text{Ezek 47:13} \\
\text{Túδε λέγει κύριος} & \quad \text{הכ אמר אדוני יוהו}
\end{align*}


\textsuperscript{613} Cornill, \textit{Ezechiel}, 508; Jahn, \textit{Ezechiel}, 351.
Thus says the Lord: “These are the borders of the land you will apportion to the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel. There will be an addition of an allotment.”

Joseph will have (two) portions.

Although θ is generally dismissed as misunderstanding its source text in Ezek 47:12, this is based on an inadequate understanding of the translator’s attitude toward foreigners. His translation of יִשֶׂרְאֵל in Ezek 47:13 is unexpected, but explicable in relation to his source text. סְכָּינָּתָם is the usual rendering for בְּרֵאשִׁית. Likewise, πρόσθεσις is easily related to the root יִשָּׂרְאֵל. Since the translator correctly renders the personal name יִשָּׂרְאֵל at 48:32, one cannot assume he was unfamiliar with the biblical figure; his rendering of the term must be purposive. If θ Ezek 47:13 is read in light of θ Ezek 47:23, it is evident that the

---

614 θ’s reading is widely treated as a corruption of הָה נַפְלֵי, witnessed by θ γ (Cornill, Ezechiel, 504; Jahn, Ezechiel, 348; G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936), 530; Alfred Bertholet, Hesekiel (HAT 13; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1936), 165; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 95 n., 4; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 517; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 274; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 705 n. 5; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezekiel 20-48, 617). See the discussion of letter confusion in §2.1.2.1 above.

615 θ’s reading is generally recognized as grammatically problematic and secondary (Cornill, Ezechiel, 504; Cooke, Ezekiel, 526; Bertholet, Hesekiel, 165; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 274; Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 705 n. 8; Pohlmann, Hesekiel 20-48, 617; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 203). ἡ τὸπ γείσας ισαρίας is to be pointed as a dual; generally a lamedh is prefixed to יִשָּׂרְאֵל.

616 Deut 32:9; Josh 17:14; 19:29; 2 Kgdms 8:2 [bis]; 3 Kgdms 4:13; 1 Par 16:18; Ps 104 (י 105):11; Zech 2:5, 7.

**TABLE 5.2.1:**

**THE RESERVED AREA (היהום) IN EZEK 48:10-22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>500 x 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translator’s unusual rendering in Ezek 47:13 is motivated by $V^\prime$’s plus in Ezek 47:23. While in מ, the proselytes live in whatever tribe they hit upon, in ג Ezek 47:23 they are granted their own tribe. As Konkel notes, the translator’s mysterious statement that “there will be an addition of an allotment” in Ezek 47:13 prepares for the mention of the tribe of foreigners in Ezek 47:23.\(^{618}\) Despite this integration of the proselytes into the people of Israel, the translator retains the ancient number of the twelve tribes, leaving only the

\(^{618}\) “Dementsprechend muß G Platz schaffen für diesen zusätzlichen Stammesanteil und nützt hierfür 47,13b” (Konkel, Architektur des Heiligen, 203).
vaguest indication how the integration of the foreigners would proceed. That they are included in the ancient tribal structure at all, however, is interesting and suggestive, and calls for reflection on its possible motivation. In order to understand this inclusion of the proselytes among the tribes, the borders of the tribes and the land in Ezekiel 47-48 must be briefly reviewed. Ezek 47:13-23 depicts the borders of the new land, while Ezek 48:1-29 divides the land among the tribes, with each tribe receiving an equal portion regardless of population. The borders of 47:13-23 recall Num 34:2-12, which exclude Davidic conquests and the Transjordan area. Smend articulated the rationale for the placement of the tribes for the first time. According to him, the placement of the tribes is indebted to the Jacob materials in Genesis: tribes descended from sons of Jacob by Leah and Rachel are placed closer to the sanctuary, while tribes descended from Bilhah and Zilpah are placed at the margins. The theological ramifications of the prophet’s portrayal of the tribal layout are clear. Although the area assigned to the tribes is identical, the tribes’ proximity to the shrine is dictated by “the narrative of their origins,” and so history is not undone in Ezekiel’s utopia but preserved.

---


620 Rudolf Smend, Der Prophet Ezechiel (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 8; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1880), 392-97.

621 Levenson, Program of Restoration, 125.
Smend also maintained that the north-to-south direction operative in the description of the tribes is abandoned in Ezek 48:9-22, in the portrayal of the reserved area. If so, the holy place would be situated in the center of the reserved area (הָרָם). Some recent exegetes have countered that the north-to-south direction is maintained in Ezek 48:8-22, as this avoids the awkward situation in which the priestly portion borders on the profane area in which the city is situated. Given the priestly consciousness of Ezekiel’s vision and his concern with levels of holiness, a geography graded by its levels of holiness is more persuasive than one in which areas of radically different holiness quotients are juxtaposed (Table 5.2.1).

The reserved area exhibits similar concerns with territoriality, or the control of access to privileged space. The temple, the center from which the blessings of the restored land emanate (Ezek 47:1-12), is situated squarely in the center of the area allotted to the Zadokites. This fact alone is sufficient to underline the significance of this group of priests, since the Zadokites minister in the temple and control the right of access to it. The significance of the foregoing for the addition of the tribe of the proselytes is that while the proselytes are incorporated within the tribal structure of Israel in some

---

622 Cooke, Ezekiel, 352; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 260; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 570; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 535; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 101-02; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 283; Levenson, Program of Restoration, 120; Rudnig, Heilig und Profan, 309; Stevenson, The Vision of Transformation, 33-34.


624 Territoriality is concerned with the control of access to space by a particular group. The most extensive and thoughtful application of the idea of territoriality to Ezekiel 40-48 is that of Stevenson, Vision of Transformation, who is informed by the work of Robert David Sack and Allan Pred (Vision of Transformation, 11-13).
undefined sense, the proselytes’ past is not erased, in the same way that the troubled history of the Israelite tribes themselves is not glossed over in Ezekiel’s restoration.

This incorporation is not unique within the Hebrew Bible. A constellation of prophetic texts imagines the nations as streaming to Zion in the eschatological future, eager to participate in the liturgy of the Temple (e.g. Isa 2:1-4; Mic 4:1-4). Yet as in Ezekiel, in these prophetic texts, the lines between the Jewish covenant people and the nations are not erased. A much more developed consideration of the idea of the possibility of incorporation into the chosen people can be found in the book of Ruth. This book has been increasingly seen as the product of a late Persian or even early Hellenistic author, and so it reflects the concerns of the period under discussion. Though a foreigner (נְבֵרָי; 2:10), Ruth acts in accordance with the Torah by leaving her father and mother (Gen 2:24) and obeying God, just as Abram did (Gen 12:1; see Ruth 2:11b). As is well known, the book thus implicitly challenges the Deuteronomic prohibition of the Law of the Assembly (Deut 23). Grätz argues that the author of Ruth based his inclusive ideal on the sapiential idea of retribution for one’s actions, but even if his argument is not accepted, the Davidic genealogy of Ruth (Ruth 4:18-22) is clear evidence that not all Jews thought foreigners should be automatically excluded from the temple, provided that

---


626 Grätz, “Legal Status of the Torah,” 281-82.

627 “Legal Status of the Torah,” 281-84.
they joined themselves permanently to Israel. The plus in הָּ'י Ezek 47:13 and the translator’s rendering in ה Ezek 47:23 show that Ezekiel’s restoration was interpreted in accord with this more inclusive strand of Jewish opinion. At the same time, there is no evidence that the genealogical differences between proselytes and native Israelites are erased.

Maintaining the fixed number of tribes given in the translator’s source text as well as throughout the rest of Scripture would be important for apologetic reasons, in addition to the considerable weight of Jewish tradition. Hekataios of Abdera, in his work about Egypt ca. 305 B.C.E., included an excursus on the Jews that famously interpreted the salient elements of their civilization in terms of Greek philosophy. Hekataios asserted that Moses “divided all of the multitude [the Jews] into twelve tribes, because that is considered the most perfect number and is harmonious with the number of months that comprises a year.” The relation to the months of the year may be due to Aristotle. This explanation of the number twelve is related to the months of the year by both Philo and Josephos, suggesting it had become a widely used topos by their time. In addition to this cosmological explanation of the importance of the number 12, Hekataios may have

628 For the title of Hekataios’ work, see n. 586 above.

629 Διείλε δὲ τὸ πλήθος εἰς δώδεκα φυλὰς διὰ τὸ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν τελείωτατον νομίζεσθαι καὶ σύμφωνον εἶναι τῷ πλήθει τῶν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν συμπληροῦντων. FGH 264 F6 (apud Diodoros 40.3.3).

630 Aristotle F 385 (ὅπως γένηται τὰ πάντα δώδεκα μέρη, καθάπερ οἱ μῆνες εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν; text cited from Stern, GLAJI, 1:30).

631 Philo De Fuga 184-85 claims that twelve is the perfect number, and relates this to the number of tribes in Israel, among other referents (including the number of months of the year). Josephos A. J. 3.182 explains the twelve loaves of showbread in the tabernacle as a reference to the months of the year. Similarly, in A. J. 3.186, the twelve stones on the high priest’s ephod are a reference to the Zodiac, as they are in Philo, Vita 2.124.
known another, more practical, explanation of the importance of this number from philosophical consideration of the geography of the ideal state. Platonic philosophy specified dividing a city and its surrounding country into twelve portions when it was being founded. Thus the number twelve as constituent of the idealized division of a land crystallizes as a fortuitous parallel development in Platonic philosophy and Jewish Scripture.

5.2.2 Ὠ Ezekiel 47:8 (Ἀραβία and Γαλιλαία)

ὁ Ἐζεκ. 47:8
καὶ ἔπει πρὸς με
Τὸ ὑδωρ τοῦτο
tὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐις τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
καὶ κατέβατον ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀραβίαν
καὶ ἤρχετο ἐως ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τὸ ὑδωρ τῆς διεκβολῆς,

ἐπὶ τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Note the rendering of the Hebrew participle יָצִיא with the Greek present participle ἐκπορευόμενον, preserving the Hebrew participle’s continuous tense (the continuous nuance of the Hebrew is noted by Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 688 n. 23). The translator recognized that this continuous nuance carried through into the converted perfects of the rest of the verse, as shown by his translation of these converted perfects with Greek imperfects (κατέβαινεν, ἤρχετο).

Compare ὤ ad tumulos sabuli, which apparently derives from נָעַל (heap of stones): Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 688 n. 24.

Compare ὤ ἵλιμα Ῥappa.

ὁ’s translator apparently read μία for μῆν, which is generally accepted as the original text. Apparently ἵλιμα was interpreted in light of the Septuagint translation. ὤ omits the phrase as a haplography. G. R. Driver, “Linguistic and Textual Problems: Ezekiel,” Bib 19 (1938): 186-87 explains ματαιώσας as deriving from ματαιῶ, “be filthy,” followed by REB; NJPS and Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 273. Cooke, Ezekiel, 523 suggested a copyist’s error for an original reading ἤ ἰεροῦσαλήμ ἄναπα. Many scholars have
And he said to me, “This water, which goes forth into Galilee toward the east, also descended towards Arabia and came as far as the sea, as far as the water of the estuary, and will make the waters fresh.”

Clues to the translator’s favorable attitude toward foreigners are discernible in his somewhat surprising renderings of גֶּלֶל as Παλαια and גָּלִילָא as ᾿Αραβία. The term גֶּלֶל does not appear to have been understood well by Septuagint translators, and was interpreted as Γαλιλαία elsewhere. Though the rendering of צֶדֶק was likewise pluriform in the LXX, this is the only instance it is rendered by ᾿Αραβία. The root צֶדֶק seems to have been problematic elsewhere. The interesting datum that can be gleaned

followed the reading of Field, who suggested צֶדֶקוֹ, “salted,” including Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 507; Bertholet, Hesekiel, 164; Fohrer with Galling, Ezechiel, 244; Cornill, Ezechiel, 502-03; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 90 n. 1 and BHS. Jahn, Ezechiel, 346 prefers the active sense of this verb (המולות). Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 688 n. 26 follows צֶדֶקוֹ, “stagnant.”

637 This is the translation of GELS, “dìækboλή,” 151-52.

638 E.g. Joel 4:11, where the “regions of the Philistines” (לְהָרַד גֹּלֶל) is rendered by the Septuagint translator “Galilee of the foreigners” (Γαλιλαία αὐτοῖς Φίλιτοῖς). See also Josh 22:10, where “the region of the Jordan” (הָרַד הָרְבָּד לְהָרַד) is rendered as a proper noun (Γαλιλαία τοῦ Ἰορδάνου). In two other instances, the term is rendered with Greek ὅριος (Josh 13:2; 22:11).

639 See the wide variety of renderings in Takamitsu Muraoka, “Hebrew/ Aramaic Index to the Septuagint,” Appendix 4 in Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books) (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 323. For the contention that this is the only instance in which צֶדֶק is rendered ᾿Αραβία in the LXX, see Hatch and Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint, Appendix 1, 18.
from these homophonous renderings, apart from the insight they shed into the translator’s Übersetzungsweise, is that the translator was ready to envision the salutary effects of the divine fructification of the land (47:1-12) as extending well beyond the borders of Palestine proper.

The Letter of Aristeas §§116-20 provides an interesting counterpart to the description in 6 Ezek 47:8, since it also mentions a river in the context of idealized geography, in this case the Jordan River. 641 Aristeas portrays the Jordan as a perennial stream (ποταμός ἀείρρους), which rises during the spring and floods the land, like the Nile. After emptying into another river in the vicinity of Ptolemais, the Jordan empties into the sea (οὖτος δὲ ἐξειπαν εἰς θάλασσαν). After the description of this river, the author mentions that originally there existed iron and copper mines in the mountains of Arabia situated next to Israel’s territory (ἐκ τῶν παρακειμένων ὁρέων τῆς Ἀραβίας μέταλλα χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου συνίστασθαι πρότερον). Hadas notes that the language of Aristeas here is indebted to Scripture (Deut 8:9). 642 For the present purposes, however, what is significant is the shared emphasis on fertility in the idealized accounts of both the letter of Aristeas and 6 Ezek 47:8, which is guaranteed through a perennial stream. Both

640 Compare 1 Kgs 17:4, in which Elijah is fed by the “ravens” (העדרים). Despite the unified support of the versions behind this reading, several scholars have suggested emending this to “Arabs” (הערבים) based on the likelihood that Elijah fled the jurisdiction of King Ahab and the similarity with the following episode, in which he is fed by a Phoenician woman. See James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings (ICC; ed. H. S. Gehman; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1951), 294; John Gray, I & II Kings: A Commentary (OTL; 2d. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 378 n. d.

641 I owe this observation to Joshua Yoder, in an electronic communication of 19 February 2009, for which I am grateful.

642 Hadas, Aristeas to Philocrates, 148.
Aristeas and Ezek 47:8 emphasize the vast extent of the land of Israel: Aristeas gives the highly exaggerated figure of six million arourae, and the Septuagint translator depicts the fructifying river as traversing Galilee and Arabia. The Septuagint translator may thus be depending on a tradition of Hellenistically-influenced idealized geography such as that evident in Aristeas, but the limits of his translational task make it impossible to be certain. What is certain, however, is that the translator has expanded the effects of the divine fertility promised to Israel outside its normal boundaries. Even if the reach of this river seems to remain within the idealized boundaries of the land in Ezek 47:13-20, it nonetheless mediates the supernatural fertility of the restored land beyond the more circumscribed vision of 

5.2.3 Conclusions

The renderings of the translator, as well as the significant plus in Ezek 47:13, presuppose an understanding of Judaism that mediates its blessings more widely than in 


---

643 An aroura is a section of cultivated land measuring 100 square cubits (Herodotos 2.168; Hadas, Aristeas to Philocrates, 147). Aristeas §116 acknowledges that the 600,000,000 arourae were significantly reduced by encroachment from the surrounding peoples. By way of comparison with Aristeas’ figure, in a similar apologetic context Josephos, C. A. 1.195 gives the extent of the land at a little less than 3,000,000 arourae.
of Ezekiel’s larger vision, the genealogical origins of the proselytes outside Israel are not undone. In this way, the religious dimension of Jewish life so central to Ezekiel’s definition of Judaism is mediated outward, with the result that in Israel “all the clans of the earth will be blessed” (Gen 12:3). In his attention to proselytism and the current conventions of architecture, then, the translator has taken his Hellenistic milieu into account. It is less clear, however, that he has consciously updated his source text to reflect the fulfillment of Ezekiel’s prophecies in his own day, as the following chapter will show.
CHAPTER SIX:
LEADERSHIP AND ACTUALIZING EXEGESIS IN © EZEKIEL 40-48

Arie van der Kooij is hardly the only figure associated with actualizing exegesis. However, his numerous publications offer both considered reflection on his methodology and copious illustrations of its results, and so his work on Isaiah can be taken as a starting-point from which to consider the contributions and limitations of the larger method.⁶⁴⁴ He articulated this method most clearly in the book-length study of a single chapter of Isaiah, where he distinguished four steps.⁶⁴⁵ First, he analyzes in terms of grammar, syntax and style, proceeding next to analysis of the oracle in ©, both in comparison with in and on its own terms. Next, van der Kooij studies the genre of the passage in Isaiah. Here is where actualizing exegesis comes into play.⁶⁴⁶

---


⁶⁴⁶ Van der Kooij, Oracle of Tyre, 17-18.
In line with the idea of actualization of prophecies … a prophetic passage in LXX Isaiah, such as ch. 23, will be examined in order to see whether that passage does not only constitute, as a translation, a transformation from the linguistic point of view, but also a transformation in the sense of a reinterpretation of the temporal application of an ancient prophecy….The hermeneutical question of the genre of prophecies is here at stake: did the translator aim at producing a vision of an ancient prophecy which would make sense of an oracle at his time?

Fourth, van der Kooij addresses the issue of the Hebrew text being rendered by the translator, and how the translator read and interpreted the text before him.

The question to be addressed in the present chapter is the possibility that the translator of 6 Ezek 40-48 encoded events of his own day into his translation as fulfilled or actualized prophecy. This question has been posed especially with regard to prophecy concerning leadership in Ezekiel, which would seem to offer opportunity for actualizing exegesis should the translator be so inclined. What will become clear throughout the course of this chapter, however, is that no such actualizing exegesis by the translator of 6 Ezek 40-48 can be detected.

6.1 The Translator and Leadership

It is widely known that Ezekiel 40-48 avoids the term מלך נביא for the future ruler, designating him instead by the term אב. In fact, מלך נביא occurs only twice in Ezekiel 40-

647 Jon Levenson deemed the נביא an “apolitical Messiah” (*Program of Restoration*, 57-107). Tuell understood him as the governor of the Persian province of Yehud (*Law of the Temple*, 115-20), but his dating of Ezekiel 40-48 in the time of Darius I makes such an identification problematic. Konkel, *Architektonik des Heiligen*, 270-86 understands the נביא as a Davidide who will restore the throne and who represented one of the pillars of the restoration alongside the high priest Joshua and theاسب. As such, Konkel dates the description of the נביא to the late exilic period as part of his second *Fortschreibung*. 238
48 (at 43:7, 9), and both of these references allude to idolatrous practices by Israel’s past rulers. If Ezekiel was skeptical of monarchy, the translators of his book were even more so: only two of the usages of βασιλεὺς in Ἐζεκιλ refer to Israelite kings, and these involve kings of the past. 648 When speaking of other Israelite or Judean kings, the translators prefer ἀρχων. 649 Even when referring to such past kings within Ezekiel 40-48, the translator uses not βασιλεὺς but ἠγούμενος (43:7, 9), which is also used to render other terms for leadership in Ἐζεκιλ. 650 Similarly, ἠφηγούμενος designates leaders (שָׁם) but becomes the favored rendering for the נָשִּׁי in Ezek 40-48. 651 How should this distribution of terminology be explained?

Raurell proposed that the use of terminology reflected the theology of the translator. ἀρχων, used negatively of the present and past rulers, was never used in Ezek 40-48 and was instead balanced by the ἠφηγούμενος, representing an ideal ruler. 652 This solution is subject to the major objection that ἀρχων is in fact used positively of the

---

648 Βασιλεὺς refers to Israelite kings at 1:2 (Jehoiachin); 17:12b (Jehoiachin or Zedekiah) and to foreign kings in Ezek 17:12a, 16; 19:9; 21:24, 26; 24:2; 26:7; 27:33, 35; 28:17; 29:2, 18, 19; 30:10, 21, 22, 24, 25 [bis]; 31:2; 32:2, 10, 11, 31.


651 שָׁם: Ezek 11:1; נָשִּׁי: Ezek 12:10; 21:17, 30; 22:6; 45:8, 9, 16, 17, 22; 46:2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18; 48:21, 22; נבָע: Ezek 22:25 [usually מ is regarded as secondary here: see Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 465].

restored Davidic ruler (Ezek 34:24; 37:22, 24, 25). Lust notes the aversion to monarchical pretensions on the part of the Septuagint translators, but prefers to solve the problem by accepting the three translator theory described in chapter one. He argues as follows. Ezekiel \( \beta' \) always uses ἄρχων for מלך and נשיא when referring to Judean and Israelite rulers, but sections \( \alpha' \) and \( \gamma' \) are inconsistent. ἀρχούμενος always has positive connotations in \( \gamma' \), but not in \( \alpha' \). Lust over-generalizes here, and so his argument is not convincing. Moreover, he argues, unlike section \( \gamma' \), section \( \alpha' \) never uses ἀρχούμενος to express נשי or נשיא מלך, but this distinction should not be pressed too far. Although Lust finds that the use of expressions for rulers in \( \sigma \) Ezekiel validates Turner’s three-translator theory, it is compatible with a two-translator theory as well.

In chapter three, I argued that the Septuagint Vorlage preserved some harmonizations that endowed the נשיא with some priestly functions. Could the vagueness of the terms chosen for leadership by the translator consciously reflect the influence of

---


654 For the most part Ezekiel \( \alpha' \) and \( \gamma' \) use ἀρχούμενος as a rendering for the Hebrew נשיא (see n. 651 above), and so the negative or positive connotations of such a usage thus belong to \( \sigma \) and are not representative of the translator’s judgments. The translator is simply rendering one term in the source text with a corresponding Greek term. Even if this were not the case, Lust’s argument would be undermined by the negative connotations of the descriptions of the ἀρχούμενος in Ezek 45:8-9, the first time this term appears in Ezekiel \( \gamma' \).

655 Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 218-19. The variation between ἀρχούμενος and ἔγραμμενος is probably not significant (see below). The avoidance of ἄρχων or a similar term to render צֶּרֶךְ in Ezek 43:7, 9 can be explained by the wish to downplay aspirations to monarchy in a portion of Ezekiel that could be thought to refer to the Second Temple period. That this is not special pleading is seen in the fact that such a downplaying of monarchic aspiration is characteristic of \( \sigma \) Ezekiel as a whole.

240
the High Priest as the *de facto* leader in Palestine during the pre-Hasomonean or early Hasmonean periods? Does the translator understand this leader as a high priest, and if so, can this be established from distinctive lexical usage? ἀφηγέομαι is common in native Greek sources, but appears only once in the Pentateuch (Exod 11:8; of Moses). It is more common in Greek Jewish sources to describe leadership in the second century B.C.E. Josephus portrays Simon III, a high priest who ruled Judea from 142-34 B.C.E., as being a capable leader (Σύμων δὲ γενναίος ἀφηγούμενος τῶν πραγμάτων; B. J. 1.50). Similarly, 4 Macc 4:18 depicts Antiochus Epiphanes as permitting Jason “both to be the high priest and rule the nation” (ὁ δὲ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἄρχειράσθαι καὶ τοῦ ἐθνος ἀφηγεῖσθαι). Similarly 2 Macc 14:6 pictures Judas Maccabeus as ethnic leader of the Jews (ὅν ἀφηγεῖται λοῦδας). These instances of ἀφηγούμενος and ἀφηγέομαι in Greek and Hellenistic Jewish sources suggest that this term is best understood in Ezek 40-48 and 1 and 2 Maccabees as referring to the leadership of a people-group (✏️). Indeed, in 4 Macc 4:18, ἀφηγέομαι is distinguished explicitly from holding the office of the high priesthood.

---

656 The best discussion of the high priests of this period can be found in James VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 181-336.

657 ἀφηγέομαι can refer to those in the vanguard during war (Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.8.37.3), command of a sailing vessel (Plutarch, *Love Stories*, 773 B.7), the captain of the royal bodyguard (Diodoros Siculo, 11.69.1.7), an army commander (Diodoros Siculo 13.51.1.2; 14.30.3.6; 14:39.5.3; 14.65.1.4; 14.78.2.1; 14.85.4.2; 15.32.5.2; 16.49.1.1), a fleet commander (Diodoros Siculo 11.12.2.1; 13.49.2.1), a cavalry commander (Diodoros Siculo 15.91.3.2; 18.40.5.2), a satrap in charge of a province (Diodoros Siculo 14.35.3.5) and the one at the head of an embassy (Strabo, *Geo.* 1.3.1.15). This term can also function as the generic term for a leader of a people-group (Δοικέτος ὁ τῶν Σκιλών ἀφηγούμενος; Diodoros Siculo 11.88.6.2; cf. also 14.10.3.6; 14.82.7.5). It also describes a nation (Sparta) as exhibiting pre-eminent political power (Diodoros Siculo14.69.5.3). In literary usage, it can refer to a subsequent portion of an account (Josephus, *A. J.* 16.404; *C. A.* 1.132). Philo uses it to describe the leading of the divine spirit (*On the Giants* 55).
'Ηγούμενος, on the other hand, is witnessed in the Pentateuch, including the messianic promise of a leader from Judah’s loins (Gen 49:10). Like ἀφηγούμενος, it is a fitting term to designate an ethnic Jewish leader in the second century B.C.E. The same Simon III described by Josephus as a capable leader (ἀφηγούμενος) is designated by the epithets “great high priest, governor, and leader of the Jews” (ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἡγουμένου Ἰουδαίων) in 1 Macc 13:42. Earlier in 1 Macc 13:8 the people had recognized him as being their leader (ἡγούμενος) in place of his younger brother Jonathan. James VanderKam argues that 1 Macc 13:1-9 refers to the remnants of Jonathan’s army designating Simon as high priest (though this title is not mentioned) as well as their general. Likewise, ἡγούμενος is an important descriptor for military leadership in the Septuagint, especially 1 and 2 Maccabees. In view of the overlap in usage, it seems no great distinction between ἀφηγούμενος and ἡγούμενος is intended by the translator of Ἐζχ 40-48, despite Lust’s contention. What is significant about both terms is the fact that they picture someone (an army commander, a satrap, the leader of an ἐξόνος) who exercises power, generally military power, under the auspices of a greater leader or over an area less than that controlled by the great empires. Thus, the vagueness of both terms allows, though it does not require, the possibility that priestly leadership is

---

658 Gen 49:26 (of Joseph’s pre-eminence among his brothers, rendering רַבֵּר; God’s leading (Exod 13:21, translating לְהָלָה), the leading of God’s angels and divine terror (Exod 23:23, 27, rendering מִשְׁרָאָל), God’s establishing leaders over the tribes (Deut 1:13, 15; 5:23; rendering inflections of שָׁחְרָא).

659 VanderKam, From Joshua to Caiaphas, 277-82.

implied in \( \text{Ezek } 40-48 \) by the terms ἀφηγοῦμένος and ἡγοῦμένος. However, other scholars have argued that the Septuagint translation of Ezekiel does in fact interpret the earlier oracles in light of current events, a claim which is necessary to consider.

### 6.2 Leadership and Actualizing Exegesis in \( \text{Ezek } 40-48 \)?

One passage in which actualizing exegesis has been detected is \( \text{Ezek } 43:7-9 \).

\( \text{Ezek 43:7-9} \)

7 καὶ ἐγε νπρός με
‘Εδράκας, \text{661} νιὲ ἀνθρώπου
tὸν τόπον τοῦ θρόνου μου
καὶ τὸν τόπον τῶν ἱχνιῶν τῶν ποδῶν μου,
ἐν οἷς κατασκηνώσει τὸ ὄνομά μου\text{663}
ἐν μέσῳ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ τὸν αἰώνα·
cαὶ οὐ βεβηλώσουσιν οὐκετί οἶκος Ἰσραήλ
tὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἄγιον μου,
αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ ἡγοῦμένοι αὐτῶν,
ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς φόνοις τῶν ἡγοῦμένων

\( \text{LXX Ezek 43:7-9} \)

7 Ἰωάμερ Αλί
βο-αδή
ἐν-μύκον οὐθέν
ἐν-ασχήμον
βασιλεὺς-Ισραήλ
λα ιστιμπο τιν νή-ισραήλ
ἐν κεδρί
ἐν οἴλοις
ἐν μέλημα
ἐν μέλημά

\text{661} A secondary reading in \( \text{Ezek } 43:7 \). See §3.1.1.1 above.

\text{662} For discussion of this difficult reading, see n. 238 above.

\text{663} The translator interprets שׁ in \( \text{Ezek } 43:7 \) along the lines of the near context and Deuteronomistic theology (e.g. Deut 12:5; cf. Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 217). For the influence of Deuteronomistic theology on Ezekiel, see Risa Levitt Kohn, \textit{A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and Torah} (JSOTSup 358; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002); and Robert R. Wilson, \textit{Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 284. ζ avoids the anthropomorphism, reading וֹדֶה אֶת־בָּלָד וֹדֶה אֶת־בָּלָד.

\text{664} The interpretation of מְבֹרֶר is varied in the versions. \( \text{LXX: } \text{et in ruinis regum suorum} \). \text{63} מְבֹרֶר כִּי־זֶה מַסָּבֶר. Konkel, \textit{Architektonik des Heiligen}, 73 interprets מְבֹרֶר כִּי־זֶה מַסָּבֶר as the funerals of their kings. Other suggestions have included the purification of the temple area through royal graves (Gese, \textit{Verfassungsentwurf}, 39), commemoration stela for kings (D. Neiman, “PGR: A Canaanite Cult-Object in the Old Testament,” \textit{JBL} 67 [1948], 55-60; Kurt Galling, “Erwägungen zum
665 θ ’ s translator read בְּמוֹת (in their high places”), followed by ζ (critical edition) ד ד, but most scholars re-point it to בְּמוֹת (“at their death”) following about 20 מ manuscripts, Theodotion (τῶν βασιλέων αὐτῶν τῶν τεθνηκότων) and several manuscripts of the Targum (Cooke, Ezekiel, 474; Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 34; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 409; Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 570; Konkel, Architektonik des Heiligen, 73). Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 217 disagrees with this repointing. Some scholars delete נו as a corruption of the following נו (e.g. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 409).

666 Exhibiting the variation of pronominal endings, which may reflect either a different Vorlage or the correction of the translator. Placing the deity’s structure first seems to be a tendentious correction by either θ or the translator. See §2.1.1 above. ζ adds: ספ בית מקדיש.

667 ἐξώμενος renders דב (Ezek 42:1 [bis]), ἀνελθε (43:6, 8); ליתת (48:13, 18, 21).

668 Jahn, Ezechiel, 306 reconstructs ס as ייִת נ כוֹ נ ב ת ב ט י נ ו י. It is difficult to know if the translator is rendering freely here or if he is reflecting a fuller Vorlage.

669 For the sense of the customary consecutive plus the perfect, see GKC §112i and Waltke and O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, §33.3.5 (561-62).

670 Presumably a plus in ס.
7 And he said to me: "Have you seen, human, the place of my throne and the place of the soles of my feet among whom my name will dwell in the midst of the house of Israel forever? And the house of Israel will no longer desecrate my holy name, they and their leaders in their immorality and in the murders committed by their leaders in their midst: when they put my threshold beside their threshold and my doorpost beside their doorposts and they placed my wall as if joining mine and theirs. And they desecrated my holy name with the lawless acts which they were committing; so I destroyed them in my anger and in murder.

9 And now let them put away from me their immorality and the murders committed by their leaders so that I may dwell in their midst forever."

This admonition to avoid royal encroachments on the divine realm in σ continues to downplay the dynasties of Judah, designating past kings not βασιλεῖς but ἡγοῦμενοι.

671 Through addition of the copula, ὁ δὲ and numerous Hebrew witnesses of מַעַן provide a smoother and secondary reading.

672 An example of an anacoulthon in מַעַן. See n. 239 above.

673 For the translation of τῶν ἡγοῦμένων as a subjective genitive, see the following discussion.
Likewise, the translator’s rendering of the mysterious מִלְכָּה (φονοίς) with “murders” is striking. Lust suggests this refers to the murder of the high priest and leader, Onias III, as does Dan 9:26. One point in support of Lust’s thesis is his observation that in the Septuagint, the objective genitive is used for a personal object of φόνος. The survey of the range of meanings of ἁγούμενος and ἀφηγούμενος above suggests that they fit easily with Lust’s theory, though they do not require it.

Yet it is unlikely that the Septuagint translator had external events in view. First, the evidence for the exclusive use of the objective genitive with personal objects of φόνος is weak. Moreover, the parallelism in Ezek 43:7 between the people’s and leaders’ idolatry (ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῶν) and the murders of their leaders (ἐν τοῖς φόνοις τῶν ἡγούμενων) leads one to expect the subjective genitive (“the murders committed by their leaders”), not the objective (“murdering their leaders”). In a context concerned to minimize the long reach of the leader, the evidence pointing to the murder of a leader is less than compelling.

---


676 Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 230. Lust does not cite specifics.

677 Theodotion uses the same term (ἡγούμενος) for the πᾶς in Dan 9:26 as does Ezek 43:7, 9, though the hyponym in ἀγρός is different (ὃς).

678 As far as I am aware, the use of the objective genitive with personal objects of φόνος occurs only at Jdt 8:22 (καὶ τὸν φόνον τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν) in the Septuagint.
How then should the rendering φόνος be explained? Although μακριν is most commonly rendered by κόλον in the Septuagint,\(^{679}\) other renderings are employed that involve a degree of interpretation on the part of the translator.\(^{680}\) It seems likely that the translator understood μακριν in the normal sense of a corpse, but interpreted it metonymically to refer to royal murder.\(^{681}\) In this method of interpretation, the translator exhibits sensitivity to the larger context with its aversion to the arbitrary exercise of royal power, but also introduces a prohibition of more universal applicability. Something of a similar process can be seen in Ἐζεκ 45:9, where the translator generalizes the Hebrew “expulsions” (גרשותם) into “oppression” (καταδυναστείαν; see below).\(^{682}\) If this interpretation can be sustained, the translator does not reflect contemporary events so much as universally valid ones.

While Ἐζεκ 43:7-9 does not reflect contemporizing exegesis, it does raise the issue of how the translator saw the ἡγούμενος as related to the ἀφηγούμενος. Did he want to distinguish the two terms? Ἐζεκ 45:7-9 provides further clues to this question.

---

\(^{679}\) Lev 26:30; Num 14:29, 32, 33; 3 Kgdms (=1 Kgs) 17:46; Isa 66:24.

\(^{680}\) Νέκρος: 2 Par 20:24; Isa 34:3; Jer 40 (=Mt 33):5; πτώμα: Ezek 6:5 (in A; B omits this clause, probably because it was not in θ but was added from the later reading of π); πτώσις: Nah 3:3; σώμα: Gen 15:15; 4 Kgdms 19:35; Isa 37:36.

\(^{681}\) See a further example in Ezek 7:15ן בֵּית בֵּית יִשָּׁרְא אָבֶר // ὁ πόλεμος ἐν ῥομφαία ἔξωθεν, which includes both the symbol (ῥομφαία) and its figural significance (ὁ πόλεμος), thus exhibiting double translation.

\(^{682}\) Like the sacrificial terminology we examined in chapter four, the term καταδυναστεία is evidence for the influence of the Pentateuch on our translator, since the term is a neologism introduced for the first time at Exod 6:7. See John W. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus (SCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 5; J. A. L. Lee, A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch (SCS 14; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1983), 48.


In בַּיָּמִים, where בַּיָּמִים is translated with ὅπως, it is used in the plural (43:12; 45:1; 47:13, 15, 16, 17 [bis]; 48:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28). An exception with the singular ὅπως occurs at 48:1.


In בַּיָּמִים is explicable as an attempt to understand מַעָלֶה’s reading by supplying the nomen rectum from v. 9 (Block, *Ezekiel 25-48*, 645 n. 31; Konkel, *Architektonik des Heiligen*, 135). For another example of this phenomenon, see בַּיָּמִים 44:13 and §3.1.2.2 above. There is thus no reason to understand מַעָלֶה as an abbreviation מַעָלֶה (Fohrer with Galling, *Ezechiel*, 259; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 467).
καὶ τὴν γῆν κατακληρονομήσουσιν οἶκος Ἰσραήλ
κατὰ φυλὰς αὐτῶν.
9 τὰδε λέγει κύριος. 688
Τικανοῦσθω ύμῖν, 689 οἱ ἀφηγούμενοι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ:
ἀδικίαν καὶ ταλαπωρίαν ἀφέλεσθε
καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ποιήσατε,
ἐξάρατε καταδυναστεῖαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ μου,
λέγει κύριος.

7 And it belongs to the leader from this side and that
of the consecrated area
as a possession of the city
facing the consecrated area
and facing the possession of the city

with respect to the regions toward the west
and from the west regions eastward.
And its length was like one of the portions

from the regions toward the west
and the length was along the borders to the east
of the land.
8 And it will be his as a possession in Israel.

And the leaders of Israel
will no longer oppress my people
and the house of Israel will inherit the land
according to their tribes.
9 Thus says the Lord
“Let it be enough for you, O leaders of Israel:
remove lawlessness and misery;
practice justice and righteousness.

7 And you will give space 690 to the
prince from this side and that
of the consecrated area
and of the city’s possession
facing the consecrated area
and facing the possession of the city—
from the west side westward
and from the east side eastward.
And its length was corresponding to
one of the portions
from the west border
to the eastern border 8 of the land.

And it will be his as a possession in Israel.
And my princes
will no longer oppress my people
and they will permit the house of the
Israel to possess the land 691
according to their tribes.
9 Thus says the Lord God
“Enough, princes of Israel!
Remove violence and bribery;
practice justice and righteousness!

688 This is the reading of ᾪ. B adds θεός.
689 Cf. Ὑ ᾳ Ezek 44:6; 3 Kgdms 12:28; Deut 1:6; 2:3 for a similar translation.
690 This is the translation of Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 466 and Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 648.
691 For this translation, see 1 Kings 18:26 and Bertholet, Hesekiel, 159.
Drive out oppression from my people!” Stop deporting my people!” says the Lord. —an oracle of the Lord God.

The Greek translator of these verses used both ἡγούμενος and ἄρχων to render the Hebrew term מנה. The use of ἡγούμενος in this fashion is unexpected within Greek Ezekiel in that is this term used to render מנה only in Ezek γ.’ After Ezek 45:7, the translator consistently renders the Hebrew מנה with ἄρχων. Much like the Hebrew מנה, which is rendered at first by θυσία and then by μαα in ς Ezek 40-48, this variation in the rendering of מנה seems to reflect normal translational variation of lexical equivalents. Despite the uniqueness of the use of ἡγούμενος to render מנה within ς Ezekiel, then, it seems no great difference in meaning separates the terms ἄρχων and ἡγούμενος. Unlike Ezek β’, in which the term ἄρχων is common, both ἄρχων and ἡγούμενος lack any monarchic connotations and may have been chosen in part for this reason. Apart from a potential evasion of unseemly monarchic

693 Ezek 45:8, 9, 16, 17, 22; 46:2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18; 48:21, 22.
694 מנה is translated by θυσία (Ezek 42:13; 44:11, 15, 29; 45:15, 17, 24; 46:5) and then almost uniformly by μαα (Ezek 45:25; 46:5, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20). Lust, “Exegesis in LXX Ezekiel,” 221 attributes the variation in the terminology to leadership either to “the inconsistency of the translator or to a three-translator theory as proposed by J. Herrmann.” Given that such variation is in evidence for other terms, in my opinion the variation in the terminology for leadership can be explained more convincingly as normal translational variation than as evidence for a three-translator solution for Ezekiel.
695 ἄρχων is used in Ezek 26:16; 27:8, 21; 28:2, 12; 30:13; 31:11; 32:29, 30; 34:24; 37:22, 24, 25; 38:2, 3; 39:1, 18.
connotations, then, no modernizing intentions in the use of terms referring to leadership in Ezek 40-48 can be discerned.

Ezek 21:25-27 [מ Ezek 21:30-32], on the other hand, has been cited recently as evidence of just such a reference to Hasmonean rule.

Reading the form as the aorist indicative, and not the imperative as in Ziegler’s critical text (’Ἀφελέω). The readings cited by Ziegler in support of the reading are later and Lucianic (L-449 410 Tht.) and correct the text back toward מ. Johan Lust. “Messianism and Septuagint.” In Congress Volume Salamanca 1983 (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 174-91; repr. in Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays by J. Lust (ed. Katrin Hauspie; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004), 23.

The appropriateness of the forms in the sequence of verbs in מ (ץסרי, וחיר, חנהקה, חפשיס) is debated. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 438-39 adduces manuscript Kennicott in favor of reading these forms as infinitives absolute. Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 22A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 433 notes that the first, second and fourth verbs in this series are infinitives construct in form, which can sometimes serve as the imperative (Jer 17:18; Ps 94:1; GKC §53m), and deems any attempt to correct these forms to infinitives absolute “sheer pedantry.” Whatever the precise identity of the forms, the significance is imperatival.

Again reading the aorist indicative with the older and better manuscripts (B and מ) against the imperative (ἀπόθου) of Ziegler’s critical text, which is supported only by later manuscripts (L-V-46 410 Tht.).

Compare מ: אופר דייו באתירה לא סקימו מכח אוילן דlanması בר אטיקוס ולא חות דלילו יבенко צוריקו דרלייה והומ❌ מנה.

Arnold B. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel 5 (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1912), 83 compared this idiom to 2 Kgs 9:37.
25 And you, profane, lawless leader of Israel

whose day has come,
whose end is in a time of iniquity:

26 Thus says the Lord:
“
You took off 702 the tiara
and you put on 708 the crown.
There will not be another one such as this.
You humbled what is exalted
and exalted what is humble.
27 Lawlessness, lawlessness I will make it!
Nor will there be another one such as this
until one comes for whom it is fitting

30 And you, profane rascal, 706 prince of Israel

whose day has come,
whose end is in a time of iniquity:

31 Thus says the Lord God:
“Remove your tiara
and take off the crown.
Nothing will be the same.
Exalt what is low
and humble what is exalted.
32 Ruin, ruin, ruin I will make it!
Moreover this will not be the same
until one comes who owns it by right

702 Either an abbreviating rendering by the translator, or a simplification in the course of transmission.

703 The feminine suffix on this form may refer to the city of Jerusalem in v. 27 (Bertholet, Hesekiel, 76) or it may be indicative of a “neutral generality” (Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 439; cf. also Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 315).

704 Cornill, Ezechiel, 309, Bertholet, Hesekiel, 76 and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 439 suggest that 
may be an abbreviation for . Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 21 suggests that the perfect may be prophetic.

705 Compare §.

706 The meaning of here is unclear. Frequently it is taken in the sense of “profane” rather than “slain,” and the phrase is re-pointed as . If so, is a kind of genitive collective (see GKC 128l; Bertholet, Hesekiel, 76; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 438; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 21). Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-38, 417, 432-33 prefers to translate this phrase as “wicked corpse,” understanding the construct phrase as appositional or adjectival, adducing Prov 11:7; 13:17. Pohlmann with Rudnig, Ezechiel 20-48, 315 translates as “Schändlicher, Frevler,” although he acknowledges that “schändlicher Frevler” is possible.

707 For the translation of an aorist active in place of an imperative (such as translated by Hubler, “Iezekiel,” NETS), see n. 697 above.

708 For the translation of an aorist active in place of an imperative (such as translated by Hubler, “Iezekiel,” NETS), see n. 699 above.
and I will entrust it to him.” and I will entrust it to him.”

Two scholars have contributed studies of this passage in Ezek 21:30-32 that both presuppose that the translator is reflecting contemporary events, but offer diametrically opposed views concerning his attitude toward such events. Johan Lust provided the first of these contributions. In the context of a consideration of Messianism in the Septuagint, he analyzes Ezekiel 21:30-32// Ezek 21:25-27 first in and then in Ṣ. According to Lust, the earliest recoverable Hebrew text contained what is presently Ezek 21:31-32, which referred to the upheaval suffered following Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction of Jerusalem. In these verses, the king is treated as simply another member of the upper class, since both the crown (ḳūnā) and priestly turban ( トラック) mentioned in Ezek 21:31 have figurative senses, according to Lust. Lust finds an analogy for the figurative use of these terms in Isa 62:3. They indicate that “Nebuchadnezzar abased the city, taking into exile the élite of the town.” The feminine expression מְאֹד לְאָשֶׁר referred in this original version to the city of Jerusalem: “She is not the same any more.” Similarly, the pronominal ending on אַשְׁמֶנָה had the city in view. Turning to Ezek 21:30, Lust notes that the second-person address to the guilty party before the messenger formula elsewhere suggests redactional passages. When

709 “Messianism and Septuagint.”
710 Lust, “Messianism and Septuagint,” 18.
711 Ezek 20:39; 21:30; 34:17. Lust is here depending on the analysis of Frank Hossfeld, Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches (Würzburg: Echter, 1977), 36, 282-85, 333 to determine that these passages are secondary.
this observation is coupled with the fact that Ezek 21:30 is similar to the language of Ezek 21:34, Lust suggests that Ezek 21:30 was added to make this oracle refer to the king himself, not to the upper class as a whole.

With the addition of v. 30, the terms לעוהה and מענה, which had been figurative in the earlier version of the oracle, were understood concretely and applied exclusively to the king. A wicked king, and not the upper stratum of Jerusalem’s elite, represented by the city of Jerusalem, was now being addressed. Corresponding to this change of address, the feminine suffixes in Ezek 21:32 no longer refer to the city of Jerusalem, but became generalized (neuter) statements. is understood as an abstract formulation: “Nothing will be the same any more.” Lust does not give a translation of אמשנה in this more generalized sense.

Lust draws attention to the interpretation of the phrase לעוהה לא המשנה.

Scholars have suggested two major referents for this phrase: 1) Nebuchadnezzar; and 2) a salvific figure or Messiah. According to the first option, Nebuchadnezzar would be bringing the judgment (משנה) expected by the prophet, and so would indicate that something like this had not had not occurred until the coming of this king. According to the second option, the clause would be understood as follows: “There will not have been (a savior) until the one who possesses justice comes.” According to Lust, determination of which option is correct depends on how one interprets in this more generalized sense.

712 See Waltke-O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, §6.6d, where such formulations are called “dummy or impersonal” pronouns; and GKC §122q.
context. If it means “judgment-punishment,” the first option is correct; if it means “right” or “justice,” this would privilege the second option.

Lust argues that the closest analogy to the use of the word מִסְפָּט in Ezek 21:32 occurs in Deut 1:17: ‘כְּוַיָּמָת לְיָהֳדָו’. Here, מִסְפָּט means “juridical power,” which can be punitive or can lead to vindication. Lust argues that in the earlier version of the oracle (דָּרֵשׁ מִסְפָּט מִסְפָּט), מִסְפָּט had a negative connotation and referred to the sentence of destruction against Jerusalem. In the later version of the oracle (including יָמָת מִסְפָּט), the addressee changed from the city to the wicked king, so that the sense of מִסְפָּט in Ezek 21:32 was naturally understood as a foil to this wicked king. In the revised oracle, מִסְפָּט would mean something like “justice”. The expected future king would bring the righteous rule envisioned by Gen 49:10. This process of Messianic exegesis in Ezek 21:30-32 is similar to the one Lust and Hossfeld see at work in Ezek 17.713

Turning to his analysis of the Septuagint rendering of the passage, Lust notes that the rendering of ἀπελθέντος with βέβηλος is unique.714 Only once does βέβηλος refer to a person, in 2 Macc 5:16, where the subject is Antiochus Epiphanes’ desecration of the holy vessels with his polluted hands. The use of such a rendering suggests that the person in

---

713 Lust, “Messianism and Septuagint,” 22-23. Here Lust has in mind the treatment of Ezek 17 in Hossfeld, Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches, 59-98.

view is seen to be “connected with a cultic situation”.\(^{715}\) This is supported by the fact that κίδαρις normally refers to the priestly headband,\(^{716}\) while the στέφανος is more royal in connotation.\(^{717}\) The unusual rendering of ἀπεθάνει in v. 31 shows that the κίδαρις and στέφανος were not conceived as synonymous: the στέφανος referred to royal power, while the κίδαρις indicated the priestly office. According to Lust, \(\text{\&}\) Ezek 21:25-27 suggests the negative evaluation of the Hasmoneans’ exercise of both priestly and civil powers, beginning with Jonathan (cf. 1 Macc 10:20). In his rendering, the translator communicated a negative evaluation of the Hasmonean joining of priestly (κίδαρις) and royal (στέφανος) power, comparable to other Second Temple Jewish groups, such as the Qumran sectarians. In v. 32 (ἀδικίαν ἀδικίαν θήσομαι αὐτήν), the antecedent of the feminine object of the destruction (αὐτήν) is the κίδαρις. This suggests that the high priest addressed had judged the importance of the priesthood too meanly when compared with royal power; he had “removed the tiara and put on the crown.” The last “clause announces the advent of a priestly Messiah who will restore the high priesthood and who will be worthy to receive the head dress of the high priest.”\(^{718}\) Thus, the Septuagint

\(^{715}\) Lust, “Messianism and Septuagint,” 24.

\(^{716}\) Rendering ἀπεθάνει: Exod 28:4, 39; 36:35 [π 39:28]; Lev 16:4; Ezek 21:31; with κεφαλή as its hyponym: Exod 28:40; Lev 8:13; with θυσία as its hyponym: Ezek 44:18; with θύσιν as its hyponym: Zech 3:5 [bis]; see also Sir 45:12; 1 Esdr 3:6; Jdt 4:15.


\(^{718}\) Lust, “Messianism and Septuagint,” 26.
translator saw Ezekiel’s oracle as attacking the Hasmonean coupling of royal and sacral power, and rendered accordingly.

In reaction to Lust’s article, Arie van der Kooij presented his own arguments that the translation of Ἑζεκίλιος Ezekiel actually sought to support, not critique, the Hasmonean leadership. Van der Kooij questions whether Lust’s interpretation fits with the context of Ἑζ 21:32, which alludes to the coming siege of Jerusalem. Zedekiah, not a contemporary high priest, must be in view. He also questions whether στέφανος / עטרת must necessarily allude to a king, or whether it can describe the high priest as well. In 2 Macc 5:16; 3 Macc 2:2, 14, βῆβηλος describes kings who overstepped the bounds of the sacred realm. For van der Kooij, then, the point of the oracle is that Zedekiah has taken off the high priestly tiara from the high priest and put it on its own head, seeking to exercise a priestly role improperly. The phrase ὁ καθήκει renders the Hebrew שמש and is parallel to Deut 21:17. This parallel allows us to understand משמש as “right” and not “judgment” or “justice,” as shown by the use of παραδίδωμι in 2 Macc 15:15, which describes Jeremiah’s gift of a sword to Judas the Maccabee. “Contextually,


721 Sir 45:12 describes the κέφαλη as part of Aaron’s headdress. In 1 Macc 10:20, ὁ Ἱσαακ 22:17, στέφανος is used for the high priest and contrasts with the king’s διάδημα in 1 Macc 1:9; 6:15; Sir 47:6, ὁ Ἱσαακ 62:3 (“Profane Leader,” 48-49; “Hasmonean Leadership,” 440).

722 ο: καὶ τούτῳ καθήκει τὰ πρωτότοκια; מ: משמש ו לת. 257
the idea is that a leader will come to whom the insignia of the high priesthood will belong, in particular the crown,” referring of course to the Hasmoneans.\textsuperscript{723}

Moreover, van der Kooij adduces a second passage for his argument. He contends that Ezek 34:17-31, esp. vv. 23-24, have a parallel in Ezek 37:22-25, sharing three elements: 1) one king (אָדָם תְּרוֹם; ἅρπαγον εἶς); 2) David my servant as king (אָדָם תְּרוֹם; ἅρπαγον); and 3) David my servant as prince (אָדָם תְּרוֹם; ἅρπαγον). Van der Kooij posits that the translator has understood Ezek 34:17-31 and 37:22-25 along similar lines to how he interpreted Ezek 21:25-27. He suggests the use of ἅρπαγον in place of βασιλεύς in Ezek 37:22, 24 may reflect its usage in Ezek 28:12, where it refers to someone who also exercises the role of the high priest in addition to royal power. He follows Lust in explaining the vestments of the King of Tyre (28:17-20) as designating that the Prince of Tyre is to be understood as the high priest.\textsuperscript{724} Van der Kooij thus concludes that the choice of ἅρπαγον in Ezek 28, 34 and 37 indicates that this ruler is understood as both a king and a high priest. Based on Sir 45:24-25, he argues that the name “David” mentioned in ἅ Ezek 34:17-31 and Ezek 37:22-25 was associated with high-priestly ideology in addition to royal ideology.\textsuperscript{725} This allows him to conclude that “LXX-Ezekiel not only has been produced for study and instruction, but also for reasons of propaganda

\textsuperscript{723} Van der Kooij, “Profane Leader,” 50.

\textsuperscript{724} “Hasmonean Leadership,” 442; Lust, “Messianism in Septuagint,” 25.

\textsuperscript{725} “Hasmonean Leadership,” 442-43.
for the Maccabean leadership—a propaganda in line with the ideology found in 1 Maccabees as well as reflected in Ben Sira (Greek).”

How can these divergent accounts be reconciled? First, it can be observed that the term ἅρπαξ in no way supports van der Kooij’s contention that it represents the high priest as well as a royal figure. There is simply no evidence in Ἐzekiel 34 and 37 that David functions as a high priest; all that links these passages in Ἐzekiel to the priestly depiction of the Prince of Tyre in Ezekiel 28 is the use of the designation ἅρπαξ. The distribution of ἅρπαξ suggests it was the simple equivalent for terms of ruling in Ezekiel α’ and β’, without necessarily carrying any priestly connotations. As a result, Ezekiel 21:30-32 is left to support van der Kooij’s contention that Ἐzekiel was translated as pro-Hasmonean propaganda on its own.

Whether the translator understood the addressee of the oracle as Zedekiah or someone living in his own times can only be discerned through his translation, not from a priori considerations. Van der Kooij is correct to discern that the context clearly refers to Zedekiah, but the crucial points in his argument are the contentions that the translator(s) of Ἐzekiel would have applied the statement in Ezekiel 21:32b (ὃς ὁ ἐλαθή̔ς ἃς καθῆκει) to the Hasmonean leadership, and that this would have served to legitimate such leadership. Both of these arguments miscarry seriously for lack of evidence and in


728 The tendency toward circular reasoning is one of the most trenchant criticisms of van der Kooij’s approach by Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation, 83-85.
fact seriously misread the orientation of the rest of the book. Most obviously, if the phrase ἔως οὖν ἐλθή ὁ καθήκει referred to exercising priestly functions, this would not necessarily refer to Maccabean priests; in the context of Ezekiel, it would be naturally read as pertaining to Zadokites, especially in view of Ezekiel’s concluding vision. Nor does the vision of restoration in ḫ Ezek 40-48 support a pro-Maccabean interpretation of the evidence. As already demonstrated, ḫ Ezek 40-48 carries a high number of secondary readings, suggesting it was the focus of study to some extent in the restoration period, and so evidence of pro-Maccabean propaganda should be evident here if it exists. Yet such an expectation is disappointed. Even if van der Kooij is correct that in Ezek 28, 34, 37 ἄφροσεν carries priestly connotations, ḫ Ezek 40-48 does not use this term for the presumed high-priestly leader, preferring ἰγούμενος and ἀφηγούμενος, as already demonstrated. Similarly, the fact that ḫ Ezek 42:13 emphasizes the Zadokite privilege to a greater extent than /Base, and is rendered straightforwardly by the translator, significantly decreases the possibility that ḫ Ezekiel is pro-Hasmonean propaganda.⁷²⁹ In ḫ Ezek 40-48, there is much more evidence of Zadokite domination of Levitical rights (e.g. judging difficult cases), as well as a serious downplaying of the past and future monarchy. As a result, van der Kooij’s proposal overreaches the available evidence and in fact contradicts the larger themes of the rest of the book.

Lust’s thesis has the advantage of cohering with the pro-Zadokite orientation of the rest of Ezekiel and of indicting royal usurpation of priestly prerogatives in the same manner as Ezek 43:7-9. His thesis that ḫ Ezek 21:27 envisions a priestly Messiah who

⁷²⁹ See §3.1.1.6 above.
would restore the broken liturgy is quite possible, but is by no means the only reading of the evidence. To different degrees, both Lust and van der Kooij assume what must be proven: namely, that translators explicitly encoded their own views of the significance of contemporary events into their work. When a larger pattern of such reformulation of the translator’s source text is not in evidence, objective evaluation of single instances of perceived actualizing exegesis is often quite difficult.

6.3 Summary and Conclusions

Despite the claims of Lust and van der Kooij, there is little basis for the claim that contemporizing or actualizing exegesis can be detected in Ἐzekiel. This is not to deny that the translator seems consciously to have updated certain elements of his source text in light of his contemporary environment, as was argued in chapter five. Similarly, as argued in chapter three, the editors of Ἐ V seem to have inserted modernizing glosses from time to time. What distinguishes these processes from the actualizing exegesis of van der Kooij is the claim that Ezekiel’s oracles were being fulfilled in the present of the author. As I read Ἐ Ezekiel 40-48, I am unable to find a basis in the text for such a claim.
CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

The importance of the Septuagint for the development of Ezekiel as a prophetic book is without question, since it provides empirical evidence for the continuing redaction of the book in the last few centuries B.C.E. It is becoming increasingly clear that in general the consonantal text of ו Ezek 1-39 represents a later literary version of the book of Ezekiel that developed from an earlier form that served as the base text of ו Ezek 1-39. This calls into serious question the consensus (at least in English-speaking circles) that the book of Ezekiel is in the main the product of a historical figure who was taken to Babylon in the first deportation and who prophesied there. Of course, the extent of this development remains subject to debate, but in the future responsible scholarship on Ezekiel will need to take the Septuagint manuscripts of Ezekiel (especially פ967) into account, with all the thorny issues that such witnesses raise.

730 Schwagmeier writes: “Der Konsonantenbestand des heute als masoretisches Ezechielbuch vorliegenden Ez-Texts ist die Überarbeitung eines älteren, im wesentlichen in der Vorlage des griechischen p967 in Vergleich mit MT indirekt greifbaren Buches” (Peter Schwagmeier, “Untersuchungen zu Textgeschichte und Entstehung des Ezechielbuches in masoretischer und griechischer Überlieferung,” [Dr.Theol. diss, Universität Zurich, 2004], 366). Unfortunately, Schwagmeier’s study came to my attention too late to inform the present work.

731 This approach is evident in the “holistic” approach popularized by Moshe Greenberg in his commentaries on Ezekiel in the Yale Anchor Bible series and taken up in many works since. The need to take the Septuagint evidence seriously and the relevance of the Septuagint for the development of the book of Ezekiel is a significant theme in Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, Ezechiel: Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion.
In view of the importance of the Septuagint for the study of Ezekiel, the goal of the present work is the analysis of a small but demanding corpus of Ezekiel in the Septuagint: the prophet’s vision of the idealized restoration in chapters 40-48.

Underwriting the present endeavor is the recognition that past forays into these chapters have often been undertaken with insufficient attention to the unique character of these chapters in the Septuagint, which results in a reductionistic understanding of how the translator approached his task. In view of Tov’s dictum that the “text-critical use of data in the LXX can proceed profitably only if the analysis of the translation technique of each individual translation unit is taken into account,” it seemed worthwhile to provide the beginnings of such an analysis of the Übersetzungsweise of ☢ Ezek 40-48 in order to facilitate more informed study of these chapters.732

Two questions have proven fundamental to this study: 1) what are the translator’s goals in rendering Ezek 40-48; and 2) which differences between ?????? and ☢ can be attributed to the redaction of the translator’s source text, and which are attributable to the translator? In many respects, understanding the translator’s general approach to his source text and the goals that can be inferred from his translation (question 1) enables one to determine whether differences found in the Septuagint translation are more likely to originate from the translator or from his source text (question 2). Those that cohere with the translator’s general goals are more likely to stem from the translator, while others probably reflect the translator’s Vorlage. For the specific case of Ezekiel 40-48, I find that deliberate, clarifying additions are generally more persuasively understood as

732 Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 18 [italics in original].
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deriving from the translator’s source text rather than the translator himself. Occasional pluses that clarify the sense of the Hebrew but that are unnecessary in Greek (e.g. Ezek 42:20b in §3.1.1.6 above) bear out this general principle.

The theoretical grounding for the study is provided by *Skopostheorie*, which recognizes that all translations fulfill a specific purpose and in some sense mediate the source text into a differing cultural context. Besides the need to render his source text into Greek accurately and comprehensibly, which the translator holds in common with the majority of the Jewish translators represented in the Septuagint, I have isolated two goals for the rendering of Ezekiel 40-48 into Greek. First, he conveyed the substance of Ezekiel’s prophecy using diction that signaled the transmission of an authoritative divine word. In other words, he reproduced the syntactical structures, flavor, and in most cases even the order of his source text (called a *philological* translation by the proponents of *Skopostheorie*) as a way to draw attention to the distance between his Greek-speaking audience and the source text. A complementary movement, one in which the translator seeks to ameliorate or interpret difficult or obsolete terms and so to facilitate understanding among those who receive his text, can be likewise discerned. Both movements (which may be termed the distancing and the bridging movements respectively) are intended to maximize the suasive appeal of Ezekiel’s final chapters in the Hellenistic environment of the translator.

In view of this environment, the translator interprets many of the technical terms for architecture in the temple description in terms of contemporary Greek architecture, thus updating the symbolic world of his source text. Likewise, his approach to several passages in Ezekiel’s description of the tribal outline reflects the reality of proselytism in
his own day. However, there seems to be no explicit actualizing prophecy in these chapters, contra the conclusions of van der Kooij. Taken together, the translator’s treatment of his source text supports the classification of Ezekiel 40-48 as an *operative* text, a category of texts that intends to persuade its listeners to adopt a certain point of view. In this case, the translator seems to have been concerned to present Ezekiel’s vision in terms that maintained its continued relevance in the present. If the utopian restoration described by Ezekiel had so far failed to materialize, the translator’s treatment of it suggests that he continued to hold out hope that it would. The reflection of some of the conventions of his own day may indicate that the translator hoped for a fulfillment of Ezekiel’s vision before too long, but of course this is no more than a guess.

Investigation of the translator’s *Vorlage* isolated numerous small pluses, particularly in the transitional sections of Ezekiel’s vision (40:1-4; 42:15-20; 43:1-12; 47:1-12). Analysis of these textual pluses demonstrated that in many cases, they are concerned with the relationship of Ezekiel’s final vision to the visions in the rest of the book, and supplement this final vision based on language common to the earlier ones. Such supplementation can occur where the language of the final vision is either subject to misunderstanding or is judged to be incomplete. Examination of pluses in Ezekiel’s legal code revealed that only in one clear instance (Ezek 45:15, the case of the tithe) was a law that contradicted the Pentateuch changed based on pentateuchal legislation. On the other hand, $\sigma^V$ Ezek 45:20 introduced a further deviation from pentateuchal norms into Ezekiel’s law code, which suggests that making Ezekiel’s laws agree with normative pentateuchal legislation was not the motivation behind the majority of these small pluses. Instead, such pluses are much more persuasively viewed as exegetically focused on the
smaller context of Ezekiel. As a result, pentateuchal analogues were employed not for the sake of assimilating Ezekiel’s laws to normative halakah but merely for their interpretive significance.

**Avenues for Further Research**

One important question has to do with the locus of the small pluses in $\text{V} \text{Ezek}$ 40-48 and how they came to be part of the authoritative text of the prophetic vision. Are these small pluses due to the work of *schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, evidence of apocalyptic or mystical schools reflecting on the prophet’s enigmatic visions, or some *tertium quid* yet to be identified? Perhaps the most likely explanation for these pluses situates them in Zadokite priestly circles as evidence of continued study and contemplation of Ezekiel. This would explain their interest in Ezekiel 40-48, which legitimated their authority, as well as in the possible halakhic meanings of his law code. If the impulse toward the kind of merkabah mysticism evident in Ezekiel (and especially in $\text{V} \text{Ezek}$ 43:2-3) owes something to priestly sensibilities, as Rachel Elior has argued, then this may provide further evidence for Zadokite involvement in these pluses.\(^{733}\) It remains to be seen if evidence in $\text{V} \text{Ezek}$ 1-39 might contribute toward answering this question.

Another outstanding issue is the relationship of the Vorlage of 6 Ezek 40-48, which bears a surprising concentration of secondary pluses relative to 77, to the Vorlage of 6 Ezek 1-39, which is generally shorter and earlier than 77. No doubt much of the explanation for these differences has to do with the fact that these exegetical pluses were added to the source text of the Septuagint after its separation from the ancestor of proto-77. Nevertheless, the significance of the concentration of these pluses in Ezekiel 40-48 remains to be explained. Is it possible that the translator used a different Vorlage, perhaps on a different scroll, than the one he used for the first 39 chapters? Whatever the answers to such questions, I hope to have demonstrated the centrality of understanding 77 and 6 Ezekiel as representing distinct literary editions of Ezekiel for informed study on this prophetic book.
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APPENDIX A:

THE ὁίκος, THE TEMPLE AND THE EASTERN GATE
The inner court and westward in Ezekiel’s temple
Legend to the Temple Diagrams

A  Seven steps (40:6, 22, 26)
B  The external eastern gate (40:6-16)
C  Chambers (παστοφορία; 40:17); no specific measurement or distribution around the walls given
D  Lower peristyle (τὸ περίστυλον τὸ ὑποκάτω; 40:17)
E  Small courtyard measuring 40 x 30 cubits. Within these are ἐξέδρατι (no specific number or measurement is given) under which are cook’s quarters (μαγειρεῖα) in which the people’s sacrifices are boiled (46:21-24).
F  Stoas behind the outer gates (40:18)
G  The inner east gate (40:32-34)
H  The inner north gate (40:35-37)
I  The altar of burnt offering (43:13-17)
J  The inner court (40:44, 47)
K  Ten steps (40:49)
L  The οἶκος (see larger diagram)
M  Hall/ arcade (ἐξέδρα) for the priests who keep the requirements of the house (40:45); measurements not given
N  Hall/ arcade (ἐξέδρα) for the priests who keep the ordinances of the altar (40:46); measurements not given
O  Place beside the north gate where there is an outflow (ἐκρυσίας) for the blood and refuse from the sacrifices washed (40:38)
P  Eight steps (40:31, 34, 37)
Q  The inner south gate (40:28-31)
R  Encircling wall (περίβολος; 40:5, 42:20)
S  The space between the chambers (ἐξέδραι) and the sides (πλεύραι) of the οἶκος is twenty cubits (41:10)
T  Open space (ἀπόλοιπος) behind the partition (41:13, 14, 15)
U  A breadth of five cubits (τοῦ φωτός τοῦ ἀπολοίπον) is given for the opening of the doors of the ἐξέδραι (a) (41:11)
V  The external northern gate (40:20-23)
W  The external southern gate (40:24-26)
X  Partition (τὸ διορίζον; 41:12), seventy cubits wide and ninety cubits long. As reconstructed, the intent of this partition is to shield the adytum from view.
Y  The priestly halls or arcades (ἐξέδραι) which together measure 100 cubits in length and 50 in width. It is uncertain whether there were 5 (Vaticanus) or 15 (Alexandrinus) of these structures.
Z  A peristyle of 10 cubits around the priestly chambers (Y) (42:4).
  a ἐξέδρατι of the inner court: of uncertain number and measurement (41:10-11). The breadth of space around them (5 cubits) differentiates them from the other ἐξέδραι (Y). These are also mentioned in 46:19-20 as the place where the priests boil the reparation and the purification offerings and bake the cereal offering.
b Porticoes (στοαί) in the priestly ἔξεδρα (Y), which are three stories in height and are arranged in a line facing one another (42:3-5)

c Outwork, or defensive rampart (προτείχισμα), of uncertain measurement and structure (40:5; 42:20).

d Περίπατος of the priestly halls, of ten cubits (42:4)
Legend to the Ὄικος

A Width of the jamb (αἷλ): 5 cubits (40:48)
B Width of the gate: 14 cubits (40:48)
C Ten steps (40:49)
D Sidewalls of the door of the vestibule (ἐπώμιδες τῆς θύρας τοῦ αἰλαμ): 3 cubits (40:48)
E Width (i.e. length) of the vestibule: 12 cubits (40:49)
F Length (i.e. width) of the vestibule: 20 cubits (40:49)
G One pillar on each side (40:49)
H Width of the jambs (αἰλαμ) on each side of the entrance: 6 cubits (41:1-2a)
I Width of the entrance: 10 cubits (41:2)
J Sidewalls (ἐπωμίς) of the entrance: 5 cubits (41:2)
K Width of the inner hall: 20 cubits (41:2)
L Length of the inner hall: 40 cubits (41:2)
M Sidewalls of the entrance: 7 cubits (41:3)
N Entrance (θύρωμα): 6 cubits (41:3)
O Jamb (αἷλ) of the entrance: 2 cubits (40:3)
P Width of the holy of holies: 20 cubits (41:4)
Q Length of the holy of holies: 40 cubits (41:4; 20 in מ)
R Width of the inner wall: 6 cubits (41:5)
S Space between the walls: 4 cubits (41:5). This is more a deduction from the total width than a clear statement of the text.
T Outer walls: 5 cubits (41:9)

Total width: 50 cubits (as in מ)
Total length: 120 cubits (20 greater than מ). The מ reading makes the המר equal in size to that of Solomon’s temple, which is a cube (20 x 20 x 20; 1 Kgs 7:19-20), although the height of the room is not indicated in Ezek 40:48-41:4.
The Eastern Gate According to 6 (Ezekiel 40:6-16)
Legend to the External Eastern Gate

α. Seven steps (40:6)

β. The width of the gate between the hinge-stones of the gate is the measurement provided by the phrase τὸ πλάτος τῆς θύρας τοῦ πυλῶνος in 40:11, according to Gese, Verfassungsentwurf, 137. Since the distance between the hinge stones is 10 (γ), it follows that the hinge-stones themselves are 1 ½ cubits in width. The exact placement of the hinge stones is uncertain.

γ. Width of the gate between the hinge stones (see β): 10 cubits (40:11)

δ. Width of the opening to the gate, without considering the hinge stones (τὸ εὔρος τοῦ πυλῶνος): 13 cubits (40:11)

ε. The vestibule of the gate (τὸ αἰλαμ τῆς πύλης) is equal to the reed, or six cubits (40:6)

ζ. “Gathered cubit” (πῆχυς ἐπισυναγόμενος) in front of the doors to the chambers, 1 cubit (square?) (40:12). I take the participle ἐπισυναγόμενος as denoting that the barrier is placed to one side of the room’s vestibule, but the placement of this barrier is uncertain.

η. Since the barrier amounts to a cubit, the remaining vestibule of the room is five cubits.

θ. It is clear that the pilaster between the first and second rooms measures six cubits in width (καὶ τὸ αἰλαμ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θαηλαθα πηχων ξ; 40:7) but the next mention of the pilaster is given as five cubits (40:7d).

ι. The length and width of the three rooms are repeatedly given as six cubits (40:6, 7, 8, 10).

κ. The pilasters (αἰλαμ) between the second and third rooms and the third room and the inner vestibule measure five cubits (40:7d: τὸ αἰλαμ πηχων πέντε). Although the measurement of the pilaster between the third room and the inner vestibule is not explicitly mentioned, the total length requires it to be five cubits wide.

λ. The small pilasters separating the inner vestibule of the gate from the inner courtyard measured two cubits. θ mentions both pilasters (καὶ τὰ αἱλευ; 40:9), somewhat unusually.

μ. The vestibule of the gate (τὸ αἰλαμ τοῦ πυλῶνος; 40:9), standing beside the pilaster of the gate; its length is eight cubits.

ν. The width of the vestibule, opening opposite opening, is 25 cubits (40:13). This does not count the width of the external walls.
APPENDIX B:
EXAMPLES OF DIVERGENCE IN WORD ORDER IN ❅ EZEKIEL 40-48

Ezek 40:17 // καὶ περίστυλα κύκλω τῆς αὐλῆς

Ezek 42:6 // καὶ στύλος οὗκ εἶχον καθώς οἱ στῦλοι τῶν ἑξωτέρων

Ezek 44:28 // καὶ κατάσχεσις αὐτοῖς οὐ δοθήσεται

Ezek 40:3 // καὶ εὖ τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἢν σπαρτίων οἰκοδόμων

Ezek 40:4 // ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἴδε

Ezek 44:2 // καὶ έπεν κύριος πρὸς με

Ezek 44:5 // καὶ έπεν κύριος πρὸς με

Demonstrative Pronouns
Ezek 40:45 // ἢ ἑξέδρα αὐτή
Ezek 45:22 // ἐν ἑκείνῃ ἢ ἡμέρᾳ

Adjectives
Ezek 44:17 // ἀπὸ τῆς πύλης τῆς ἑσωτέρας αὐλῆς

Numerals and Measurements

Ezek 40:6: יִקְּחֹת (πιχὼν ἕξ)
Ezek 40:11: תֵּשָׁעְּאָה (πιχὼν δέκα)
Ezek 40:12: יִקְּחֹת מַעֲשֵׂה (πιχὼν ἕξ ἐνθεν καὶ πιχὼν ἕξ ἐνθεν)
Ezek 40:13: ἱλαστήριον (πλάτος πίθεις εἴκοσι πέντε)
Ezek 40:15: מַעֲשֵׂה (πιχὼν πεντήκοντα)
Ezek 40:19: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις ἐκατόν)
Ezek 40:21: מַעֲשֵׂה (καὶ πιχὼν εἴκοσι πέντε τὸ εὖρος αὐτῆς)
Ezek 40:23: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις ἐκατόν)
Ezek 40:25: מַעֲשֵׂה (ἵρμος και πιχὼν εἴκοσι πέντε)
Ezek 40:27: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις ἐκατόν)
Ezek 40:29: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις πεντήκοντα τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ εὖρος πίθεις εἴκοσι πέντε)
Ezek 40:33: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις πεντήκοντα μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ εὖρος πίθεις εἴκοσι πέντε)
Ezek 40:36: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις πεντήκοντα μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ εὖρος πίθεις εἴκοσι πέντε)
Ezek 40:42: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεις καὶ ἡμίσους τὸ πλάτος καὶ πίθεων δύο καὶ ἡμίσους τὸ μῆκος καὶ ἐπὶ πίθεων τὸ ὀψυ)
Ezek 40:47: מַעֲשֵׂה (μῆκος πίθεων ἐκατόν καὶ εὖρος πίθεων ἐκατόν)
Ezek 40:48: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεων πέντε τὸ πλάτος ἐνθεν καὶ πίθεων πέντε ἐνθεν... πίθεων τριών ἐνθεν καὶ πίθεων τριών ἐνθεν)
Ezek 40:49: מַעֲשֵׂה (καὶ τὸ μῆκος τοῦ αἰλαμ πίθεων εἴκοσι καὶ τὸ εὖρος πίθεων δώδεκα)
Ezek 41:1: מַעֲשֵׂה (πίθεων ἕξ τὸ πλάτος ἐνθεν καὶ πίθεων ἕξ τὸ εὖρος τοῦ αἰλαμ ἐνθεν)
Ezek 41:2: מַעֲשֵׂה (καὶ τὸ εὖρος τοῦ πυλῶνος πίθεων δέκα, καὶ ἐπώμιδες τοῦ πυλῶνος πίθεων πέντε ἐνθεν καὶ πίθεων πέντε ἐνθεν· καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ μῆκος αὐτοῦ πίθεων τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τὸ εὖρος πίθεων εἴκοσι)

735 This excludes the differences between Ezek 40:6-10, where $\Theta$ seems to have been different than $\Pi$. 
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Ezek 41:3 // καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ αἶλ τοῦ θυρώματος πιθῶν δύο καὶ τὸ θύρωμα πιθῶν ἕξ καὶ τὸ θύρωμα πιθῶν ἑξ καὶ τὰς ἐπωμίδας τοῦ θυρώματος πιθῶν ἐπτὰ

Ezek 41:4 // καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ μῆκος τῶν θυρῶν πιθῶν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ εὐρός πιθῶν εἴκοσι

Ezek 41:5 // καὶ διεμέτρησεν τὸν τοίχον τοῦ οίκου πιθῶν ἕξ καὶ τὸ εὐρὸς τῆς πλευρᾶς πιθῶν τεσσάρων κυκλοθεν

Ezek 41:8 // πίχεων ἔξε διάστημα

Ezek 41:9 // πιθῶν πέντε

Ezek 41:10 // εὐρὸς πιθῶν εἴκοσι

Ezek 41:11 // πιθῶν πέντε πλάτος κύκλοθεν

Ezek 41:12 // καὶ τὸ διορίζον ... πιθῶν ἐβδομήκοντα, πλάτος τοῦ τοίχου του διορίζοντος πιθῶν πέντε, εὐρὸς κυκλοθεν καὶ μῆκος αὐτοῦ πιθῶν ἐνείκοντα

Ezek 41:13 // μῆκος πιθῶν ἐκατόν, καὶ τὰ ἄπολοιπα καὶ τὰ διορίζοντα καὶ οἱ τοίχοι αὐτῶν μῆκος πιθῶν ἐκατόν

Ezek 41:14 // πιθῶν ἐκατόν

Ezek 41:15 // πιθῶν ἐκατόν

Ezek 41:22 // πιθῶν τριῶν τὸ ὑψος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ μῆκος πιθῶν δύο

Ezek 42:1 // καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ τοίχον πλάτος τοῦ κόρδου του διορίζοντος τοῦ τοίχου πιθῶν ἐκατόν

Ezek 42:2 // περίπατος πιθῶν δέκα τὸ πλάτος, ἐπὶ πίχεως ἐκατόν τὸ μῆκος

Ezek 42:4 // πεπτήκοντα πιθῶν πέντε // πεπτήκοντα πιθῶν ἐκατόν τὸ μῆκος

Ezek 42:7 // πεπτήκοντα

Ezek 42:8 // ὁτι τὸ μῆκος τῶν ἐξεδρῶν ... πιθῶν πεπτήκοντα, καὶ αὐτὰ εἰσὶ ἀντιπρόσωποι ταῦτας τὸ πάν πιθῶν ἐκατόν

Ezek 42:17 // πίχεως πεντακοσίων

Ezek 42:20 // πεντακοσίων πιθῶν εὐρος

Ezek 43:14 // πιθῶν δύο καὶ τὸ εὐρὸς πίχεως ... πίχεως τέσσαρες καὶ εὐρὸς πίχεως

Ezek 43:15 // καὶ τὸ αριθμὸν πιθῶν τεσσάρων, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αριθμὸν καὶ ὑπεράνω τῶν κεράτων πίχεως

736 Reading with וק. 300
Ezek 45:2 // καὶ πίχεις πεντήκοντα διάστημα αὐτῷ κυκλόθεν
Ezek 46:22 // μήκος πηχῶν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ εὐρος πηχῶν
tριάκοντα
APPENDIX C:

SELECT TECHNICAL TERMS
AND THE TRANSLATOR'S LEXICAL FLEXIBILITY

1. Greek Terms and their Hebrew Hyponyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Term</th>
<th>Hebrew References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄγιον</td>
<td>41:4, 21b, 23; 42:13 [3x], 14a-b, 20; 43:21; 44:5, 13 [3x]; 45:1 [2x], 6, 7 [2x]; 46:19; 48:10a, 12 [2x], 14, 18 [2x], 20, 21 (= קדש)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπόλυτος</td>
<td>43:12 (= הבדית)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γείσος</td>
<td>41:9, 11 [2x] (= מנוח)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάστημα</td>
<td>41:6 (= באת)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄξεδρα</td>
<td>40:44, 45, 46; 41:10; 42:1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 [3x]; 44:19; 46:19 (= ליישב)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: References are from the text provided.
46:23 [2x] (= טור)
41:11 not in מ
not used in ג outside Ezekiel 40-48

θύρα 40:11; 41:11 [3x] (= מחנה)
41:24 (=:')
46:12 (= שער)
40:48; 41:4; 42:9?
1 Kgdms 6:31, 32, 34; 7:36 (= מ 7:50); 16:34 (=')
1 Kgdms 7:42 (= מחנה)

θύρωμα 40:38; 41:3 [3x]; 42:4, 11, 12 (= מחנה)
40:48 (= שער)
41:23, 24 [4x], 25 (=')
1 Kgdms 6:31; 7:42 (= מ 7:5)
1 Kgdms 7:36 (= מ 7:50)

μέτρον 40:3, 5, 10 [ביס], 21, 24, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35; 42:11 [reading כמו כמארח], 16, 17, 18, 19; 43:13; 46:22; 48:16, 30, 33 (= מוד)
45:10, 11 [ביס], 13a; 46:14 (= אפיות)
47:3

νότος 40:24, 27, 28, 44, 45; 41:11; 42:12, 13, 19 (= דרומ)
46:9; 47:1, 19 [ביס]; 48:10, 16, 17, 33 (= ננב)

περίπατος 42:4 (= מהלך)
42:5 (= לשבח)
42:10 (not in מ)
42:11, 12 (= דרדר)

περίστυλον 40:17, 18; 42:3 (= רצפת)
42:5 (= הארק)
2 Macc 4:46; 3 Macc 5:23

προτεῖχισμα 40:5 (= בנין)
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2. Hebrew Hyponyms and their Greek Renderings
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αφα 
μέτρον 45:10, 11 [bis], 13a; 46:14 
οιφι 45:13b 
pέμμα 45:24 [tris]; 46:5 [bis], 7 [tris], 11 [tris]

αρτικ 
ἀπόλοιπον 41:15b 
ὑπόφανοις 41:16 
στοά 42:3 
περίστυλον 42:5

βη 
προτείχισμα 40:5 
τὸ διορίζον 41:12, 15; 42:1, 10 
στοά 42:5

β 
χοινίζ 45:10, 11 [bis] 
κοτύλη 45:14 [bis]

βολ 
γείσος 43:13, 17 
ὁριον 43:12; 45:1, 7; 47:13, 15, 16 [tris], 17 [tris]; 48:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 21 [bis], 22 [bis], 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 [bis] 
βάσις 43:20 
ἐρωτήμα τοῦ 40:12 
διορίζω / ὁρίζω 47:18, 20 (= מִבלי)

γνώ 
ἀπόλοιπος 41:12, 13, 14, 15; 42:1, 10 
διαστήμα 42:13

θωμή 
περίβολος 40:5 
τείχος 26:4, 9?, 10, 12; 27:11; 38:11, 20 
ἐρωτήμα 42:20

σω 
ἐξέδρα 46:23 [bis] 
στίχος Exod 28:18, 19, 20; 39:11, 12, 13; 3 Kgdms 6:26 [bis]; 7:2 (= ὅ 7:39), 3 (= ὅ 7:39), 12 (= ὅ 7:49), 18 (= ὅ 7:6), 42 (= ὅ 7:28)
παστοροφία 40:17 [bis], 38
έξέδρα 40:44, 45, 46; 41:10; 42:1 (adds the descriptor πέντε here), 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 [tris]; 44:19; 46:19
περίπατος 42:5
tοῦ κατοικεῖν 45:5

πορεία Jon 3:3, 4; Neh 2:6

κλιμακτήρ 40:22, 26, 31, 34, 37; 43:17
ἀναβαθμός 40:6, 49

μέρος 46:21a
κλίτος 46:21b-c [bis], 22
γωνία Exod 26:23, 24
41:22: not in δ

σπουδαίος 41:25
ζυγών 41:26

ιλαστήριον 43:14 [tris], 17, 20
ιερόν 45:19
αὐλή 2 Par. 4:9; 6:13

πλευρά 41:5
πλευρόν 41:6 [4x], 7, 8, 9 [bis], 26
έξέδρα 41:11

θύρα 40:11; 41:11
πύλη 40:13 [bis]
θύρωμα 40:38; 42:4, 11
πρόθυρα 46:3; 47:1
πυλών 41:2, 3
φάτνωμα 41:20
40:48; 41:17; 42:2, 12 [bis]?

τοῖχος 41:5, 6 [bis], 9, 12, 13, 17, 22; 43:8
άγιος 41:25
41:20?


ראמה

περίστυλον 40:17; 42:3
στοά 40:18
42:5?
λιθόστρωτον 2 Par. 7:3; Est 1:6
otherwise a personal name

שערה

θύρα 40:11
πύλη 40:3, 6 [bis], 13, 40